

Herding the Crowd: Automated Planning for Crowdsourced Planning

Kartik Talamadupula and Subbarao Kambhampati

Dept. of Computer Science and Engg.

Arizona State University

Tempe, AZ 85287 USA

{krt, rao}@asu.edu

Abstract

There has been significant interest in crowdsourcing and human computation. One subclass of human computation applications are those directed at tasks that involve planning (e.g. travel planning) and scheduling (e.g. conference scheduling). Much of this work appears outside the traditional automated planning forums, and at the outset it is not clear whether automated planning has much of a role to play in these “human computation” systems. Interestingly however, work on these systems shows that even primitive forms of automated oversight of the human planner does help in significantly improving the effectiveness of the humans/crowd. In this paper, we will argue that the automated oversight used in these systems can be viewed as a primitive automated planner, and that there are several opportunities for more sophisticated automated planning in effectively steering crowdsourced planning. Straightforward adaptation of current planning technology is however hampered by the mismatch between the capabilities of human workers and automated planners. We identify two important challenges that need to be overcome before such adaptation of planning technology can occur: (i) *interpreting* the inputs of the human workers (and the requester) and (ii) *steering* or critiquing the plans being produced by the human workers armed only with *incomplete* domain and preference models. In this paper, we discuss approaches for handling these challenges, and characterize existing human computation systems in terms of the specific choices they make in handling these challenges.

1 Introduction

In recent years, thanks to the ease of communication afforded by the internet, human computation has emerged as a powerful and inexpensive alternative to solving computationally hard problems, especially those that require input from humans for solution. Indeed, the area has been defined as “...a paradigm for utilizing human processing power to solve problems that computers cannot yet solve.” (Von Ahn 2009). A similar term, crowdsourcing, is often used to denote the process wherein traditional (perhaps specifically trained or skilled) human workers are replaced by members of the public (Howe 2006). To complete the classification (Quinn and Bederson 2011), collective intelligence is a label that is often given to a set of tasks which contain “...groups of individuals doing things collectively that seem intelligent” (Malone, Laubacher, and Del-

larocas 2009). A core class of human computation problems are thus directed at that quintessential human activity: *planning*. Several recent efforts have started looking at crowd-sourced planning tasks (Law and Zhang 2011; Zhang et al. 2012; Zhang et al. 2013; Lasecki et al. 2012b; Lotosh, Milo, and Novgorodov 2013).

At first glance, these applications and problem categories appear to have very little to do with existing automated planning methods, as they seem to depend solely on human planners. However, a deeper look at these systems shows that most of them use primitive automated components in order to enforce checks and constraints to steer human workers. More importantly, experiments show that even these primitive automated components go a long way towards improving plan quality, for little to no investment in terms of cost and time (c.f. Zhang et al. 2012).

The effectiveness of even primitive planning techniques begs the obvious question: *is it possible to improve the effectiveness of crowdsourced planning even further by using more sophisticated automated planning technologies?* It seems reasonable to expect that a more sophisticated automated planner can do a much better job of steering the crowd (much as human managers “steer” their employees). It would also seem, at first blush, that importing automated planning technology into crowdsourced planning scenarios should be relatively straightforward. Indeed, work such as (Law and Zhang 2011) and (Zhang et al. 2012) are replete with hopeful references to the automated planning literature. There exists a vibrant body of literature on automated plan generation, and automated planners have long tolerated humans in their decision cycle – be it mixed initiative planning (Ferguson, Allen, and Miller 1996) or planning for teaming (Bagchi, Biswas, and Kawamura 1996; Talamadupula et al. 2010). Nevertheless, the context of crowdsourced planning scenarios poses some critical challenges in adapting planning technology.

In this paper, we aim to develop a general architecture for human computation (crowdsourced) systems aimed at planning and scheduling tasks, with a view to foreground the types of roles an automated planner can play in such systems, and the challenges involved in facilitating those roles. We shall see that the most critical challenges include:

Interpretation Need for interpreting the requester’s goals as well as the crowd’s plans from semi-structured or un-




Figure 1: An architecture for planning in crowdsourced planning systems.

structured natural language input.

Steering with Incompleteness Need for planning techniques that can get by with incomplete or incorrect models of both dynamics and preferences.

The *interpretation* challenge arises because human workers will find it most flexible to exchange/refine plans expressed in a form as close to natural language as possible, and automated planners typically operate on more structured plans and actions. The *steering* challenge is motivated by the fact that an automated planner operating in a crowdsourced planning scenario cannot possibly be expected to have a complete model of the domain or preferences; if it does, then there is little need or justification for using human workers! Both these challenges are further complicated by the fact that the (implicit) models used by the human workers and the automated planner are very likely to differ in many ways, making it hard for the planner to critique the plans being developed by the human workers. We shall see that existing systems handle the incompleteness and interpretation challenges in primitive ways, and subsequently discuss ways in which these challenges can be handled in more effective fashions.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We start by discussing related work, and distinguish the focus of our work from them. Next we look at the problem of planning for crowdsourced planning in more detail, and present a generalized architecture for this task. Next, we consider the roles that an automated planner can play within such an architecture, and discuss the challenges that need to be tackled in order to facilitate those roles. We then describe a spectrum of approaches for handling those challenges. Finally, we characterize the existing crowdsourced planning systems in terms of our architecture and challenges. We hope that this work will spur directed research on the challenges that

we have identified.

2 Related Work

The role played by automated planning in crowdsourced planning problems has interesting connections and contrasts to the role of planners in mixed-initiative planning and planning for human-robot teaming (Talamadupula et al. 2010). For example, in mixed-initiative planning, the "interpretation" problem is punted away by expecting the human in the loop to interact with the plan on the planner's terms; this will certainly not work in crowdsourced planning. Further, in mixed-initiative and human-robot teaming scenarios, the planner is expected to have a complete model of the planning problem – which is rarely the case in crowdsourced planning. Instead, the planner must deal with a model-lite (Kambhampati 2007) spectrum, where models may range from simple feasibility constraints, through incomplete theories of the task domain and very rarely preferences specified in a standardized format. Planning techniques that have so far expected input in the form of PDDL (or some other standard) must also change to take this model-lite spectrum into account.

A number of other implemented human computation systems that use automated technology to assist with and improve the quality of tasks other than planning are listed in (Quinn and Bederson 2011)'s wide-ranging survey of the field. Our paper focuses solely on the crowd-planning aspect, rather than the gamut of general human-computation tasks.

In this paper, we discuss how automated planning can and should help crowd-sourced planning tasks. A related but different strand of work is to use the planning technology in general crowd sourcing systems to control the crowds (regardless of whether the task they are helping with is a plan-

ning task or any other general computation task). An example of this strand of research is the TurKontrol project (Dai, Mausam, and Weld 2011), which is an end-to-end system that dynamically optimizes live crowdsourcing tasks, and deals with the problem of assigning human intelligence tasks (HITs) to both improving the quality of a solution, as well as checking the current quality. This work also concentrates on optimizing iterative, crowdsourced workflows by learning the model parameters (Weld, Mausam, and Dai 2011) from real Mechanical Turk data, and modeling worker accuracy (for quality improvement) and voting patterns (to check the quality of work done). Such systems are independent of the actual task at hand – whether that be text improvement or human intelligence to produce plans – and focus more on worker-independent parameters to assign improvement and voting jobs instead.

3 Planning for Crowdsourced Planning

The crowdsourced planning problem involves returning a plan as a solution to a task, usually specified by a user or *requester*. The requester provides a high-level description of the task – most often in natural language – which is then forwarded to the crowd, or *workers*. The workers can perform various roles, including breaking down the high-level task description into more formal and achievable sub-goals (Law and Zhang 2011), adding actions into the plan that support those sub-goals (Zhang et al. 2012), or propose further refinements to the task (which can in turn be approved or rejected by the requester, if they choose to remain part of the loop). The *planner* is the automated component of the system, and it performs various tasks ranging from constraint checking, to optimization and scheduling, and plan recognition. The entire planning process must itself be iterative (Smith 2012), proceeding in several rounds which serve to refine the goals, preferences and constraints further until a satisfactory plan is found. A general architecture for solving this crowdsourced planning problem is depicted in Figure 1.

3.1 Motivating Example

As a motivating (and running) example, we consider a problem that is repeated around the world every year – that of planning a *local tour*¹ for visitors, families and students who are unfamiliar with a new college campus. This problem can be easily generalized to any attraction that is *local* in nature; i.e., any attraction that is large enough to warrant creating a customized plan, yet smaller than an entire city or town, thus ruling out complex transportation planning problems. We choose this problem because it offers a nice combination and trade-off in terms of the causal complexity of the actions that any local tour plan must contain, without transforming into a full-blown transit or journey planning problem. Instead, we believe there are some rules that are common to local tour planning problems across locations. These common rules may be used as a guideline when creating the PDDL model M for this particular scenario.

¹Note that we only introduce, but do not formally define the Local Tour Planning problem in this paper.

In order to better illustrate the college tour problem, we present an example request from a user, specified in natural language:

I want to take a tour of the State University campus. In particular, I want to see buildings that are relevant to a new undergraduate student, with an emphasis on the engineering departments. I also want to look at the various food options around the different places that I visit. I would like the tour to include some elements of the history and culture of the university. The tour should last about 3 hours, and I would like to finish at the parking spot where I started. It would also be nice to take a look at the football stadium.

In the above example, both the critical challenges – *Interpretation*, and *Steering with Incompleteness* – are reflected to some degree. The user’s preferences, expressed here in the form of the vague goal as well as some partial preferences on what they want to do, are incompletely specified. The dynamics of the domain are incompletely known as well, both to the turkers that receive this request from the user (the turkers may not know everything about that specific campus), as well as to any automated planner that must critique the turkers’ plans.

The interpretation challenges come both in extracting goals from the requester, and identifying the plans being proposed/discussed by the crowd of turkers. It is not very likely that turkers will give information about actions that satisfy the requester’s preferences (a tour) in a standardized form – in fact, enforcing them to do such a thing may lead to them leaving out important details. Instead, the turkers must be encouraged to contribute as much information as possible via a natural specification mode, e.g. free, unstructured text. The automated planner’s challenge is then to understand the plan that the turkers are proposing from that free-form text. In order to do this, the planner must be aware that its model of the campus may well be incomplete (and the human workers might have a better one).

Finally, once the crowd’s plan is interpreted and structured knowledge extracted from it, the automated planner must account for the fact that the turkers created that plan using *their* own model of the world – a model that is decidedly closer to the requester’s as far as preferences and goals are concerned, yet perhaps not as cognizant of world constraints as the planner’s model. Therefore the planner must consider the gap between the two models when critiquing and directing the further refinement of the crowd’s plan. In the campus tour planning example, it is easy to see how the planner may critique a crowd plan that takes the requester to different corners of the campus in the interests of time; yet the longer plan may actually be fulfilling more of the requester’s vague goal of wanting to “see the campus”. The optimization here is not merely on one factor (time taken), but a complex combination of various factors (which humans are better at even now than automated planners).

In the rest of this paper, we will return time and again to this running example, in order to illustrate more concretely some of the points that we make.

3.2 Roles in Crowdsourced Planning

We will now get back to our general architecture for crowdsourced planning problem (shown in Figure 1), and take a more detailed look at the three major roles in this problem:²

Requester The requester, or user, is at the head of this general system – she must specify the task at hand, as well as the desired goals; together, we denote these as G . Additionally, the requester can specify preferences on the form or contents of the plan that is eventually returned as a solution. Usually, this specification is done in natural language which can be understood easily by fellow (unskilled) humans, but not as easily by machines and automated systems. The requester can also (optionally) choose to observe the planning process as it unfolds, and provide feedback in order to steer it in the right direction. An example of a specification from a requester is provided in Section 3.1.

Workers (Crowd) The task specification G is then passed on to the crowd of workers. The workers’ job consists of two main tasks:

1. Break down G into a set of machine-readable sub-goals S_G . An example of this can be seen in Section 3.1, where the workers must take the requester’s vaguely specified goal of wanting a tour of campus into smaller sub-goals such as visiting specific buildings and conducting various activities.
2. Help generate a “crowd” plan P_c aimed at solving G , either by suggesting a brand new one or by modifying the existing plan based on critiques. This part consists of the workers suggesting actions that will fulfill the sub-goals specified by them in the previous stage.

The crowd may also provide preferences on the task, either explicitly or by evaluating plans that were generated in previous iterations³ – for example, there may be many different tours of a campus that visit different buildings via different routes, and it is up to the workers to choose the one that they think best satisfies the requester’s specified preferences. Note that P_c may be generated in natural language, and does not need to have a formal structure, since it involves multiple workers collaborating and natural language is the lowest common denominator when it comes to workers of various skill-levels collaborating.

Planner The planning module, or the automated component of the system, can provide varying levels of support. It accepts both S_G and P_c as input from the workers. This module analyzes the current plan generated by the crowd, as well as the sub-goals, and determines constraint violations

²We note that we are considering a dedicated architecture for crowdsourced planning (much as systems such as DuoLingo consider dedicated architectures for specific tasks). An interesting future direction would be to consider how this architecture can be embedded into the popular crowdsourced platforms such as those provided by Amazon or Odesk.

³When the requester and crowd’s preferences clash, it is usually the case that the requester wins – since they are paying for the crowdsourced planning process.

according to the model M of the task that it has (see Section 5). The planner’s job is to steer the crowd towards more effective plan generation.

However, these three roles need a common space in which to interact and exchange information. This is achieved through a common interactive space – the *Distributed Blackboard* (DBb) – as shown in Figure 1. The DBb acts as a collaborative space where all the information related to the task as well as the plan that is currently being generated to solve it is stored, and exchanged between the various components of the system.

In contrast to the workers, the planner cannot hope for very complex, task-specific models, mostly due to the difficulty of creating such models. Instead, a planner’s strong-suit is to automate and speed-up the checking of plans against whatever knowledge it *does* have. With regard to this, M_P can be considered shallow with respect to preferences, but may range the spectrum from shallow to deep where domain physics and constraints are concerned.

The planning process itself continues until one of the following conditions (or a combination thereof) is satisfied:

- The crowd plan P_c reaches some satisfactory threshold and the requester’s original goal G is fulfilled by it; this is a subjective measure and is usually determined with the intervention of the requester.
- There are no more outstanding alerts, and all the sub-goals in S_G are supported.

The various interactions among the requester, workers and the planner produce several problems of interest to automated planning. In the following, we categorize these problems into two main categories, and we then describe the constituents of these categories – problems that should be familiar to the automated planning community, yet are missing from current crowdsourced planning systems.

4 Planning Challenges

From the architecture described in Figure 1, it is fairly obvious that a planner (automated system) would interact with the rest of the system to perform one of two tasks: (1) **interpretation** and (2) **steering**. These two tasks define the planner’s role in the entire process. Interpretation is required for the planner to inform itself about what the crowd *is* doing; steering is required for the planner to tell the crowd what they *should* be doing. Here we take a deeper look at these two modes.

4.1 Interpretation of the Crowd’s Evolving Plan

The planner must interpret the information that comes from the requester, and from the crowd (workers), in order to act on that information. There are two ways in which the planner can ensure that it is able to understand that information:

Force Structure The system can enforce a pre-determined structure on the input from both the requester, and the crowd. This can by itself be seen as part of the model M_P , since the planner has a clear idea about what kind of information can

be expected through what channels. For example, in a travel-planning application, the requester can be given a dynamic form to fill out, instead of a box for free-form text. This instantly imposes structure on the information provided, and makes it easier for the planner to separate various fields. Similarly, when the workers are creating plans, the system can impose a flow on that process. Such structured data can include – apart from just the dynamics of the domain in question – information about the requester’s preferences as well. The obvious disadvantage is that it reduces flexibility for the human workers.

An interesting research challenge here is to develop interfaces that will incentivize human workers to provide more structured information about their plans—including temporal, causal and teleological dependencies. In the campus tour example, we might force the requester to number his/her goals, and force the workers to explicitly state which goals their proposed plan aims to handle (c.f. (Zhang et al. 2012)). We might also force the workers to add other structured attributes to their plans such as the amount of time that is expected to be taken by the plan.

Extract Structure The planner can also *extract* structure from the text input of the (human) requester as well as human workers, in order to determine the current state of the crowd-planning process. The specific extraction method used may vary from methods that extract from plain text and impose structure (Ling and Weld 2010), to plan extraction which tries to obtain a structured plan from unstructured text. Although this problem has connections to plan recognition (Kautz and Allen 1986; Ramírez and Geffner 2010), it is significantly harder as it needs to recognize plans not from actions, but rather textual descriptions. Thus it can involve first recognizing actions and action order from text, and then recognizing plans in terms of those actions.

Consider an example from the campus tour problem – worker input such as

‘I suggest you go to the student union at lunch time as there are many entertainment shows at that time’

would have to be interpreted in terms of the action (of going to the student union). Subsequent to this, the planner must also identify additional information related to that action, such as the time when it is to execute (lunch time) and possible goals that it satisfies (entertainment).

Unlike traditional plan recognition that starts from observed plan traces in terms of actions or actions and states, the interpretation involves first extracting the plan traces. The extracted traces are likely to be noisy (e.g. (Zhuo, Yang, and Kambhampati 2012)) complicating plan recognition. An even more challenging obstacle is the impedance mismatch between the (implicit) planning models used by the human workers and that available to the planner.

4.2 Steering the Crowd’s Plan

After determining what is going on in the planning process, the planner can steer the workers by offering helpful suggestions, alerts and perhaps even its own plan. In some ways, the role of the planner in this scenario is akin to that of a

human manager who effectively oversees, shepherds, and steers employees without necessarily knowing the full details of what the employees are doing (March and Simon 1958; Davis, Schoorman, and Donaldson 1997). There are two main kinds of feedback an automated planner can provide to the human workers:

Problem Identification Even with a very simple model, the planner can be used as a basic automated constraint and arithmetic checker. For example, in producing crowd-sourced plans for travel planning, if the only things known as part of the automated planner’s model are the maximum distance that the requester is willing to walk, and the number of transfers they want to make – as is often the case with transit directions in online maps – then the automated planner is restricted to just enforcing those constraints on any plan that the crowd comes up with. A planner with a slightly more complex model can try to apply the plan recognition methods described previously, in order to generate alerts for the crowd in terms of sub-goals or actions that are currently unsupported.

Constructive Critiques Once the planner has some knowledge about the plan that the workers are trying to propose (using the recognition methods described above), it can also try to actively help the creation and refinement of that plan by offering suggestions as part of the alerts. These suggestions can vary depending on the depth of the planner’s model. They can range from simple notifications of constraint violations, as outlined previously; through plan critiques (such as suggestions on the order of actions in the plan and even what actions must be present); suggesting new plans or plan fragments because they satisfy the requester’s stated preferences or constraints better; and suggesting new ways of decomposing the problem (Nau et al. 2003).

As far as the actual generation of suggestions goes, given an incomplete model M , a simple regression approach can be adopted that tries to match the sub-goals in the scenario with the actions that support them (those actions having been extracted previously from text). This approach can be augmented further with the introduction of plan, goal and intent recognition methods. The planning system can try to guess which of the sub-goals are currently being supported by the actions in the crowd’s plans, and expand that particular path further in order to generate alerts that are more specific to the current plan under consideration. Additionally, there are connections to other, established planning and scheduling problems:

Model Evolution Given that the crowd’s plan P_c – being realized as free-form natural language expressed as text – may contain actions not present in M , the planner may also ask the human planners to (i) “explain” the role of those actions with respect to subsequent actions, or (ii) confirm the applicability of those unknown actions with respect to preceding actions. These alerts may help the planner update the model M with preconditions and effects of the new actions.

Preference Handling & Elicitation Approaches can range from already implemented methods, like generating a diverse set of plans for the crowd or the requester to pick

from (Nguyen et al. 2012) (implicit preference elicitation), to making the crowd explicitly enumerate the preferences that the requester might hold (which may also have been specified via natural language on the DBb).

Scheduling & Optimization In certain cases, the crowd produces suggestions for actions that can be used to create a plan for the requester’s task. However, those actions still need to be scheduled to create the plan P_c . The automated system can be used to perform this scheduling – in certain cases, if the model is detailed enough, the system can even be used to perform optimization to produce the best plan from the suggestions mooted by the crowd.

Differences from traditional plan synthesis/critiquing While the task of plan steering has several similarities to the traditional plan synthesis and plan critiquing (Ghallab, Nau, and Traverso 2004), it differs in significant ways because of the incompleteness of the domain models and requester preferences available to the planner. The model incompleteness precludes the traditional techniques that view planning as producing a provably correct course of action. The incompleteness of the model, as well as the attendant impedance mismatch between the planner’s and human workers’ models also makes the plan critiquing harder. What may be seen as a wrong or suboptimal plan given the planner’s incomplete model of the domain may well be a desirable one from the requester’s point of view. This difficulty is ameliorated in part by ensuring that the planner only provides non-binding alerts/advice to the human workers.

Rather than traditional planning models, we believe “model-lite planning,” as envisioned in (Kambhampati 2007; Nguyen et al. 2009; Allen et al. 2007) may be more appropriate for crowdsourced planning scenarios. In particular, (Kambhampati 2007) categorizes planning with incomplete models into two cases, shallow model case and approximate model case, depending on the degree of incompleteness of the domain model. We believe that this distinction is relevant for crowdsourced planning scenarios too. In particular, *approximate* domain models are those that are almost complete, but have some missing details. Examples of missing details could include missing preconditions and effects of actions (c.f. (Nguyen et al. 2009; Weber and Bryce 2011; Morwood and Bryce 2012)), or cost models. We would like to be able to use approximate models to support plan creation as well as plan critiquing. *Shallow* domain models, in contrast, are those that aim to provide knowledge to mostly support critiquing, rather than creation of plans. Examples of shallow models include I/O type specifications, task dependency knowledge, or databases of past plans (aka case-bases), or even low-level constraints (such as temporal deadlines) etc. Typically, these models are not generative, and do not involve precondition-effect style characterization of the actions. They are useful mostly for critiquing the plans (c.f. (Allen et al. 2007; Dong et al. 2004)). (It is of course possible to have domain models that are shallow in some aspects and approximate in other.)

Another aspect of incomplete models is that the planning has an incentive to improve the completeness of its model

over time. It will be interesting to see if the existing work on learning planning models (c.f. (Yang, Wu, and Jiang 2007; Blythe 2005)) can be adapted to allow learning from observing the crowd’s plans.

5 Classifying Existing Crowdsourced Planning Systems

In the previous section, we saw that both the challenge of interpreting the crowd’s plan and the challenge of steering it can have primitive solutions (e.g. force structure and critique the plan in terms of lower level consistency checks), and more ambitious solutions (e.g. interpret structure by extracting actions and plans from text, and evaluate the extracted plan in terms of the planning model to provide constructive extensions or alternatives for the crowd’s consideration). We shall see in Section 5 that most existing work uses the primitive solutions for interpretation and steering. Their success argues for exploration of the more ambitious solutions to these problems.

A few systems have attempted to solve some version of the crowdsourced planning problem. All of these systems can be seen as special cases of the general architecture shown in Figure 1. In the following, we describe approaches that rely on automated systems in order to improve the synthesis of crowd-plans, or the quality of those plans.

Mobi (Zhang et al. 2012) takes a planning mission that consists of both preferences and constraints as input from a requester, and generates a plan or itinerary by allowing workers in the crowd to plan in a shared manner. Constraints are limited to two types: qualitative, which are high-level and specified in natural language (e.g. what the user hopes to accomplish with the trip); and quantitative, which are specified over arbitrary categories that may be created by requesters (e.g. “cool artsy things”). Constraints may be specified either over the amount of time to be spent on activities in each category, or on the number of such activities. Taken together, these can be seen as Mobi’s primitive model (“shallow model” in the terminology of the previous section), which is enforced by a simple automated constraint checker. Zhang et al. show in two experiments that: (i) for the same amount of money spent on human workers, a system with automated alerts tends to come up with higher quality plans; and (ii) the automated alerts tend to spur the plan towards breaching a set plan quality threshold in far fewer steps than a system without them.

Law and Zhang (Law and Zhang 2011) introduce CrowdPlan, a collaborative planning algorithm that takes as input a high-level mission from the user (such as “I want to live a healthier life”) and provides web-based resources for accomplishing that mission. To facilitate this, CrowdPlan uses human workers to decompose the high-level mission into a variety of goals (such as “stop smoking”, “eat healthier food”). Although the decomposition process has similarities to HTN planning (Nau et al. 2003), CrowdPlan itself doesn’t have any automated planning component overseeing the human workers.

On the other hand, there are systems like CrowdPlanr (Lotosh, Milo, and Novgorodov 2013) that focus more on se-

quencing the steps in a plan once the actions themselves have been selected. CrowdPlanr takes a given set of actions – for example, in a travel planning scenario, the cities in Italy that one could visit starting from Rome – and determines the least number of questions (and what those questions are) to ask the crowd of workers to achieve a plan of acceptable quality. The requester initially specifies the constraints associated with the task in free-form text (for e.g., “the trip must last 2 weeks”) and it is assumed that the crowd will take these into consideration when answering the questions posed by the system. It is important to note the departure from the two previous systems we have looked at – in this case, the *model* consists of both the constraints specified by the requester as well as the crowd’s knowledge. It is quite likely that the quality of plans produced by such a system would be sensitive to the familiarity of the workers with the task at hand.

The Cobi (Zhang et al. 2013) system employs the same basic idea – that the *crowd* that is assisting with the planning already has a built-in model of preferences and constraints. Cobi seeks to “communitysource” the scheduling of a large-scale conference (CHI 2013) by taking input from organizers, as well as authors and attendees in order to come up with a schedule (plan) of good quality, that violates a fewer number of constraints while being feasible. The automated system performs four overall tasks: (i) clustering papers by topic into either sessions or affinity groups larger than sessions; (ii) preference collection, both hard and soft; (iii) scheduling of rooms and time slots of sessions; and (iv) assignment of session chairs based on the best session matches to a person’s expertise. The collection of these constraints, and the grouping of papers into areas of expertise for the clustering, may be seen as Cobi’s model. The automated system thus uses this model in order to resolve as many of the constraints as possible, and come up with a conference schedule which is both satisfactory, and more importantly transparently collaborative.

The system proposed (but not yet implemented) by (Lasecki et al. 2012b) is the closest in spirit and idea to applying automated planning methods on a distributed interaction platform to aid crowdsourced planning. That system allows workers to decompose tasks and interact by posting constraints and further sub-tasks to the problem of planning a trip. The task is specified by the requester in free-form text, using natural language; some constraints may be specified as part of the task (for e.g., date and time constraints, cost ceilings etc.). Workers are provided up-front with four decomposable sub-tasks – a primitive model of sorts – into which further sub-tasks may be added. Additionally, workers are provided with a text box into which they can type suggestions for new tasks and constraints. The automated system enables collaboration amongst the workers and the requester, and also extracts additional information from their input (restricted to a structured form) in order to update the model.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we took a first step towards investigating the opportunities and challenges for automated planning tech-

nology in crowdsourced planning scenarios. We identified several roles an automated planner can play in steering the human workers in producing effective plans. We then identified two important challenges in adapting automated planning technology to such scenarios: *interpreting* the requester inputs as well as human worker plans—often expressed in natural language, and critiquing these plans in the presence of *incompleteness* of requester preferences as well as the planner domain model. We discussed several ways in which these challenges can be tackled, and also characterized the specific (if primitive) choices made by the existing crowdsourced planning systems in handling these challenges. We hope that this work will spur directed research on the challenges that we have identified.

References

- [Allen et al. 2007] Allen, J. F.; Chambers, N.; Ferguson, G.; Galescu, L.; Jung, H.; Swift, M. D.; and Taysom, W. 2007. Plow: A collaborative task learning agent. In *AAAI*, 1514–1519.
- [Bagchi, Biswas, and Kawamura 1996] Bagchi, S.; Biswas, G.; and Kawamura, K. 1996. Interactive task planning under uncertainty and goal changes. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems* 18(1):157–167.
- [Blythe 2005] Blythe, J. 2005. Task learning by instruction in tailor. In *IUI*, 191–198.
- [Branavan et al. 2009] Branavan, S.; Chen, H.; Eisenstein, J.; and Barzilay, R. 2009. Learning document-level semantic properties from free-text annotations. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 34(2):569.
- [Chilton et al. 2013] Chilton, L.; Little, G.; Edge, D.; Weld, D. S.; and Landay, J. A. 2013. Cascade: Crowdsourcing taxonomy creation.
- [Dai, Mausam, and Weld 2011] Dai, P.; Mausam; and Weld, D. S. 2011. Artificial intelligence for artificial artificial intelligence. In *Twenty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [Davis, Schoorman, and Donaldson 1997] Davis, J. H.; Schoorman, F. D.; and Donaldson, L. 1997. Toward a stewardship theory of management. *Academy of Management review* 22(1):20–47.
- [Dong et al. 2004] Dong, X.; Halevy, A. Y.; Madhavan, J.; Nemes, E.; and Zhang, J. 2004. Similarity search for web services. In *VLDB*, 372–383.
- [Ferguson, Allen, and Miller 1996] Ferguson, G.; Allen, J.; and Miller, B. 1996. Trains-95: Towards a mixed-initiative planning assistant. In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Artificial Intelligence Planning Systems (AIPS-96)*, 70–77. Edinburgh, Scotland.
- [Ghallab, Nau, and Traverso 2004] Ghallab, M.; Nau, D.; and Traverso, P. 2004. *Automated Planning: Theory and Practice*. Morgan Kaufmann.
- [Gupta and Sarawagi 2006] Gupta, R., and Sarawagi, S. 2006. Creating probabilistic databases from information extraction models. In *PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON VERY LARGE DATABASES*, volume 32, 965. Citeseer.

- [Howe 2006] Howe, J. 2006. Crowdsourcing: A definition. *Crowdsourcing: Tracking the rise of the amateur*.
- [Hung et al. 2013] Hung, N. Q. V.; Tam, N. T.; Miklós, Z.; and Aberer, K. 2013. On leveraging crowdsourcing techniques for schema matching networks. In *Database Systems for Advanced Applications*, 139–154. Springer.
- [Kambhampati 2007] Kambhampati, S. 2007. Model-lite planning for the web age masses: The challenges of planning with incomplete and evolving domain theories. *Proceedings of AAAI 2007*.
- [Kautz and Allen 1986] Kautz, H., and Allen, J. F. 1986. Generalized plan recognition. In *Proceedings of the fifth national conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 1, 32–37. Philadelphia, PA.
- [Kittur et al. 2013] Kittur, A.; Nickerson, J. V.; Bernstein, M.; Gerber, E.; Shaw, A.; Zimmerman, J.; Lease, M.; and Horton, J. 2013. The future of crowd work. In *Proceedings of the 2013 conference on Computer supported cooperative work*, 1301–1318. ACM.
- [Kokkalis et al. 2012] Kokkalis, N.; Huebner, J.; Diamond, S.; Becker, D.; Chang, M.; Lee, M.; Schulze, F.; Koehn, T.; and Klemmer, S. R. 2012. Automatically providing action plans helps people complete tasks. In *Proceedings of the 4th Human Computation Workshop, HCOMP*, volume 12.
- [Lasecki et al. 2012a] Lasecki, W.; Wesley, R.; Kulkarni, A.; and Bigham, J. 2012a. Speaking with the crowd. In *Adjunct proceedings of the 25th annual ACM symposium on User interface software and technology*, 25–26. ACM.
- [Lasecki et al. 2012b] Lasecki, W. S.; Bigham, J. P.; Allen, J. F.; and Ferguson, G. 2012b. Real-time collaborative planning with the crowd. In *Twenty-Sixth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [Law and Zhang 2011] Law, E., and Zhang, H. 2011. Towards large-scale collaborative planning: Answering high-level search queries using human computation. *Proc. AAAI*.
- [Ling and Weld 2010] Ling, X., and Weld, D. S. 2010. Temporal information extraction. In *Proceedings of the Twenty Fifth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [Lotosh, Milo, and Novgorodov 2013] Lotosh, I.; Milo, T.; and Novgorodov, S. 2013. CrowdPlanr: Planning Made Easy with Crowd. In *Data Engineering (ICDE), 2013 IEEE 29th International Conference on*. IEEE.
- [Malone, Laubacher, and Dellarocas 2009] Malone, T. W.; Laubacher, R.; and Dellarocas, C. 2009. Harnessing crowds: Mapping the genome of collective intelligence.
- [Mao et al. 2012] Mao, A.; Chen, Y.; Gajos, K. Z.; Parkes, D.; Procaccia, A. D.; and Zhang, H. 2012. Turkserver: Enabling synchronous and longitudinal online experiments. *Proceedings of HCOMP 12*.
- [March and Simon 1958] March, J., and Simon, H. A. 1958. Organizations. *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership Historical Research Reference in Entrepreneurship*.
- [Morwood and Bryce 2012] Morwood, D., and Bryce, D. 2012. Evaluating temporal plans in incomplete domains. In *AAAI*.
- [Nau et al. 2003] Nau, D. S.; Au, T.-C.; Ilghami, O.; Kuter, U.; Murdock, J. W.; Wu, D.; and Yaman, F. 2003. Shop2: An htn planning system. *J. Artif. Intell. Res. (JAIR)* 20:379–404.
- [Nguyen et al. 2009] Nguyen, T.; Do, M.; Kambhampati, S.; and Srivastava, B. 2009. Planning with partial preference models. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc, 1772–1777.
- [Nguyen et al. 2012] 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*.
- [Quinn and Bederson 2011] Quinn, A. J., and Bederson, B. B. 2011. Human computation: a survey and taxonomy of a growing field. In *Proceedings of the 2011 annual conference on Human factors in computing systems*, 1403–1412. ACM.
- [Ramírez and Geffner 2010] Ramírez, M., and Geffner, H. 2010. Probabilistic plan recognition using off-the-shelf classical planners. In *AAAI*.
- [Smith 2012] Smith, D. E. 2012. Planning as an iterative process. In *Proc. of AAAI '12*.
- [Talamadupula et al. 2010] Talamadupula, K.; Benton, J.; Kambhampati, S.; Schermerhorn, P.; and Scheutz, M. 2010. Planning for human-robot teaming in open worlds. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)* 1(2):14.
- [Von Ahn 2009] Von Ahn, L. 2009. Human computation. In *Design Automation Conference, 2009. DAC'09. 46th ACM/IEEE*, 418–419. IEEE.
- [Weber and Bryce 2011] Weber, C., and Bryce, D. 2011. Planning and acting in incomplete domains. In *ICAPS*.
- [Weld, Mausam, and Dai 2011] Weld, D. S.; Mausam; and Dai, P. 2011. Human intelligence needs artificial intelligence. In *Human Computation Workshop 2011*.
- [Yang, Wu, and Jiang 2007] Yang, Q.; Wu, K.; and Jiang, Y. 2007. Learning action models from plan examples using weighted MAX-SAT. *Artificial Intelligence Journal* 171:107–143.
- [Zhang et al. 2012] Zhang, H.; Law, E.; Miller, R.; Gajos, K.; Parkes, D.; and Horvitz, E. 2012. Human Computation Tasks with Global Constraints. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Annual Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI)*, 217–226. ACM.
- [Zhang et al. 2013] Zhang, H.; Andre, P.; Chilton, L.; Kim, J.; Dow, S. P.; Miller, R. C.; MacKay, W.; and Beaudouin-Lafon, M. 2013. Cobi: Communitysourcing Large-Scale Conference Scheduling. In *CHI Interactivity 2013*. ACM.
- [Zhang, Horvitz, and Parkes 2013] Zhang, H.; Horvitz, E.; and Parkes, D. 2013. Automated workflow synthesis.
- [Zhuo, Yang, and Kambhampati 2012] Zhuo, H. H.; Yang, Q.; and Kambhampati, S. 2012. Action-model based multi-agent plan recognition. In *NIPS*, 377–385.