Plan library generation can be directed through a number of automatically generate arbitrarily complex plan libraries; such to the need for a principled approach to evaluating them. In rarely are they compared with each other experimentally, leading to the need for a principled approach to evaluating them. In order to address this shortcoming, we develop a mechanism to the performance of various plan recognition algorithms. Plan recognition can be defined as the task of recognizing the intentions of the user based on the available evidence, that is, user actions, explicit statements about intentions, and user preferences. Plan recognition research was initially defined in [6] using a rule-based approach, like other early work such as [7]. Kautz and Allen [2] developed one of the first logical formalization of plan recognition, providing the conceptual framework for much of the work in plan recognition up to the present. They defined the problem of plan recognition as finding a minimal set of top level actions adequate to justify the set of observed actions. Charniak and Goldman [8] argued that plan recognition is largely a problem of inference under conditions of uncertainty, and in addition to retrieving explanatory plans, a plan recognition system must also be able to select a hypothesis based on the likelihood of the explanation given the evidence.

Since plan recognition is the process of inferring an agent’s plan, based on observations of its interaction with its environment, a plan recognition system must have a mechanism that is capable of inferring agent intentions by observing the agent’s actions in the environment. Thus, this mechanism, from a given set of observations, retrieves one or more hypotheses about the agent’s current plan of action. The knowledge used by this mechanism to infer plans is domain dependent, and therefore is commonly specified beforehand for each specific domain. This domain dependent information is usually encoded as two kinds
of inputs for the recognizer: a sequence of actions from the observed agent, and a set of plans and goals. In other words, the inputs to a plan recognizer are generally a set of goals the recognizer expects the agent to carry out in the domain, a set of plans describing the way in which the agent can reach each goal, and a sequence of actions observed by the recognizer. The plan recognition process itself consists in inferring the agent’s goal, and determining how the observed actions contributes to reach it. The set of plans form a plan library and can include preconditions, effects, and subgoals. For a good overview of plan recognition in general, see Carberry [1], and for the most recent research in the field of plan, intent, and activity recognition, see Sukthankar et al. [9].

III. PLAN LIBRARY

Most plan recognition systems require a knowledge base that encodes, into recipes, the ways in which agent goals can be achieved. A plan library is a knowledge base that codifies in some way the agent’s beliefs concerning how the agent can reach each particular goal in the domain. Plan recognition systems have a plan library as an input, so several representations of agent plans have been used to approach this problem, and various methods applied to infer the agent’s intention. These methods can be grouped in two main categories: symbolic and probabilistic approaches. Symbolic approaches aim at narrowing the set of candidate intentions by eliminating those plans that cannot be explained by the actions that the agent performs. The most used representation for symbolic approaches are plan hierarchies and consistency graphs. Probabilistic approaches explicitly represent the uncertainty associated with agent plans and allow a probabilistic ranking of the agent intentions mainly making use of Bayesian Networks [10] and Markov Models [11]. Most symbolic and probabilistic approaches are domain independent and can lead to accurate predictions provided the plan library is complete (for symbolic approaches) or provided the probabilities are correct (for probabilistic approaches). These approaches normally have the disadvantage of considering all the possible plans in the plan library given the observations. However, if observations so far can not distinguish between a set of possible intentions, probabilistic approaches can find the most probable one, while symbolic approaches can not select between them and have to wait for a single consistent explanation. Symbolic approaches are very sensitive to noisy actions, as the plan recognizer could wrongly exclude a plan (from the hypotheses explaining the observed behavior) if an unexpected action occurs in the middle of the execution of a plan.

Many plan recognition systems structure their plan libraries as an Hierarchical Task Network (HTN) [12], [13] to define the set of plans they are expected to recognize, in which goals are the root nodes and the observed actions are directly mapped to the leaf nodes. An attachment point in an HTN tree is a point in which an observation can be assigned to an action not observed yet, while shared leaders are action prefixes in the plan library that are common to different plans with different goals (root nodes). Typically, a plan library has a single dummy root node where its children are top-level plans and all other nodes are simply plan steps. In the library, sequential edges specify the expected temporal order of a plan execution sequence and vertical edges decompose plan steps into sub-steps. The library has no hierarchical cycles. However, plans may have a sequential self-cycle, allowing a plan step to be executed during multiple subsequent time stamps. Each agent action generates a set of conditions on observable features that are associated with a plan. When these conditions are met, the observations match a particular plan step. A complete algorithm for plan recognition must consider all coherent explanations for a given set of observations. Goldman et al. [14] assume that a plan library is made up of tasks structured in an hierarchical way, in which task nodes could represent goals, methods, and primitive actions. Similarly to Brown [15], the plan library could be viewed as a partially ordered AND/OR tree, in which the AND nodes are methods, connecting all action steps or sub-tasks needed to achieve the parent task, and the OR nodes are other isolated sub-tasks.

IV. PLAN LIBRARY GENERATOR – PARAMETERS

The algorithm developed in this work was created in order to enable systematic analysis and performance comparison between several plan recognition algorithms given the variety of possible plan libraries. Thus, the Plan Library Generator (see algorithms in Section V) generates plan libraries based on various given parameters as follows:

Number of top-level plans (nlp): value that represents the branching factor of the root node, in other words, the number of children for the root node. This refers to the number of different independent top level plans in the plan library.

Depth (dlt): corresponds to a measure of the depth of the plan trees. The depth of the plan library, from the root, which determines the number of plan steps that an instance of a plan (i.e., a complete path from a top level node to a bottom level node) contains.

Number minimum of branches (mi): represents the number minimum of branches that all nodes (other than root) must have. This value must belong to the interval [1; ma].

Number maximum of branches (ma): represents the number maximum of branches that all nodes (other than root) can have. This value must be greater or equal to mi. The actual number of branches from a node is randomly chosen from the interval [mi, ma] whenever a new node is created.

Number of features (fs): defines the number of observable features, in the domain, available to be attached with a given plan step. Features are properties associated with the action of a given plan step, which need to be observed by the plan recognition algorithms for it to recognize the execution of that particular plan step.

Number of features per node (fn): defines the number of features associated with each top level plan and plan step. As a restriction, the value of the number of features (fs) has to be equal to or greater than the depth (dlt) of the tree multiplied by the number of features attributed to each individual node (fn). In other words, there has to exist at least fn distinct features for each plan step node of an instance of a plan.

Conditions (mv): defines the number of values that can be associated with the features (recall that features, with particular value conditions, allow the identification of particular actions being executed by the observed agent). This value must be greater or equal to 0. Thus, assuming mv = 2 implies that all features will be multivalued assuming the values 0, 1 or 2 (i.e., only integer values in the interval [0,mv] can be assigned to the features).
Sequential edges \((sq)\): value in the interval \([0, 1]\), which determines the probability in which a branch can be created as sequential type. Thus, \(sq = 0\) means that all branches will be decomposition type, as well as, \(sq = 1\) means that all branches will be sequential type. Regarding feature distribution, it is important to emphasize that the same feature cannot be assigned with different values to a node and its respective decomposition children (as they represent a specialization of the parent). This way, when a decomposition node is created, it automatically inherits the features (as well as the values attributed to them) from its parent node.

Duplication \((pd)\): represents the percentage of top level plans that are duplicated in order to generate ambiguous paths. The duplicated plan is not exactly equal to the top plan from which it was generated. The last leaf plan step in a duplicated plan is made different to establish some distinction between them. For example, \(pd = 0.2\) means that 20% of top level plans are duplicates of others. So, approximately 40% of top level plans are not unique, presenting some difference only on the last leaf.

The size of the plan library is mainly determined by the number of top-level plans \((np)\), the interval composed by the number minimum and maximum of branches \([mi, ma]\), and by the depth \((dp)\). All plans in the plan library have an unique identification. Plans that present the same set of associated features and the same value of these features are considered equal, that is, they will match given the same set of observations. The ambiguity of the plan library influences the amount of distinct plans are fitting given a sequence of observations. The ambiguity is determined by the duplication parameter \((pd)\) (larger implies more duplicated plans, and thus increased ambiguity), by the number of features \((fs)\) (less features tend to decrease the possibility of distinction between plans), by the conditions value (more values associated to the features enable greater differentiation between plans that use the same set of features), and the number of features per node \((fn)\) (greater number will cause more variety in plans).

V. PLAN LIBRARY GENERATOR – ALGORITHM

The generation of the plan library is conducted as described in Algorithm 1. The algorithm execution starts with the creation of root node of the plan library (Line 1), which is responsible for connecting all agent plans. This node is created as a decomposition node and no features are assigned to it. Next, the algorithm determines the number of distinct plans that will be created (Line 2). This number is based on number of top-level plans \((np)\) and in the percentage of plans which will be duplicated \((pd)\). For example, if \(np\) is set to 10 and \(pd\) to 10%, then 9 distinct plans will be created and the last one will be obtained through the copy of one of the previously created plans. This is important for evaluating plan recognition algorithms that typically keep track of sets of potential plans being executed until some disambiguation is possible, which is harder when many similar plans exist in the plan library. The next step consists in creation of the top-level nodes (Line 3) which corresponds to the agent plans (e.g., plans “p1” and “p2” in Figure 1). These nodes are created as simple decomposition nodes to which no features are assigned. After creation of top-level plans, the next step (Lines 4-7) consists in creation of their respective branches. This creation is conducted as described in Algorithm 2. Finally, after the creation of individual top-level plans, the algorithm selects (Line 8) the ones that will be duplicated (if a duplication percentage has been set). Note, however, that features values of bottom-level nodes from an plan copy are changed in order to distinguish it from the original plan, whenever plans are duplicated.

Algorithm 2 Create Branches

\begin{algorithm}
\textbf{Input:} Id \(id\), Number of features \(fs\), Parent Features \(pf\), Current Depth \(cd\)
\textbf{Output:} Node \(n\)
1: \(nb \leftarrow \text{getNumberOfBranches}(mi, ma)\)
2: \(se \leftarrow \text{getNumberOfSeqEdges}(nb, sq)\)
3: \(rf \leftarrow \text{getRandFeatures}(fs, fn)\)
4: \(nd \leftarrow \text{getNewNode}(id, nb, se, cd, rf)\)
5: \textbf{if} \(pf\) \textbf{not empty} \textbf{then}
6: \hspace{1em} \(\text{getParentFeatures}(nd, pf)\)
7: \textbf{end if}
8: \textbf{if} \(cd = dt\) \textbf{then}
9: \hspace{1em} \textbf{return} Node \(nd\)
10: \textbf{end if}
11: \(ct \leftarrow 1\)
12: \textbf{for} \(i = 0\) \textbf{to} \(sq \) \textbf{do}
13: \hspace{1em} \(ti \leftarrow \text{getNodeId}(ct)\)
14: \hspace{1em} \(sc \leftarrow \text{createBranches}(ti, fs, \emptyset, cd + 1, fn)\)
15: \hspace{1em} \text{addSequentialChildren}(nd, sc)\)
16: \hspace{1em} \(ct \leftarrow ct + 1\)
17: \textbf{end for}
18: \textbf{for} \(i = 0\) \textbf{to} \((nb - sq)\) \textbf{do}
19: \hspace{1em} \(ti \leftarrow \text{getNodeId}(ct)\)
20: \hspace{1em} \(sf \leftarrow \text{getFeatureSubset}(rf, fs)\)
21: \hspace{1em} \(sc \leftarrow \text{createBranches}(ti, fs, sf, cd + 1, fn)\)
22: \hspace{1em} \text{addSequentialChildren}(nd, sc)\)
23: \hspace{1em} \(ct \leftarrow ct + 1\)
24: \textbf{end for}
25: \textbf{return} Node \(nd\)
\end{algorithm}

Algorithm 2 describes the creation of plan-step nodes and their respective branches. It receives as input the textual identification of a new node \((id)\), the number of features \((fs)\), the subset of features assigned to its parent node \((pf)\) and, finally, the current depth \((cd)\), i.e., depth level in which the node is going to be created. Some of the parameters such
as number of features per node \((f_n)\), number minimum of branches \(m_i\), number maximum of branches \(m_o\) and sequential edges \((s_q)\) are assumed as global (see Algorithm 1). The algorithm starts by determining the number of branches to be created for the new node (Line 1) and how many of them will be set as sequential branches (Line 2). Both information have to be defined before the creation of the new node as they help to determine its type. If the number of sequential edges \((s_q)\) is equal to the total number of branches \((nb)\), the new node is going to be created as an action node (also referred as "leaf node"). Otherwise, the node is going to be created as a decomposition node. In next step (Line 3), the algorithm generates the subset of features to be assigned to the new node. This subset, of size as defined by \(f_n\), is extracted from the feature set \((f_s)\) received from the parent node; those features receive values randomly extracted from the previously defined interval \(([0, m_i])\). Using the subset of features, and the information previously determined, the algorithm creates the new node (Line 4). However, before the branches of the new node are created, the algorithm checks if the current level has reached the expected depth (Line 8). If the expected depth has been reached, the new node is returned and the creation of the plan path is completed. If the depth has not been reached yet, the algorithm goes to the next step, which is the creation of the next level of the tree.

The next stage of algorithm execution is creation of sequential branches of node (Lines 12-17). It starts by defining the textual identifications of nodes to be created (controlled by \(ct\)). After that, the method is recursively called until all the sequential nodes are created. All nodes created in those recursive calls are added to the list of sequential children of the new node (Line 15). After the creation of the sequential branches, the algorithm uses a similar approach to create the decomposition branches of the new node (Lines 18-24). The main difference between the creation of sequential and decomposition branches is the distribution of features among nodes. While in creation of sequential nodes the construction of the feature subset (Line 3) is based on the whole feature set \((f_s)\), in creation of decomposition nodes the creation is based on a subset of \(f_s\), which eliminates features already used by parent nodes. Such elimination is conducted in line 20 of the algorithm. As previously explained, the same feature cannot be attributed to a node and its (decomposition) children with different values, so the node child inherits the features (and its respective values) from parent node (Line 5). In Figure 1, the nodes of the tree represent plans (first level) and plan steps (second level and below) of the plan library, and the edges of the tree represent the relations between them. The “root” node is not considered as a plan, being used only as a way of connecting the various plans. Figure 1 shows sequential links represented by dashed arrows and decomposition links represented by solid arrows. For instance, there is a decomposition link between \(p_2\) and \(ps_2\_2\), and a sequential link between this \(ps_2\_2\) and \(ps_2\_2\_1\). The top-level plans are \(p_1\) and \(p_2\). For clarity, Figure 1 does not show the set of conditions on observable features associated with plan steps.

VI. Conclusion

In this paper, we have developed an approach that allows principled performance evaluation for plan recognition algorithms. A plan library generator was created to generate complex structures based on a number of parameters that will determine the complexity of the plan library. Thus, a unique representation of an information domain can be used to compare the efficiency of several plan recognition algorithms. The performance of plan recognition algorithms is directly related to the structure and size of the plan library, as well as to the set of observations given to the plan recognition system.
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