

Hybrid Declarative-Imperative Representations for Hybrid Discrete-Continuous Decision-Making

Jiayuan Mao Joshua B. Tenenbaum Tomás Lozano-Pérez Leslie Pack Kaelbling

jiayuanm.com jiayuanm@mit.edu

The choice between policy and model depends on the context and the task Many times, they need to be combined

A Broad Class of "Hybrid" Systems

Open Research Questions

The Continuous Spectrum of Hybrid Systems

Today's talk: a unified theory, starting with a "programming language"

Imperative Representations

Declarative Representations

NAMO in the Crow Description Language: Basic Primitives

State: the state is represented as a set of objects and relational features

object A, B, C: object feature shape_of(o: object) -> vector feature pos_of(o: object) -> vector

Primitive Action: parameterized "low-level" controllers

```
controller move_path(t: list[vector])
controller attach(o: object)
```


"Navigation Among Movable Obstacles" Reif and Sharir, 1985 Wilfong, 1988 Stilman and Kuffner, 2005

Directly Programmed Solution

Imperative

```
behavior goto v\theta(G):
 goal: agent pos() == G body:
    let path = find_path(agent_pos(), G)
     do move_path(path)
global goal: agent pos() == (270, 50)achieve pos_of(A) == (500, 100)achieve pos_of(B) == (500, 300)achieve pos_of(C) == (500, 500)
```


Like "Behavior Trees"

Mateas and Stern. 2002. "A Behavior Language for story-based believable agents" Bagnell et al. 2012. "An Integrated System for Autonomous Robotics Manipulation" Colledanchise and Ögren. 2018 "Behavior Trees in Robotics and AI"

Adding (Continuous) Variable Bindings

Imperative +Variables behavior goto_v1(G: vector): goal: $agent pos() == G$ body: bind path = find_path(agent_pos(), G) global goal: agent $pos() == (270, 50)$ **+Ordering** achieve not_blocking(A, path) achieve not_blocking(B, path) | achieve not_blocking(C, path) $\frac{1}{2}$ unordered: behavior move_away(x: object, path): goal: not_blocking(x, p) body: assert reachable(x) bind new_p: valid_pos(x, new_p) ... eff: $pos_of(x) = new_p$ do move_path(path)

The Spectrum Between Imperative and Declarative

Imperative +Variables +Ordering

Insight 1: Behaviors = Generators of "non-deterministic subroutine calls" + Verifiers based on causal models

Adding More Recursive Subroutines

Adding More Recursive Subroutines

Insight 2: Declarative = Imperative + Variable + Ordering + Promotion

- Specifically, if you only denote:
- the variables needed
- the preconditions they need to satisfy
- no ordering information about how preconditions should be achieved
- You get full declarative modeling

Reformulate Classical Formulations by "Language Feats."

Do not support $\left(\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}\right)$ Support, but you can't configure $\left(\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}\right)$ Support, and configurable

Reformulate Classical Formulations by "Language Feats."

Do not support $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ Support, but you can't configure $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ Support, and configurable

Reformulate Classical Formulations by "Language Feats."

Do not support $\left(\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}\right)$ Support, but you can't configure $\left(\begin{array}{cc} \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}\right)$ Support, and configurable

Application: Context-Specific Solution Strategies

Mid Level: Closely related to the *LP1* class in Stilman and Kuffner 2005, *"disconnected spaces can be connected by moving a single obstacle"*

Application: Context-Specific Solution Strategies

```
G
                                                                                              G
                                                      G
                                                                                                            C
          \mathcal{C}C
                                                      B
                                                                                              B
          B
          A
                                                   AA
behavior goto v1(G: vector):
                                        S S
 goal: agent pos() == Gbody:
                                          body:
                                                                                  body:
   bind path = find path(agent pos(), G)
                                            bind waypoint: vector
                                                                                    bind waypoint: vector
   unordered:
                                            achieve agent pos() == waypointachieve agent pos() == waypointachieve not blocking(A, path)
                                            bind path = find path(agent pos(), G)
                                                                                    bind path = find path(agent pos(), G)
     achieve not blocking(B, path)
                                            unordered:
                                                                                    promotable unordered:
     achieve not blocking(C, path)
                                                                                      achieve not blocking(A, path)
                                              achieve not blocking(A, path)
   do move path(path)
                                              achieve not blocking(B, path)
                                                                                      achieve not blocking(B, path)
                                              achieve not blocking(C, path)
                                                                                      achieve not blocking(C, path)
                                            do move path(path)
                                                                                    do move path(path)
```
Context-Specific Strategies Improves Efficiency

Context-Specific Strategies Improves Efficiency

Context-Specific Strategies Improves Efficiency

Theory: Planning Complexity of Problems

Promotable Section

Serialized Section

Theorem (very informally): under serializability assumptions over R, the planning complexity is bounded by $n^{O(k)}$, where n is the number of objects, k is the maximum number of subgoals that would accumulate in M

Intuition: *k* defines how easy it is to "serialize" a problem

• **NAMO:** k is the number of obstacles that have "dependencies"

Closely Related to "Width" in Symbolic Planning and Neural Network Expressivity Lipovetzky and Geffner. 2012. "Width and serialization of classical planning problems" **Mao** et al. 2023. "What Planning Problem Can A Relational Neural Network Solve?"

Dirty Laundry

Theory

- The bound is not tight because it treats all objects "uniformly"
- Ultimately, what we really want to is to identify the "kernel" of the problem

Practice

- Although we support description of different solution strategies compactly,
- we do not know which one to apply
- Actually, this can be as hard as solving the original problem

Conclusion

Principle: Using program semantics to characterize flexibilities in behaviors

We provide a new framework for "how to plan more efficiently"

- **Theory:** characterize the hardness of a problem
- **Practice:** a framework for mix-and-match representations

Next: learning how to reason more efficiently

- learning to select the best strategy in context
- learning to form new strategies, by reasoning about different types of flexibilities