

Temporal Planning via Interval Logic Satisfiability for Autonomous Systems

Miquel Ramirez, Anubhav Singh, Peter J. Stuckey, Chris Manzie

Abstract—Many automated planning methods and formulations rely on suitably designed abstractions or simplifications of the constrained dynamics associated with agents to attain computational scalability. We consider formulations of temporal planning where intervals are associated with both action and fluent atoms, and relations between these are given as sentences in Allen’s Interval Logic. We propose a notion of planning graphs that can account for complex concurrency relations between actions and fluents as a Constraint Programming (CP) model. We test an implementation of our algorithm on a state-of-the-art framework for CP and compare it with PDDL 2.1 planners that capture plans requiring complex concurrent interactions between agents. We demonstrate our algorithm outperforms existing PDDL 2.1 planners in the case studies. Still, scalability remains challenging when plans must comply with intricate concurrent interactions and the sequencing of actions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Temporal planning is an optimization problem where solutions are given by sets of actions, or *plans*, which need to be chosen in such a way that certain requirements are met. Actions abstract the set of possible behaviours that are available to steer a given dynamical system. We distinguish three types of requirements on actions. The first is that of *suitability and relevance* of an action to bring about some task or goal. For instance, we may need to transport cargo between locations, using as efficiently as possible a given set of automated vehicles. Actions that move vehicles between locations are relevant as long as a vehicle has been tasked with running cargo between those locations. Other actions that abstract the handling of cargo become relevant as well for the same reason. The second requirement is that of *sequencing*, where there are restrictions on the ordering of the temporal extent of an action. For instance, the actions for handling cargo and moving the vehicle need to be ordered in a causally and temporally consistent way. The action to move the vehicle cannot temporally overlap with cargo handling activities, and clearly loading cargo at the source must happen before unloading it at the destination. The third and last requirement is that of *concurrency*, in which some action in a plan requires some formal property of vehicle or other entities “states” (a *fluent*)




Fig. 1. An architecture for (semi)-autonomous system, boxes represent physical and/or computational processes, arrows indicate information exchanged between these.

to be true throughout its execution or to overlap with it in some specific manner. An example of this in our cargo transportation example, follows from observing that handling cargo will require to have other robots or human workers present at the source or destination location, ready to load or unload the cargo. These restrictions can be represented implicitly in terms of preconditions, effects, and invariants [1], given as logical formulas over sets of fluents, or given explicitly as temporal constraints between pairs of time-points that define time intervals with fluents associated to them [2], [3], [4].

This paper proposes a formulation of temporal planning in which actions are given concrete meaning, that of *atoms* in so-called Motion Description Languages (MDL) [5], [6], [7]. Figure 1 depicts an abstract architecture for semi-autonomous systems where boxes are *processes* and arrows indicate information flows, and we will refer to as *teleo-reactive* [8]. The *physical system* to be controlled is represented by a standard input-output model [9], where a continuous time, multi-dimensional input signal $u(t)$ is applied on the system affecting the temporal evolution of $y(t)$ the system output. Autonomy in this architecture is achieved by coupling a *deliberative* component, in our case a temporal planner (TP) that comes up with plans π , with an *executive* (EC) component that defines $u(t)$ *online*, scheduling the execution of MDL atoms that actions in plans π are mapped to. Inputs to temporal planners are specifications, in some suitably defined formal language, of the *goals* that the plan must achieve, and *constraints* on plans. In this paper, these constraints include the definition of the mappings between actions and MDL atoms, the representation of the suitability, relevance, sequencing and concurrency requirements discussed earlier in this section, and any suitable abstractions of properties of $y(t)$, or *fluents*, such as its value being inside some set for a set amount of time. Communication between the executive and deliberative components takes place mediated by a symbolic interface, embodied in Figure 1 by a process of *abstraction*

Manuscript uploaded to Arxiv on 14th June 2024 by M. Ramirez.

M. Ramirez is with The University of Melbourne, Dept. of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Parkville VIC 3052 Australia (e-mail: first-name.lastname@unimelb.edu.au)

A. Singh is with The University of Toronto, Dept. of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, Toronto ON M5S 3G8 Canada

P. J. Stuckey is with Monash University, Dept. of Data Science & AI, Clayton VIC 3168 Australia

C. Manzie is with The University of Melbourne, Dept. of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Parkville VIC 3052 Australia

and approximation, that is defined offline and determines which fluents are true at any given point in time, and so the (abstract) initial configuration of the physical system to be considered by the temporal planner. We end these introductory remarks with the observation that two control strategies coexist in our architecture, operating at two different time-scales. Namely, the deliberative level follows an *open-loop control* strategy, suitable for the pursuit of long-term goals, that sets the expectations on the outcomes to be achieved by the input signal $u(t)$ generated by the executive levels. On the other hand, the executive level follows a *closed-loop control* strategy, and uses feedback from the controlled system to compensate for disturbance while tracking the plan. The executive level may fail to bring about the outcomes expected by plans. Such eventuality, covered by the control theoretic interpretation of MDL atoms, and to be discussed later in the paper, puts a hold on the autonomous operation of the executive layer, requiring a revision of the plan, either incremental, or from scratch.

A. Related Work

Our work belongs to the line of inquiry into temporal planning that decomposes the problem into a causal reasoning task over suitably defined *knowledge graphs* [10], to identify what actions are present in the plan, and a numerical optimization task over (disjunctions of) linear constraints, that define the set of valid schedules for the chosen actions. Early work focused on directly applying Blum and Furst planning graphs in temporal settings [11], [12], [13]. The atemporal, partially-ordered plans that result from reachability analysis are then mapped onto a temporal constraint satisfaction problem (TCSP). The resulting TCSP can then be solved off-the-shelf with standard Optimization and Satisfiability technology for scheduling problems [14]. The flow of information between the procedures for reachability analysis in planning graphs search and solving TCSPs is limited in these early approaches. This issue is compounded by the inability of Blum and Furst planning graphs, designed for the STRIPS assumptions on action structure, to capture plans with non-trivial concurrent interactions between actions [12], [15].

Research split into three major approaches in response: Heuristic Search methods that hybridize approximate dynamic programming, using heuristics for reachability analysis over *relaxed planning graphs* [16], and consistency checking of TCSPs [17], [18], [19], Constraint Programming (CP) algorithms [20] that integrate planning graph analysis into constraint propagation and backtracking search, and Satisfiability Modulo Theory (SMT) approaches [21], [22], [23], [24], [25] that propose their own or use off-the-shelf lazy or eager versions of the DPLL(T) algorithm for SMT [26]. In these, the satisfiability of a Boolean theory in Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF) captures Blum and Furst reachability analysis [27], and sub-theories, usually linear arithmetic over the rationals or the integers, are used to represent the TCSPs that follow from selecting actions in plans. All of the above provides integrated reasoning over planning graphs and TCSPs, tackling some limitations of early decomposition approaches.

Notable works that rely on formulations of temporal planning distinct from the ones above include timeline-based

planners [3] such as NASA’s EUROPA [28], or more recently, the work led by A. Bit-Monnot [4]. All of these approaches use expressive temporal logic [29] to represent and reason over properties of plans and rely on Optimization or SMT technology. Still, they struggle to scale up as “larger” plans are required to solve instances, and their ability to capture complex concurrent interactions is limited. Our ideas to represent complex temporal structures are inspired by this line of research while taking note of lessons learned from existing research into action-centric PDDL 2.1 formulations of temporal planning. Also reliant on Allen’s are works is the work on the representation and analysis of plans defined over timelines [30], [31]. We acknowledge the novelty of the timeline-based representations discussed in these papers with respect with to earlier works discussed above, based on the same representation paradigm. We note that our approach formulates key concepts such as frame axioms in a very different manner as these works, and we are focus on the problem of *synthesizing* plans from given specifications, rather than assuming that the plan is obtained from an oracle and *analyzing* whether certain properties hold throughout their execution.

B. Contributions

This paper proposes a novel formulation of temporal planning that is aligned and consistent with the theoretical foundations and established engineering practices [9] to design and analyze dynamical systems like those in Figure 1. Our formulation relies on discrete timelines. This ensures that the resulting optimization problem is a decidable one [32], yet intractable in general, so the challenge lies in proposing algorithms that scale up. We assume that the minimum duration of any time period considered in a plan matches that of the control cycle set for the control system. We propose a novel notion of planning graphs, encoded as a CP model, that results from the synthesis of Van den Briel et al. [33] Integer Programming formulation of classical planning, and Allen’s Interval Logic. Crucially, our notion of planning graphs, or rather, *timing diagrams* [34], overcome the long-standing limitations [12] of Blum & Furst’s seminal approach to express concurrent interactions between the preconditions and effects of actions in the plan.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Interval Logic

Allen’s Interval Logic (IL) [35], [29] is a temporal logic whose atoms follow from pairing two classes of abstract objects pieces of time, or *intervals*, and Boolean predicates. The latter are *atoms* in some decidable first-order theory [36] we will refer to as *domain theory*, and we denote by T . Theories T are given by a *signature* Σ that specifies constant, predicate and function symbols, and their *axioms*, sets of closed well-formed first-order formulas which only use symbols in Σ and standard logical connectives. The domain theory signature is augmented, if necessary, with the signature of the Theory of the Integers $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$, with *standard* interpretation [36, Chapter 3]. Along with a domain theory T we will also consider a *finite*

set of variables V . All of this enables to represent and reason about the existence of time intervals with specific properties.

Time intervals are *periods* or *moments* in time, given by either constants in Σ or variables in V . We map the notions of time periods and moments onto those of time *interval* and *points*, respectively, as formalized by [37]. We start by setting the *time domain* \mathbb{T} to be a subset of the integers \mathbb{Z}_0^+ , whose smallest element is 0. A *time interval* I is a non-empty, convex subset of \mathbb{T} given by two numbers $l, r \in \mathbb{Z}_0^+$. We consider one kind of interval in this paper. A *half-open* interval I is a set

$$I := \{t \in \mathbb{T} : l \leq t < r\}$$

and we refer to them in a compact fashion as $I = [l, r)$, where l (resp. r) is the smallest or *left* (largest or *right*) time-point in I , we refer to l and r collectively as the *bounds* of I . We will use the notation l_I and r_I to refer to the points used to define an interval I . We denote the *size* or volume of intervals I by $|I|$, and observe that $|I| = r - l$.

TABLE I
THE PREDICATES OF INTERVAL LOGIC EXCLUDING *meets*.

Relation	Notation	Relation	Notation
X equal to Y	$X = Y$	X met-by Y	$X \sim^* Y$
X before Y	$X \prec Y$	X after Y	$X \succ Y$
X contains Y	$X \supset Y$	X during Y	$X \subset Y$
X started by Y	$X \uparrow^* Y$	X starts Y	$X \uparrow Y$
X finished by Y	$X \downarrow^* Y$	X finishes Y	$X \downarrow Y$
X overlapped by Y	$X \frown^* Y$	X overlaps Y	$X \frown Y$

Allen’s IL is based on two basic predicates (binary relations). The first one is used to assert that an atomic formula, or *property*, φ in $\text{Atoms}(\Sigma)$ *holds through* time interval I . We denote this by $\varphi@I$, a contraction of Allen’s original notation *holds*(φ, I). We will refer to formulas $\phi@I$ where I is non-singular, i.e. $|I| > 0$, as Temporally Qualified Assertions (TQA) [38]. The second basic predicate is a relation over interval pairs X and Y that holds whenever X and Y are *adjacent* or *meeting*. We thus say that X *meets* Y ($X \sim Y$) if both X and Y are closed, and there is no interval Z such that $X \sim Z$, $Z \sim Y$, $l_Z > r_X$ and $r_Z < l_Y$. Twelve other predicates can be derived from $X \sim Y$ [35] and are shown in Table I.

1) *Syntax and Semantics*: An IL sentence φ is a quantifier-free first-order formula that includes both TQAs and atoms of predicates in Table I, which we will refer to as *temporal constraints*, using variables in V and constants in Σ to denote the bounds of intervals in \mathbb{T} . IL formulas are interpreted over some subset \mathcal{I} of **half-open** intervals in \mathbb{T} , and a *history* $h : \mathbb{T} \times \Phi \rightarrow \{\top, \perp\}$ [39, Chapter 3], where $\Phi = \text{Atoms}(\Sigma)$. We say that the interpretation given by pairing set \mathcal{I} with history h satisfies an IL formula φ , denoted by $\mathcal{I}, h \models \varphi$, when

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}, h \models \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2, & \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{I}, h \models \psi_1 \text{ and } \mathcal{I}, h \models \psi_2 \\ \mathcal{I}, h \models \psi_1 \vee \psi_2, & \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{I}, h \models \psi_1, \text{ or } \mathcal{I}, h \models \psi_2, \text{ or both} \\ \mathcal{I}, h \models \varphi@X & \quad \text{iff } h(t, \varphi) \mapsto \top, \text{ for all } t \in X \\ \mathcal{I}, h \models X \sim Y, & \quad \text{iff } r_X = l_Y \\ \mathcal{I}, h \models X \prec Y, & \quad \text{iff } r_X < l_Y \\ \mathcal{I}, h \models X \succ Y, & \quad \text{iff } l_X > r_Y \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}, h \models X \supset Y, & \quad \text{iff } l_X < l_Y, r_Y < r_X \\ \mathcal{I}, h \models X \uparrow Y, & \quad \text{iff } l_X = l_Y \text{ and } r_X < r_Y \\ \mathcal{I}, h \models X \downarrow Y, & \quad \text{iff } r_X = r_Y \text{ and } l_X < l_Y \\ \mathcal{I}, h \models X = Y, & \quad \text{iff } l_X = l_Y \text{ and } r_X = r_Y \\ \mathcal{I}, h \models X \frown Y, & \quad \text{iff } l_X < l_Y, l_Y < r_X \text{ and } r_X < r_Y \\ \mathcal{I}, h \models \varphi@X \bowtie \phi@Y, & \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{I}, h \models \varphi@X, \mathcal{I}, h \models \phi@Y, \\ & \quad \mathcal{I}, h \models X \bowtie Y \end{aligned}$$

X and Y above are *interval variables* referring to elements of \mathcal{I} , and \bowtie is one of the temporal relations in Table I. The interpretations for $X \sim^* Y$, $X \subset Y$, $X \uparrow^* Y$, $X \downarrow^* Y$ and $X \frown^* Y$ follow from swapping X for Y in the rules given above for \sim , \supset , \uparrow , \downarrow , and \frown , respectively.

The language of temporal constraints allowed by the relations above is very rich, as one can compose via disjunction any combination of the basic relations above, giving rise to 2^{13} composite predicates [35], [40]. Two such composite predicates are of particular interest for reasoning about plan existence. The first one is the *disjoint* relation, which we define as follows

$$X \parallel Y \equiv X \prec Y \vee Y \prec X \vee X \sim Y \vee Y \sim X \quad (1)$$

and the second one being the *inclusion* relation, defined as

$$X \sqsupset Y \equiv X \supset Y \vee X \uparrow Y \vee X \downarrow Y \quad (2)$$

We conclude the discussion of IL by introducing the formal properties that serve as the foundations of our methods for reasoning about plan existence. Using (2) Allen introduces the following *homogeneity axiom*

Axiom 1: Let \mathcal{I} and h be a set of intervals and a history as defined above. Whenever formula φ holds over an interval X , i.e. $\mathcal{I}, h \models \varphi@X$, then φ holds during each subinterval Y

$$\varphi@X \leftrightarrow (\forall Y. X \sqsupset Y \rightarrow \varphi@Y) \quad (3)$$

and shows [39, Chapter 1] the Theorem below to follow

Theorem 1: Let \mathcal{I} and h be as above, φ a formula in $\text{Atoms}(\Sigma)$, and \vdash a proof system based on resolution. Whenever (1) $\mathcal{I}, h \models \varphi@X$, (2) $\mathcal{I}, h \models \psi@Y$ and (3) $\psi \wedge \neg\varphi \vdash \perp$, are true, then $\mathcal{I}, h \models \varphi@X \wedge \psi@Y$ if $\mathcal{I}, h \models X \parallel Y$.

Remark 1: The Axiom and Theorem introduced above are crucial to define the structure of plans, understood as a description of both fluents, properties whose truth changes throughout the execution of a plan, and actions, that represent processes that drive change in the truth of fluents. Allen’s principle of homogeneity allows us to “decompose” any TQA into sequences of adjacent TQAs for the same atom but shorter time spans. Theorem 1 grounds the concept of “mutual exclusion” to serialize access or changes in the state of “resources” required by actions.

B. Motion Description Languages

We now introduce the notion of Motion Description Language (MDL) following the presentation due to Egerstedt [5] for the most part, and we note below the changes we propose. Given a finite set, or alphabet, A , we define a generic sequence by $\mathbf{a} = a_1 a_2 \dots a_m$, which can be interpreted as partial




Fig. 2. Refinement of Figure 1 in which we identify two new sub-systems in the executive control (supervisor and control) and physical system models (plant and measurement). The diagram also makes explicit the possibility of plans defining the control for multiple autonomous systems that need to act in a co-ordinated manner. See text for details and discussion.

functions from \mathbb{N} to A , and thus we will refer to a_i by $\mathbf{a}(i)$. The set of all such sequences is denoted by $Seq(A)$, and we denote its so-called Kleene closure by $A^* = Seq(A) \cup \{\epsilon\}$, where ϵ is the empty sequence. There is a naturally defined binary operation in this set, namely the concatenation of sequences or strings, denoted by $\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot \mathbf{a}_2 \in A^*$ if $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2 \in A^*$. With respect to this operation, A^* is a *monoid*, a semigroup w.r.t. concatenation with an identity element, the empty string. All formal languages L are a subset of A^* .

A *motion alphabet* is a possibly infinite set of symbols that represent control actions that, when applied to a specific system, define segments of motion. A MDL is thus given by such a set of symbolic strings that represent idealized motions, and these strings become meaningful only when the language is defined relative to the physical system that is to be controlled. Following [5] we let the system dynamics be given by functions

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u) \quad (4)$$

$$y = h(x) \quad (5)$$

where x , u and y are *functions* from \mathbb{R} to some subset of \mathbb{R}^n . The domains of these functions represent time, and their codomains correspond, respectively, to sets of states or configurations X , inputs U , and outputs Y . We will refer to these functions as state, input and output *signals*, and to their codomains as state, input and output *spaces*. The differential equation (4) specifies a family of mappings $F : X^{\mathbb{R}} \times U^{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow X^{\mathbb{R}}$, that is, of *pairs of functions* whose domains are the reals and codomains are respectively X and U , to a function with real-valued domain and its codomain being X . Such mappings regulate how inputs change system states. The mapping $h : X^{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow Y^{\mathbb{R}}$ assigns an output value to each point $x \in X$. Figure 2 refines the notion of ‘‘Physical System’’ in Figure 1 by identifying two subsystems¹ which we have labelled ‘‘Plant’’ and ‘‘Measurement’’, that correspond with (4) and (5).

Egerstedt’s framework is one amongst many possible approaches to decompose control strategies for complex systems into basic building blocks, often referred to as *behaviors*, *modes*, or *skills* [8]. We will use the latter term as is the most specific and unambiguous one to refer to the elements of the motion alphabet A . We say that a *skill* $a \in A$ is given

¹The notion of *system* in Control Theory refers to any mapping between suitably defined functions.

by a tuple $a = (\mu, \kappa, \xi)$ where $\mu \in U$ is the *open-loop component*, $\kappa : Y \times U \rightarrow U$ is the *closed-loop component*, and $\xi : Y \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a Boolean function referred to as the *motion interrupt*. We will denote the components of a skill a as μ_a , κ_a and ξ_a . Given a MDL string $\mathbf{a} \in A^*$, we denote the components of the i -th skill $\mathbf{a}(i)$ in the string by μ_i , κ_i and ξ_i . We also note that skills are always associated with a *single entity* in the system, or *actor*. We will denote the number of actors in the system with the letter M . An actor could be, for instance, a mobile robot, but also a manipulator or a sensor on a mobile robot, that is endowed with some degree of autonomy. A plan π is thus an M -tuple of strings $(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_M)$ where $\mathbf{a}_j \in A^*$ and $j = 1, \dots, M$, that assigns to each actor j a string. We assume that the set of plans to be a non-empty set $\Pi \subset (A^*)^M$. In Figure 2 we have two actors, so $M = 2$, that are physically independent but their control is coupled through the assigned MDL strings, chosen jointly to be part of a plan.

Let us consider that an actor in our system receives a string \mathbf{a} of length q , then its state signal x satisfies the following differential equations

$$\dot{x} = f(x, \kappa_1(y, \mu_1)) \quad t_0 \leq t < T_1$$

$$\vdots \quad \vdots$$

$$\dot{x} = f(x, \kappa_i(y, \mu_i)) \quad T_{i-1} \leq t < T_i$$

$$\vdots \quad \vdots$$

$$\dot{x} = f(x, \kappa_q(y, \mu_q)) \quad T_{q-1} \leq t < T_q$$

where $i = 1, \dots, q$ and T_i is the time at which interrupt ξ_i changes from 0 to 1. Egerstedt proposes a simple trigger-based hybrid system to reproduce the above

$$\dot{x} = f(x, \kappa_{[p]}(y, \mu_{[p]})) \quad (6a)$$

$$y = h(x) \quad (6b)$$

$$\dot{p} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \xi_{[p]}(t, y) = 0 \\ \delta_t & \text{if } \xi_{[p]}(t, y) = 1 \end{cases} \quad (6c)$$

where δ_t is Dirac’s *delta function* or unit impulse at time t , $x(0) = x_0$ is a given initial condition, and $p(0) = 1$. In words, a new signal $p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ is introduced which is used as a *clock* to track progress in the execution of the string \mathbf{a} assigned by the plan. We note that the solution to the differential equation (6c) will increase p by one whenever the interrupt $\xi(y)$ evaluates to 1. In the context of the theory of hybrid systems [41], Egerstedt’s framework is notable in that a discrete clock signal with variable rate triggers transitions between skills, rather than considering a clock signal with constant rate.

C. Supervisory Control

In order to address systems with more than one actor, we propose two modest changes to Egerstedt’s system model [5]. First, we introduce the notion of a *controller* function $g : Y \times A \rightarrow U$ that is defined as $g(y, a) = \kappa_a(y, \mu_a)$ where κ_a and μ_a are the closed-loop and open-loop components of skill a . Secondly, we have an explicit component that acts as

an interface between the deliberative and executive levels, the *supervisor*. The supervisor component implements (6c), and as depicted in Figure 2, the supervisor is a function $s : \mathbb{R} \times Y \times \Pi \rightarrow A$ that takes as an input time, the output signals of the M actors in the system ($M = 2$ in Fig. 2), and the plan chosen by the planner to produce M parallel action signals $a_j(t) = \mathbf{a}(p)$, identifying the skill that is under execution at any point in time by actor j .

III. THEORIES OF TEMPORAL PLANNING

In this section we describe a framework to interpret a planning problem as that of determining the satisfiability of an Interval Logic theory, such as the ones described in section II-A. We will denote the theory whose models describe the structure of plans and their executions by T_P . We also observe that these theories do not exist in a vacuum, but rather are suitable abstractions of other, more complex theories, which we denote by T_S , or *system theories*. Section II-B introduces the signature and some of the axioms that define such theories. We note that more general and expressive theories can be built for complex control systems, but for the purposes of this paper we think that Egerstedt’s framework strikes the right balance between being rigorous enough to justify our modeling choices when describing T_P , and being sufficiently flexible to account for robotic systems of real-world interest. Clearly, for any given system S and theory T_S , many planning theories T_P are possible, all related by several common components and differing on choices of axioms or some elements of their signature. Hence, what follows is best understood as a collection of axiom and symbol *schemata* [36], that are instantiated as it best suits to account for the particular characteristics of T_S .

A. Assumptions

We start by introducing some assumptions on the structure of Egerstedt’s MDL framework, which will facilitate our discussion. We start defining the *duration* of skills a

Definition 1: Let A be an MDL alphabet, and $\delta : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a function that maps skills $a \in A$ to their *maximal duration*, that is the largest value that $T_i - T_{i-1}$, for $i > 1$, and $T_1 - t_0$ can take when a appears at position i (resp. 1) of a control string $\mathbf{a} \in L_S$, the MDL for system S .

Assumption 1: We will assume that $\delta(a)$ is always *finite* and furthermore, $\delta(a) \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ for all $a \in A$.

By adopting the above all the intervals I will have positive and finite size $|I|$. It does also imply that the plans for T_P will be *conservative* when it comes to quantify the efficiency of plans π with respect to their *makespan* [14], and that skill control functions κ_a will steer S to states where ξ_a is true in finite time.

Egerstedt’s framework does not interrogate the structure of skill triggers ξ_a . We observe that it is commonly the case that triggers are defined by combining simpler Boolean functions, that are used by several skills a . We formalize this observation with the following

Assumption 2: Let $a \in A$ be a skill in a MDL alphabet, with trigger ξ_a . We assume that ξ_a is as follows

$$\xi_a(y) = \prod_{i=1}^{n_a} \phi_i(y), \quad \phi_i(y) = \llbracket y \in Y_\phi \rrbracket, \quad \phi_i \in \Phi_A$$

That is, each trigger ξ_a is the product of $n_a > 0$ Boolean functions $\phi \in \Phi_A$, which we will refer to as *fluents*, and are defined to be the *Iverson bracket* [42] for the property that output y belongs to set $Y_\phi \subset Y$. We note that the sets Y_ϕ need not be disjoint.

The third assumption we make is the alphabet A is partitioned in the following way

Assumption 3: Let A an MDL alphabet. We assume that there exist subsets of A , A_p and A_e , that satisfy the following conditions: (1) $A = A_p \cup A_e$, (2) $A_p \cap A_e = \emptyset$, and (3) for every $a \in A_p$ it holds that $\mu_a = 0$ and $\kappa_a(y, u) = 0$ for all $y \in Y$ and $u \in U$.

The above condition establishes two types of skills, those belonging to A_p , one whose purpose is to monitor the evolution of system outputs over time until ξ evaluates to 1, and those belonging to A_e , which actually provide input into the system dynamics steering them towards states in which ξ evaluates to 1. We will refer to the former set as *precondition timers*, and we denote their elements by p , while we refer to the latter set as *effect delays*, which we denote with the letter e .

The fourth and final assumption places restrictions on the structure of control strings in L_S

Assumption 4: Let L_S be MDL for system S . We assume that (1) $\epsilon \notin L_S$ and (2) that for every $\mathbf{a} \in L_S$, $\mathbf{a}(1) \in A_p$.

The above introduces the almost universal assumption in the planning literature that actions in plans are defined in terms of a *precondition* and one or more *effects*, where the first skill in every control string essentially “waits for” trigger ξ_1 to become true. Doing so becomes very useful to account for periods of time an agent must be idle while waiting for other agents to accomplish some task [43], or *coasting* between two equilibrium points of its dynamics [44] as part of the execution of some maneuver. We note that any MDL L_S can be easily mapped into another language L'_S that satisfies Assumption 4.

B. Signature




Fig. 3. Global plan timeline, or *dateline*, and fluent timelines. Each rectangle is an interval. The top row is the intervals or *epochs* we use to define the temporal extent of actions. The rows below are labeled with the fluents that can be used with them to define TQAs. Intervals may not all be the same size but must satisfy other temporal constraints.

Temporal planning theories T_P are Interval Logic theories, hence they inherit the non-logical symbols introduced in

section II-A. To these we add the following predicates and constants, so TQAs (section II-A) can be formed. We consider two sets of 0-ary predicates, $\mathcal{F} := \{\varphi : \phi \in \Phi_A\}$, and $\mathcal{A} := \{\alpha_j : a \in A, 1 \leq j \leq M\}$. These predicates will be used to form *fluent* and *action* TQAs, describing in an abstract manner what properties hold on the output and control components of system S at every point in time. We note that φ and ϕ (resp. α_j and a) are two representations of the same object, and thus we will use either form as it suits. For instance, we will use always φ and α in logical formulas, while we will use ϕ and a when referring to facts about their structure, properties they may have or how they relate to other objects.




Fig. 4. Truth value assignments to TQAs supported by theories $T_{P,N}$ describe *timing diagrams* like the above. For each fluent φ_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, we set to true TQAs referring to the following intervals shown in Figure 3: $I_{\varphi_1,1,1}$, $I_{\varphi_1,0,2}$, $I_{\varphi_1,1,3}$, $I_{\varphi_2,1,1}$, $I_{\varphi_2,0,2}$, $I_{\varphi_2,1,3}$, $I_{\varphi_3,1,2}$, and $I_{\varphi_2,0,3}$. Hatched “bumps” correspond to periods of time the fluent on the left is true. Above each of such periods we write the corresponding IL formula.

One subtle modeling issue arises when defining the sets of intervals that need to be considered to form TQAs. It is obvious that plans may require several instances of the same fluent and action symbols to become true at different, non-overlapping periods of time. In terms of MDL strings and actors, we could for instance have the same skill a assigned to two different actors $j \neq j'$ at two different moments, or alternatively, multiple non-adjacent instances of the same skill a in an actor control string \mathbf{a}_j . To allow for this kind of structures in plans, from now on we consider planning theories to be parametrized both by a positive integer N , and denote them as $T_{P,N}$. We thus have the set of intervals $\mathcal{I}_{P,N}$, which is of finite size, and has the following structure

$$\mathcal{I}_{P,N} := \{I_{\prec}, I_{\succ}\} \cup \mathcal{D}_{P,N} \cup \mathcal{S}_{P,N} \cup \mathcal{K}_{P,N} \quad (7)$$

$\mathcal{D}_{P,N} := \{I_1, \dots, I_N\}$ is a *dateline* [39, Chapter 3] depicted on the top row of Figure 3, i.e. a totally ordered set of intervals such that $I_t \sim I_{t+1}$ for $1 \leq t < N^2$. To form action TQAs a theory $T_{P,N}$ considers the set of *action intervals* $\mathcal{K}_{P,N}$, defined

$$\mathcal{K}_{P,N} := \{I_{\alpha,k} : \alpha \in \mathcal{A}, 1 \leq k < N\} \quad (8)$$

For fluent TQAs, $T_{P,N}$ considers the set of *fluent intervals*

$$\mathcal{S}_{P,N} := \{I_{\varphi,0,t}, I_{\varphi,1,t} : \varphi \in \mathcal{F}, 1 \leq t \leq N\} \quad (9)$$

When using the intervals above to form action and fluent TQAs we will skip the fluent (action) symbol from the interval subindex list, e.g. we write $\varphi @ I_{0,t}$ rather than $\varphi @ I_{\varphi,0,t}$. Importantly, it is only allowed to combine fluents $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$ (resp.

actions $\alpha_j \in \mathcal{A}$) with intervals $I \in \mathcal{S}_{P,N} \cup \{I_{\prec}, I_{\succ}\}$ (resp. intervals $I \in \mathcal{K}_{P,N}$). We denote the set of TQAs allowed by a theory $T_{P,N}$ as $\text{TQA}_{P,N}$.

We finalize this section noting that all the predicates and constants above are *uninterpreted* [36]. That is, their values are to be chosen by defining an *interpretation* that assigns truth values or elements of the time domain \mathbb{T} to symbols φ , α and I in such a way that a number of axioms and constraints, detailed below, are satisfied. Figure 4 illustrates how an interpretation that sets TQAs truth values corresponds with a timing diagram [34] that tracks the evolution of binary variables values over time.

C. Connecting Planning and System Theories

We now make the satisfiability of $T_{P,N}$ and T_S to be connected by means of the following two axioms, which use the symbols in the signature of $T_{P,N} \cup T_S$

$$\phi(t) = 1 \leftrightarrow (\varphi @ I \wedge l_I \leq t < r_I) \quad (10)$$

$$a_j(t) = a \leftrightarrow (\alpha_j @ I \wedge l_I \leq t < r_I) \quad (11)$$

By introducing the two logical equivalences above, a correspondence between the models of $T_{P,N}$ and T_S is established trivially, as it is easy to see that by forcing the truth values of the left-hand sides the rest of functions and variables in T_S become all uniquely determined. From the above it is trivial to see that there is a bijection between system output functions $y \in Y^{\mathbb{R}}$ and histories h (see section II-A). We assume that there exists at least one such function y that satisfies the system theory T_S dynamic constraints discussed in sections II-B and II-C.

The intuitive interpretation for the above is that the planner component, which is tasked with finding satisfying assignments for $T_{P,N}$ that in turn encode plans, is able to choose what events and temporal evolutions occur. Plan existence thus is proof of, from the point of view of Control Theory, *weak controllability* as in the *possibility* of steering the controlled system to the set of desired terminal states, rather than certifying the *certainty* of a plan execution doing so. Such a global liveness property is known as *controllability* in Control Theory and an example analysis for a special type of MDL languages can be found in the work of Emilio Frazzoli et al. on the *Maneuver Automata* framework [44]. We next describe the three types of axioms to be found on theories $T_{P,N}$.

D. Type I Axioms: Actions

The first set of axioms we consider address the relation (if any) between skills $a \in A$ being executed, that is, axiom (11) holding for some actor j at time t , and changes in the values assigned by Boolean functions $\phi \in \Phi_A$ to system outputs $y(t) \in Y$, that is, axiom (10) truth changing between two time instants t and t' where $t < t'$. These axioms are not universal, as applying to every system S , but depend on the suitability of the MDL alphabet to a wide variety of control systems, such as wheeled robots or other human-designed vehicles [44].

²Technically this property is an axiom, albeit a trivial one

Action axioms have the following general structure. For every skill $a \in A$, actor $j = 1, \dots, M$, and set of intervals $\mathcal{I} = \{I_0 \in \mathcal{K}_{P,N}\} \cup \{I_k : I_k \in \mathcal{S}_{P,N}\}_{k=1}^{n_a}$ we have that

$$\alpha_j @ I_0 \rightarrow \text{TC}_a(\mathcal{I}) \quad (12)$$

where TC_a is a conjunction of temporal constraints (Table I) between fluent TQAs $\varphi @ I$ in $\text{TQA}_{P,N}$ and the action TQA $\alpha_j @ I_0$. Clearly, the structure of (12) is specific to each skill $a \in A$, as they represent relevant properties of skills being applied, system outputs, temporal order and duration. Additionally, in order to break undesired symmetries in satisfying assignments of $T_{P,N}$ we do require that for every $a \in A$, actor j and pair of intervals $\{I, I'\} \subset \mathcal{K}_{P,N}$

$$I \sim I' \leftrightarrow \neg \alpha_j @ I \vee \neg \alpha_j @ I' \quad (13)$$

In words, the above ensures that no action TQAs assigning skill a to some actor j at different times do so for periods of time that overlap. The last set of axioms related to actions are explanatory frame axioms [21], that require some suitable action TQA to justify a fluent changing its truth value. For every $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$, and intervals $I, I' \subset \mathcal{S}_{P,N}$ we need to have that

$$\varphi @ I \sim (\neg \varphi) @ I' \rightarrow \bigvee_{a \uparrow \phi} \alpha_j @ I'' \wedge I'' \supset I \wedge I'' \supset I' \quad (14)$$

where $a \uparrow \phi$ is a relation between skills $a \in A$ and Boolean terms $\phi \in \Phi_A$ that holds whenever ϕ is a term of ξ_a and is deemed that ϕ 's value depends directly on the inputs applied by the control function κ_a .

E. Type II Axioms: Domain Constraints

The second type of axioms in planning theories $T_{P,N}$ account for theorems of the system theory T_S that state mathematical relations between sets Y_ϕ (see Assumption 2 in section III-A). These facts about these sets are then reflected into $T_{P,N}$ as axioms, which can be used to reasoning about plans. Of specific interest to us in this paper are mathematical relations of the kind

$$Y_{\phi_1} \cap Y_{\phi_2} = \emptyset$$

that is, that the subsets of output space Y where both Boolean functions ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 evaluate to 1 are disjoint. From this fact it trivially follows that

$$y \in Y_{\phi_1} \leftrightarrow y \notin Y_{\phi_2}$$

Using Theorem 1 the following axioms follow, for fluents φ_1 and φ_2 corresponding with ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 , and for every pair of interval $I, I' \in \mathcal{S}_{P,N}$ compatible with these fluents

$$\varphi_1 @ I \wedge \varphi_2 @ I' \rightarrow I \parallel I' \quad (15)$$

We use the phrase *domain constraints* for these axioms as they are, from our point of view, semantically equivalent to the notion with the same name widely used in action-centric temporal planning [45], [21] and the notion of *grounding constraints* used in the literature on timeline-centric temporal planning [28], [30]. For convenience, we will use the notation $\phi_1 \parallel \phi_2$ (resp. $\varphi_1 \parallel \varphi_2$) for pairs of fluents that satisfy the requirements above.

F. Type III Axioms: Temporal Structures

The third set of axioms describe *temporal structures* that must be satisfied by all assignments to fluent and action TQA symbols. In contrast with actions and domain constraints, these axioms are *universal* to all planning theories $T_{P,N}$. Time intervals in fluent TQAs must cover dateline intervals I_t (see section III-B) and correspond to a partition each of these into two distinct, non-overlapping sub-intervals. This property is formalised by requiring that for every fluent symbol φ and intervals $I_{\varphi,0,t}, I_{\varphi,1,t}$ in $\mathcal{S}_{P,N}$, the following holds

$$(I_{\varphi,0,t} \sim I_{\varphi,1,t}) \wedge (I_{\varphi,0,t} \uparrow I_t) \wedge (I_{\varphi,1,t} \downarrow I_t) \quad (16)$$

Time intervals in action TQAs must also cover the dateline intervals, but do so from the ‘‘outside’’ as in *aggregating* several of them where each $I_{\alpha,k}$ is

$$I_{\alpha,k} := \bigcup_{l_{\alpha,k} \leq t < r_{\alpha,k}} I_t \quad (17)$$

$l_{\alpha,k}$ and $r_{\alpha,k}$ above are integer constants with domain $[1, N]$ that define the interval $I_{\alpha,k}$ (see section II-A). The size of intervals $I \in \mathcal{K}_{P,N}$ are subject to constraints on their size $|I|$. Intervals $I_{\alpha,k}$ where $a \in A_p$ must satisfy the condition that $|I_{\alpha,k}| \geq 1$, while intervals $I_{\alpha',k}$ where $a' \in A_e$ must in turn satisfy $|I_{\alpha',k}| = \delta(a')$. We note that the constraints above for intervals $I_{\varphi,0,t}, I_{\varphi,1,t}$, and $I_{\alpha,k}$ are trivial consequences of Allen’s Homogeneity Axiom (3). To wit, for every IL sentence Φ using TQAs $\varphi @ I$ there is a finite³ number of *equisatisfiable* IL sentences Φ' where each occurrence of $\varphi @ I$ is replaced by

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \varphi @ I_i \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-1} (I_i \sim I_{i+1}) \wedge I_1 \uparrow I \wedge I_n \downarrow I \quad (18)$$

Importantly, intervals I_{\prec} and I_{\succ} are arbitrarily chosen constants, and we require the following

$$I_{\prec} \sim I_1 \wedge I_n \sim I_{\succ} \quad (19)$$

from dateline intervals $I_1, I_n \in \mathcal{D}_{P,N}$. Associated with intervals I_{\prec} and I_{\succ} we have *initial* and *terminal* conditions $\Phi_0, \Phi_* \subset \Phi_A$, so for each $\varphi \in \Phi_0$ and $\varphi' \in \Phi_*$ the following must be true

$$\bigwedge_{\varphi \in \Phi_0} \varphi @ I_{\prec} \wedge \bigwedge_{\varphi' \in \Phi_*} \varphi' @ I_{\succ} \quad (20)$$

G. Plan Existence and Satisfiability

With the signature and axioms of $T_{P,N}$ we can now discuss its satisfiability. The latter is contingent on the existence of plans, objects with the following structure

Definition 2: Let $\text{TQA}_{P,N}$ be the set of TQAs for a theory $T_{P,N}$. A plan is a *partial* function $\pi : \text{TQA}_{P,N} \rightarrow \mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{Z}_0^+ \times \mathbb{Z}_0^+$ so, given TQA ψ_I then $\pi(\psi_I) = (b, l, r)$ where b is a Boolean value that gives the truth value of of fluent or atom ψ , and l and r are non-negative integers that define l_I and r_I .

We say that a TQA ψ_I is *in the plan* if and only if $\pi(\psi_I)$ is defined. We will denote by $\Pi_{P,N}$ the set of all objects that satisfy the Definition above. $T_{P,N}$ is thus satisfiable if there

³ \mathbb{T} is a countable set.

is some $\pi \in \Pi_{P,N}$ that satisfies all axioms and constraints in $T_{P,N}$. Intervals $\mathcal{D}_{P,N}$ are thus best understood as *auxiliary variables* that enable us to formalize the temporal structure axioms in section III-F, their values determined by the values taken by intervals in $\mathcal{S}_{P,N}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{P,N}$.

IV. SATISFIABILITY OF TEMPORAL PLANNING THEORIES VIA CONSTRAINT PROGRAMMING

We now give algorithms for (1) determining the least value for the parameter N so that $T_{P,N}$ is satisfiable, and (2) to determine whether a theory $T_{P,N}$ is satisfiable, via an encoding into Constraint Programming [46], [14], [26], or CP for short.

As observed in section III-B in order to articulate the notion of plan, it is required first to make a commitment on the “size” of the set of candidate plans to consider. While one aspect of this size parameter is fixed by defining fluent \mathcal{F} and action \mathcal{A} predicate, the number N of “moments in time” or “stages” in the dateline structure of the plan [39] to consider is not given and needs to be calculated. We search for the value of parameter N in the framework of planning as SAT [27], by considering a sequence of theories $T_{P,N_1}, T_{P,N_2}, \dots, T_{P,N_k}, \dots$, defined as covered in section III. For each theory T_{P,N_k} we check if there exists some plan $\pi \in \Pi_{P,N_k}$ that satisfies all theory axioms and constraints, and stop as soon as we found one such plan. It is easy to see that this algorithm is complete provided that there exists a satisfiable theory $T_{P,N}$ where $N > 0$ and finite. Several algorithms have been proposed to accelerate this basic linear search procedure [47], [48], at the expense of accepting parameters N_k larger than strictly necessary, and we do not claim any specific contribution in this regard.

To determine the satisfiability of theories $T_{P,N}$, for some suitably chosen N , either directly or via a suitably defined search procedure, we give an encoding of $T_{P,N}$ into a CSP with variables and constraints supported by state-of-the-art Constraint Programming solvers, such as Google OR-Tools [49]. Importantly, the variables and constraints of the CSP are representations of the uninterpreted symbols and axioms of the theory $T_{P,N}$ chosen to maximize the performance of state-of-the-art CP solvers, rather than a direct compilation.

Let us recall Definition 2 where plans are defined as partial functions π that map TQAs in $T_{P,N}$ into triples (b, l, r) of Boolean and integer values. The fact that not all TQAs may be part of a plan π is a non-trivial complication that we address in different ways for fluent and action TQAs, each having associated several variables of the CSP that allow to choose which TQAs are in the plan and what values they have.

For each fluent $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$ and dateline index $1 \leq t \leq n$ we define Boolean variables φ_{vw}^t , where $v, w \in \{0, 1\}$. These Boolean variables determine the structure of timing diagrams (see Figure 4) by asserting pairs TQAs

$$\varphi_{00}^t = 1 \leftrightarrow (\neg\varphi)@I_{0t} \wedge (\neg\varphi)@I_{1t} \quad (21)$$

In words, setting φ_{00}^t to 1 indicates that the φ is false for the entirety of I_t . The pair of TQAs for φ_3 given in Figure 4 would be thus asserted by setting $\varphi_{3,01}^2 = \varphi_{3,10}^3 = 1$. The approach to choose action TQAs follows directly from (17).

For each ground action $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$ we have a Boolean variable $u_{\alpha,k} \in \{0, 1\}$, in addition to the integer variables $l_{\alpha,k}$ and $r_{\alpha,k}$ introduced in section III-F to select the dateline intervals spanned by an action TQA in the plan. Whenever $u_{\alpha,k} = 1$, then we have one or more action TQAs $\alpha_k@I_{t_l}, \alpha_k@I_{t_l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k@I_{t_r-1}$ in the plan, where $l_{\alpha,k} = t_l$ and $r_{\alpha,k} = t_r$. The following constraints ensure that $l_{\alpha,k}$ and $r_{\alpha,k}$ are set according to (17)

$$u_{\alpha,k} \rightarrow (l_{\alpha,k} < r_{\alpha,k}) \wedge \neg u_{\alpha,k} \rightarrow (l_{\alpha,k} > r_{\alpha,k}) \quad (22a)$$

$$u_{\alpha,k} \rightarrow u_{\alpha,k-1} \quad (22b)$$

Constraint (22a) enforces (17) directly. When no TQA α_k is defined by π , we set $l_{\alpha,k}$ and $r_{\alpha,k}$ in a way that they cannot be used to justify a fluent φ truth changing (see constraints implementing frame axioms (29a)–(29b) below). Constraint (22b) is redundant, and its purpose is to break symmetries. We finalize our discussion of the variables in the CSP for $T_{P,N}$ by noting that recovering “whole” TQAs from their decompositions via Equation (18) is trivial and requires linear time on N . Next, we introduce the constraints to model temporal relations between action and fluent TQAs compatible with action schemas preconditions and constraints, as well as, objective functions, and other temporal constraints enforcing offsets and (action) interval durations.

A. Flow Constraints

Changes of truth are regulated with *flow constraints* [33]

$$\varphi_{10}^1 + \varphi_{11}^1 = 1, \quad \varphi \in \Phi_0 \quad (23a)$$

$$\varphi_{01}^1 + \varphi_{00}^1 = 1, \quad \varphi \notin \Phi_0 \quad (23b)$$

$$\sum_{v \in \{0,1\}} \varphi_{v1}^h = 1, \quad \varphi \in \Phi_* \quad (23c)$$

$$\varphi_{0w}^t + \varphi_{1w}^t = \varphi_{w0}^{t+1} + \varphi_{w1}^{t+1}, \quad 1 \leq t < h \quad (23d)$$

where $w \in \{0, 1\}$. Constraint (23d) requires continuity of truth values at the boundary of intervals $I_t \in D_{P,N}$, disallowing φ truth-value to change from 1 to 0. Changes in truth values are only allowed within intervals I_t and must be justified by an action TQA, as per the action axioms given in $T_{P,N}$ (section III-D).

B. Precondition and Effect Constraints

Assumption 3 partitions the set of skills A into sets of *precondition timers* A_p and *effect delays*, A_e , while Assumption 4 places a restriction on the structure of the control strings in L_S . While we do not place any restrictions on the structure of action axioms (12), clearly not all possible combinations of temporal constraints are generally useful for control systems based on MDLs. For any given skill $a \in A$, TC_a can clearly only consist of constraints $\varphi@I \supset \alpha_j@I_0$ or $\alpha_j@I_0 \wedge \varphi@I$, as it can only be the case that (1) $\phi \circ y(t)$ was true before a started and continues to do so until the trigger ξ_a evaluates to true, or (2) $\phi \circ y(t)$ is true for some time t after a has started.

In order to facilitate the presentation of the constraints, we introduce the following auxiliary predicates

$$\text{starts}(\alpha, k, t) \equiv u_{\alpha,k} \wedge l_{\alpha,k} = t \quad (24a)$$

$$\text{ends}(\alpha, k, t) \equiv u_{\alpha,k} \wedge r_{\alpha,k} = t \quad (24b)$$

$$\text{spans}(\alpha, k, t, t') \equiv u_{\alpha,k} \wedge l_{\alpha,k} = t \wedge r_{\alpha,k} = t' \quad (24c)$$

$$\text{contains}(\alpha, k, t) \equiv u_{\alpha,k} \wedge l_{\alpha,k} \leq t \wedge t < r_{\alpha,k} \quad (24d)$$

which assert, resp., that whenever we have a TQA for α_k in the plan then (1) $I_t \uparrow I_{\alpha,k}$, (2) $I_{t-1} \downarrow I_{\alpha,k}$, (3) $I_{\alpha,k}$ overlaps both I_t and $I_{t'}$, and (4) $I_{\alpha,k} \supset I_t$.




Fig. 5. Illustration of the constraints enforcing temporal constraints $\varphi_I \supset \alpha_{I_0}$. From top to bottom, we show four possible ways to decompose I as per Eq. 18. Epochs run in between vertices and selected edges in the planning graph, e.g., the arrow below I_{t_1} connecting the top vertices stands for the decision variable φ_{11}^1 being set to 1. Diagonal arrows correspond to a change in the truth value of φ .

For each axiom like (12) with TQA $\alpha @ I$ where we have a temporal constraint $\varphi @ I \supset \alpha @ I_0$, and $2 \leq t < N$, the following constraints must be satisfied

$$\text{starts}(\alpha, k, t) \rightarrow (\varphi_{01}^{t-1} \vee \varphi_{11}^{t-1}) \wedge (I_{t-1} \sim I_{\alpha,k}) \quad (25a)$$

$$\text{ends}(\alpha, k, t') \rightarrow (\varphi_{10}^{t'} \vee \varphi_{11}^{t'}) \wedge (I_{\alpha,k} \sim I_{t'}) \quad (25b)$$

$$\text{spans}(\alpha, k, t, t') \rightarrow \bigwedge_{t \leq t'' < t'} \varphi_{11}^{t''} \quad (25c)$$

Figure 5 illustrates the four possible scenarios covered by constraints (25a)–(25c), restricting when TQAs for action α can be added to plans P . Constraint (25a) (resp. (25b)) ensures that $I_{\alpha,k}$ starts (resp. ends) during a time in which φ is true. Constraint (25c) ensures that φ remains true during $I_{\alpha,k}$.

For each t s.t. $2 \leq t < N$ and action axiom with temporal constraint $\alpha @ I_0 \frown \varphi @ I$ the following must be satisfied

$$\text{spans}(\alpha, k, t, t') \rightarrow \left(\sum_{t \leq t'' < t'} \varphi_{01}^{t''} = 1 \right) \quad (26a)$$

$$\text{ends}(\alpha, k, t') \rightarrow (\varphi_{01}^{t'-1} \vee \varphi_{11}^{t'-1}) \wedge (I_{\alpha,k} \sim I_{t'}) \quad (26b)$$

Constraint (26b) ensures that $I_{\alpha,k}$ ends during periods that fluent φ is true. Constraint (26a) prescribes that there must be at most one change in the truth value of φ , from true to false, that is allowed to take place anytime during $I_{\alpha,k}$.

C. Operational Constraints

Constraints (25a)–(25b) and (26a)–(26b) suffice to account for action axioms necessary to account for the dynamics of control systems in the MDL framework. Nevertheless, it is very common that one would like to consider only a subset of the set of plans that satisfy $T_{P,N}$. For instance, it may be the case that not all plans are convenient or desirable given some contextual information that is not available as axioms of $T_{P,N}$ regardless of any loss of performance due to ruling out otherwise valid output functions $y(t)$. One example for this is when system operators wants plans to comply with given structures, like those formalized as *hierarchical task networks* [50]. Another example is that of having two or more skills a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n that cannot be executed concurrently due to being desired that plans conform to some *global resource constraint* [23], [51], [52].

A trivial case for skills being arranged according to some hierarchical structure are the concepts of *temporal action* present in representation frameworks such as PDDL 2.1 [1] or NDL [23]. Temporal actions simply aggregate skills in a sequential fashion. Let us extend the signature of $T_{P,N}$ with a finite set of uninterpreted symbols $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, and consider additional axioms

$$\tau @ I \rightarrow \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n_\tau} \alpha_i @ I_i \wedge I_1 \uparrow I \wedge I_{n_\tau} \downarrow I \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n_\tau-1} I_i \sim I_{i+1} \quad (27)$$

where I is an interval from $\mathcal{K}_{P,N}$ extended to accommodate TQAs for temporal actions τ . These constraints are directly implemented by setting trivial constraints on CSP variables $u_{\alpha,k}$, $l_{\alpha,k}$ and $r_{\alpha,k}$.

Handling resource constraints on plans requires too to extend the signature of $T_{P,N}$ with uninterpreted logical symbols $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$, and extending $\mathcal{S}_{P,N}$ accordingly. Rather than introducing new axioms we extend action axioms, since resource constraints can be implemented with temporal constraints $\alpha_{I_0} = \rho_{I'}$, that approximates the notion of *overall effect conditions* put forward by Cushing et al.[15]

$$\text{starts}(\alpha, k, t) \rightarrow \rho_{01}^t \wedge (I_{t-1} \sim I_{\alpha,k}) \wedge |I_{\rho,0,t}| = 1 \quad (28a)$$

$$\text{ends}(\alpha, k, t') \rightarrow \rho_{10}^{t'-1} \wedge (I_{\alpha,k} \sim I_{t'}) \wedge |I_{\rho,1,t'}| = 1 \quad (28b)$$

$$\text{spans}(\alpha, k, t, t') \rightarrow \bigwedge_{t < t'' < t'-1} \rho_{11}^{t''} \quad (28c)$$

Namely, the TQA for resource ρ is required to “expand” covering all the dateline intervals spanned by the action TQA. We also require the intervals $I_{\rho,0,t}^\varphi$ and $I_{\rho,1,t'}^\varphi$ to span exactly 1 time unit. We note that to be consistent with the hybrid dynamics in (6c), the TQA for this effect must start on the first control cycle after the skill a starts being applied and finishing on the control cycle *before* a ceases to be active. As per the definition of MDL skills a , one or more functions ϕ will need to be observed to change from false to true for a execution to finish, hence why we allow for some minimum amount of time separation.

D. Frame and Interference Constraints

Frame axioms ensure that no atom φ changes truth value without proper justification, as per the frame axioms (14) of the theory

$$\varphi_{01}^t \rightarrow \bigvee_{a \uparrow \phi} \text{contains}(\alpha, k, t) \quad (29a)$$

$$\varphi_{10}^t \rightarrow \bigvee_{a \downarrow \phi} \text{contains}(\alpha, k, t) \quad (29b)$$

where $a \uparrow \phi$ was defined in section III-D, and $a \downarrow \phi$ is the relation that holds whenever we have $a \uparrow \phi'$ and $\phi \text{Int} \phi'$. We note that when $r_{\alpha,k} = t$, we are implying that $I_{\alpha,k} \sim I_t$, and therefore I_t cannot be contained in $I_{\alpha,k}$, since we want only to allow actions to explain those changes that occur strictly during their intervals.

Domain constraint axioms III-E are implemented as follows. Let $\varphi_1 \parallel \varphi_2$ and t be s.t. $1 \leq t \leq N$. We need to ensure that sub-intervals $I_{\varphi_1,0,t}$, $I_{\varphi_1,1,t}$, $I_{\varphi_2,0,t}$, and $I_{\varphi_2,1,t}$ do not overlap when they are referenced by a TQA in the plan, as per the definition of $X \parallel Y$ in Eq. (1)

$$\varphi_{01}^t \rightarrow (I_{\varphi_2,0,t} \sim I_{\varphi_1,1,t} \vee I_{\varphi_2,0,t} \prec I_{\varphi_1,1,t}) \quad (30a)$$

$$\varphi_{10}^t \rightarrow (I_{\varphi_1,0,t} \sim I_{\varphi_2,1,t} \vee I_{\varphi_1,0,t} \prec I_{\varphi_2,1,t}) \quad (30b)$$

Constraints (30a) and (30b) intuitively account with the “pushing and shoving” amongst intervals depicted in Figure 3. We also add the following constraints

$$\varphi_{v1}^t + \phi_{w1}^t \leq 1, v, w \in \{0, 1\} \quad (31a)$$

$$\varphi_{1v}^t + \phi_{1w}^t \leq 1, v, w \in \{0, 1\} \quad (31b)$$

Constraints (31a)–(31b) are meant to leverage Boolean unit propagation to discover conflicts early due to the instance Int relation.

E. Objective Functions

Beyond finding plans for theories $T_{P,N}$ one would like also to consider the *optimization* problem in which, for a set value of N , we seek a plan that satisfies $T_{P,N}$ that also minimizes some given measure of performance $f : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, that assigns positive real values to satisfying plans and $+\infty$ to plans that do not satisfy all axioms and constraints. To do so we consider two classic objective functions from the literature on Optimization methods for scheduling [14]: the so-called *sum of task costs*, and *makespan*. We replace the notion of task from the literature in scheduling with that of skill and thus assume that we have a function $c : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ that assigns to every skill $a \in A$ some positive real number. The “sum of skill costs” objective function f_{ssc} is thus defined

$$f_{ssc}(\pi) := \sum_a \sum_{1 \leq k \leq N} c(a)u_{\alpha,k} \quad (32)$$

Formalizing the makespan objective function f_m is less straightforward and requires the introduction of an auxiliary variable Δ and auxiliary constraints

$$u_{\alpha,k} \rightarrow (\Delta \geq r_{I_{\alpha,k}}), 1 \leq k \leq N, \alpha \in \mathcal{A} \quad (33)$$

$$\Delta \geq 0 \quad (34)$$

with $f_m(\pi) := \Delta$. We also note that subsets of satisfying plans can be selected by setting *deadlines* for plan completion. This would amount to set suitable constraints on Δ .

V. EVALUATION




Fig. 6. Action TQAs in plan for Cushing’s gadget, adapted from Figure 3 in [15]. The 2018 International Planning Competition benchmarks consist of instances where the plans required consist of increasing number of copies of the structure above, starting with 1 and up to 18.




Fig. 7. Run-time of our CP algorithm across three types of instances. Type I instances replicate the structure observed in the 2018 IPC *cushing* benchmark, but with number of copies of Cushing’s gadget going all the way to 50. Type II instances require plans in which several copies of action structure in Figure 6 need to be sequenced. Type III instances add to the previous requirement that synchronizing the executions of Cushing’s gadgets in a hierarchical way. See text for further details and discussion.

We have tested the previous algorithm on several benchmarks, of which we report the one we find more significant: a generalization of the “required concurrency” gadget discussed by Cushing et al. [15] to analyze the ability of temporal planning algorithms to reason with concurrency requirements. Cushing’s gadget is crafted to only admit plans like that in Figure 6. The gadget requires to coordinate the execution of three skills a_1 , a_2 and a_3 , with the requirement that the action TQAs intervals must have the configuration given in Figure 6. We note that there are many ways to enforce such structure in plans. In our framework, this can be achieved in two ways. One is to do so directly by having axioms that are conditional on the presence of any combination of action TQAs $\alpha_{i,k} @ I_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ in the plan. We note that doing so would result in having to generate $O(N^3)$ CSP constraints. A more compact modeling approach is to introduce *resource* fluents (section IV-C) ρ_i where $i = 1, 2$, and action axioms

$$\alpha_1 @ I_1 \rightarrow \rho_1 @ I = \alpha_1 @ I_1 \quad (35)$$

$$\alpha_2 @ I_2 \rightarrow (\rho_2 @ I' = \alpha_2 @ I_2) \wedge (\rho_1 @ I \frown \alpha_2 @ I_2) \quad (36)$$

$$\alpha_3 @ I_3 \rightarrow (\rho_1 @ I \supset \alpha_3 @ I_3) \wedge (\rho_2 @ I' \supset \alpha_3 @ I_3) \quad (37)$$

We observe that the last constraint above is not handled by many otherwise highly performant solvers [20], [18], [19],

which ignore the requirement altogether and thus produce invalid plans, or greatly impacts the performance of other planners [22], [25]. We note that Cushing’s gadget can be “scaled up” in two obvious ways. One is to add more “levels” to it, so the “bottom” action a_n ($n = 3$ in Figure 6) needs to be contained in $n - 1$ intervals simultaneously. The other way is to simply require plans to feature multiple disjoint copies of the gadget, which is the one taken to construct the `cushing` benchmark in the temporal track of the 2018 International Planning Competition.

While Cushing’s gadget is an excellent vehicle for testing the ability to reason about plans with concurrency requirements, it ignores altogether the other key aspect of planning that we highlight in the Introduction, that of having to sequence actions in plans. For that we consider two additional types of structures, which we refer to as Type II and Type III. Type II structures include Type I ones and further scale the complexity of planning “stacking” copies of the gadget. That is, introducing a resource fluent ρ_3^j for copies $j = 1, \dots, m$ we introduce temporal constraints $\alpha_1^{j+1}@I \rightarrow \rho_3@I' \supset \alpha_1^{j+1}$. This requires the execution of all actions in gadget $j + 1$ to be contained by the time interval for the TQA of action α_3^j . Type III structures require plans to consider n copies of the gadget which need to be *sequenced*. We do so by introducing additional resource fluents γ and temporal constraints $\alpha_1^i@I \rightarrow \alpha_1^1@I \wedge \gamma_i@I'$ and $\alpha_1^{i+1}@I \rightarrow \alpha_1^{i+1}@I \supset \gamma_i@I'$, where i and $i + 1$ are two consecutive copies of the gadget.

We conducted our experiments over the three types of instances above. The Type I set considers up to 50 copies of the gadget. Plans for these instances can be found for a small value of N , or in other words, the number of unsatisfiable theories $T_{P,k}$ with $k < N$ to consider is small. Type II instances consider up to 20 gadget copies, and the stacking of gadgets that appear in plans have heights between 2 and 8. Type III instances are like the Type II in terms of number of gadget copies and stacking height, but additionally require all top level actions α_1 to be totally ordered according to some arbitrary order.

Figure 7 plots the run-time of our algorithm (y -axis) as an estimate of the size of the search space for optimal plans P (x -axis) grows. We have used Google’s CP-SAT solver in our implementation, part of the OR-TOOLS optimization framework. Also plotted are the instances solved by the only PDDL 2.1 known to produce valid plans for Cushing’s gadget, Benton [17] OPTIC solver. All algorithms were allowed 1800s and 4 GBytes of RAM to find a solution. The size of data points for our CP-SAT implementation depends on the number of Boolean variables in the CP model, the largest points corresponding to CP models with hundreds of thousands of Boolean variables. The IT-SAT planner [22] was not able to solve any instances, running out of memory even with the smallest of the Type I instances. We also tested recent planners like TAMER [25] and ARIES [53]. TAMER solved 1 Type I instance, and ARIES solved 4 Type I instances.

VI. DISCUSSION

Figure 7 clearly shows the CP-SAT implementation of our algorithm to scale up for Type I instances, and solve mid-

size Type II instances in tens of seconds. Larger Type II instances and Type III instances do challenge our algorithm and present a motivation for further research on the search and inference algorithms used by CP-SAT, as well as on the formulation III and encodings [?] that are novel contributions reported in this paper. On the other hand, our experiments on instances where plans require actors to execute long control strings, e.g. have non-trivial sequencing requirements, clearly show the limitations of the plan search strategy outlined at the beginning of section IV.

We look forward to drawing on the extensive work in for Planning as SAT [47], and existing lower-bounding, constraint propagation, and decomposition techniques in Optimization [51], [14]. We think that our experimental results are a strong signal highlighting the need to come up with new algorithmic ideas. These will be needed to extend existing CDCL-based solvers from the *inside*, adding specific decision procedures for suitably identified subproblems, rather than just from the *outside*, via encodings and restart heuristics. Alternative solver architectures, such as those based on heuristic search [17], [18], seem to us ill-equipped to be the framework integrating the mix of algorithms required to reason effectively over the three aspects (task assignment, action sequencing and concurrency) of planning identified in the Introduction, while also optimizing an objective function. Nevertheless, heuristic search remains a key algorithmic framework for reasoning efficiently over long sequences of actions and drive branching over decision variables, so we are sure it will remain a relevant technique delivering critical components for next generation temporal planning algorithms.

A key motivation of this work is that of developing a rigorous yet workable analytic and computational framework that is useful for both finding plans and controlling their execution. For that, we choose a very specific framework from the literature in Control Theory and Robotics. Many such frameworks have been proposed since the start of the century, with greater expressive power than the one we have chosen in this paper. We observe that expressive power is not the only concern one should consider when developing frameworks for research into autonomous systems: analytical tractability (e.g. decidability of elementary properties) and computational viability (e.g. existence of general, scalable exact and approximate algorithms to find models of such properties) are in our opinion more important and useful for developing practical engineering applications.

We would like to end this paper acknowledging the many seminal contributions this work has been constructed upon. Their existence and success, no matter how belatedly the latter comes to pass, are both a source of inspiration and a challenge.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Fox and D. Long, “An extension to PDDL for expressing temporal planning domains,” *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, vol. 20, pp. 61–124, 2003.
- [2] N. Muscettola, “HSTS: Integrating planning and scheduling,” in *Intelligent Scheduling*. Morgan Kaufman, 1994.
- [3] M. Ghallab and H. Laruelle, “Representation and control in ixtet, a temporal planner,” in *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Planning Systems*, 1994, pp. 61–67.

- [4] A. Bit-Monnot, M. Ghallab, F. Ingrand, and D. E. Smith, “Fape: a constraint-based planner for generative and hierarchical temporal planning,” 2020.
- [5] M. Egerstedt, “Motion Description Languages for Multi-Modal Control in Robotics,” in *Control Problems in Robotics*, ser. Springer Tracts in Advanced Robotics, 2003, pp. 75–89.
- [6] —, “Linguistic Control of Mobile Robots,” *Proceedings 2001 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems. Expanding the Societal Role of Robotics in the the Next Millennium (Cat. No.01CH37180)*, vol. 2, pp. 877–882, 2001.
- [7] R. Brockett, “On the computer control of movement,” *Proceedings. 1988 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 534–540 vol.1, 1988.
- [8] F. Ingrand and M. Ghallab, “Deliberation for autonomous robots: A survey,” *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 247, pp. 10–44, 2017.
- [9] E. A. Lee and S. A. Seshia, *Introduction to Embedded Systems: A Cyber-Physical Systems Approach*, 2nd ed. MIT Press, 2017.
- [10] A. L. Blum and M. L. Furst, “Fast planning through planning graph analysis,” *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 90, pp. 281–300, 1997.
- [11] D. E. Smith and D. S. Weld, “Temporal planning with mutual exclusion reasoning,” in *IJCAI*, 1999, p. 326–333.
- [12] D. Long and M. Fox, “Exploiting a Graphplan Framework in Temporal Planning,” in *ICAPS*, 2003.
- [13] F. Maris and P. Régnier, “TLP-GP: New results on temporally-expressive planning benchmarks,” in *IEEE International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 1, 2008, pp. 507–514.
- [14] J. N. Hooker, *Integrated Methods for Optimization*. Springer, 2010.
- [15] W. Cushing, R. Kambhampati, Mausam, and D. Weld, “When is temporal planning really temporal,” in *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 2007.
- [16] J. Hoffmann and B. Nebel, “The FF planning system: Fast plan generation through heuristic search,” *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, vol. 14, pp. 253–302, 2001.
- [17] J. Benton, A. Coles, and A. Coles, “Temporal planning with preferences and time-dependent continuous costs,” in *ICAPS*, 2012.
- [18] P. Eyerich, R. Mattmüller, and G. Röger, “Using the Context-enhanced Additive Heuristic for Temporal and Numeric Planning,” in *ICAPS*, 2009.
- [19] S. Jiménez, A. Jonsson, and H. Palacios, “Temporal Planning with Required Concurrency using Classical Planning,” in *ICAPS*, 2015.
- [20] V. Vidal and H. Geffner, “Branching and pruning: an optimal temporal POCL planner based on constraint programming,” *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 170, pp. 298–335, 2006.
- [21] J.-A. Shin and E. Davis, “Processed and continuous change in temporal planning,” *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 166, no. 1, 2005.
- [22] M. F. Rankooh and G. Ghassem-Sani, “ITSAT: An Efficient SAT-Based Temporal Planner,” *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research (JAIR)*, vol. 53, 2015.
- [23] J. Rintanen, “Temporal planning with clock-based SMT encodings,” in *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 2017.
- [24] M. Cashmore, D. Magazzeni, and P. Zehtabi, “Planning for hybrid systems via satisfiability modulo theories,” *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research (JAIR)*, vol. 67, pp. 235–283, 2020.
- [25] S. Panjkovic and A. Micheli, “Expressive Optimal Temporal Planning via Optimization Modulo Theory,” *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 10, pp. 12 095–12 102, 2023.
- [26] D. Kroening and O. Strichman, *Decision Procedures: an Algorithmic Point of View*, 2nd ed. Springer, 2016.
- [27] H. Kautz, D. McAllester, and B. Selman, “Encoding Plans in Propositional Logic,” in *Proc. of Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR)*, 1996.
- [28] J. Frank and A. Jónsson, “Constraint-Based Attribute and Interval Planning,” *Constraints*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 339–364, 2003.
- [29] J. F. Allen, “Towards a general theory of action and time,” *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 123–154, 1984. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0004370284900080>
- [30] M. Cialdea Mayer, A. Orlandini, and A. Umbrico, “Planning and execution with flexible timelines: a formal account,” *Acta Informatica*, vol. 53, no. 6, pp. 649–680, 2016.
- [31] D. Della Monica, N. Gigante, A. Montanari, P. Sala, et al., “A novel automata-theoretic approach to timeline-based planning,” in *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR 2018)*. AAAI Press, 2018, pp. 541–550.
- [32] N. Gigante, A. Micheli, A. Montanari, and E. Scala, “Decidability and complexity of action-based temporal planning over dense time,” *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 307, pp. 1036–1086, 2022.
- [33] M. van den Briel, T. Vossen, and S. Kambhampati, “Reviving integer programming approaches for AI planning: A branch-and-cut framework,” in *ICAPS*, 2005.
- [34] Object Management Group, “OMG unified modeling language 2.5.1,” Object Management Group, Tech. Rep., 2017.
- [35] J. F. Allen, “Maintaining knowledge about temporal intervals,” *Commun. ACM*, vol. 26, no. 11, p. 832–843, nov 1983. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/182.358434>
- [36] A. R. Bradley and Z. Manna, *The Calculus of Computation*. Springer, 2007.
- [37] R. Alur, T. Feder, and T. A. Henzinger, “The benefits of relaxing punctuality,” *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 116–146, 1996.
- [38] D. Joslin and M. E. Pollack, “Is ‘early commitment’ in plan generation ever a good idea?” in *AAAI*, 1996, pp. 1188–1193.
- [39] J. Allen, H. Kautz, R. Pelavin, and J. Tenenber, *Reasoning about Plans*, 1st ed. Morgan Kaufmann, 1991.
- [40] N. Beldiceanu, M. Carlsson, A. Derrien, C. Prud’homme, A. Schutt, and P. J. Stuckey, “Range-Consistent Forbidden Regions of Allen’s Relations,” in *Proc. of the 14th Int’l Conference on Integration of AI and OR Techniques in Constraint Programming (CPAIOR)*, 2017, pp. 21–29.
- [41] P. Tabuada, *Verification and Control of Hybrid Systems*. Springer, 2009.
- [42] D. E. Knuth, “Two notes on notation,” 1992.
- [43] A. Cimatti, A. Micheli, and M. Roveri, “Dynamic Controllability of Disjunctive Temporal Networks: Validation and Synthesis of Executable Strategies,” *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2016.
- [44] E. Frazzoli, M. A. Dahleh, and E. Feron, “Maneuver-Based Motion Planning for Nonlinear Systems With Symmetries,” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 1077–1091, 2005.
- [45] A. Gerevini and L. Schubert, “Inferring State Constraints for Domain-Independent Planning,” in *AAAI*, 1998.
- [46] K. Marriott and P. J. Stuckey, *Programming with Constraints: an Introduction*. The MIT Press, 1998.
- [47] J. Rintanen, “Planning and SAT,” in *Handbook of Satisfiability*, 2nd ed. IOS Press, 2021, vol. 2.
- [48] M. Streeter and S. F. Smith, “Using Decision Procedures Efficiently for Optimization,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (ICAPS)*, 2007.
- [49] L. Perron and F. Didier, “Cp-sat,” Google. [Online]. Available: https://developers.google.com/optimization/cp/cp_solver/
- [50] D. Pellier, H. Fiorino, M. Grand, A. Albore, and R. Bailon-Ruiz, “Hddl 2.1: Towards defining an htn formalism with time,” 2022.
- [51] S. Antoy, E. Albert, T. Feydy, A. Schutt, and P. J. Stuckey, “Global difference constraint propagation for finite domain solvers,” in *Proc. of the 10th Int’l ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Principles and Practice of Declarative Programming*, 2008, pp. 226–235.
- [52] P. Baptiste and C. Le Pape, “Disjunctive constraints for manufacturing scheduling: Principles and extensions,” *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 306–310, 1996.
- [53] A. Bit-Monnot, “ARIES: Toolbox for automated planning and combinatorial solving,” LAAS - Toulouse. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/plaans/aries>