Behaviour Planning: A Toolkit for Diverse Planning

Mustafa F Abdelwahed^{1,2}, Joan Espasa¹, Alice Toniolo¹, Ian P. Gent¹

¹University of St Andrews, School of Computer Science, UK ²Helwan University, Faculty of Engineering, Egypt {ma342, jea20, a.toniolo, ian.gent}@st-andrews.ac.uk

May 8, 2024

Abstract

Diverse planning is the problem of generating plans with distinct characteristics. This is valuable for many real-world scenarios, including applications related to plan recognition and business process automation. In this work, we introduce *Behaviour Planning*, a diverse planning toolkit that can characterise and generate diverse plans based on modular diversity models. We present a qualitative framework for describing diversity models, a planning approach for generating plans aligned with any given diversity model, and provide a practical implementation of an SMT-based behaviour planner. We showcase how the qualitative approach offered by Behaviour Planning allows it to overcome various challenges faced by previous approaches. Finally, the experimental evaluation shows the effectiveness of Behaviour Planning in generating diverse plans compared to state-of-the-art approaches.

I. Introduction

Diverse planners' primary objective is to find diverse plans for a given task. Domain modellers may require diverse plans for several reasons. One of those reasons is to account for possible future situations Haessler and Sweeney (1991). Another vital reason is the challenges a modeller would face when trying to account for side-information, such as preferences, which sometimes are hard to model Nguyen et al. (2012). One more reason is from a practical viewpoint, where sometimes a single optimal solution could be practically hard to implement; thus, having a set of different solutions becomes more practical for the modeller to pick from Ingmar et al. (2020); Cully and Demiris (2017). Furthermore, a lot of real-world applications such as business process automation Chakraborti et al. (2020), malware detection Boddy et al. (2005); Sohrabi et al. (2013), plan recognition Sohrabi et al. (2016), and machine learning pipeline gen-



Figure 1: A 2D space defined by the domain modeller for the rover domain. The horizontal dimension shows the sample ordering (e.g. soil, rock, image), while the vertical dimension shows the number of used rovers. Ordering for the samples is read from top to bottom.

eration learning Katz et al. (2020) drive the need for new diverse planning frameworks and planners.

This paper introduces Behaviour Planning, a diverse planning toolkit that can generate diverse plans based on a modular diversity model. We present a novel framework for modelling diversity that overcomes the challenges the current diverse planning framework faces when modelling diversity and use those models to generate plans that align with them. The current approach to model diversity relies on similarity functions, presenting two primary challenges for the domain modeller when defining their diversity model. The first challenge is to encode all relevant information to the user into a single numeric function Coman and Munoz-Avila (2011), thus limiting the level of details the domain modeller can use when comparing plans. Even if the user succeeded in encoding this, another challenge arises: explaining why two plans are different when the user searches for plans based on specific criteria or compares plan sets. Similarity functions fail to explain why two plans are different because they are one-way functions that receive two plans and produce a number without a reversible computation, meaning that similarity functions have low expressivity. Therefore, our main objective is to offer users higher expressivity, allowing them to account for more details when modelling and comparing plans.

Our toolkit for behaviour planning comprises Behaviour Sorts Suite (BSS) and Forbid Behaviour Iterative (FBI). BSS is a qualitative-based framework that can describe a diversity model (i.e., the difference between two plans) and either generate diverse cost-bounded (i.e., optimal and suboptimal) plan sets or evaluate any given plan set diversity. FBI is a planning approach that uses a diversity model described by BSS to generate diverse plans.

To show the advantages of behaviour planning over the current diverse planning framework, assume a domain modeller for the rover planning task requires a set of diverse plans to select ones that collect samples (i.e., soil, rock and image) with specific orders (e.g. taking images first) and various rovers used. Hence, the modeller considers that two plans will differ based on the number of used rovers in a plan Mantik et al. (2022) and the collected samples order Abdelwahed et al. (2023). Vadlamudi and Kambhampati's Vadlamudi and Kambhampati (2016) bi-level framework generates a substantial number of plans and then extracts a subset of plans. For the first phase, the domain modeller can use a diverse or top-k planner, such as FI Katz et al. (2018) or SymK Speck et al. (2020) to generate plans. In the second phase, a similarity function that reflects the difference between two plans based on a property is selected (e.g. the plan's actions), and the MaxSum model is computed, thus quantifying the diversity of the plan set Nguyen et al. (2012). The MaxSum model is the sum of the pairwise similarity between plans. Projecting similarity functions' limitations on the motivating example, the domain modeller may or may not get plans that account for required features (e.g., the number of rovers or sampling ordering). In addition, it is difficult for the domain modeller to filter out plans, for example, with a specific sample ordering.

BSS overcomes these challenges by offering more expressivity to the domain modeller when defining their diversity model. Such expressivity is achieved by defining a set of discrete features and constructing a diversity model. Using the behaviour planning toolkit, the domain modeller discretises the solution space based on the two aforementioned criteria (Figure 1). This is called *Behaviour Space*, where each box is a *behaviour*, containing a set of plans that share the same properties defined by the domain modeller. Therefore, by combining this space with any planner that accounts for preferences and constraints Gerevini and Long (2005), such as OPTIC Tierney et al. (2012) or OMTPlan Leofante (2023), the domain modeller can generate the required set of plans by forcing the planner to create a plan that satisfies certain behaviour suntil reaching the desired number of plans. On top of higher expressivity, behaviour planning uses less computational resources as it accounts for the diversity model while generating a set of plans, unlike Vadlamudi and Kambhampati Vadlamudi and Kambhampati (2016)'s framework, which requires a second phase to extract a subset of diverse plans using an NP-hard procedure Kuo et al. (1993).

This paper has three primary contributions: (i) a new diverse planning approach for generating diverse plans, (ii) a qualitative framework for describing diversity models, and (iii) an experimental SMT-based diverse planner. This planner uses the diversity model described by BSS to generate cost-bounded diverse plans.

II. Related work

Srivastava et al. Srivastava et al. (2007) is one of the first attempts to generate diverse plans in a domain-independent manner. They proposed generating diverse plans through a local search-based planner (e.g., LGP Gerevini et al. (2003)). They used LGP with distance functions to force the planner to generate different plans. Even though they succeeded, they converged to non-optimal solutions. Roberts et al. Roberts et al. (2014) suggested using a multi-queue A^* algorithm to find diverse plans while ensuring optimal results. One queue was for optimality, and the other for diversity. However, the two heuristics interfered with each other, thus affecting the overall quality of the

results.

Vadlamudi and Kambhampati Vadlamudi and Kambhampati (2016) suggested splitting the problem into two optimisation phases: planning and diversity extraction phases. Their bi-level optimisation approach, where the first phase generates a substantial number of plans and then the second extracts a subset of diverse plans. This framework received much attention since it guaranteed cost-bounded diverse plan sets. Diverse/top-k planners were utilised to generate several plans. State-of-the-art diverse and top-k planners are FI Katz et al. (2018) and SymK Speck et al. (2020) respectively. FI produces several plans through a plan-forbid loop, which generates a plan and then reformulates the planning task to force the planner to find another solution. On the other hand, SymK is a symbolic search planner that groups similar states and keeps exploring the search space till it finds a goal state. Such grouping enables SymK to search for several solutions easily. Regarding the diversity problem, Nguyen et al. Nguyen et al. (2012) showed that it is possible to compare plan sets based on MaxSum, which is the sum of pairwise similarity functions selected by the domain modeller. Katz and Sohrabi Katz and Sohrabi (2020) suggested a greedy method for extracting a diverse set of plans while maximising the MaxSum value.

Other works focused on modelling diversity for planning using similarity functions such as stability (δ_a), state (δ_s) and uniqueness (δ_u) Nguyen et al. (2012); Roberts et al. (2014). Stability and state metrics are Jaccard measures between two plans' actions and states. On the other hand, uniqueness is a discrete function that returns 1 if one action is present in one plan but not the other and 0 otherwise. Goldman and Kuter Goldman and Kuter (2015) suggested the Normalised Compression Distance (NCD) distance metric to approximate Kolmogorov complexity.

III. Behaviour planning

Behaviour planning is an approach for generating diverse plans based on a diversity model defined by the domain modeller. This section formulates the diverse planning problem, followed by the Behaviour Sorts Suite and Forbid Behaviour Iterative formulations.

A planning task is a tuple of $\Pi = \langle P, A, I, G \rangle$, where P is a set of fluents, A denotes a set of actions, I represents the initial state while G is the goal formula. An action a_i is described in terms of preconditions (pre) and effects (eff). A solution for Π is a *plan* (π) which is defined as a sequence of actions a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m such that $a_i \in A$. A plan's cost is computed by $cost(\pi) \to \mathbb{R}$, which accumulates the actions' costs in π . A *diverse planning task* is a task where the solution is Ψ , a set of different plans of size k with a quality bound c. A quality bound c is a real number that indicates that all plans' costs in Ψ are less than c (i.e. $cost(\pi) \leq c \forall \pi \in \Psi$). k represents the number of required plans (i.e. $|\Psi| = k$). Thus, we extend $\Pi = \langle P, A, I, G, c, k \rangle$ to include c and k.

III.A Behaviour Sorts Suite

Here, we describe the Behaviour Sorts Suite's components. The core component is behaviour spaces, which allows domain modellers to describe the diversity model based on features of interests. Behaviour count is a metric that evaluates the diversity of a given set of plans based on a given diversity. The last component is a behaviour features library, a collection of features gathered from the literature.

III.A.1 Behaviour Spaces

Lehman and Stanley Lehman and Stanley (2011) collapsed the search space for combinatorial optimisation problems into a finite space (*behaviour space*) to model solutions' characteristics. Their motivation was to keep track of different generated solutions by evolutionary algorithms. They used behaviour spaces to include or discard solutions into an archive based on their objective values in case the behaviour was already included. Inspired by such ideas, we use behaviour space as a guide for the planner to search for plan(s) that satisfy a desired property, guaranteeing the generation of a diverse plan set that accounts for the domain modeller's definition of diversity.

Behaviour space is constructed using dimensions corresponding to the domain modeller's set of features F, so a dimension is generated by discretising the values of a feature. A feature $f_i \in F$ includes a feature descriptor ξ_i and, since a dimension can be domain-dependent, we use μ_i to represent a set of additional information, such as domain-dependent information required to construct that dimension (e.g. resource usage). Hence, each feature is a tuple $f_i = \langle \xi_i, \mu_i \rangle$. For features that do not require additional information, μ_i is an empty set. We define a dimension constructor as follows:

Definition 1 (Dimension constructor). A function DimensionConstructor(Π, f) $\rightarrow D_f$ gets a diverse planning task Π and a feature f, and returns a tuple

$$D_f = \langle \mathrm{vals}_f, \odot_f, \odot_f \rangle$$

where vals_f is a set of all possible discretised values for f, $\otimes(v)_f \to v'$ is a discretisation function that takes a value v then computes its discretised value v', and $\odot_f(\pi) \to v$ is a function that receives a plan π and extracts the feature value v from π .

Using the dimension constructor's definition, we define the behaviour space configuration, behaviour space, behaviour (i.e., the blue box shown in Figure 1) and behaviour planning as follows:

Definition 2 (Behaviour space configuration). *Given a diverse planning task* Π , *and a set of features F, a* Behaviour space configuration *is defined as*

$$\Xi = \langle \text{DimensionConstructor}(\Pi, f) \forall f \in F \rangle$$

a tuple containing the set of dimensions constructing the behaviour space created using *F*.

Definition 3 (Behaviour space). Given a diverse planning task Π , we define a behaviour space with configuration Ξ as an n-dimensional grid (vals₁ × · · · × vals_n), such that vals_i is a set of all possible discretised values for dimension *i*.

Definition 4 (Behaviour). *Given a diverse planning task* Π *with a behaviour space configuration* Ξ , we define behaviour \mathcal{B} as an *n*-dimensional vector containing a discretised value for each dimension in the space $\mathcal{B} = \langle v'_1, \times \cdots \times v'_n \rangle$, such that $v'_i \in \text{vals}_i$. A behaviour is valid if at least one valid plan has the extracted values; otherwise, it is invalid.

Definition 5 (Behaviour planning). *Given a diverse planning task* Π *and a behaviour space configuration* Ξ *, we define* behaviour planning *as generating a set of plans* Ψ *with different behaviours defined by* Ξ *, such that* $|\Psi| = k$.

To locate a plan π 's behaviour \mathcal{B} for a given behaviour space configuration Ξ , must extract the dimensions' values from π and construct its behaviour vector using Def. 1. We define a plan's behaviour as follows:

Definition 6 (Plan behaviour). *Given a diverse planning task* Π , π *a valid plan for* Π , *and a behaviour space with configuration* Ξ , plan behavior PlanBehaviour(Ξ, π) $\rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ *is a function that extracts and computes the discrete values* v'_i *of the dimensions for* π *where*

PlanBehaviour(Ξ, π) = $\langle \otimes_f (\odot_f(\pi)) \forall \otimes_f, \odot_f \in \Xi \rangle$.

Thanks to the plan behaviour operator, a plan is now labelled with a behaviour. The domain modeller can use this information to evaluate the usefulness of this plan against their requirements based on the diverse features characterising this behaviour. For example, in Figure 1, plans on the blue box are characterised by collecting soil samples first and using two rovers.

III.A.2 Behaviour Count

Now, we propose two metrics to evaluate the diversity of a plan set. Recall the example in Figure 1. Assume we have plan sets A and B, each with three plans, and each plan has its behaviour as in Figure 2. We computed the MaxSum scores using the diversity metrics (δ_a , δ_s , δ_u). We see in Table 1 that A has higher values compared to B. Still, when considering the behaviour space in Figure 1, B should be more diverse as it contains three behaviours while A only has two.

Instead of using the MaxSum model to quantify diversity in BSS better, we suggest evaluating any given plan set's diversity by computing the number of included behaviours. To calculate the behaviour count metric, we first infer the behaviour for each plan π on a given set of plans Ψ using Def. 6. Then, we define behaviour count as:

Definition 7 (Behaviour count). *Given a diverse planning task* Π , Ψ *a valid plan set for* Π *and a behaviour space with configuration* Ξ , behaviour count $BC(\Xi, \Psi) \to \mathbb{N}$ *is a function to compute the number of available behaviours in* Ψ *where*

$$\mathrm{BC}(\Xi,\Psi) = |\{\mathrm{PlanBehaviour}(\Xi,\pi) \; \forall \; \pi \in \Psi\}|$$



Figure 2: Two plan sets, each containing three plans for the rover problem, using the same behaviour space presented in Figure 1

Planset		A	В
	Stability (δ_a)	0.81	0.55
	States (δ_s)	0.47	0.29
Metrics	Uniqueness (δ_u)	1.00	1.00
	Behaviour Count	2	3

Table 1: Normalised MaxSum scores computed using different metrics and behaviour count for the set shown in Figure 2. Higher numbers are in bold



Figure 3: Two plan sets with the same number of behaviours.

If two sets have the exact behaviour count, we suggest comparing their ranges of values with plans for each dimension. For example, Figure 3 shows two sets of plans C and D, and both sets include the same number of behaviours (i.e. four behaviours). However, we can break such a tie by choosing the set with more dimension values than the other based on preference. For example, if the domain modeller favours the ordering of samples over the number of rovers, then C will be more diverse than D and the other way around if the domain modeller favours the number of rovers of the samples ordering. The domain modeller can tiebreak between C and D by computing the vals size of each dimension for $C = \langle 4, 1 \rangle$, $D = \langle 2, 2 \rangle$ and decide on the order of features based on their preferences. This metric is called dimension count, and it is defined as:

Definition 8 (Dimension count). *Given a diverse planning task* Π , Ψ *a valid plan set* for Π , and a behaviour space with configuration Ξ , dimension count $DC(\Xi, \Psi) \to \mathbb{N}^n$ is a function mapping to a *n*-tuple where each element is a number that represents the cardinality of the covered subset of values in a given dimension. $DC(\Xi, \Psi) =$ $\langle |\{v\}| \forall v \in PlanBehaviour(\Xi, \pi) \forall \pi \in \Psi \rangle$

III.A.3 Behaviours Features Library

The literature showed several attempts to differentiate between plans using domainindependent features. Our features library is an initial collection of some of those features and can be easily extended in the future. Mantik et al. (2022) suggested two primary features: (i) plan length (f_{cb}) and (ii) resource utilisation (f_{ru}) . The plan length feature distinguishes between plans based on the number of actions in each plan. On the other hand, the resource utilisation feature computes the number of used resources in a plan and then uses this information to differentiate between plans. Note that the domain modeller provides information on the resources used. Abdelwahed et al. Abdelwahed et al. (2023) suggested differentiating between plans based on the order of the goal predicates achieved by each plan (f_{go}) . This feature reflects how a plan tries to solve the planning problem. In section IV, we provide examples of implementing and using those features.

III.B Forbid Behaviour Iterative

FBI is a planning approach that uses a behaviour space to generate diverse plans by generating a plan per behaviour. FBI is inspired by the plan-forbid loop approach suggested by Katz et al. Katz et al. (2018). However, the major difference between the FBI planner and FI is that the FBI forbids behaviours instead of plans. To clarify this statement, Figures 4-5 illustrates how each planner explores the solution space when solving a planning task where the goal is to find four plans. FI starts with finding one plan and then forbids it together with its possible reorderings. Then, it keeps repeating this operation until it reaches the number of required plans (Figure 4). On the other hand, FBI finds a plan, then uses behaviour space to infer this plan's behaviour and to acquire another plan, it forbids this behaviour then uses the updated formula to acquire a different one (Figure 5).

Algorithm 1: FBI

Require: Π : Planning task, Ξ : Behaviour space configuration **Ensure:** Ψ : set of plans with different behaviours 1: $\Psi \leftarrow \emptyset$, $S_B \leftarrow \emptyset$ 2: **do** 3: $\pi \leftarrow$ BehaviourGenerator (Π, Ξ, S_B) 4: $S_B \leftarrow S_B \cup \{\pi\}$ 5: **while** $\pi \neq \emptyset$ 6: **return** Ψ

Let BehaviourGenerator(Π, Ξ, S_B) $\rightarrow \{\emptyset, \pi\}$ be a function that receives a diverse planning task Π , a behaviour space configuration Ξ , a set of behaviours S_B and returns a plan with a behaviour $\mathcal{B}_i \notin S_B$ or an empty set in case it failed to find a new behaviour. In a later section, we shall show how to realise such a function. Algorithm 1 describes the FBI's key operation. It starts with an empty set of plans (Ψ) and behaviours (S_B) (line-1), then it keeps generating and accumulating plans with new behaviours until solver-b returns an empty set (lines 2-5).

There could be a scenario where a domain modeller could require a specific number of plans that exceeds the number of behaviours. To resolve such a situation, let PlanGenerator(Π, Ξ, S_B, Ψ) $\rightarrow \{\emptyset, \pi\}$ a function that receives a diverse planning



Figure 4: The white space represents all possible plans for a planning task Π . FI operation starts by finding a plan (i.e. red circle), then forbid this plan's all possible reordering (i.e. red box), then keeps repeating this until the required number of plans is found or runs out of resources.



Figure 5: FBI operation starts with finding a plan that infers its behaviour (i.e. blue circle), then forbids its, and keeps repeating this loop until there are no valid behaviours remaining or it runs out of resources.

```
Algorithm 2: FBI-k
```

Require: Π : Planning task, Ξ : Behaviour space configuration, k: Required plans count **Ensure:** Ψ : the set of plans with different behaviours

1: $\Psi \leftarrow \text{FBI}(\Pi, \Xi)$ 2: $S_B \leftarrow \{\text{PlanBehaviour}(\Xi, \pi) \ \forall \pi \in \Psi\}$ 3: **do** 4: $\pi \leftarrow \text{PlanGenerator}(\Pi, \Xi, S_B, \Psi)$ 5: $\Psi \leftarrow \Psi \cup \{\pi\}$ 6: **while** $|\Psi| < k$ and $\pi \neq \emptyset$ 7: **return** Ψ

task Π , a behaviour space configuration Ξ , a set of behaviours S_B , a set of plans Ψ and returns a plan π if one exists with behaviour $\mathcal{B} \in S_B$ and not belonging to $\pi \notin \Psi$. Algorithm 2 can generate more plans if the required number of plans is bigger than the number of available behaviours by forbidding plans rather than behaviours. Algorithm 2 invokes Algorithm 1 to generate a plan per behaviour and collects those plans behaviours (Lines 1-2). Afterwards, FBI-k resumes the same loop as FBI except for generating plans rather than behaviours (Lines 3-6).

IV. Realisation of Behaviour Planning

We propose a Planning as Satisfiability approach to implement Behaviour Planning. This approach allows us to incorporate arbitrary constraints into the problem, granting us the flexibility to describe and reason over plan behaviours during search. The first works that addressed Planning as Satisfiability (model finding) problem Kautz et al. (1996) showed that off-the-shelf SAT solvers could effectively solve planning problems. In the last decade, various works followed by leveraging SMT Bofill et al. (2016); Leofante et al. (2020), SAT Höller and Behnke (2022); Rintanen (2012) or CP Babaki et al. (2020); Villaret et al. (2021) solvers, amongst others. The problem II is generally solved by considering a sequence of queries in the form of satisfaction problems ϕ_0 , ϕ_1 , ϕ_2 , ..., where ϕ_i encodes the existence of a plan that reaches a goal state from the initial state in exactly *i* steps. The number of actions allowed per step would vary based on the used encoding. A simple linear encoding allows exactly one action per step, unlike other encodings such as Relaxed \exists -step Bofill et al. (2017), which allows more than one action per step.

The solving procedure will sequentially test the satisfiability of $\phi_0, \phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n$, until a satisfiable formula ϕ_n is found, proving the existence of a valid plan of exactly n steps. Each formula ϕ_n is defined as

$$\phi_n \coloneqq \mathcal{I}(s_0) \bigwedge_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{T}(s_i, s_{i+1}) \wedge \mathcal{G}(s_n)$$

Where \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{G} respectively encode the formulas for the initial and goal states, and \mathcal{T} encodes the transition function in terms of both the action preconditions and effects

(i.e. $\langle a_i \rightarrow pre \rangle$, $\langle a_i \rightarrow eff \rangle$) and the frame axioms. For further details on Planning as Satisfiability, readers are encouraged to refer to Rintanen (2021).

In our framework, to identify a plan, we abstract the creation of the formulas ϕ_n by defining the function $\text{Encoder}(\Pi, n) \rightarrow \phi_n$, which takes a planning task Π , a number of steps (n) and returns a formula that encodes the existence of a plan with exactly n steps.

IV.A Behaviour space

Now we describe an example of behaviour space based on the planning as satisfiability method and constructed over the three features presented in section III.A.3: cost bound (f_{cb}) , resource utilisation (f_{ru}) and goal predicate ordering (f_{go}) . The configuration of this space Ξ is based on the corresponding dimensions and dimension constructors. Following Def. 1, each dimension is characterised by the feature f, complemented by the discretised values vals_f, and the discretisation $\otimes_f(\pi)$ and extraction functions $\odot_f(v)$. We assume $\otimes_f(v) = v$ for all the dimensions, where the discretised values are the same as the extracted values. In other situations, the domain modeller may be required to group some discrete values, e.g., in ranges.

By using planning as satisfiability we can encode the dimensions directly in the formula ϕ_n by updating it to $\phi'_n := \phi_n \wedge \Gamma \wedge \Lambda \wedge \Theta$ where Γ , Λ , and Θ represent the encodings for the cost bound, resource utilisation, and goal predicate ordering respectively. If ϕ'_n is satisfied, then the extracted model contains a plan and its behaviour. Below, we present the features' descriptions and corresponding information to construct the dimensions and encodings.

Feature I - Cost Bound (f_{cb}) . In this work, we only consider makespan-optimality, and therefore our cost function $cost(\pi)$ will be the plan length with no additional information required $(\mu_{cb} = \emptyset)$. The corresponding cost-bound dimension D_{cb} includes $vals_{cb} = \{i.\forall i \in 1..n\}$ is a set of integer values between 1 and the formula's length $(n). \odot_{cb}(\pi)$ returns the number of actions in π .

To count the number of actions enabled in a given plan, we use an indicator function $\Omega(a, i) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ to indicate whether action a is enabled at step i. In the formula, we encode the plan length as the sum of all enabled actions.

$$\Gamma \coloneqq cb = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \Omega(a, i) \, \forall a \in A$$

Feature II - Resource utilisation (f_{ru}) . This feature requires domain-specific information. We consider the set of problem objects μ_{ru} , representing the resources of interest. Following the previous examples, μ_{ru} could be a set of available rovers in the planning task as shown in Figure 1 (e.g. $\mu_{ru} = \{\text{RedRover}, \text{PurpleRover}\}$). The resource utilisation dimension D_{ru} is formed by $vals_{ru} = \{i.\forall i \in 0.. |\mu_{ru}|\}$, a set of integers between 0 to the number of resources provided in μ_{ru} . $\odot_{ru}(\pi)$ uses the provided information in μ_{ru} to count the number of actions per resource and then return how many resources are used in π .

We encode the number of used resources in a plan π using an indicator function $\Upsilon(r, i) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, returning 1 if the resource $r \in \mu_{ru}$ is used at step *i*, and 0 otherwise.

The resource utilisation feature then sums 1 for each $r \in \mu_{ru}$ if r is used in any step of the plan.

$$\Lambda \coloneqq ru = \sum_{r \in \mu_{ru}} \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \sum_{i=0}^{n} \Upsilon(r, i) = 0\\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Notice in particular that how we model the resource utilisation impacts the implementation of \otimes_{ru} (here $\otimes_{ru}(v) = v$). For example, for computing the ratio of the number of actions using a resource r to the plan length, $\otimes_{ru}(v)$ must map the value v to a range (i.e. min and max values), and the information of the available ranges will be provided in μ_{ru} alongside the resources information. However, there is no widely known approach for modelling resource utilisation for a plan. Therefore, we adhere to Mantik et al.'s Mantik et al. (2022) suggestion.

Feature III - Goal predicate ordering (f_{go}) . This feature considers the total order in which goal predicates are achieved. This feature does not require additional information since the goal predicates can be extracted directly from the instance $(\mu_{go} = \emptyset)$. The goal ordering dimension D_{go} includes $vals_{go} = \{o. \forall o \in \sigma(G)\}$ as a set containing all permutations for goal predicates, where $\sigma(G)$ generates those permutations. $\odot_{go}(\pi)$ returns a number indicating the goal ordering.

To encode such a dimension, let $PStep(p) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a function that maps a predicate p to which step i it first became true. For a given goal predicate $g \in G$ and step i, we can encode its semantics using the formula

$$\operatorname{PStep}(g) = i \leftrightarrow (g_i \bigwedge_{j=0}^{i-1} \neg g_j)$$

That is, PStep(g) = i when goal predicate g is satisfied at step i and not satisfied in any step from 0 up to i - 1. Note that g can become false after i again, but we are not concerned about that.

We now can encode a precedence relation between any two goal predicates $g_a, g_b \in G$ by stating $PStep(g_a) \leq PStep(g_b)$. To encode a total order, we only need to define the binary precedence relation between all pairs of goal predicates. If we consider G as a set of goal predicates, there are |G|! different possible orders. Therefore, there is an alternative way to compactly encode $\sigma(G)$ and avoid generating all possible permutations by using a classical binary encoding operation Frisch et al. (2005) where each binary number denotes a unique goal predicate ordering. We encode a single total order using a formula composed of Boolean variables representing the order as a binary number. More concretely, for each pair of goal predicates $g_a, g_b \in G$ and fresh Boolean variable to_{ab} , we add the formula $to_{ab} \leftrightarrow PStep(g_a) \leq PStep(g_b)$.

For example, having goal predicates $G = \{g_a, g_b, g_c\}$, we create one Boolean to variable per each pair of goal predicates: to_{ab} , to_{ac} and to_{bc} and add the formulas

$$to_{ab} \leftrightarrow \operatorname{PStep}(g_a) \leq \operatorname{PStep}(g_b)$$

$$to_{ac} \leftrightarrow \operatorname{PStep}(g_a) \leq \operatorname{PStep}(g_c)$$

$$to_{bc} \leftrightarrow \operatorname{PStep}(g_b) \leq \operatorname{PStep}(g_c)$$

To extract the total order from an assignment, we retrieve the value of variables to_{ab} , to_{ac} and to_{bc} . Now, the full encoding of the goal ordering feature Θ is then the conjunction of the two following equations

$$\operatorname{PStep}(g) = i \leftrightarrow (g_i \bigwedge_{j=0}^{i-1} \neg g_j) \qquad \forall i \in 1..n, \forall g \in G$$
(1)

$$to_{ij} \leftrightarrow \operatorname{PStep}(g_i) \le \operatorname{PStep}(g_j) \qquad \forall g_i, g_j \in G$$
 (2)

where eq.1 encodes the first step where any given goal predicate becomes true, and eq.2 then maps the relative orders between goal predicates in *to* variables.

Behaviour extraction. Having defined the dimensions constituting our behaviour space Ξ , now consider ExtractModel(ϕ) $\rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\phi}$, a function that given a formula ϕ gives a model \mathcal{M}_{ϕ} . Once the SMT solver finds a model for the augmented formula ϕ'_n , we can extract both a plan and its behaviour. Given a model $\mathcal{M}_{\phi'_n}$, we extract the plan behaviour with the three dimensions by

PlanBehaviour(
$$\Xi, \pi$$
) = $\langle \mathcal{M}_{\phi'_{\pi}}[cb], \mathcal{M}_{\phi'_{\pi}}[ru], \mathcal{M}_{\phi'_{\pi}}[to_{ij}] \forall g_i, g_j \in G \rangle$

IV.B Forbid Behaviour Iterative Realisation

To realise FBI, we require two more functions: (i) one function to check if a formula ϕ_n is satisfiable or not and (ii) one to extract a plan from a satisfiable formula. We use IsSatisfiable $(\phi_n) \rightarrow \{\top, \bot\}$ a function that returns true if ϕ'_n is satisfiable and false otherwise. we use PlanExtractor $(\mathcal{M}_{\phi'_n}) \rightarrow \pi$ to construct a plan from $\mathcal{M}_{\phi'_n}$. PlanExtractor is a function that iterates over the model and extracts the enabled actions (i.e., the actions that are part of the plan) in every step to construct a plan. The BehaviourGenerator can now be implemented using Encoder, IsSatisfiable and PlanExtractor. Algorithm 3 is an implementation for BehaviourGenerator. First, it constructs ϕ'_n using Encoder, then append behaviour space encodings excluding S_B . (Line 1). Afterwards, it checks whether it can find a model for ϕ'_n . If it succeeds, then it extracts and returns the plan (π) ; otherwise, it returns an empty set (Lines 2 - 5)

Algorithm 3: BehaviourGenerator

Require: Π : planning task, Ξ : behaviour space configuration, S_B : set of behaviours, n: formula length

Ensure: $\pi \bigvee \emptyset$ 1: $\phi'_n \leftarrow \phi_n = \text{Encoder}(\Pi, n) \land \Gamma \land \Theta \land \Lambda \bigwedge_{b \in S_B} \neg b$ 2: **if** IsSatisfiable (ϕ'_n) **then** 3: **return** PlanExtractor(ExtractModel (ϕ'_n)) 4: **end if** 5: **return** \emptyset

PlanGenerator follows a similar implementation to Algorithm 3. Algorithm 4 starts with encoding the planning problem, behaviour space and available behaviours in S_B into ϕ (Line 1). Afterwards, it forbids all plans in Ψ , checks for satisfiability, and returns a plan π if ϕ'_n is satisfiable; otherwise, it is an empty set (Line 2-6).

Algorithm 4: PlanGenerator

Require: Π : planning task, Ξ : behaviour space configuration, S_B : set of behaviours, Ψ : set of plans, n: formula length

Ensure: $\pi \bigvee \emptyset$ 1: $\phi'_n \leftarrow \text{Encoder}(\Pi, n) \land \Gamma \land \Theta \land \Lambda \bigvee_{b \in S_B} b$ 2: $\phi'_n \leftarrow \phi'_n \bigwedge_{\pi \in \Psi} \neg \pi$ 3: **if** IsSatisfiable (ϕ'_n) **then** 4: **return** PlanExtractor(ExtractModel (ϕ'_n)) 5: **end if** 6: **return** \emptyset

V. Experimental Evaluation & Discussion

We implemented behaviour planning using Python and the Z3 SMT solver De Moura and Bjørner (2008).¹ To examine the practicality of behaviour planning for generating diverse plans and evaluating the diversity of sets of plans, we performed two experiments: First, we validated the behaviour count metric on plan sets generated by both a diverse and a top-k planner, showing it can distinguish between the two. Then, we compare the diversity of plans generated by a state-of-the-art diverse planner with our approach. In those experiments, we assumed makespan optimal planning.

Our experiments are configured as follows: we solved a set of planning tasks (i.e. 41 domains, 1450 tasks) on an AMD EPYC 7763 64-Core Processor@2.4GHz using FI Katz et al. (2018),² Symk Speck et al. (2020), and FBI for k plans, where $k \in \{5, 10, 100, 1000\}$ and relative quality bounds $q \in \{1.0, 2.0\}$ (i.e. c = round(q * l), where l is the optimal length), where q = 1.0 implies the generated set Ψ has optimal solutions only. On the other hand, q = 2.0 indicates that Ψ contains plans with cost more than the optimal value but less than double the optimal value. After generating k plans, we compute the behaviour count for those k plans. Regarding the resource utilisation information, we provided μ_{ru} through external files since PDDL does not allow us to provide such information. We restrict the resources used by each task to one CPU core, 30 minutes, 16 GB of memory, and a 10-minute solver's timeout.

FI assumes that it is used in conjunction with Vadlamudi and Kambhampati's framework Vadlamudi and Kambhampati (2016). Such an assumption makes FI ignore the *k* constraint, generating substantially more plans than requested. To have comparable results with Symk and FBI, we have three configurations for FI. The FI_{MaxSum} configuration uses MaxSum model with the stability metric (δ_a) to select *k* plans. The FI_k configuration selects the first *k* unique plans generated by FI. Finally, FI_{bc} selects *k* plans that maximise behaviour count.

Table 2 shows the accumulated number of solved instances per k for a given q for all planners' configurations after computing the behaviour count scores. FI_{MaxSum} has the lowest number of solved instances compared to the other FI's configurations due to the extra computation required to extract k diverse plans. On the contrary, selecting the

¹Source in the additional material, will also be released upon publication

²https://github.com/AI-Planning/classical-domains

q	k	FI _{bc}	FI _k	FI _{MaxSum}	FBI	Symk
1.0	5	559	587	404	213	746
	10	466	497	339	194	688
	100	244	272	167	156	479
	1000	67	74	43	114	243
2.0	5	603	631	443	65	758
	10	548	583	409	64	727
	100	350	377	253	60	575
	1000	95	102	65	58	375

Table 2: Number of solved instances by FI, FBI and Symk for various values of k with different relative quality bounds q. Bold highlights the higher behaviour count.

q	k	CI	FI _k	FI _{MaxSum}	Symk
1.0	5	393	1301	1256	973
	10	329	1933	1829	1295
	100	161	6445	6648	2923
	1000	42	4606	4263	1891
2.0	5	428	1455	1471	1057
	10	393	2227	2271	1520
	100	244	7881	7860	4012
	1000	60	6833	7313	3306

Table 3: Columns FI and Symk denote the accumulated behaviour counts for different values of quality bounds q and number of extracted plans k for each planner. CI denotes the number of commonly solved instances by FI and Symk. Bold highlights statistical significance difference.

first k plans or optimising on behaviour count configurations solved more instances, showing less computational cost than MaxSum. First, Table 2 shows the number of solved instances by planners on various k and different q values. As expected, FI coverage decreases as the number of plans increases due to the increase of work during the plan forbidding phase. Table 3 shows the accumulated behaviour count for all planners based on the commonly solved instances. To show that behaviour count meaningfully captures plans' diversity, we performed a pairwise t-test with a significance level of 0.05 (i.e. p < 0.05). To conduct the test, we constructed a vector of behaviour count pairs (FI_k/FI_{MaxSum},Symk) per commonly solved instance.³

Q1: Does Behaviour Count capture diversity?

We consider the commonly solved set of instances by both diverse ($FI_{k/MaxSum}$) and top-k (Symk) planners. If the behaviour count metric can capture diversity, it should be able to meaningfully distinguish between the sets generated by both types of planners, because diverse planners aim to create diverse plans instead of just sets of plans. We leave FI_{bc} out of this comparison as it maximises behaviour count, and this

³Supplementary material contains additional stats due to space constraints.

first experiment is about validating that behaviour count is a diversity metric.

Table 3 shows that FI can generate more diverse plans compared to Symk in all cases, and there is a significant difference between the number of plans generated by FI compared to Symk (p < 0.05) in most cases. This result indicates that behaviour count is a valid domain-independent measure for quantifying the diversity of a given plan set since it can distinguish between a diverse and normal plan. The only case where there is no significant difference ($p(FI_k/Symk)=0.07, p(FI_{MaxSum}/Symk)=0.08)$) is for k = 1000, where the number of common instances is very low (42). This occurred because of FI solving fewer instances compared to its counterpart for large values of k (i.e. q=1.0, k=1000, #FI=74/43, #Symk=243 as shown in Table 2) indicating that more samples are needed to investigate differences at k = 1000.

Since behaviour count is computed based on a behaviour space configuration, it benefits from quantitative and qualitative approaches for modelling diversity without drawbacks. On the other hand, quantitative approaches rely on distance functions to quantify diversity, such as stability and state Srivastava et al. (2007); Nguyen et al. (2012). Even though such functions are domain-independent and have a straightforward implementation, they limit the details a domain modeller can encode Coman and Munoz-Avila (2011). Moreover, Goldman and Kuter Goldman and Kuter (2015) showed that such distance functions might be suboptimal as they do not adhere to distance function properties such as identity, symmetry and triangle inequality. As an alternative, they proposed Normalized Compression Distance (NCD) as a domainindependent distance function that adheres to these properties. NCD overcame the problems associated with other distance functions but faced challenges differentiating between plans caused by naming and plan representation variations since their approach relies on compression algorithms. We argue that qualitative approaches allow more details when describing a diverse model than its counterpart. However, this comes at the cost of domain independence. A clear example is the approach by Coman and Munoz-Avila Coman and Munoz-Avila (2011), where they suggested a quantitative/qualitative plan distance function that requires the domain modeller to provide minimal domain-specific details when comparing plans. However, there is no widely known method for measuring the minimal detail required by this distance function Goldman and Kuter (2015). In summary, the domain modeller's construction of a behaviour space allows them to account for domain-dependent details if needed while maintaining domain independence, removing the need for a distance function and thus overcoming the aforementioned drawbacks. Therefore, behaviour count quantifies a plan set's diversity regarding a provided behaviour space configuration.

Q2: How diverse are plans generated via behaviour planning? To answer this question, we compared FBI against all FI's configurations regarding their behaviour count and coverage scores. Table 4 shows the accumulated behaviour count for the commonly solved instances by the planners. From this table, we can conclude that FBI generates more diverse plans compared to FI.

Since FBI is an experimental planner, it is not expected to solve more instances. Yet, what is expected from it is to generate more diverse plans, especially compared to the FI's configuration that optimises on a behaviour count metric. Table 2 shows that FBI solves fewer instances compared to FI, especially when the q increases. The primary reason behind such performance is the used encoding for FBI, a simple linear

q	k	CI	FBI	$\mathrm{FI}_{\mathrm{MaxSum}}$	CI	FBI	FI _k	FI_{bc}
1.0	5	131	567	332	183	812	614	653
	10	106	862	450	150	1247	897	973
	100	72	4576	2314	103	6395	3596	4175
	1000	36	32590	2207	50	41029	8750	8877
2.0	5	49	237	145	61	297	201	255
	10	48	442	210	60	558	336	433
	100	42	2002	669	55	2831	1326	1539
	1000	16	3413	685	28	9383	5818	5875

Table 4: Columns FBI and FI_{*} denote the accumulated behaviour counts comparison for the different values of the quality bound q and the number of extracted plans kfor each respective planner. CI denotes the number of commonly solved instances. Bold highlights statistical significance difference. FI_{k/bc} are grouped with FBI to avoid duplication since they both had the same solved common instances and FBI's behaviour count.

encoding. Such encoding keeps incrementing steps until a valid plan is found, and its performance is influenced by the problem size (i.e. # grounded actions). Yet, such performance can be improved by adopting better encodings, such as lifted encodings Höller and Behnke (2022). However, Table 4 shows FBI superiority in generating more diverse plans with statistical significance (p < 0.05) for $k \ge 5$ compared to all FI's configurations.

The primary motivation behind selecting Planning as Satisfiability to implement behaviour planning is due to the offered expressivity. Such expressivity made it possible to model information, such as ordering the goal predicates and asking the planner to generate different plans that have different ordering. Encoding such information in a heuristic function would be challenging, and Roberts Roberts (2013) showed that optimal and diverse heuristic functions interfere and make it harder for the planner to find diverse and cost-bounded plans in the same phase. To conclude this experiment, we showed that the experimental FBI planner is a diverse planner that competes with state-of-the-art diverse planner FI. Furthermore, FBI success proves the practicality of behaviour planning as a proxy for diverse planning.

VI. Conclusions & Future work

In this paper, we introduced the behaviour planning framework, a proxy for diverse planning that uses a discretised version of the solution space called behaviour space. Moreover, we suggested a new metric called behaviour count to quantify diversity in terms of behaviours. Behaviour count quantifies the diversity of a given plan set by counting the number of behaviours included in this set based on the domain modeller's used behaviour space. We also showed the applicability of behaviour planning by developing an experimental cost-bounded diverse planner called FBI. Finally, our experiments show that behaviour count can quantify diversity based on a qualitative

diversity model provided by the domain modeller and the competitiveness of FBI in generating diverse plans compared to FI, especially when a large number of plans is required. In our future work, we aim to research better encodings to increase the number of solved instances by FBI and explore more possible diversity features to extend the behaviour features library that domain modellers can use.

References

- Abdelwahed, M., Espasa, J., Toniolo, A., and Gent, I. (2023). Bridging the gap between structural and semantic similarity in diverse planning. In *ICAPS 2023 Workshop on PAIR*.
- Babaki, B., Pesant, G., and Quimper, C. (2020). Solving classical AI planning problems using planning-independent CP modeling and search. In Harabor, D. and Vallati, M., editors, *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Symposium on Combinatorial Search (SOCS)*. AAAI Press.
- Boddy, M. S., Gohde, J., Haigh, T., and Harp, S. A. (2005). Course of action generation for cyber security using classical planning. In *ICAPS*.
- Bofill, M., Espasa, J., and Villaret, M. (2016). The RANTANPLAN planner: system description. *The Knowledge Engineering Review*.
- Bofill, M., Espasa, J., and Villaret, M. (2017). Relaxed ∃-step plans in planning as smt. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Chakraborti, T., Isahagian, V., Khalaf, R., Khazaeni, Y., Muthusamy, V., Rizk, Y., and Unuvar, M. (2020). From robotic process automation to intelligent process automation: –emerging trends–. In Business Process Management: Blockchain and Robotic Process Automation Forum: BPM 2020 Blockchain and RPA Forum, Seville, Spain, September 13–18, 2020, Proceedings 18. Springer.
- Coman, A. and Munoz-Avila, H. (2011). Generating diverse plans using quantitative and qualitative plan distance metrics. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Cully, A. and Demiris, Y. (2017). Quality and diversity optimization: A unifying modular framework. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 22(2):245–259.
- De Moura, L. and Bjørner, N. (2008). Z3: an efficient smt solver. In *Proceedings of* the Theory and Practice of Software, 14th International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, TACAS'08/ETAPS'08. Springer-Verlag.
- Frisch, A. M., Peugniez, T. J., Doggett, A. J., and Nightingale, P. (2005). Solving non-boolean satisfiability problems with stochastic local search: A comparison of encodings. *J. Autom. Reason.*, 35(1-3):143–179.

- Gerevini, A. and Long, D. (2005). Plan constraints and preferences in pddl3. Technical report, Technical Report 2005-08-07, Department of Electronics for Automation
- Gerevini, A., Saetti, A., and Serina, I. (2003). Planning through stochastic local search and temporal action graphs in lpg. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*.
- Goldman, R. and Kuter, U. (2015). Measuring plan diversity: Pathologies in existing approaches and a new plan distance metric. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Haessler, R. W. and Sweeney, P. E. (1991). Cutting stock problems and solution procedures. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 54(2):141–150.
- Höller, D. and Behnke, G. (2022). Encoding lifted classical planning in propositional logic. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*.
- Ingmar, L., de la Banda, M. G., Stuckey, P. J., and Tack, G. (2020). Modelling diversity of solutions. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34.
- Katz, M., Ram, P., Sohrabi, S., and Udrea, O. (2020). Exploring context-free languages via planning: The case for automating machine learning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*.
- Katz, M. and Sohrabi, S. (2020). Reshaping diverse planning. In *Proceedings of the* AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence.
- Katz, M., Sohrabi, S., Udrea, O., and Winterer, D. (2018). A novel iterative approach to top-k planning. In *Twenty-Eighth International Conference on Automated Planning* and Scheduling.
- Kautz, H., McAllester, D., Selman, B., et al. (1996). Encoding plans in propositional logic. *KR*.
- Kuo, C.-C., Glover, F., and Dhir, K. S. (1993). Analyzing and modeling the maximum diversity problem by zero-one programming. *Decision Sciences*.
- Lehman, J. and Stanley, K. O. (2011). Abandoning objectives: Evolution through the search for novelty alone. *Evolutionary computation*.
- Leofante, F. (2023). Omtplan: A tool for optimal planning modulo theories. J. Satisf. Boolean Model. Comput.
- Leofante, F., Giunchiglia, E., Ábrahám, E., and Tacchella, A. (2020). Optimal planning modulo theories. In Bessiere, C., editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2020.* ijcai.org.
- Mantik, S., Li, M., and Porteous, J. (2022). A preference elicitation framework for automated planning. *Expert Systems with Applications*.

- Nguyen, T. A., Do, M., Gerevini, A. E., Serina, I., Srivastava, B., and Kambhampati, S. (2012). Generating diverse plans to handle unknown and partially known user preferences. *Artificial Intelligence*.
- Rintanen, J. (2012). Engineering efficient planners with SAT. In Raedt, L. D., Bessiere, C., Dubois, D., Doherty, P., Frasconi, P., Heintz, F., and Lucas, P. J. F., editors, *Proceedings of the 20th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI)*, volume 242 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*.
- Rintanen, J. (2021). Planning and SAT. In Biere, A., Heule, M., van Maaren, H., and Walsh, T., editors, *Handbook of Satisfiability - Second Edition*, volume 336 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, pages 765–789. IOS Press.
- Roberts, M. (2013). *A tale of 'T'metrics: Choosing tradeoffs in multiobjective planning*. PhD thesis, Colorado State University.
- Roberts, M., Howe, A., and Ray, I. (2014). Evaluating diversity in classical planning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*.
- Sohrabi, S., Riabov, A. V., and Udrea, O. (2016). Plan recognition as planning revisited. In *IJCAI*.
- Sohrabi, S., Udrea, O., and Riabov, A. (2013). Hypothesis exploration for malware detection using planning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Speck, D., Mattmüller, R., and Nebel, B. (2020). Symbolic top-k planning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Srivastava, B., Nguyen, T. A., Gerevini, A., Kambhampati, S., Do, M. B., and Serina, I. (2007). Domain independent approaches for finding diverse plans. In *IJCAI*.
- Tierney, K., Coles, A., Coles, A., Kroer, C., Britt, A., and Jensen, R. (2012). Automated planning for liner shipping fleet repositioning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*.
- Vadlamudi, S. G. and Kambhampati, S. (2016). A combinatorial search perspective on diverse solution generation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Villaret, M. et al. (2021). Exploring Lifted Planning Encodings in Essence Prime. In Artificial Intelligence Research and Development: Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference of the Catalan Association for Artificial Intelligence.