

# Planning with Pattern Databases

Stefan Edelkamp

Institut für Informatik  
Albert-Ludwigs-Universität  
Georges-Köhler-Allee, Gebäude 51  
D-79110 Freiburg  
eMail: edelkamp@informatik.uni-freiburg.de

**Abstract.** Heuristic search planning effectively finds solutions for various benchmark planning problems, but since the estimates are either not admissible or too weak, optimal solutions are found in rare cases only. In contrast, heuristic pattern databases are known to significantly improve lower-bound estimates for optimally solving challenging single-agent problems like the 24-Puzzle and Rubik’s Cube.

This paper studies the effect of pattern databases in the context of deterministic planning. Given a fixed state description based on instantiated predicates, we provide a general abstraction scheme to automatically create admissible domain-independent memory-based heuristics for planning problems, where abstractions are found in factorizing the planning space. We evaluate the impact of pattern database heuristics in A\* and hill climbing algorithms for a collection of benchmark domains.

## 1 Introduction

General propositional planning is PSPACE complete [3], but when tackling specific benchmark planning instances, improving the solution quality usually reveals the intrinsic hardness of the problems. For example, plan existence of Logistic and Blocks World problem instances is polynomial, but minimizing the solution lengths for these planning problems is NP-hard [11]. On the other hand for some benchmark domains like *Sokoban* and *Mystery* even plan existence is NP-hard. Therefore, we propose a planner that is able to find optimal plans and, if challenging planning problems call for exponential resources, the planner approximates the optimal solution.

### 1.1 Optimal Planning Approaches

*Graphplan* [1] constructs a layered planning graph containing two types of nodes, action nodes and proposition nodes. In each layer the preconditions of all operators are matched, such that *Graphplan* considers instantiated actions at specific points in time. *Graphplan* generates partially ordered plans to exhibit concurrent actions and alternates between two phases: *graph extension* to increase the

search depth and *solution extraction* to terminate the planning process. *Graphplan* finds optimal parallel plans, but does not approximate solution lengths; it simply exhausts the given resources.

Another optimal planning approach is symbolic exploration simulating a breadth-first search according to the binary encoding of planning states. The operators unfold the initial state over time and an efficient theorem prover then searches for a satisfying truth assignment. A Boolean formula  $f_t$  describes the set of states reachable in  $t$  steps. If  $f_t$  contains a goal state, the problem is solvable with the minimal  $t$  as the optimal solution length.

Two approaches have been proposed. *Satplan* [17] encodes the planning problem with a standard representation of Boolean formulae as a conjunct of clauses. The alternative in the planner *Mips* [8] is to apply binary decision diagrams (BDDs); a data structure providing a unique representation for Boolean functions [2]. The BDD planning approach is in fact *reachability analysis* in model checking [4]. It applies to both deterministic and non-deterministic planning and the generated plans are optimal in the number of sequential execution steps. Usually, symbolic approaches cannot approximate except for recent preliminary results with domain abstractions [15] and with symbolic best-first search [6]. Though promising, the solution quality is not as good as in explicit search.

## 1.2 Heuristic Search Planning

Directed search is currently the most effective approach in classical AI-planning: four of five honored planning systems in the general planning track of the AIPS-2000 competition at least partially incorporate heuristic search. However, in traversing the huge state spaces of all combinations of grounded predicates, all planners rely on inadmissible estimates. The currently fastest deterministic planner, FF [13], solves a relaxed planning problem for each state to compute an inadmissible estimate. Furthermore, non-general pruning rules in FF such as *helpful action cuts* and *goal ordering cuts* help to avoid plateaus and local optima in the underlying hill-climbing algorithm. Completeness in undirected problem graphs is achieved by breadth-first searching improvements for the estimate and by omitting pruning in case of backtracks. Nevertheless, the daunting problem for FF are directed problem graphs with dead-ends from which its move committing hill-climbing algorithm cannot recover.

The best admissible estimate that has been applied to planning is the *max-pair* heuristic [10] implemented in the HSP planner. However, even by sacrificing optimality due to scaling, in AIPS-2000 this estimate was too weak to compete with the FF-heuristic. Moreover, own experiments with an improvement to *max-pair* according to a minimum matching on a graph weighted with fact-pair solution lengths were discouraging.

This paper proposes a pre-computed admissible heuristic that easily outperforms *max-pair* and by scaling the influence of the heuristic even the state-of-the-art FF-heuristic is beaten. To build the database we exhaustively search all state-to-goal distances in tractable abstractions of the planning state-space that serve as lower bound estimates for the overall problem. After studying the

pattern database framework, we present experiments with a sizable number of benchmark planning problems of AIPS-1998 and AIPS-2000 and draw concluding remarks.

## 2 Planning Space Representation

For the sake of simplicity we concentrate on the STRIPS formalism [9], in which each operator is defined by a precondition list  $P$ , an add list  $A$ , and a delete list  $D$ , but the presented approach can be extended to various problem description languages which can be parsed into a fixed state encoding. We refer to state descriptions and lists as sets/conjuncts of *grounded* predicates also called *facts* or *atoms*. This is not a limitation since all state-of-the-art planners perform grounding; either prior to the search or on the fly.

**Definition 1.** Let  $F$  be the set of grounded predicates and  $O$  be a set of grounded STRIPS operators. The result  $S'$  of an operator  $o = (P, A, D) \in O$  applied to a state  $S \subseteq F$  is defined as  $S' = (S \setminus D) \cup A$  in case  $P \subseteq S$ . Inverse STRIPS operators  $o^{-1}$  are given by  $o^{-1} = ((P \setminus D) \cup A, D, A)$ .

We exemplify our considerations in the Blocks World domain of AIPS-2000, specified with the four operators `pick-up`, `put-down`, `stack`, and `unstack`. For example, the grounded operator `(pick-up a)` is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \{(\text{clear } a), (\text{ontable } a), (\text{handempty})\}, \\ A &= \{(\text{holding } a)\}, \text{ and} \\ D &= \{(\text{ontable } a), (\text{clear } a), (\text{handempty})\} \end{aligned}$$

The goal of the instance 4-1 is defined by  $\{(\text{on } d \ c), (\text{on } c \ a), (\text{on } a \ b)\}$  and the initial state is given by  $\{(\text{clear } b) (\text{ontable } d), (\text{on } b \ c), (\text{on } c \ a), (\text{on } a \ d)\}$ . The first step to construct a pattern database is a domain analysis prior to the search. The output are *mutex groups* of mutually exclusive facts. In every state (reachable from the initial state), exactly one of the atoms in each group will be true. In general this construction is not unique such that we minimize the state description length over all possible partitionings as proposed for the MIPS planning system [7]. In the example problem we find the following nine mutex-groups.

- $G_1 = \{(\text{on } c \ a), (\text{on } d \ a), (\text{on } b \ a), (\text{clear } a), (\text{holding } a)\},$
- $G_2 = \{(\text{on } a \ c), (\text{on } d \ c), (\text{on } b \ c), (\text{clear } c), (\text{holding } c)\},$
- $G_3 = \{(\text{on } a \ d), (\text{on } c \ d), (\text{on } b \ d), (\text{clear } d), (\text{holding } d)\},$
- $G_4 = \{(\text{on } a \ b), (\text{on } c \ b), (\text{on } d \ b), (\text{clear } b), (\text{holding } b)\},$
- $G_5 = \{(\text{ontable } a), \text{true}\},$
- $G_6 = \{(\text{ontable } c), \text{true}\},$
- $G_7 = \{(\text{ontable } d), \text{true}\},$
- $G_8 = \{(\text{ontable } b), \text{true}\},$  and
- $G_9 = \{(\text{handempty}), \text{true}\},$

where `true` refers to the situation, when none of the other atoms is present in a given state description.

**Definition 2.** Let  $G = \{G_1, \dots, G_k\}$  with  $G_i \subseteq F \cup \{\text{true}\}$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  be the set of mutex groups, i.e.  $f_i \neq f_j$  for  $f_i \in G_i \setminus \{\text{true}\}$  and  $f_j \in G_j \setminus \{\text{true}\}$ . A state is a conjunct  $f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_k$  of facts  $f_i \in G_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . All represented states span the planning space<sup>1</sup>  $\mathcal{P}$ .

### 3 Pattern Databases

A recent trend in single-agent search is to calculate the estimate with heuristic pattern databases (PDBs) [5]. The idea is to generate heuristics that are defined by distances in space abstractions. PDB heuristics are consistent<sup>2</sup> and have been effectively applied to solve challenging  $(n^2 - 1)$ -Puzzles [19] and Rubik’s Cube [18]. In the  $(n^2 - 1)$ -Puzzle a pattern is a collection of tiles and in Rubik’s Cube either a set of edge-*cubies* or a set of corner-*cubies* is selected.

For all of these problems the construction of the PDB has been implemented problem-dependently, i.e. by manual input of the abstraction for the puzzles and its storage by suitable perfect hash functions. In contrast, we apply the concept of PDBs to general problem-independent planning and construct pattern databases fully automatically.

#### 3.1 State Abstractions

State space abstractions in the context of PDBs are concisely introduced in [12]: A state is a vector of fixed length and operators are conveniently expressed by label sets, e.g. an operator mapping  $\langle A, B, \_ \rangle$  to  $\langle B, A, \_ \rangle$  corresponds to a transposition of the first two elements for any state vector of length three. The state space is the transitive closure of the seed state  $S_0$  and the operators  $O$ . A *domain abstraction* is defined as a mapping  $\phi$  from one label set  $L$  to another label set  $K$  with  $|K| < |L|$  such that states and operators can be simplified by reducing the underlying label set. A *state space abstraction* of the search problem  $\langle S_0, O, L \rangle$  is denoted as  $\langle \phi(S_0), \phi(O), K \rangle$ . In particular, the abstraction mapping is non-injective such that the abstract space (which is the image of the original state space) is therefore much smaller than the original space.

The framework in [12] only applies to certain kinds of permutation groups, where in our case the abstract space is obtained in a more general way, since abstraction is achieved by projecting the state representation.

<sup>1</sup> The planning space  $\mathcal{P}$  is in fact smaller than the set of subsets of grounded predicates, but includes the set of states reachable from the initial state.

<sup>2</sup> Consistent heuristic estimates fulfill  $h(v) - h(u) + w(u, v) \geq 0$  for each edge  $(u, v)$  in the underlying, possibly weighted, problem graph. They yield monotone merits  $f(u) = g(u) + h(u)$  on generating paths with weight  $g(u)$ . Admissible heuristics are lower bound estimates which underestimate the goal distance for each state. Consistent estimates are indeed admissible.

**Definition 3.** Let  $F$  be the set of grounded predicates. A planning space abstraction  $\phi$  is a mapping from  $F$  to  $F \cup \{\mathbf{true}\}$  such that for each group  $G$  either for all  $f \in G : \phi(f) = f$  or for all  $f \in G : \phi(f) = \mathbf{true}$ .

Since planning states are interpreted as conjuncts of facts,  $\phi$  can be extended to map each planning state of the original space  $\mathcal{P}$  to one in the abstract space  $\mathcal{A}$ . In the example problem instance we apply two planning space abstractions  $\phi_{odd}$  and  $\phi_{even}$ . The mapping  $\phi_{odd}$  assigns all atoms in groups of odd index to the trivial value  $\mathbf{true}$  and, analogously,  $\phi_{even}$  maps all fluents in groups with even index value to  $\mathbf{true}$ . All groups not containing a atoms in the goal state are also mapped to  $\mathbf{true}$ <sup>3</sup>. In the example, the goal is partitioned into  $\phi_{even}(G) = \{(\mathbf{on\ c\ a})\}$  and  $\phi_{odd}(G) = \{(\mathbf{on\ a\ b}), (\mathbf{on\ d\ c})\}$ , since the groups  $G_4$  to  $G_9$  are not present in the goal description.

Abstract operators are defined by intersecting their precondition, add and delete lists with the set of non-reduced facts in the abstraction. This accelerates the construction of the pattern table, since several operators simplify.

**Definition 4.** Let  $\phi$  be a planning space abstraction and  $\delta_\phi(S_1, S_2)$  be the graph-theoretical shortest path between to two states  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Furthermore, let  $S_0$  be the start and  $S_t$  be the set of goal states in  $\mathcal{P}$ . A planning pattern database (PDB) according to  $\phi$  is a set of pairs, with the first component being an abstract planning state  $S$  and the second component being the minimal solution length in the abstract problem space, i.e.,

$$\text{PDB}(\phi) = \{(S, \delta_\phi(S, \phi(S_t))) \mid S \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

$\text{PDB}(\phi)$  is calculated in a breadth-first traversal starting from the set of goals in applying the inverse of the operators. Two facts about PDBs are important. When reducing the state description length  $n$  to  $\alpha n$  with  $0 < \alpha < 1$  the state space and the search tree shrinks exponentially; e.g.  $2^n$  bit vectors correspond to an abstract space of  $2^{\alpha n}$  elements.

The second observation is that once the pattern database is calculated, accessing the heuristic estimate is fast by a simple table lookup (cf. Section 3.3). Moreover, PDBs can be re-used for the case of different initial states.  $\text{PDB}(\phi_{even})$  and  $\text{PDB}(\phi_{odd})$  according to the abstractions  $\phi_{even}$  and  $\phi_{odd}$  of our example problem are depicted in Table 1. Note that there are only three atoms present in the goal state such that one of the pattern databases only contains patterns of length one. Abstraction  $\phi_{even}$  corresponds to  $G_1$  and  $\phi_{odd}$  corresponds to the union of  $G_2$  and  $G_4$ .

### 3.2 Disjoint Pattern Databases

Disjoint pattern databases add estimates according to different abstractions such that the accumulated estimates still provide a lower bound heuristic.

<sup>3</sup> To include mutex-groups into PDB calculations which are not present in the goal state, we may generate *all possible instances* for the fact set. In fact, this is the approach that is applied in our implementation.

$((\text{clear } a),1)$	$((\text{on } d \text{ c})(\text{clear } b),1)$	$((\text{on } a \text{ b})(\text{clear } c),1)$
$((\text{holding } a),2)$	$((\text{on } d \text{ c})(\text{holding } b),2)$	$((\text{clear } c)(\text{clear } b),2)$
$((\text{on } b \text{ a}),2)$	$((\text{on } d \text{ c})(\text{on } d \text{ b}),2)$	$((\text{on } a \text{ b})(\text{holding } c),2)$
$((\text{on } d \text{ a}),2)$	$((\text{on } a \text{ c})(\text{on } a \text{ b}),2)$	$((\text{clear } c)(\text{holding } b),3)$
	$((\text{clear } b)(\text{holding } c),3)$	$((\text{on } a \text{ c})(\text{clear } b),3)$
	$((\text{on } d \text{ b})(\text{clear } c),3)$	$((\text{holding } c)(\text{holding } b),4)$
	$((\text{on } b \text{ c})(\text{clear } b),4)$	$((\text{on } a \text{ c})(\text{holding } b),4)$
	$((\text{on } c \text{ b})(\text{clear } c),4)$	$((\text{on } d \text{ b})(\text{holding } c),4)$
	$((\text{on } a \text{ c})(\text{on } d \text{ b}),4)$	$((\text{on } b \text{ c})(\text{holding } b),5)$
	$((\text{on } a \text{ b})(\text{on } b \text{ c}),5)$	$((\text{on } d \text{ b})(\text{on } b \text{ c}),5)$
	$((\text{on } c \text{ b})(\text{holding } c),5)$	$((\text{on } a \text{ c})(\text{on } c \text{ b}),5)$
	$((\text{on } c \text{ b})(\text{on } d \text{ c}),5)$	

**Table 1.** Pattern databases  $PDB(\phi_{even})$  and  $PDB(\phi_{odd})$  for the example problem.

**Definition 5.** Two pattern databases  $PDB(\phi_1)$  and  $PDB(\phi_2)$  are disjoint, if the sum of respective heuristic estimates always underestimates the overall solution length, i.e.,  $\delta_{\phi_1}(\phi_1(S), \phi_1(S_t)) + \delta_{\phi_2}(\phi_2(S), \phi_2(S_t)) \leq \delta(S, S_t), \forall S \in \mathcal{P}$ .

PDBs are not always disjoint. Suppose that a goal contains two atoms  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ , which are in groups 1 and 2, respectively, and that an operator  $o$  makes both  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  true. Then, the distance under abstraction  $\phi_1$  is 1 (because the abstraction of  $o$  will make  $p_2$  in group 2 true in one step) and the distance under  $\phi_2$  is also 1 (for the same reason). But the distance in the original search space is also 1.

**Definition 6.** An independent abstraction set  $I$  is a set of group indices such that no operator affects both atoms in groups in  $I$  and atoms in groups that are not in  $I$ . The according abstraction  $\phi_I$  that maps all atom groups not in  $I$  to true is called an independent abstraction.

**Theorem 1.** A partition of the groups into independent abstractions sets yields disjoint pattern databases.

*Proof.* Each operator changes information only within groups of a given partition and an operator of the abstract planning space contributes one to the overall estimate only if it changes facts in available fact groups. Therefore, by adding the solution lengths of different abstract spaces each operator on each path is counted at most once.

For some domains like Logistics operators act locally according to any partition into groups so that the precondition of Theorem 1 is trivially fulfilled.

### 3.3 Perfect Hashing

PDBs are implemented as a (perfect) hash table with a table lookup in time linear to the abstract state description length.

According to the partition into groups a perfect hashing function is defined as follows. Let  $G_{i_1}, G_{i_2}, \dots, G_{i_k}$  be the selected groups in the current abstraction and  $offset(k)$  be defined as  $offset(k) = \prod_{l=1}^k |G_{i_{l-1}}|$  with  $|G_{i_0}| = 1$ . Furthermore, let  $group(f)$  and  $position(f)$  be the group index and the position in the group of fact  $f$ , respectively. Then the perfect hash value  $hash(S)$  of state  $S$  is

$$hash(S) = \sum_{f \in S} position(f) \cdot offset(group(f)).$$

Since perfect hashing uniquely determines an address for the state  $S$ ,  $S$  can be reconstructed given  $hash(S)$  by extracting all corresponding group and position information that define the facts in  $S$ . Therefore, we establish a good compression ratio, since each state in the queue for the breadth-first search traversal only consumes one integer. The breadth-first-search queue is only needed for construction and the resulting PDB is a plain integer array of size  $offset(k+1)$  encoding the distance values for the corresponding states, initialized with  $\infty$  for patterns that are not encountered. Some states are not generated, since they are not reachable, but the above scheme is more time and space efficient than ordinary hashing storing the uncompressed state representation. Since small integer elements consume only a few bytes, on current machines we may generate PDBs of a hundred million entries and more.


### 3.4 Clustering

In the simple example planning problem the combined sizes of groups and the total size of the generated pattern databases  $PDB(\phi_{even})$  and  $PDB(\phi_{odd})$  differ considerably. Since we perform a complete exploration in the generation process, in larger examples the requirements in time and space resources for computing PDBs might be exhausted. Therefore, an automatic way to find a suitable balanced partition according to given memory limitations is required. Instead of a bound on the total size of all PDBs together, we globally limit the size of each pattern database, which is in fact the number of expected states. The restriction is not crucial, since the number of different pattern databases is small in practice. The threshold is the parameter to tune the quality of the estimate. Obviously, large threshold values yield optimal estimates in small problem spaces.

We are confronted with a Bin-Packing variant: Given the sizes of groups, the task is to find the minimal number of pattern databases such that the sizes do not exceed a certain threshold value. Notice that the group sizes are multiplied in order to estimate the search space size. However, the corresponding encoding lengths add up. Bin-Packing is NP-hard in general, but good approximation algorithms exist. In our experiments we applied the best-fit strategy.

## 4 Results

All experimental results were produced on a Linux PC, Pentium III CPU with 800 MHz and 512 MByte. We chose the most efficient domain-independent planners as competitors. In Logistics, the program FF is chosen for comparison and



**Fig. 1.** Time performances and numbers of expansions of A\* and hill climbing in the Logistics domain with respect to the PDB and FF heuristic on a logarithmic scale. PDB construction time is included in the overall search time.

in Blocks World, the pattern database approach is compared to the optimal planner *Mips*.


#### 4.1 Logistics

We applied PDBs to Logistics and solved the entire problem set of AIPS-2000. The largest problem instance includes 14 trucks located in one of three locations of the 14 cities. Together with four airplanes the resulting state space has a size of about  $3^{14} \cdot 14^4 \cdot 60^{42} \approx 8.84223 \cdot 10^{85}$  states. All competing planners that have solved the entire benchmark problem suite are (enforced) hill-climbers with a variant of the FF heuristic and the achieved results have about the same characteristics [14]. Therefore, in Table 1 we compare the PDB approach with the FF-heuristic. In the enforced hill climbing algorithm we allow both planners to apply branching cuts, while in A\* we scale the influence of the heuristic with a factor of two. The effects of scaling are well-known [22]: weighting A\* possibly results in non-optimal solution, but the search tends to succeed much faster. In the AIPS-2000 competition, the scaling factor 2 has enhanced the influence of the *max-pair* heuristic in the planner HSP. However, even with this improvement it solves only a few problems of this benchmark suite.

The characteristics of the PDB and FF heuristics in Figure 1 are quite different. The number of expanded nodes is usually larger for the former one but the run time is much shorter. A\* search with PDBs outperforms FF with hill climbing *and* branching cuts. The savings are about two orders of magnitude with respect to FF and A\* and one order of magnitude with respect to FF and hill climbing, while the effect for the number of expansions is the exact opposite. In the example set the average time for a node expansion in PDB-based planning is smaller by about two orders of magnitude compared to FF.

On the other hand, in larger problem instances enforced hill climbing according to the PDB heuristic generates too many nodes to be kept in main memory. In a few seconds the entire memory resources were exhausted. This





**Fig. 2.** Overall and magnified solution quality of A\* and enforced hill climbing in the Logistics domain with respect to the PDB and FF heuristic.


suggests applying memory limited search algorithm like thresholding in IDA\* and alternative hashing strategies to detect move transpositions in high search depths.

We summarize that hill climbing is better suited to the FF heuristic while weighted A\* seems to perform better with PDBs. The solution qualities are about the same as Figure 2 depicts. Even magnification to larger problem instances fails to establish a clear-cut winner.

## 4.2 Blocks World

Achieving approximate solutions in Blocks World is easy; 2-approximations run in linear time [24]. Moreover, different domain-dependent cuts drastically reduce the search space. Hence, TALPlanner [20] with hand-coded cuts and FF with hill climbing, helpful action and goal ordering cuts find good approximate solutions to problems with fifty Blocks and more. FF using enforced hill climbing without cuts is misguided by its heuristic, backtracks and tends to get lost in local optima far away from the goal. We concentrate on optimal solutions for this domain. Since any  $n$ -Tower configuration is reachable from the initial state state, the state space grows exponentially in  $n$ , and indeed, optimizing Blocks World is NP-hard. *Graphplan* is bounded to about 9 blocks and no optimal heuristic search engine achieves a better performance, e.g. HSP with *max-pair* is bounded to about 6-7 blocks. Model checking engines like BDD exploration in *Mips* and iterative Boolean satisfiability checks in *Satplan* are best in this domain and optimally solve problems with up to 12-13 blocks. Table 3 depicts that PDBs are competitive and that the solution lengths match.

Moreover, better scaling in time seems to favor PDB exploration. However, in both approaches space consumption is more crucial than time. In the bidirectional symbolic breadth-first search engine of *Mips* the BDD sizes grow very rapidly and large pattern databases with millions of entries still lead to millions of node expansions. When searching for optimal solutions to 13-block benchmark



**Fig. 3.** Time performance and solution quality of BDD exploration and optimal PDB planning in Blocks World. PDB construction time is included in the overall search time.

problems this thrashes the memory resources in both planning approaches. In summary, optimal solving Blocks World is still hard for general planning engines.

### 4.3 Other Domains

*Gripper* (AIPS-1998) spans an exponentially large but well-structured search space such that greedy search engines find optimal solutions. On the other hand, *Gripper* is known to be hard for *Graphplan*. Both FF with hill-climbing and cuts and PDB with weighted A\* find optimal solutions in less than a second.

Like Logistics, the NP-hard [11] *Mystery* domain (AIPS-1998) is a transportation domain on a road map. Trucks are moving around this map and packages are being carried by the mobiles. Additionally, various *capacity* and *fuel constraints* have to be satisfied. *Mystery* is particularly difficult for heuristic search planning, since some of the instances contain a very high portion of undetected dead-ends [14]. In contrast to the most effective heuristic search planner GRT [23], the PDB planning algorithm does not yet incorporate manual reformulation based on explicit representation of resources. However, experiments show that PDB search is competitive: problems 1-3, 9, 11, 17, 19, 25-30 were optimally solved in less than 10 seconds, while problem 15 and 20 required about 5 and 2 minutes, respectively. At least problem 4, 7, and 12 are not solvable. Time performance and the solution qualities are better than in [23] Scaling reduces the number of node expansion in some cases but has not solved any new problem.

The start position of *Sokoban* consists of a selection of balls within a maze and a designated goal area into which the balls have to be moved. A man, controlled by the puzzle solver, can traverse the board and push balls onto adjacent empty squares. *Sokoban* has been proven to be PSPACE complete and spans a directed search space with exponentially many dead-ends, in which some balls cannot be placed onto any goal field [16]. Therefore, hill climbing will eventually encounter a dead-end and fail. Only overall search schemes like A\*, IDA\* or best-first prevent the algorithm from getting trapped. In our experiments we optimally solved all 52 automatically generated problems [21] in less than five seconds each. The

screens were compiled to PDDL with a one-to-one ball-to-goal mapping so that some problems become unsolvable. Since A\* is complete we correctly establish unsolvability of 15 problems in the test set. Note that the instances span state spaces much smaller than the 90 problem suite considered in [16] with problems currently too difficult to be solved with domain independent planning.

As expected, additional results in Sokoban highlight that in contrast to the PDB-heuristic, the FF-heuristic, once embedded in A\*, yields good but not optimal solutions. BDD exploration in Mips does find optimal solutions, but for some instances it requires over a hundred seconds for completion.

## 5 Conclusion

Heuristic search is currently the most promising approach to tackle huge problem spaces but usually does not yield optimal solutions. The aim of this paper is to apply recent progress of heuristic search in finding optimal solutions to planning problems by devising an automatic abstraction scheme to construct pre-compiled pattern databases.

Our experiments show that pattern database heuristics are very good admissible estimators. Once calculated our new estimate will be available in constant time since the estimate of a state is simply retrieved in a perfect hash table by projecting the state encoding. We will investigate different pruning techniques to reduce the large branching factors in planning. There are some known general pruning techniques such as *FSM pruning* [25], *Relevance Cuts* and *Pattern Searches* [16] that should be addressed in the near future.

Although PDB heuristics are admissible and calculated beforehand, their quality can compete with the inadmissible FF-heuristic that solves a relaxed planning problem for *every* expanded state. The estimates are available in a simple table lookup, and, in contrast to the FF-heuristic, A\* finds optimal solutions. Weighting the estimate helps to cope with difficult instances for approximate solutions. Moreover, PDB heuristics in A\* can handle directed problem spaces and prove unsolvability results.

One further important advantage of PDB heuristics is the possibility of a symbolic implementation. Due to the representational expressiveness of BDDs, a breadth-first search (BFS) construction can be completed with respect to larger parts of the planning space for a better quality of the estimate. The exploration yields a relation  $H(\text{estimate}, \text{state})$  represented with a set of Boolean variables encoding the BFS-level and a set of variables encoding the state. Algorithm BDDA\*, a symbolic version of A\*, integrates the symbolic representation of the estimate [6]. Since PDBs lead to consistent heuristics the number of iterations in the BDDA\* algorithms is bounded by the square of the solution length. Moreover, symbolic PDBs can also be applied to explicit search. The heuristic estimate for a state can be determined in time linear to the encoding length.

*Acknowledgments* We thank J. Hoffmann for the Sokoban problem generator, M. Helmert for eliminating typos, the anonymous referees for helpful comments, and P. Haslum for fruitful discussions on this research topic.

## References

1. A. Blum and M. L. Furst. Fast planning through planning graph analysis. In *IJCAI*, pages 1636–1642, 1995.
2. R. E. Bryant. Symbolic manipulation of boolean functions using a graphical representation. In *DAC*, pages 688–694, 1985.
3. T. Bylander. The computational complexity of propositional STRIPS planning. *Artificial Intelligence*, pages 165–204, 1994.
4. E. M. Clarke, O. Grumberg, and D. A. Peled. *Model Checking*. MIT Press, 2000.
5. J. C. Culberson and J. Schaeffer. Pattern databases. *Computational Intelligence*, 14(4):318–334, 1998.
6. S. Edelkamp. Directed symbolic exploration and its application to AI-planning. In *AAAI Symposium (Model-based Validation of Intelligence)*, pages 84–92, 2001.
7. S. Edelkamp and M. Helmert. Exhibiting knowledge in planning problems to minimize state encoding length. In *ECP*, LNCS, pages 135–147. Springer, 1999.
8. S. Edelkamp and M. Helmert. The model checking integrated planning system MIPS. *AI-Magazine*, 2001. To Appear.
9. R. Fikes and N. Nilsson. Strips: A new approach to the application of theorem proving to problem solving. *Artificial Intelligence*, (2):189–208, 1971.
10. P. Haslum and H. Geffner. Admissible heuristics for optimal planning. In *Artificial Intelligence Planning and Scheduling (AIPS)*, pages 140–149, 2000.
11. M. Helmert. On the complexity of planning in transportation and manipulation domains. Master’s thesis, Computer Science Department Freiburg, 2001. Available from <http://www.informatik.uni-freiburg.de/~ki/theses.html>.
12. I. T. Hernádvögyi and R. C. Holte. Experiments with automatic created memory-based heuristics. In *SARA*, 2000.
13. J. Hoffmann. A heuristic for domain independent planning and its use in an enforced hill climbing algorithm. In *ISMIS*, LNCS, pages 216–227. Springer, 2000.
14. J. Hoffmann. Local search topology in planning benchmarks: An empirical analysis. In *IJCAI*, 2001. To appear.
15. R. Jensen and M. M. Veloso. OBDD-based universal planning for synchronized agents in non-deterministic domains. *JAIR*, 13, 2000.
16. A. Junghanns. *Pushing the Limits: New Developments in Single-Agent Search*. PhD thesis, University of Alberta, 1999.
17. H. Kautz and B. Selman. Pushing the envelope: Planning, propositional logic, and stochastic search. In *AAAI*, pages 1194–1201, 1996.
18. R. E. Korf. Finding optimal solutions to Rubik’s Cube using pattern databases. In *AAAI*, pages 700–705, 1997.
19. R. E. Korf and A. Felner. Disjoint pattern database heuristics. *Artificial Intelligence*, 2001. To appear (<http://www.elsevier.nl/locate/artint>).
20. J. Kvarnström, P. Doherty, and P. Haslum. Extending TALplanner with concurrency and resources. In *ECAI*, pages 501–505, 2000.
21. Y. Murase, H. Matsubara, and Y. Hiraga. Automatic making of Sokoban problems. In *Pacific Rim Conference on AI*, 1996.
22. J. Pearl. *Heuristics*. Addison-Wesley, 1985.
23. I. Refanidis and I. Vlahavas. Heuristic planning with resources. In *ECAI*, pages 521–525, 2000.
24. J. Slaney and S. Thiébaux. Blocks world revisited. *Artificial Intelligence*, pages 119–153, 2001.
25. L. A. Taylor and R. E. Korf. Pruning duplicate nodes in depth-first search. In *AAAI*, pages 756–761, 1993.