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Abstract
This paper describes a modular action language, ALM, dedicated to the specification of complex dynamic systems. One of the main goals of the language is to facilitate the development and testing of knowledge representation libraries. We present the implementation of a large scale library of commonsense concepts, achieved by porting knowledge from the Component Library (CL1B) into ALM. Our choice of CL1B as a source of inspiration is justified by the well-founded methodology used by its authors in selecting the general concepts it contains, and its extensive testing in the context of the Automated User-centered Reasoning and Acquisition System. The resulting ALM library has the additional advantage of incorporating established knowledge representation methodologies developed in the action language research community.

Introduction
This paper describes a modular action language, ALM (Action Language with Modules), dedicated to the specification of complex dynamic systems, and presents the implementation of an ALM library of commonsense concepts, achieved by translating knowledge from the Component Library (CL1B) (Barker, Porter, and Clark 2001) into ALM.

Dynamic systems that change because of actions and evolve in discrete steps (i.e., discrete dynamic systems) can theoretically be modeled by transition diagrams whose nodes represent physical states of the domain and whose arcs are labeled by actions. Action languages (Gelfond and Lifschitz 1998) were introduced as one of the solutions to the long debated problem of finding the concise and mathematically accurate description of transition diagrams. These are formal languages that describe the effects of actions and action preconditions in a syntax close to that of natural language. Several action languages exist nowadays. They incorporate, in various degrees, solutions to important problems from the field of representing and reasoning about actions (e.g., the frame, ramification, or qualification problems). Action languages sometimes differ in their underlying assumptions. For instance, the semantics of action language AL (Turner 1997; Baral and Gelfond 2000) relies on the Inertia Axiom (McCarthy and Hayes 1969), which expresses the intuition that “Normally things stay the same”.

Although traditional action languages represent a substantial advancement, they are unsuitable for representing knowledge about large dynamic systems. First of all, they lack the means for structuring knowledge and representing hierarchies of abstraction, relevant for the design of knowledge bases and the creation of libraries. Secondly, traditional action languages do not thoroughly address the issue of how to represent objects of the domain (including actions). They do not possess means for describing optional attributes of objects, or objects as special cases of other objects—a common practice in natural language (e.g., “carry” is defined as “move while holding,” a special case of “move”).

Modular action language ALM intends to remedy these problems and allow for the elaboration tolerant representation of knowledge about large dynamic systems. ALM incorporates the underlying ideas of AL, and addresses the issues of the traditional approach by (1) separating a general theory from its structure; (2) organizing knowledge into modules; (3) introducing classes of objects with optional attributes; and (4) allowing the declaration of classes in terms of previously defined ones. Other modular action languages exist, but they have different underlying assumptions. For instance, modular language MAD (Lifschitz and Ren 2006; Erdoğan and Lifschitz 2006) is based on the Causality Principle that says that “everything true in the world must be caused” (McCain and Turner 1997; Giunchiglia and Lifschitz 1998; Giunchiglia et al. 2004).

A first version of our language was introduced in (Gelfond and Inclezan 2009). Since then, substantial improvements have been made based on our practice in formalizing knowledge. As an example, we tested our language in the context of Project Halo (Gunning et al. 2010) by representing specialized knowledge about a biological process (Inclezan and Gelfond 2011).

After defining our language, our next goal was to develop an ALM library of commonsense knowledge that would facilitate the description of large dynamic systems through the reuse of its components. We started by creating a small library of motion. We were satisfied with the result, and were able to use our representation in solving reasoning tasks by combining system descriptions of ALM with reasoning al-
algorithms written in Answer Set Prolog (Gelfond and Lifschitz 1988; 1991). However, we were not sure what criteria to use for the selection of further concepts, general enough to deserve inclusion in our commonsense library.

An answer to our question was provided by our collaboration on project AURA (Automated User-centered Reasoning and Acquisition System) (Chaudhri et al. 2007; Clark et al. 2007; Chaudhri et al. 2009). AURA is a knowledge acquisition system that allows domain experts to enter knowledge and questions related to different disciplines, with minimum support from knowledge engineers. Our task within the project was to revise a section of AURA’s core knowledge base, called Component Library (CLIB), from the point of view of its soundness and completeness with respect to the goals of AURA (Chaudhri, Dinesh, and Inclezan 2014). CLIB (Barker, Porter, and Clark 2001) is a vast library of general, reusable knowledge components with goals similar to ours. It was extensively tested in AURA along the years and, more importantly for us, its concepts were similar to ours. It was extensively tested in AURA along the years and, more importantly for us, its concepts were similar to ours. It was extensively tested in AURA along the years and, more importantly for us, its concepts were similar to ours.
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In what follows we describe language ALM. We present CLIB and AURA, and introduce our CLIB-inspired library in ALM. We end with conclusions and future work.

**Modular Action Language ALM**

**Syntax**

A dynamic system is represented in ALM by a system description that consists of two parts: a general theory (i.e., a collection of modules with a common theme organized in a hierarchy) and a structure (i.e., an interpretation, in the classical logical sense, of some of the symbols in the theory). A module is a collection of declarations of classes and functions together with a set of axioms. The purpose of a module is to allow the organization of knowledge into smaller reusable pieces of code – modules serve a similar role to that of procedures in procedural languages.

We briefly illustrate the syntax of ALM via some examples. Note that boldface symbols denote keywords of the language; identifiers starting with a lowercase letter denote constant symbols; and identifiers starting with a capital letter denote variables.

Let us consider a dynamic system in which we have things and discrete points in space. Certain things, called movers, are able to move from one point to another. We are interested in the locations of things, as well as the effects of action move and its executability conditions. To describe this domain, we create a module called basic_motion that we declare as follows:

```
module basic_motion
```

Then, we declare the classes of objects in our domain, which are organized into a DAG class hierarchy with the root universe; points, things, and actions are children of universe; movers is a child of things; and move is a child of actions. Note that in our language universe is a predefined class and the root of every class hierarchy.

**class declarations**

```
points,things :: universe
movers :: things
```

The above declarations say that things, points, and movers are classes, where movers is a special case of things. The symbol :: above denotes the specialization construct, introduced to represent links between nodes in the class hierarchy. Multiple links can be represented in a single statement, as shown in the declaration of classes points and things.

The only class remaining to declare is move, which is a subclass of the pre-defined class actions of our language; move has three attributes (i.e., three intrinsic properties): actor, origin, and destination (shortened as dest). These are possibly partial functions that map elements of class move into elements of class movers, points, and points, respectively. For readability purposes, we do not repeat the domain move of these attributes and simply write:

```
move :: actions
attributes
actor : movers
origin : points
dest : points
```

The next component of our module is the declaration of functions in our domain. Functions represent relevant relations between domain objects, and are divided into statics (those properties that cannot be changed by actions) and fluents (those that can). Statics and fluents are further divided into basic and defined, where defined functions are described in terms of other functions and can be viewed as shorthands used for the ease of representation. In our base_motion domain, the only property of interest is the location of things, which can be changed by actions of type move – hence it is a fluent; it is also a basic and total fluent, as we will not define it in terms of other functions and we assume that the location of all things is known at each step in time. We encode all this information in ALM as follows:

```
function declarations
fluents
basic

total loc_in : things \rightarrow points
```

The final part of a module contains axioms that describe direct effects of actions (dynamic causal laws), indirect effect of actions (state constraints), definitions of defined functions (function definitions), and conditions for the executability of actions (executability conditions). This section starts with the keyword axioms followed by domain axioms ending with a period symbol (.). In our scenario, we have a dynamic causal law specifying that the actor of a move action will be located at the destination after the execution of the action:
occurs(X)  causes  loc.in(A) = D
if    instance(X, move),
occurs(X),
actor(X) = A,
dest(X) = D.

We also have two executability conditions, one of them specifying that a move action cannot occur if the actor is not located at the origin:

impossible  occurs(X)
if    instance(X, move),
actor(X) = A,
origin(X) = O,
loc.in(A) ≠ O.

and the other preventing circular movements in which the destination is the same as the initial location of the actor:
impossible  occurs(X)
if    instance(X, move),
actor(X) = A,
dest(X) = D,
loc.in(A) = D.

Next, let us illustrate how classes of $\mathcal{ALM}$ can be defined in terms of other classes. Let us imagine that some of the objects of our domain are light enough to be carried between points by movers. We call such objects carriables. In the dictionary, action carry is defined as “to move while supporting.” To encode this information, we expand the module basic_motion by the following class declarations:

carriables :: things

attributes
carried_thing : carriables

This says that carry is a special case of the action class move, meaning that, in addition to its own attributes and axioms, carry inherits the attributes and axioms of move.

Our module will also contain the following basic total fluent declaration, which will be added underneath the declaration of loc.in shown above:

total supports : things x carriables -> booleans
(We assume that booleans is a pre-defined and pre-interpreted class of our language).

We expand the axioms of the original module by the following state constraint saying that the location of a supported thing is the same as the location of its supporter:

loc.in(C) = loc.in(T)  if  supports(T,C).

and the executability condition:
impossible  occurs(X)
if    instance(X, carry),
actor(X) = A,
carried_thing(X) = C,
¬supports(A,C).

that says that only the supporter of a thing can carry it around.

New modules of knowledge can be developed and tested independently from existing ones, while reusing already encoded information from the older modules. This is done via the module dependency syntactic construct that allows knowledge engineers to create tree-like hierarchies of modules in which declarations and axioms from parent modules do not have to be explicitly repeated in children modules, as they are considered implicit. A collection of modules satisfying certain restrictions forms a theory of $\mathcal{ALM}$. Intuitively, a theory describes a collection of transition diagrams corresponding to different scenarios that may differ in the instantiation of classes of the theory or the values of statics.

Theories containing very general information can be stored into libraries and can be imported from there into system descriptions using import statements. For instance, imagine that the general knowledge about motion represented above is stored in a theory called commonsense_motion, which currently consists of only the basic_motion module, and that this theory is part of a library named commonsense_lib.

The second part of a system description, specified after the theory, is its structure. The structure represents a specific scenario for the domain described in the theory. For example, let us consider a scenario of the motion domain described earlier, in which two people, John and Bob, travel between London and Paris; Bob may carry his suitcase with him. To encode this scenario, we start with the keyword structure and a name, and continue with the definitions of instances of our classes:

structure travel

instances

  john, bob in movers
  london, paris in points
  suitcase in carriables
  move(A, P) in move
    actor = A
    dest = P
  bob_suitcase JP carry in carry
    actor = bob
    carried_thing = suitcase
    origin = london
    dest = paris

The definition of move(A, P) above, called an instance schema, is a shorthand for a set of instances that includes, for example, the instance:

move(john, london)

with the following values assigned to its attributes:

actor = john
dest = london

Our particular domain is described by a system description whose theory, commonsense_motion, is imported from the commonsense_lib library and whose structure is the one presented earlier:

system description travel
  import commonsense_motion
from commonsense_lib

structure travel
  ⟨structure body⟩

This concludes the brief exemplification of the syntax of $\mathcal{ALM}$.

Informal Semantics

Semantically, a theory can be viewed as a function that maps possible interpretations of its symbols into transition diagrams describing dynamic domains. We give the semantics
of \(\mathcal{ALM}\) by defining the states and transitions of the transition diagram defined by a system description. For that purpose, we encode statements of the system description into a logic program of ASP\{f\} (Balduccini 2012), an extension of Answer Set Prolog (Gelfond and Lifschitz 1991) by non-Herbrand functions. The states and transitions of the corresponding transition diagram will be determined by parts of the answer sets of this logic program. As an example, the dynamic causal law about actions of the type move shown earlier is encoded as the following ASP\{f\} rule:

\[
\text{loc\_in}(A, I + 1) = D \leftarrow \text{instance}(X, \text{move}), \text{occurs}(X, I), \text{actor}(X) = A, \text{dest}(X) = D.
\]

The remainder of the theory is translated in an equally simple manner. The structure is encoded using statements like:

\[
\text{instance}(\text{bob, movers}).
\]

\[
\text{instance}(\text{move}(A, P), \text{move}) \leftarrow \text{instance}(A, \text{movers}), \text{instance}(P, \text{points}).
\]

Note that the encoding of a theory in ASP\{f\} needs to be done only once. Then, this encoding can be used together with the encodings of any number of its structures. This illustrates the reuse of knowledge in \(\mathcal{ALM}\).

System descriptions of \(\mathcal{ALM}\) are normally used in conjunction with the description of the system’s history (Balduccini and Gelfond 2003) to perform a variety of reasoning tasks like temporal projection, diagnosis, or reasoning about process interruptions (Inclezan and Gelfond 2011).

### CLIB and AURA

CLIB (Barker, Porter, and Clark 2001) is an ontology of general, reusable, composable, and interrelated components of knowledge. One of its goals is to provide domain experts with means for encoding knowledge from their fields, with no or minimal involvement from the part of knowledge engineers. Notions included in CLIB were selected using a solid methodology relying on linguistic and ontological resources such as WordNet, FrameNet, VerbNet, a thesaurus and an English dictionary, as well as various ontologies from the semantic web community. CLIB was built with three main design criteria in mind: (1) coverage: CLIB should contain enough components to allow representing a variety of knowledge; (2) access: components should meet users’ intuition and be easy to find; and (3) semantics: components should be enriched with non-trivial axioms.

The library is written in the knowledge representation language of Knowledge Machine (KM) (Clark and Porter 2004). KM is a frame-based language with first-order logic semantics. It has two types of basic concepts: class and instance. A slot is a special type of a class that defines a relation between two classes (it sometimes corresponds to an attribute of a class in \(\mathcal{ALM}\)). CLIB organizes its components into three main classes: entities, events, and roles. Events are divided into actions and states. An example of a CLIB state is Be-Touching, which would be called a domain property in action language terminology. A state of CLIB should not be confused with a state of a transition diagram.

To distinguish between the two, we will use the expression “CLIB-state” for the former and “state” for the latter. The CLIB library was integrated in two systems developed at SRI International, SHAKEN and its successor AURA, and was extensively tested as a result.

AURA (Automated User-centered Reasoning and Acquisition System) (Chaudhri et al. 2007; Clark et al. 2007) is a knowledge-based system whose goal is “to enable domain experts to construct declarative knowledge bases from parts of a science textbook for Physics, Chemistry, and Biology in a way that another user can pose questions similar to those in an Advanced Placement exam and get answers and explanations” (Chaudhri et al. 2009). In AURA, domain experts encode new knowledge by building upon the general concepts of CLIB: they create directed graph structures specifying relations between new and existing components in a user-friendly graphical interface. Tests performed on the system showed promising results: knowledge was captured in a speedy manner and at least 70% of the questions from an Advanced Placement test suite were accurately answered by the AURA system in all three domains of interest (Gunning et al. 2010). These results seem to demonstrate that CLIB is a valuable library of general concepts. On the other hand, the extensive use of CLIB by knowledge engineers also indicated aspects of the library that needed revision. The author of this article was involved in the activity of reviewing and refining part of CLIB based on the lessons learned from its use in AURA (Chaudhri, Dinesh, and Inclezan 2014).

As a second task within project AURA, we translated CLIB into modular action language \(\mathcal{ALM}\). The goal was to create a CLIB-inspired knowledge base that would take advantage of the methodologies developed in the action language community for the representation of knowledge and reasoning about dynamic systems (e.g., solutions to the frame and ramification problems). \(\mathcal{ALM}\) is a good choice for such an endeavor as its relative closeness to the object-oriented paradigm (in comparison with more traditional action languages) eases the translation from KM. More importantly, encoding CLIB in \(\mathcal{ALM}\) leads to an improved representation of CLIB action classes, as detailed below:

1. Axioms are specified in \(\mathcal{ALM}\) in an elaboration tolerant way, and in a syntax close to that of natural language, whereas in KM they are described using STRIPS-like operators (e.g., add lists, delete lists, etc.) and a more complex syntax at times.

2. System descriptions of \(\mathcal{ALM}\) can be used to solve various computational tasks by coupling them with reasoning algorithms written in ASP or its extensions (e.g., ASP\{f\} (Balduccini 2012), CR-Prolog (Balduccini and Gelfond 2003)). On the other hand, the inference engine of KM cannot perform planning nor postdiction (i.e., projection backwards in time when the present is not completely known). As a result, the \(\mathcal{ALM}\) version of CLIB could be used to answer more complex questions about the targeted scientific domains, for instance questions that re-
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A CLIB-Inspired $\mathcal{ALM}$ Library

Our $\mathcal{ALM}$ translation focused mainly on the 147 actions of CLIB, but some related concepts, such as CLIB-states, had to be addressed as well. The result was an $\mathcal{ALM}$ library called clib consisting of eight theories. In what follows, we describe some of the challenges we encountered in constructing this library and show more details about one of the produced $\mathcal{ALM}$ modules, contained by the motion theory of this new library.

Challenges

In porting the CLIB library into $\mathcal{ALM}$ we had two main concerns:

1) How to translate entities, events, and roles of CLIB into classes, functions, and axioms of $\mathcal{ALM}$.

2) How to conveniently group the resulting classes, functions, and axioms into modules of $\mathcal{ALM}$.

In addressing the first concern, we faced several difficulties, most of them derived from the differences in basic concepts between KM and our language:

- The two languages share the basic concepts of class and instance, but $\mathcal{ALM}$ has an extra concept, that of a function. Properties of dynamic systems (i.e., domain properties: statics and fluents) are described in $\mathcal{ALM}$ by functions. On the other hand, CLIB-states, which correspond roughly to domain properties, are represented in CLIB by classes, and their parameters and range are encoded by attributes of these classes, where attributes may be optional. For instance, the declaration of the CLIB-state Be-Accessible looks as follows:

\[
\text{(Be-Accessible has (superclasses (State)))}
\]

\[
\text{(every Be-Accessible has (object ((a Entity)))}
\]

\[
\text{(base ((must-be-a Thing)))}
\]

This says that a Be-Accessible CLIB-state has an object that is required and must be of type Entity, and a base that is optional, but if it exists it must be of type Thing. If we think in terms of functions, Be-Accessible is a boolean function with a variable arity, either 1 or 2. The translation challenge is that in $\mathcal{ALM}$ the number and order of a function’s parameters is fixed. To solve this problem, multiple domain properties are defined in $\mathcal{ALM}$ for each CLIB-state with optional parameters, to reflect the various combinations of required and optional parameters. For instance, the CLIB-state Be-Accessible is encoded in $\mathcal{ALM}$ using two domain properties, declared as follows:

```
fluents
  basic accessible_to : thing \times entity \rightarrow booleans
defined accessible : entity \rightarrow booleans
```

The domain property accessible will be defined in terms of accessible_to via state constraints.

- As CLIB-states are specified by classes and classes can be organized in inheritance hierarchies, a CLIB-state can be defined in terms of other CLIB-states. For instance, the CLIB-state Be-Attached-To is defined in terms of the CLIB-state Be-Touching:

\[
\text{(Be-Attached-To has (superclasses (Be-Touching)))}
\]

In $\mathcal{ALM}$ however, only classes are organized into a hierarchy, but not functions. This issue is addressed by introducing state constraints stating that a domain property must hold in every state of the transition diagram in which the properties specializing it also hold. Let us take the example of the CLIB-state Be-Touching, with two required attributes, and its subclass Be-Attached. We model this relation by the state constraint:

\[
touching(X,Y) \text{ if } attached_to(X,Y).
\]

- Certain features of CLIB have no translation into concepts of $\mathcal{ALM}$. One such example are defeasible laws, for instance soft preconditions for the execution of an action, which are not always necessary to hold in order for the occurrence of the action to be possible.

Regarding our second concern, the primary challenge was that the main reusable unit of $\mathcal{ALM}$ is not that of a class, as in CLIB, but rather that of a module, a concept that does not exist in KM. This results from our knowledge representation thought pattern, which revolves around the task of specifying dynamic systems, not action classes in isolation. To address this issue, we grouped action classes of CLIB by themes. Some of the themes we identified were: motion, accessibility, contact and attachment, resource management, collections, communication, or change in possession. The action classes corresponding to one theme were all placed in the same module, unless there were too many such classes. For instance, the theme of motion had to be broken down into several modules (fundamental_motion, locomotion, container_motion, etc.) to ensure their manageable size and readability. All these motion modules, however, formed part of the same theory stored in the library. Once action classes were assigned to a module, the $\mathcal{ALM}$ module was completed with the translation of axioms and of the related CLIB components mentioned in these axioms (e.g., other classes of objects, CLIB-states, other actions inhibiting the execution of the selected actions). Classes of CLIB that were recurrently referenced in other classes were grouped in a high-level module upon which all other modules depended. Two examples are the hierarchy of entities, captured by module entity_ontology, and the general definition of events and actions, included in a module called general_events. Both of these modules form part of a theory fundamental_concepts stored in the library. Below, we show parts of the contents of these modules, after which we will explain some key points.

```
theory fundamental_concepts
module entity_ontology
class declarations
  entity :: universe
  spatial_entity :: entity

```
In CLIB, the agent of a carry action is required (and similarly for the object of move). We specified this in our module via state constraints of the type
\[
\text{false if } \neg \text{dom}_{\text{agent}}(X), \text{instance}(X, \text{carry}).
\]
Function dom\_agent above is considered implicitly declared in module general\_events where attribute agent is declared explicitly: \(\neg \text{dom}_{\text{agent}}(X)\) is to be read as “\(X\) is not in the domain of function agent,” meaning that “function agent is not defined on object \(X\).”

It is important to remark that our fundamental\_motion ALM module contains a much smaller number of axioms and lines of code than its counterpart classes in CLIB – the relevant part of the declaration of action classes Move and Carry in CLIB totals approximately 300 lines, while our module contains around 90 lines. As a consequence, we believe that the ALM representation gains in readability. All this is largely because of (1) the way action effects and preconditions are specified in ACM; (2) the introduction of fluent spatial\_sit; and (3) the introduction of classes sym\_sp\_rel and antisym\_sp\_rel with their constant objects. We also noticed that the use of the CLIB knowledge representation methodology in which all actions may have an agent (or other attributes) forced us to introduced additional executability conditions for move in order to cover the case in which the optional attribute agent is actually specified. This indicates one disadvantage for the CLIB approach of declaring all possible attributes in the event class.

Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper, we have described a modular action language, ALM, suitable for the specification of large dynamic systems and for the development of knowledge representation libraries. We have presented our approach of building a large ALM library by translating CLIB—a library of general components selected from lexical and ontological resources based on a thorough methodology.

This work enables an informal comparison between two knowledge representation languages: ALM and KM, the language of CLIB. ALM has the advantage of a concise representation of effects and preconditions of actions, as well as an increased readability due to the structuring in the same module of knowledge on a common theme. On the other hand, KM allows the description of classes of compound actions, which were not addressed by the current translation. For instance, an action like Disperse—several objects leaving the same place—cannot be elegantly represented in ALM currently, although instances of compound actions can be represented. Future work on ALM will address this issue.

A strength of CLIB is the ease of finding relevant components in it, as the library provides users with well-documented specifications of its components. This aspect was not yet explored in the context of ALM, but will have to be studied in the future.
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\[\text{module general\_events}\]
\[\text{depends on entity\_ontology}\]
\[\text{class declarations}\]
\[\text{event :: universe}\]
\[\text{attributes}\]
\[\text{agent : entity}\]
\[\text{object : entity}\]
\[\text{base : universe}\]
\[\text{origin : spatial\_entity}\]
\[\text{destination : spatial\_entity} \ldots\]
\[\text{actions :: event}\]
\[\text{sequences\_of\_actions :: event}\]
\[\text{role :: universe}\]
\[\text{function declarations}\]
\[\text{statics}\]
\[\text{plays : entity \times role \times event \rightarrow booleans}\]
\[\text{constants}\]
\[\text{target, medium, signal, resource : role}\]

Notice first that the knowledge representation methodology of CLIB differs from that of ALM illustrated by the commonsense theory shown earlier. In CLIB, all possible attributes of events are specified in the topmost class of the hierarchy of events, whereas in the ALM theory of commonsense\_motion, we only introduced attributes in the subclasses of the pre-defined class actions as these attributes became relevant to an action class. Moreover, the attributes of the CLIB class event are all supposed to have the same meaning across subclasses of this class with the exception of base; in commonsense\_motion attributes have names closely related to the meaning of the action class to which they belong (e.g., grasp and grasped\_thing in an action class grasp). Which methodology is the best is still up to debate. Second, notice how object constants (i.e., functions of arity 0 such as target, medium, etc.) can be specified in the function declaration section of an ALM module, in a subsection preceded by the keyword constants.

A CLIB-inspired fundamental\_motion Module

We further discuss our methodology of translating CLIB into ALM by briefly focusing on the fundamental\_motion module that includes actions move and carry.\(^4\)

When creating the fundamental\_motion module, we took advantage of the features of ALM, which encourage representing knowledge in as general terms as possible, and we introduced new classes to create a more general representation. For instance, CLIB contains a class of Spatial\_Relations; we further divided this class into the classes sym\_sp\_rel and antisym\_sp\_rel, denoting symmetric and antisymmetric spatial relations respectively, to minimize the number of axioms in the encoding. We then declared the different spatial relations defined in CLIB as object constants of the ALM module. We introduced a new basic fluent absent in CLIB, spatial\_sit, to describe the spatial situation between two spatial entities, and a new defined fluent, known\_sp\_sit, to describe the spatial situation of a spatial entity in terms of a place.

\(^4\)See http://tinyurl.com/m5a9zn3. The CLIB counterpart can be seen at http://tinyurl.com/k6z6ues.
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