

View Reviews

Paper ID

5169

Paper Title

Implementing BDI Continual Temporal Planning

Track Name

IJCAI 2023 Main Track

Reviewer #1

Questions

1. Summary

The paper presents an extended BDI architecture that supports online continual planning. Agents can generate plans at runtime and revise them if the plan is predicted to fail. An implementation of the approach based on ROS2-BDI is described, and the implementation is evaluated in a simple litter collection scenario.

3. Justification of the score

The ability of autonomous agents to select and update a course of action at runtime is a key problem and very relevant to IJCAI. The approach supports temporal goals and durative actions (necessary for many real-world problems). In addition, the implementation is based on ROS, facilitating deployment on physical robots. The paper is reasonably well written.

On the negative side, some aspects of the architecture are not clearly explained (see detailed feedback below), and the paper does not discuss or compare against relevant related work in the BDI literature (in contrast, the discussion of related work in robotics and planning is reasonable). As a result, it's not clear to what extent the proposed approach represents an advance on the state of the art.

4. Detailed feedback

The paper presents a "BDI approach" to continual planning. However, it's not clear what is meant by BDI in this context. BDI agents typically have a set of pre-defined plans which are selected at run-time to achieve a particular goal. This seems consistent with the introduction to Section 3, which states that for BDI agents "A set of plans is provided in their knowledge base to reach the desires with alternative solutions". Yet in the approach proposed in the paper, all plans appear to be generated from scratch. This is in contrast to approaches in the BDI literature where plan generation is used to augment the set of pre-defined plans. Such approaches typically use HTN planning rather than PDDL, as HTN plans are closer to the agent's pre-defined plans. While there may well be advantages of adopting a PDDL planner, there is no discussion or comparison with the prior work in the BDI literature, making it difficult to determine to what extent the approach proposed represents an advance on the state of the art. See, for example, the work of Sardina et al 2006, on CANPlan and de Silva et al. 2006 on integrating HTN planning into BDI agents.

Related to the above point, it's not clear if the proposed approach is capable of pursuing multiple goals in parallel (as is typical in BDI agents). In some parts of the text it seems as though a single plan is generated to achieve multiple goals, while at other points it seems that goals are pursued in sequence. The paper would be stronger if the assumptions made about the agent's goals were more clearly stated.

There has been considerable work in the BDI literature on goal lifecycles, i.e., when goals should be adopted, suspended, resumed or abandoned. It's not clear how the approach presented relates to this work. See, for example, van Riemsdijk et al., 2008, Harland et al. 2014. Similarly, there has been considerable work on how an agent with multiple intentions should interleave the actions in these intentions, e.g., Thangarajah et al 2011, Yao et al 2016. Again this is not discussed in the current paper.

The evaluation is a little limited in comparing the approach presented to a closely related approach that plans to completion. There is no comparison against related approaches from the BDI literature or even against a BDI agent with pre-defined plans. I appreciate that evaluation scenarios are often simplified, but the litter collection problem is a standard benchmark in the BDI literature which can be easily solved using pre-defined plans. The evaluation would have been stronger if the scenario more clearly demonstrated the advantages of online planning. There is also no discussion of the time taken to generate or update the plans, on the grounds that the number of plans steps is the key criterion. However, for agents in a dynamic environment, reaction time is important. Even for a prototype implementation (and accepting that the planner is not optimised), I would have expected to see some indication that the proposed approach could produce the next action in reasonable time.

5. Are the results in this paper easily reproducible ?

CREDIBLE: I believe that the obtained results can, in principle, be reproduced. Even though key resources (e.g., proofs, code, data) are unavailable at this point, the key details (e.g., proof sketches, experimental setup) are sufficiently well described for an expert to confidently reproduce the main results, if given access to the missing resources.

Reviewer #2

Questions

1. Summary

This paper proposes a control loop for robotic systems that interleaves planning and execution by combining online/continual temporal planning with Belief-Desire-Intention decision-making. This BDI continuous temporal planning framework is implemented in ROS2 (via an extension to ROS2-BDI) and JavaFF (via extended planning algorithms). The proposed framework is evaluated in a simple robotic scenario and compared against a ROS2-BDI baseline that does not support continual planning.

3. Justification of the score

Strengths:

- + Practical implementation with code available
- + Easy to follow, but with some grammatical errors

Weaknesses:

- Presentation
- No formalisation
- Weak evaluation

4. Detailed feedback

I am familiar with BDI agents, but the paper does not properly introduce them or explain why they are useful in this context. Readers have to assume that BDI agents are relevant because there is an existing piece of work that integrates BDI with ROS2. I suggest adding a paragraph dedicated to BDI in the introduction.

There are other approaches to BDI and ROS other than ROS2-BDI:

Patrick Gavigan, Babak Esfandiari: BDI for Autonomous Mobile Robot Navigation. EMAS@AAMAS 2021: 137-155

Rafael C. Cardoso, Angelo Ferrando, Louise A. Dennis, Michael Fisher: An Interface for Programming Verifiable Autonomous Agents in ROS. EUMAS/AT 2020: 191-205

These do not support (explicit) temporal behaviour, therefore I am not suggesting they should be referenced in the paper. They are simply alternatives to having BDI within ROS, in case the authors are not familiar with them.

In section 2, when you describe the core ROS2-BDI nodes, it would help if the numbers (i to v) would appear in Figure 1. With some careful reading we can match them to the figure, but it would be much easier if the numbers were already there for the reader to immediately recognise and match the explanation to the node.

Everything is explained in text format, which makes it hard to understand how exactly some pieces of the

framework work or interact with each other. Providing pseudocode algorithms (either that or another form of formalisation) for the framework would help solve this problem and ground the contributions of the paper. The algorithm for the extended search should appear in the main paper instead of the appendix. But only that algorithm is not enough, the rest of the framework should also be represented in algorithms (or another formalisation).

For example, there are things that are not properly addressed even in the text, such as the conversion from sensor data to symbolic beliefs, which is not straightforward. Likewise, converting beliefs into the initial states that will be used by the temporal planner to perform continuous planning can also be problematic. None of these things are properly explained (with enough level of detail) in the paper.

In terms of space constraints and presentation, figure 2 is not very useful. I suggest replacing it with some of my previous suggestions (algorithms, paragraphs, etc.).

In terms of implementation, ROS Java bindings can be quite finicky and will usually stop working when a new distribution of ROS is released. I would consider using something like `rosbridge` (https://github.com/RobotWebTools/rosbridge_suite) instead.

The evaluation was performed on a relatively simple example with only one agent. But even considering only one agent, the settings (or situations as referred in the paper) are very basic and fail to evaluate the scalability of the framework. I also disagree with the statement that a comparison of computation time would not be fair. Both the baseline and the extended framework use the same planner, search algorithm, and heuristics. The only difference is one is offline and the other is online (respectively). Therefore, I believe that the comparison would not only be fair, but crucial in judging the effectiveness of using the extended (online) framework over the baseline (offline) framework.

Small typos:

Your quotation marks are wrong, for example see "standard" in page 2. Both are closed quotes, when the first one should be open. You can fix this in Latex with (for example): ``standard"

Page 1: , do not show temporal planning capabilities -> , and do not show temporal planning capabilities

Page 1: with also support -> with support

Page 3 I am not sure what this sentence means: "it might also tell the Executor to arrest earlier the plan in execution". Would it be stop instead of arrest?

Page 3: in input the Planning Initial State -> as input the Planning Initial State

Page 3: according to a a given expansion strategy -> according to a given expansion strategy

Page 4: is early aborted -> is aborted early

Page 4: not be always affective -> not always be effective

Page 5: within the Gaol Reasoner -> within the Goal Reasoner

Page 6: the different actions (e.g., move), and pickup) -> and the different actions (e.g., move, and pickup)

Page 6: For a low-level bug -> Due to a low-level bug

5. Are the results in this paper easily reproducible ?

CONVINCING : I am convinced that the obtained results can be reproduced, possibly with some effort. Key resources (e.g., proofs, code, data) are already available, will be made available upon acceptance, or good reasons as to why they are not (e.g., proprietary data or code) are reported in the paper. Key details (e.g., proofs, experimental setup) are sufficiently well described but their exact recovery may require some work.

6. Questions for the author response.

1) Is the restriction to one agent only a limitation of PlanSys2? If the execution environment is changed to something else, would the rest of your approach work with multiple agents?

2) Which programming language was used to implement the BDI agent? Are you aware of BDI programming languages such as Jason?

