

Intelligent Execution through Plan Analysis

Daniel Borrajo¹ and Manuela Veloso²

J.P.Morgan AI Research, New York, NY (USA)

{daniel.borrajo,manuela.veloso}@jpmchase.com

Abstract—Intelligent robots need to generate and execute plans. In order to deal with the complexity of real environments, planning makes some assumptions about the world. When executing plans, the assumptions are usually not met. Most works have focused on the negative impact of this fact and the use of replanning after execution failures. Instead, we focus on the positive impact, or opportunities to find better plans. When planning, the proposed technique finds and stores those opportunities. Later, during execution, the monitoring system can use them to focus perception and repair the plan, instead of replanning from scratch. Experiments in several paradigmatic robotic tasks show how the approach outperforms standard replanning strategies.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the key intelligent capabilities of robots is their ability to generate plans. Automated planning systems generate plans as sequences of actions from an initial state to achieve a set of goals [1]. In order to generate those plans, planners assume the models of their environment they take as input are the right ones. However, robotic environments are dynamic and change throughout the execution of plans in ways unexpected by the planning models [2]. For instance, actions preconditions and effects might not be the right ones or they might evolve; new facts might appear that were not defined in the domain model; objects can appear or disappear; facts can change their truth value; or goals can become irrelevant or new goals might appear [3].

Thus, executives continuously monitor the execution for plan validity. If failures are detected (the effects were not the expected ones, and/or they can avoid achieving the goals with the current plan), then they replan. Most executives only check for failures. However, there is a second type of unexpected result from the actions execution, facts that represent opportunities to improve the plan in execution.

In general, in order to improve the execution, there are three levels of information that can be exchanged between a planner and the execution system:

- 1) plan: this is the simplest and most used approach. The planner provides no annotation to the executive, so when the execution does not proceed as expected, it must replan. Replanning can be done from scratch [4] or by taking into account the previous plan [5], [6], [7].
- 2) plan plus subgoal structure: the planner attaches to each action the goals and subgoals that it can achieve

directly or indirectly. It also includes precedence constraints among actions. This kind of plan annotation increases the ability of the executive to reason about changes to the expected behavior of the plan. For instance, it can detect whether the changes affect the future execution of the plan, and replan if so [8], [9].

- 3) plan plus rationale on why the planner generated this plan: the plan is also annotated with other relevant planning-related information that can yield to better decisions in terms of how to repair a plan [10].

In recent work, we used the plan rationale to reason about *static* opportunities [11]; that is, facts that cannot change by the robot's actions, such that if their value changes in the environment, it can yield to better plans by replanning. Instead, in this paper, we use the subgoal structure to reason about *dynamic* opportunities, facts that can be changed by the robot actions. The paper provides as contributions novel techniques to solve the following challenges: (1) how can the system compute dynamic opportunities at planning time; (2) how can they be detected when they appear during execution; and (3) how can the executive use them efficiently. First, opportunities are computed by using the causal links among actions of the plan. Causal links capture the information on what actions achieve some facts that are needed as preconditions of other actions [12]. Second, opportunities serve two purposes to the executive: detect when an opportunity arises; and focus the perception system only on those changes in the state that matter with respect to finding those opportunities. This second aspect is crucial in robotic applications where the perception system can focus on many different aspects of the environment. Third, opportunities allow the executive to detect which components of the plan are not needed anymore given the appearance of those opportunities, so that it can repair the plan without performing expensive replanning.

II. RELATED WORK

Some previous works have defined different methods for performing plan repair, for case-based planning [10], [13] or for making changes to an existing plan [5], [6], [7]. In these works, there is no notion of opportunities; they just focus on the repair task. Other works focused on monitoring for optimal plans [8]. The planner provides part of the rationale built for generating the plan and it serves the purpose of maintaining optimality on the execution of a plan. This work requires to work in optimal planning, which is unrealistic in many robotic applications.

¹Consultant. On leave from Universidad Carlos III de Madrid

²On leave from Carnegie Mellon University, School of Computer Science

Opportunities have also been studied in cognitive science for human reasoning [14]. These works focused on which pending goals to pursue when opportunities arise, instead of using opportunities for guiding perception, and performing repair of a plan. Also, these works were not implemented.

In relation to robotics, there has been some work related to opportunism in navigation tasks, but opportunism was defined as solving the Team Orienteering Problem [15], as alternative actions that could be more desirable for the robot [16], or it was used to compute alternative routes for navigation [17], [18]. In general, robotics-related use of opportunities has focused in a single task, defining task-dependent models. In our case, we present a domain-independent technique. Other domain-independent planning related works have focused on pre-defined goals that could be achieved in case of underused resources or resources uncertainty [19], [20]; or new goals to be pursued (with little or no re-planning capabilities) [21]. In those cases, opportunities are pending goals that are not part of the causal structure of the current plan, while our opportunities are part of the causal structure.

III. BACKGROUND

A classical planning task is a tuple $\Pi = \{F, A, I, G\}$, where F is a set of facts, A is a set of instantiated actions, $I \subseteq F$ is an initial state represented by the set of facts that are true initially, and $G \subseteq F$ is a set of goals, facts that should be true at the end. Each action $a \in A$ is described by a set of preconditions ($\text{pre}(a)$) and a set of effects ($\text{eff}(a)$). The definition of each action might also include a cost $c(a)$ (the default cost is one). The planning task should generate as output a plan, sequence of actions $\pi = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ such that if applied in order from the initial state I would result in a state s_n , where goals are true, $G \subseteq s_n$. Plan cost is commonly defined as: $C(\pi) = \sum_{a_i \in \pi} c(a_i)$.

We will use the concept of causal link from partial-order planning [12] to define opportunities.

Definition 1 (Causal link): A causal link is a tuple $\langle a_p, f, a_c \rangle$ that specifies that action a_p (producer) achieves an effect $f \in F$ that is needed as a precondition of action a_c (consumer).

\mathcal{L} will be the set of causal links from a plan. Since there might be more than one instance of the same action in the plan, we will use a vector for \mathcal{L} , where each position represents a step in the plan, and will hold a set of causal links on that step.

Example. Suppose we have a robot that is taking actions in an environment with rooms and objects as shown in Figure 1. We named the domain ROOMS. Let us assume it can execute three actions: **move** from one room to another, **prepare** an object for grasping and **grasp** the object. In the example, it operates in an environment composed of three rooms - locations - ($L1$, $L2$ and $L3$), where there are two objects ($O1$ at $L1$, $O2$ at $L2$). Initially, it is at $L3$ and the goal is to hold both objects.

Table I shows schematically the lifted actions in this domain. Names preceded by a question mark are variables.




Fig. 1: Example of the ROOMS domain with one robot, two objects and three rooms. The goal is to grab all objects.

The actual actions in A are computed by instantiating the variables with the objects in the initial state. As mentioned before, actions are modeled with a set of preconditions that need to be true before applying them, and a set of effects that are expected to be true (add effects) or false (del effects, preceded by \neg) after executing the action. In this domain, $\text{at-robot}(?l)$ means that the robot is at a given room $?l$, $\text{prepared}(?o)$ means that an object is ready to be grasped, and $\text{holding}(?o)$ means that object $?o$ is held by the robot.

TABLE I: Actions in the ROOMS domain.

Action	Preconditions	Effects
$\text{move}(?l1, ?l2)$	$\text{at-robot}(?l1)$	$\text{at-robot}(?l2)$ $\neg\text{at-robot}(?l1)$
$\text{prepare}(?o, ?l)$	$\text{at-object}(?o, ?l)$ $\text{at-robot}(?l)$	$\text{prepared}(?o)$
$\text{grasp}(?o, ?l)$	$\text{at-object}(?o, ?l)$ $\text{at-robot}(?l)$ $\text{prepared}(?o)$	$\text{holding}(?o)$ $\neg\text{at-object}(?o, ?l)$

A potential causal link in this domain would be:
 $\langle \text{move}(L3, L1), \text{at-robot}(L1), \text{prepare}(O1, L1) \rangle$

The action $\text{move}(L3, L1)$ achieves the proposition $\text{at-robot}(L1)$ that is needed by action $\text{prepare}(O1, L1)$ as one of its preconditions.

IV. COMPUTATION OF CAUSAL LINKS OPPORTUNITIES

Given a planning task and a plan, the computation of Causal Links based Opportunities, CLO, follows Algorithm 1. It computes the set of causal links \mathcal{L} from which it extracts the opportunities and that will also serve to perform intelligent repair. It computed the set from a valid plan and it starts from the end of the plan in reverse order, to there cannot be threats in \mathcal{L} . Threats are actions that could potentially be executed between the producer and consumer actions are executed and that would delete the fact of the causal link. The algorithm starts by initializing P , a set of pairs where each pair is composed of a pending goal (the algorithm did not find yet an action that can achieve it), and the action that needs that goal to be true (consumer). At start, pairs will be formed by the goals of the problem and a virtual action A_∞ . Then, for each action in the plan (starting from the end), and each effect of that action, if that effect is needed by any pending goal, it creates a causal link and removes the corresponding pending goal from P . The final step in the loop inserts the preconditions of the action into P . The algorithm returns the set of causal links that will be used in monitoring. The set of opportunities \mathcal{O} is the set of all propositions involved in at least one causal link.

Algorithm 1 CAUSAL LINKS OPPORTUNITIES, CLO (Π, π)

Inputs: planning task $\Pi = \{F, A, I, G\}$, plan π **Outputs:** set of causal links \mathcal{L} , opportunities, \mathcal{O}

```
1: Init:  $\forall i \in [1..|\pi| - 1], \mathcal{L}(i) \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2: Init:  $P \leftarrow \{\langle g, A_\infty \rangle : \forall g \in G\}; i \leftarrow 1$ 
3: for all  $a \in \text{reverse}(\pi)$  do
4:   for all  $f \in \text{eff}(a)$  do
5:     for all  $p = \langle f, a_c \rangle \in P$  do
6:        $\mathcal{L}(i) \leftarrow \mathcal{L}(i) \cup \{\langle a, f, a_c \rangle\}$ 
7:        $P \leftarrow P \setminus \langle f, a_c \rangle$ 
8:      $P \leftarrow P \cup \{\langle p, a \rangle : p \in \text{pre}(a)\}$ 
9:      $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
10:  $\mathcal{O} \leftarrow \{f \mid \langle a_p, f, a_c \rangle \in \mathcal{L}\}$ 
11: return  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{O}$ 
```

Example. The causal links associated to the plan to solve the problem in Figure 1 are represented in Table II, where the first column shows the plan actions.

TABLE II: Causal links of the plan to solve problem in Figure 1.

Step	Producer	Proposition	Consumer
1	move(L3, L1)	at-robot(L1)	prepare(O1, L1)
	move(L3, L1)	at-robot(L1)	grasp(O1, L1)
	move(L3, L1)	at-robot(L1)	move(L1, L2)
2	prepare(O1, L1)	prepared(O1)	grasp(O1, L1)
3	grasp(O1, L1)	holding(O1)	A_∞
4	move(L1, L2)	at-robot(L2)	prepare(O2, L2)
	move(L1, L2)	at-robot(L2)	grasp(O2, L2)
5	prepare(O2, L2)	prepared(O2)	grasp(O2, L2)
6	grasp(O2, L2)	holding(O2)	A_∞

The opportunities in this example would be the set:

$$\mathcal{O} = \{\text{at-robot(L1)}, \text{prepared(O1)}, \text{holding(O1)}, \text{at-robot(L2)}, \text{prepared(O2)}, \text{holding(O2)}\}$$

V. INTELLIGENT MONITORING

The goal of the monitoring and execution system is to execute actions, check if a dynamic opportunity has appeared and modifying the plan if needed. Algorithm 2 performs the execution-monitoring loop. It first computes the plan (π), and the causal-links (\mathcal{L}) and opportunities \mathcal{O} . Then, it loops while it did not achieve the goals and there are still actions to be executed. It executes the first action of the remaining plan, and senses the environment for the new state. The sensing action takes as input the opportunities and the action, since it will focus its attention on those facts plus the effects of the action. For each opportunity in the new state, it calls the REPAIR algorithm. Then, if replanning is needed due to a failed execution (preconditions of next actions are not met), then a new plan and opportunities are computed by calling the planner and the CLO algorithm. The algorithm returns True if the goals were achieved and False otherwise.

Algorithm 3 presents the pseudo-code of the repair strategy. In a nutshell, it removes the opportunity o from all the causal links where it was needed. If the set of causal links of

Algorithm 2 OPPORTUNITIES PLAN EXECUTION(Π)

Inputs: planning task $\Pi = \{F, A, I, G\}$ **Outputs:** boolean (solved or not)

```
1: Init:  $\pi \leftarrow \text{PLAN}(\Pi); \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{O} \leftarrow \text{CLO}(\Pi, \pi); s \leftarrow I$ 
2: while  $\pi \neq \emptyset$  AND  $G \not\subseteq s$  do
3:    $a \leftarrow \text{POP}(\pi)$ 
4:   EXECUTE( $a, \Pi$ )
5:    $s' \leftarrow \text{SENSE}(a, \mathcal{O})$ 
6:   for all  $o \in s' \cap \mathcal{O}$  do
7:      $\pi, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{O} \leftarrow \text{REPAIR}(o, \pi, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{O})$ 
8:   if NEEDREPLANNING( $s', \pi$ ) then
9:      $\pi', \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{O} \leftarrow \text{PLAN OPPORTUNITIES}(\{F, A, s', G\}, \pi, \mathcal{L})$ 
10:    if  $\pi' \neq \emptyset$  then
11:       $\pi \leftarrow \pi'$ 
12:    else
13:      return False
14:    else
15:       $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \text{rest}(\mathcal{L})$ 
16:       $s \leftarrow s'$ 
17:    if  $G \subseteq s$  then
18:      return True
19:    else
20:      return False
```

any action becomes empty, the action is no longer needed. Algorithm 4 removes all such actions iteratively. The same action can appear multiple times in a plan, so the algorithm only removes the first one found in the remaining plan and removes actions backwards from that action.

Example. Suppose the robot starts executing the plan by applying the action `move(L3, L1)`. If the new state only changes in the robot position, it continues with the execution since this was the expected state. If new facts become true but they are not opportunities, it also continues the execution. It will only react to state changes that could affect the causal links of the plan. If the new state includes changes in any of the opportunities, then it will try to repair the plan. Suppose that `holding(O2)` becomes true after executing the action `move(L3, L1)` because another agent has prepared and given the object to the robot. The REPAIR algorithm would find the first step where there is a causal link that uses that fact, step 6. The action `grasp(O2, L2)` will achieve that fact, which is needed by the goals (A_∞ action). Then, the algorithm removes the causal link in step 6 from \mathcal{L} . If the set of causal links at that step becomes empty, it means that the corresponding action, `grasp(O2, L2)`, is not needed; that is, the action does not provide anything useful to the plan. This is what happens to step 6. Since the action is no longer needed, it analyzes backwards from that step which causal links produced some fact to be consumed by that action, because those causal links will also not be needed. We see that step 5 had only one causal link whose consumer action is `grasp(O2, L2)`. Therefore, we can also remove that causal link, and proceed backwards. Since step 5 becomes empty, the algorithm also adds action `prepare(O2, L2)` to the list

Algorithm 3 REPAIR($o, \pi, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{O}$)

Inputs: found opportunity o , current plan π , causal links \mathcal{L} **Outputs:** new plan π , new causal links \mathcal{L} , opportunities, \mathcal{O}

```
1: repeat
2:   Init: changed? $\leftarrow$ False;  $i \leftarrow 0$ 
3:   repeat
4:     for all  $l = \langle a_p, o, a_c \rangle \in \mathcal{L}(i)$  do
5:        $\mathcal{L}(i) \leftarrow \mathcal{L}(i) \setminus \{l\}$ 
6:        $a \leftarrow a_p$ 
7:       changed? $\leftarrow$ True
8:     if  $\mathcal{L}(i) = \emptyset$  then
9:        $\pi, \mathcal{L} \leftarrow \text{REMOVEACTIONS}(i, \pi, \mathcal{L})$ 
10:     $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
11:   until changed? or  $i = |\mathcal{L}|$ 
12: until not(changed?)
13:  $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \{l : l \in \mathcal{L}, l \neq \emptyset\}$ 
14:  $\mathcal{O} \leftarrow \{f \mid \langle a_p, f, a_c \rangle \in \mathcal{L}\}$ 
15:  $\pi' \leftarrow \{a : a \in \pi, a \neq \emptyset\}$ 
16: return  $\pi', \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{O}$ 
```

of actions to be removed. Step 4 also included grasp(O2, L2) as a consumer of a causal link, so that causal link is removed. However, the producer action, move(L1, L2) still has other causal links, so it is not added to the list of actions to be removed yet. At this step, the remaining causal links are depicted in Table III.

TABLE III: Causal links after removing two causal links.

Step	Producer	Proposition	Consumer
2	prepare(O1, L1)	prepared(O1)	grasp(O1, L1)
3	grasp(O1, L1)	holding(O1)	A_∞
4	move(L1, L2)	at-robot(L2)	prepare(O2, L2)

The set of actions to be removed is now composed of grasp(O2, L2) and prepare(O2, L2). The algorithm proceeds until there are no more actions to be removed. The algorithm returns: the new set of causal links, removing the corresponding steps; the new plan, removing all actions whose steps became empty after removing the causal links; and the new set of opportunities (propositions in the remaining causal links). The new set of causal links is shown in Table IV and the new plan would be:

$$\pi = \text{prepare}(O1, L1), \text{grasp}(O1, L1).$$

The algorithm has obtained a new plan much shorter than the original one by removing actions that are no longer needed after finding an opportunity.

TABLE IV: Causal links after removing the causal links that are no longer needed.

Step	Producer	Proposition	Consumer
1	prepare(O1, L1)	prepared(O1)	grasp(O1, L1)
2	grasp(O1, L1)	holding(O1)	A_∞

Algorithm 4 REMOVEACTIONS(i, π, \mathcal{L})

Inputs: position of a in π i , current plan π , causal links \mathcal{L} **Outputs:** new plan π , new causal links \mathcal{L}

```
1: Init:  $j \leftarrow |\pi|$ ;  $A^- \leftarrow \{i\}$ 
2: repeat
3:   found? $\leftarrow$ False
4:    $i \leftarrow \text{pop}(A^-)$ 
5:    $a \leftarrow \pi(i)$ 
6:    $k \leftarrow i$ 
7:   repeat
8:     for all  $l = \langle a_p, f, a_c \rangle \in \mathcal{L}(k)$  do
9:       if  $a_c = a$  then
10:         $\mathcal{L}(k) \leftarrow \mathcal{L}(k) \setminus \{l\}$ 
11:       if  $a_p = a$  then
12:        found? $\leftarrow$ True
13:       if  $\mathcal{L}(k) = \emptyset$  then
14:         $A^- \leftarrow A^- \cup \{k\}$ 
15:         $\pi(k) \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
16:         $k \leftarrow k - 1$ 
17:       until found? or  $k = 0$ 
18:   until  $A^- = \emptyset$ 
19: return  $\pi, \mathcal{L}$ 
```

VI. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

In this section, we compare the performance of our proposed system, CLO, to that of REPLAN, a standard strategy that replans every time there is some change between the perceived state and the expected state. We have created versions of three known robotic tasks: the ROOMS domain defined before that covers navigation and grasping tasks; the DIALOG domain that covers human-robot interaction tasks; and the COOKING domain that covers home-related tasks. We have just defined the barebones of those tasks to highlight that, even with minimalistic models, the technique introduced in this paper outperforms standard replanning strategies. The more actions the plans have, the greater the benefits will be of using our approach. For each domain, we generated four problems of increasing difficulty, named p-05, p-10, p-20 and p-40 where we increase the number of objects and goals according to those numbers. The appearance of an opportunity at a given time step depends on a probability that we have varied using the values 0.1, 0.2 and 0.5.

We used LAMA-FIRST as the base planner implemented in Fast Downward [22]. Experiments were performed on a MacBook Pro, with processor 2.4 GHz Intel Core i5, 4Gb of RAM. The time bounds were: 1800s for the complete planning-execution cycle; 500s for each planning episode; and 300s for computing opportunities. These bounds were reached only by REPLAN in two cases.

A. ROOMS Domain

The ROOMS domain is the one defined in Table I. Opportunities are objects being held by the robot because another agent gave them or objects prepared before they are needed by other robots. In order to simulate a real environment,




Fig. 2: Total time in the (a) ROOMS, (b) DIALOG and (c) COOKING domains taken by CLO (replanning with opportunities) and REPLAN.

TABLE V: Number of executed actions in the three domains.

Problem	Probability	ROOMS		DIALOG		COOKING	
		#actions CLO	#actions REPLAN	#actions CLO	#actions REPLAN	#actions CLO	#actions REPLAN
p-05	0.1	12.0	12.0	23.0	23.0	28.0	28.0
p-05	0.2	9.0	9.0	26.0	26.0	30.0	29.0
p-05	0.5	8.0	8.0	14.0	14.0	23.0	22.0
p-10	0.1	27.0	26.0	48.0	48.0	68.0	68.0
p-10	0.2	24.0	23.0	41.0	39.0	44.0	43.0
p-10	0.5	20.0	18.0	35.0	33.0	39.0	36.0
p-20	0.1	51.0	49.0	95.0	93.0	96.0	96.0
p-20	0.2	53.0	49.0	86.0	82.0	80.0	80.0
p-20	0.5	41.0	33.0	66.0	61.0	50.0	46.0
p-40	0.1	110.0	103.0	197.0	-	176.0	174.0
p-40	0.2	96.0	92.0	167.0	-	162.0	162.0
p-40	0.5	71.0	69.0	127.0	123.0	92.0	88.0

every time the robot executes some action, the perception system discovers five new objects in the room it is operating at. This is only relevant for REPLAN, since CLO focuses only on the found opportunities. The initial length of the plans were: 14, 29, 59 and 119 actions, respectively.

B. DIALOG Domain

The DIALOG domain consists of a robot that operates in an open environment and has to approach humans to ask them a sequence of questions. It uses two actions (move and ask) and four predicates (at-robot, at-human, asked and another one for defining the dependency between questions, depends). In the initial state, the robot did not ask any question to any available human, and in the goals, it should have asked five questions to all these humans. Opportunities arise because, sometimes, humans provide information on future questions in the surveys when answering previous questions. In this domain, the robot’s perception system sees five new humans in their surrounding every time it executes an action in the plan. The number of actions of the initial plans were: 30, 60, 120 and 240 actions, respectively.

C. COOKING Domain

The COOKING domain consists of a robot that has to cut some specific quantities of ingredients in a restaurant. It uses two actions (get and cut ingredient) and two predicates

(has-ingredient, and has-cut, to define how many units of each ingredient the robot has cut). In the initial state, the robot did not cut any ingredient, and in the goals, it should have cut a given amount of units of those ingredients. Opportunities might arise given that the robot might expect that the ingredients can yield a given quantity of cut units, but there are ingredients of varying size that will yield different quantities when cut. Also, there might be other agents cutting ingredients unexpectedly generating the required cut units. In this domain, the robot perceives five more ingredients every time it executes an action. The number of actions in the initial plans were: 35, 85, 185 and 385 actions, respectively.

D. Results

Figure 2 shows the total time employed by CLO and REPLAN (in seconds) in the three domains: (a) ROOMS, (b) DIALOG and (c) COOKING. The problems are on the x-axis, while the different lines correspond to the probabilities of opportunity appearance. The graph for time for REPLAN in the DIALOG domain stops at p-20, since it cannot solve the p-40 problem due to the time constraint. Table V shows the number of executed actions in the three domains. A dash means the task could not be solved in the allotted time.

E. Discussion

We can draw the following conclusions that are common for all domains. The computational effort measured in terms

of computation time or number of nodes expanded of REPLAN can be up to two orders of magnitude bigger than that of CLO. Changes in the environment in most robotic domains occur at each time step. Since REPLAN has to replan every time there is a change in the environment, the total planning time is a burden for this approach compared to the short time required to perform repairs in the plan. This is true even in domains, such as the minimalist versions used in the experiments, where the planning time is really small (less than one second per planning step in most replanning episodes). This effect is most noticeable in the DIALOG domain where REPLAN cannot solve the hardest task in the allotted time in two out of the three configurations.

The computational effort is also affected by the probability of appearance of an opportunity, especially in the case of REPLAN. The higher the probability, the higher the reduction in computational effort, since the length of execution (and thus planning) episodes decreases. Also, since CLO provides the monitoring system with a reduced set of propositions to look at, the perception system only has to focus on those. Therefore, the perception cost gets reduced accordingly.

In terms of quality of solutions, the results are similar for both configurations. The number of executed actions of REPLAN is slightly less than CLO, given that replanning can potentially find improvements on the new plan that cannot be found by our repair approach. And, again, there is a huge influence on how many opportunities appear. When many opportunities appear (high probability of appearance), the number of executed actions can decrease to half the number of executed actions with less opportunities.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we present three main contributions: definition and computation of opportunities on dynamic predicates; detection of opportunities during execution; and repairing a plan when some opportunity arises. Experimental results show the benefits that using this approach brings to three domains that cover a wide range of representative robotic tasks. As future work, we would like to study other alternatives to improve the repair mechanism. Besides, this work checks the opportunities at every execution step. However, some opportunities may be only, or more relevant, at some execution step. Furthermore, we do not consider perception cost of each type of opportunity. In our future work, we will continue to enrich the model of interleaving planning and execution, bringing to execution knowledge about the potential value of opportunities, but also weighing the cost, frequency, and timing of opportunity perception.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper was prepared for information purposes by the Artificial Intelligence Research group of JPMorgan Chase & Co. and its affiliates (“JP Morgan”), and is not a product of the Research Department of JP Morgan. JP Morgan makes no representation and warranty whatsoever and disclaims all liability, for the completeness, accuracy or reliability of the information contained herein. This document is not

intended as investment research or investment advice, or a recommendation, offer or solicitation for the purchase or sale of any security, financial instrument, financial product or service, or to be used in any way for evaluating the merits of participating in any transaction, and shall not constitute a solicitation under any jurisdiction or to any person, if such solicitation under such jurisdiction or to such person would be unlawful. This work has been partially funded by FEDER/Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades - Agencia Estatal de Investigación, TIN2017-88476-C2-2-R.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Ghallab, D. Nau, and P. Traverso, *Automated Planning. Theory & Practice*, M. Kaufmann, Ed. Morgan Kaufmann, 2004.
- [2] M. M. Veloso, J. Biswas, B. Coltin, and S. Rosenthal, “Cobots: Robust symbiotic autonomous mobile service robots,” in *Proceedings of IJCAI*, 2015, p. 4423.
- [3] K. Z. Haigh and M. M. Veloso, “Interleaving planning and robot execution for asynchronous user requests,” *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 79–95, March 1998.
- [4] S. Yoon, A. Fern, and R. Givan, “FF-replan: A baseline for probabilistic planning,” in *Proceedings of ICAPS*, 2007, pp. 352–360.
- [5] J. Bruce and M. Veloso, “Real-time randomized path planning for robot navigation,” in *Proceedings of IROS*, 2002, pp. 2383–2388.
- [6] M. Fox, A. Gerevini, D. Long, and I. Serina, “Plan stability: Replanning versus plan repair,” in *Proceedings of ICAPS*, 2006, pp. 212–221.
- [7] D. Borrajo and M. Veloso, “Probabilistically reusing plans in deterministic planning,” in *Proceedings of ICAPS Workshop on Heuristics and Search for Domain-Independent Planning*, 2012, pp. 17–25.
- [8] C. Fritz and S. A. McIlraith, “Monitoring plan optimality during execution,” in *Proceedings of ICAPS*, 2007, pp. 144–151.
- [9] M. M. Veloso, M. E. Pollack, and M. T. Cox, “Rationale-based monitoring for planning in dynamic environments,” in *Proceedings of AIPS*, 1998, pp. 171–180.
- [10] M. M. Veloso and J. G. Carbonell, “Derivational analogy in PRODIGY: Automating case acquisition, storage, and utilization,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 10, pp. 249–278, 1993.
- [11] D. Borrajo and M. M. Veloso, “Computing opportunities to augment plans for novel replanning during execution,” in *Proceedings of ICAPS*, 2021.
- [12] J. S. Penberthy and D. S. Weld, “UCPOP: A sound, complete, partial order planner for ADL,” in *Proceedings of KR*, 1992, pp. 103–114.
- [13] D. Borrajo, A. Roubířková, and I. Serina, “Progress in case-based planning,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 35:1–35:39, 2015.
- [14] C. M. Seifert and A. L. Patalano, “Opportunism in memory: Preparing for chance encounters,” *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 198–201, 2001.
- [15] D. Thakur, M. Likhachev, J. Keller, V. Kumar, V. Dobrokhodov, K. Jones, J. Wurz, and I. Kammer, “Planning for opportunistic surveillance with multiple robots,” in *Proceedings of IROS*, 2013, pp. 5750–5757.
- [16] T. Kruse and A. Kirsch, “Towards opportunistic action selection in human-robot cooperation,” in *33rd Annual German Conference on Artificial Intelligence (KI)*, 2010, pp. 374–381.
- [17] M. Cefalo, P. Ferrari, and G. Oriolo, “An opportunistic strategy for motion planning in the presence of soft task constraints,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 6294–6301, 2020.
- [18] S. M. Chaves, A. Kim, and R. M. Eustice, “Opportunistic sampling-based planning for active visual slam,” in *Proceedings of IROS*, 2014, pp. 3073–3080.
- [19] M. Cashmore, M. Fox, D. Long, D. Magazzini, and B. Ridder, “Opportunistic planning in autonomous underwater missions,” *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 519–530, 2017.
- [20] A. Coles, “Opportunistic branched plans to maximise utility in the presence of resource uncertainty,” in *Proceedings of ECAI*, 2012, pp. 252–257.
- [21] J. H. Lawton and C. Domshlak, “Multi-agent opportunistic planning and plan execution,” in *Proceedings of ICTAI*, 2004, pp. 408–416.
- [22] M. Helmert, “The Fast Downward planning system,” *JAIR*, vol. 26, pp. 191–246, 2006.