

An End-to-end Planning Framework with Agentic LLMs and PDDL

***Emanuele La Malfa¹, *Ping Zhu¹, Samuele Marro²
Sara Bernardini¹ Michael Wooldridge¹**

¹Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford

²Department of Engineering, University of Oxford

Abstract

We present an end-to-end framework for planning supported by verifiers. An orchestrator receives a human specification written in natural language and converts it into a PDDL (Planning Domain Definition Language) model, where the domain and problem are iteratively refined by sub-modules (agents) to address common planning requirements, such as time constraints and optimality, as well as ambiguities and contradictions that may exist in the human specification. The validated domain and problem are then passed to an external planning engine to generate a plan. The orchestrator and agents are powered by Large Language Models (LLMs) and require no human intervention at any stage of the process. Finally, a module translates the final plan back into natural language to improve human readability while maintaining the correctness of each step. We demonstrate the flexibility and effectiveness of our framework across various domains and tasks, including the Google NaturalPlan benchmark and PlanBench, as well as planning problems like Blocksworld and the Tower of Hanoi (where LLMs are known to struggle even with small instances). Our framework can be integrated with any PDDL planning engine and validator (such as Fast Downward, LPG, POPF, VAL, and uVAL, which we have tested) and represents a significant step toward end-to-end planning aided by LLMs.¹

1 Introduction

Planning is a cornerstone of intelligent behaviour: from robotics and logistics to digital assistants and collaborative environments, agents must translate high-level goals into structured sequences of actions. Automated planning, one of the most longstanding subfields of AI, offers guarantees of correctness and optimality (Fikes and Nilsson 1971; Ghalilab et al. 1998). However, it requires expert-crafted domain models, typically in PDDL (Planning Domain Definition Language) (McDermott et al. 1998), and is ill-suited to handle ambiguous, incomplete, or underspecified requirements expressed in natural language. In contrast, Large Language Models (LLMs) excel at interpreting complex instructions but struggle to produce long-horizon or multi-agent plans

directly, often hallucinating steps or producing infeasible sequences (Valmeekam et al. 2023; Zuo et al. 2024).

Recent work has sought to bridge these paradigms by using LLMs as front-ends to symbolic solvers, translating natural language descriptions into structured representations (Ahn et al. 2022; Gundawar et al. 2024). While such pipelines reduce the modelling burden, they typically rely on fixed, pre-defined workflows. Multi-agent systems allow for planning with shared resources, asynchronous execution, and dynamic coordination (Oliehoek, Amato et al. 2016; Lowe et al. 2017). Addressing these challenges requires systems that are simultaneously linguistically capable, formally grounded, and robust to diverse scenarios.

In this paper, we present the first end-to-end agentic framework for planning that unifies natural language understanding, dynamic agent orchestration, symbolic reasoning, and plan interpretation. Unlike prior approaches with static role assignment (Erdogan et al. 2025), our orchestrator LLM dynamically creates multi-agent workflows on the fly, asynchronously invoking agents to construct PDDL domains and problems, which are first merged, then iteratively refined by a sequence of specialised agents depending on the task at hand. The refined PDDL problem is then solved by a planner to guarantee correctness with respect to the specification and, potentially, cost-optimality. The resulting plan is automatically translated back into natural language, which ensures accessibility and interpretability while preserving formal correctness. We offer the following contributions:

- We introduce a fully automated, end-to-end multi-agent planning pipeline that closes the gap between natural language intent communication and optimal plans, enabling the system to move from free-form specifications to validated plans with no human intervention.
- We show how dynamically generated multi-agent workflows can mitigate some longstanding obstacles in planning, including ambiguity resolution in a human specification (Grosz 1996; Tambe 1997), as well as issues typical of LLMs, such as hallucinations (Farquhar et al. 2024).
- Our iterative refinement loop enables self-correction and robust plan generation, yielding significant performance gains of up to 30% on tasks such as meeting/calendar scheduling (Google Natural Plan Bench-

^{*}These authors contributed equally. Correspondence to emanuele.lamalfa@cs.ox.ac.uk

¹The code is available at <https://github.com/EmanueleLM/MultiAgentPlanning>




Figure 1: Overview of our end-to-end planning framework graph that generates a plan, backed up by a planner, from a human specification (left). The framework includes the first JSON and PDDL plan generator, and the agentic sub-component, which refines an existing plan (right).

mark (Zheng et al. 2024)), and 40% on standard tasks like Blocksworld, logistics, and depots (Planbench (Valmeekam et al. 2023)) compared to baseline methods on GPT-5-mini. Additionally, our method solves hard instances of the Tower of Hanoi, where LLMs are known to struggle even with small cases. (Shojaee et al. 2025).

- We release our framework as open-source code and as an intuitive web application that necessitates minimal installation requirements.² Furthermore, we present a parallel implementation built on LangGraph (Chase 2022), leveraging natively supported ReAct (Yao et al. 2022) agents to make tool calls in the clarification and refinement subprocesses.

Overall, our framework represents a decisive step toward unifying LLMs and symbolic planning into general-purpose autonomous systems. By dynamically orchestrating multiple agents, grounding reasoning in solvers, and ensuring human-auditable outputs through natural language back-translation, we push the frontier of end-to-end multi-agent planning toward real-world applicability. This positions our approach as both a practical and conceptual advancement in the integration of language models and multi-agent symbolic reasoning.

2 Background and Related Work

We provide an overview of research at the intersection of LLMs, automated planning, and agentic systems, highlighting key trends in the literature.

LLMs for planning. Early attempts to use LLMs for planning focused on directly generating action sequences from natural-language task descriptions. However, studies show that LLMs alone are brittle, with even modern models exhibiting subpar performance (Gundawar et al. 2024). In fact, a line of works (Kambhampati et al. 2024; Valmeekam et al.

2022) reinforces that while LLMs by themselves are poor planners, they perform notably better when augmented with symbolic components. Valmeekam, Marquez, and Kambhampati (2023) also underlines that without extra tooling, LLMs alone are unreliable at reasoning about their planning decisions (a pitfall that our system circumvents by introducing external feedback). More robust frameworks integrate LLMs with symbolic solvers. Liu et al. (2023) proposed an *LLM+P* pipeline, where LLMs attempt to directly translate language into PDDL specifications and subsequently call planners. Other approaches integrate LLMs with search algorithms: Ahn et al. (2022) introduce *SayCan*, which uses LLMs with value functions to ground high-level instructions. Similarly, Hazra, Dos Martires, and De Raedt (2024) introduce *SayCanPay*, coupling an LLM with A* search to guarantee cost-feasible plans. Another promising line treats planning as a form of program synthesis. Silver et al. (2024) show the potential of GPT-4 as a generalised planner by synthesising Python programs that generate valid plans for PDDL domains, using iterative prompting and automated debugging loops to improve reliability. In Mahdavi et al. (2024), the authors leverage LLMs to generate valid PDDL domains and problems that are then fed to a solver, but do not employ any explicit refinement strategy, based on the feedback of the solver and validator or previous interactions, to enhance them. Overall, the literature shows a shift from using LLMs on their own to hybrid systems that combine the generative flexibility of LLMs with the correctness guarantees of symbolic planners.

Multi-agent and agentic systems. Modern research on multi-agent planning emphasizes learning-based coordination. Lowe et al. (2017) proposed a multi-agent actor-critic algorithm that addresses non-stationarity in concurrent learning via centralised critics. Differentiable communication channels (Sukhbaatar, Fergus et al. 2016; Foerster et al. 2016) further enable emergent coordination strategies. Benchmarks such as MeltingPot (Leibo et al. 2021) and

²<https://github.com/EmanueleLM/MultiAgentPlanning>




Figure 2: Overview of our planning framework illustrating how the agentic components interact with each other. The “PDDL Generator” produces the JSON representation of the problem and the first PDDL domain, problem, and plan. The “Refiner” solves the outstanding issues in the domain, problem, and plan, informed by the output of the PDDL solver and verifier. The “Clarifier” block, which asks human intervention if any part of the specification is not clear, can be removed seamlessly and appears only in the LangGraph implementation (all the experiments have been carried out without this module or any human intervention).

MPE (Lowe et al. 2017) evaluate cooperative and competitive multi-agent behaviours. Additionally, recent work integrates LLMs as agents in collaborative environments. For example, Wu et al. (2024) introduced *CoBlock*, a collaborative Blocksworld domain where two LLM-driven agents coordinate on construction tasks. The results show that incorporating chain-of-thought reasoning into agent prompts significantly improved coordination success rates and ensured more balanced workloads. However, prompts still included the world state at each decision iteration, reinforcing the challenges current LLMs face when holding complex states in persistent memory and underscoring the benefit of outsourcing this task to a symbolic engine.

Automated planning and PDDL. Automated planning has long served as the formal backbone for generating autonomous behaviour. The STRIPS formalism (Fikes and Nilsson 1971) laid the foundation for domain-independent planning, later standardised in PDDL (McDermott et al. 1998). Planners such as GraphPlan (Blum and Furst 1997), FF (Hoffmann 2001), and Fast Downward (Helmert 2006) achieve efficient heuristic search across domains. However, designing correct PDDL models remains a bottleneck in the widespread adoption of verifiable planning. Recent work leverages LLMs to automate or assist with this process. Zuo et al. (2024) show that LLMs are often better at generating formal specifications (in PDDL) than directly producing valid plans. Additionally, benchmarks such as PlanBench (Valmeekam et al. 2023) highlight that, while LLMs struggle to outperform solvers, they are promising for lowering the modelling barrier. Oswald et al. (2024) explore using GPT-4 to generate entire PDDL domains, though the proposed system still requires iterative refinement.

Tools, benchmarks, and datasets. A wave of benchmarks and open-source resources has supported modern evaluation of multi-agent planning in the context of LLMs. Zheng et al. (2024) introduced *NATURAL PLAN*, a benchmark for realistic language-based planning tasks (e.g., trip planning, scheduling). PlanBench (Valmeekam et al. 2023) offers standardised domains and metrics for LLM planning, while Planetarium Zuo et al. (2024) provides a large dataset (145k pairs) for text-to-PDDL evaluation with equivalence checking tools. For multi-agent collaboration, CoBlock (Wu et al. 2024) explicitly tests human-LLM and LLM-LLM collaboration in Blocksworld scenarios. Embodied benchmarks such as ALFRED Shridhar et al. (2020a) and its symbolic variant ALFWorld Shridhar et al. (2020b) bridge natural language instructions with embodied planning. Other environments, including BabyAI (Chevalier-Boisvert et al. 2019), remain popular for testing instruction following and sequential decision-making.

3 Agentic End-to-End Planning

We now present in detail the architecture to solve, in an end-to-end fashion, a wide range of planning problems. Recent advancements in agentic LLMs (Chan et al. 2024; Toledo et al. 2025) inspire our design, which combines the LLMs’ ability to understand which parts of a plan should be refined with the formality of PDDL solvers and validators.

Architecture

Our agentic architecture takes as input a planning problem in natural language and returns the final plan, also in natural language. The natural language plan is a one-to-one back-translation of the plan obtained by using a solver on

the PDDL domain and problem, which our framework iteratively generates and refines to solve any outstanding issues. Figures 1 and 2 show the architectural details of such an agentic framework.

The process begins by instantiating the orchestrator agent to generate a structured representation of the environment, the agents, their goals, and constraints from the natural language description. We choose JSON as the intermediate representation because it flexibly represents heterogeneous data and is widely used in several open- and closed-source LLM pre-training corpora (Shorten et al. 2024). The structure and an example of a JSON entirely generated by GPT-5-mini are reported in the Appendix. With that, the orchestrator produces the first PDDL domain and problem, which are fed to a solver (e.g., FastDownwards, POPF2, etc.) to attempt to compute an initial plan.

The next step involves several refinements to the domain and problem specifications. Informed by the logs from an external PDDL validation tool (VAL/uVAL), as errors may arise due to improper syntax or the domain/problem being incomplete/wrong due to semantic mis-specifications, the orchestrator selects the most suited agent from a pool of available agents. In the appendix, we report the instructions (prompt and system prompt) for the orchestrator, which includes the PDDL domain and problem, the candidate plan, the debug information produced by the solver and validator, and the history of the agents that were previously selected for improvement.

Our agentic framework implements a wide variety of agents:

- **FastDownwardsAdapter**: it adapts the current PDDL domain and problem to be compliant with the syntax of a specific solver (e.g., FastDownwards).
- **DeepThinkPDDL**: it identifies inconsistencies between the constraints, the goal, and the final plan.
- **DeepThinkConstraints**: it focuses on the constraints expressed in the natural language prompt and the JSON representation, to see if they match the PDDL domain and problem.
- **SyntaxPDDL**: it ensures that the PDDL domain and problem are syntactically correct and can be executed by the solver. It specifically focuses on the output of the validator (e.g., uVAL).
- **TemporalConsistency**: it assesses whether the events/actions in the PDDL problem are temporally consistent with the input prompt and the JSON representation.
- **AgentNaturalLanguage**: it turns the final plan into natural actions and the response for the user.
- **NoOpAgent**: it recognises the task has been solved in advance (i.e., without using the whole budget), and terminates the computation.

In the Appendix, we comprehensively report effective employment of these agents in each benchmark.

When the orchestrator considers the problem correctly encoded and solved (or if it runs out of budget for the refinements), the procedure ends, and, based on the final PDDL domain and problem, the back-translation procedure begins.




Figure 3: Results for GPT-5-mini on the Google Natural Plan Benchmark and Planbench for 30 problems of each benchmark.

AgentNaturalLanguage maps each action in the plan to a sentence in natural language, so that the user receives both the specifications (domain, problem, and plan) and a readable and interpretable version of it.

Our LangGraph implementation of the framework further introduces an agent that asks for human clarification when any part of the specification is unclear. Such a “Clarifier” block (top-left, Figure 2) has not been used in our experiments (as it would be unrealistic to provide human feedback for each instance), yet it can be added and removed seamlessly, providing the flexibility to reduce further the chance of mis- or under-specification at the cost of human intervention.

To complement our framework, we provide an off-the-shelf web interface that requires only a ChatGPT API key and shows how our tool produces and reports all planning steps, eventually reporting the PDDL domain, problem, and plan, as well as the final plan in natural language. We include the code to run the web interface, and, in the Appendix, a few screenshots of its functioning.

4 Experimental Evaluation

We evaluate our framework across several planning problems and domains, ranging from scheduling (e.g., agents

should agree on when to meet given some constraints) to standard planning domains (e.g., Blocksworld and the Tower of Hanoi).

Since the objective of our framework is to improve the planning capabilities of LLMs, we compare the performance of our framework to that of the a *vanilla* LLM, which receives the planning task and produces the solution. For our experiments, the *vanilla* LLM is the same in our framework.

To judge the correctness of a plan, we rely on the ground-truth label provided in each dataset and an LLM-as-a-judge (Gu et al. 2025), which compares the ground-truth plan with the candidate plan produced by the LLM and our framework (it returns 0 if the plans mismatch, 1 otherwise). We measure the overall accuracy on a task as the number of problems for which the LLM-as-a-judge considers the generated plan correct; we further report the “verified accuracy” of our framework, i.e., the number of plans that are correct divided by the number of problems for which our implementation produces a valid plan (i.e., one that compiles and runs).

Google Natural Plan Benchmark and Planbench

The Google Natural Plan benchmark (Zheng et al. 2024) is a popular task to test the planning capabilities of LLMs, and consists of three tasks: calendar scheduling, where people have to find a slot in their calendar to meet, meeting planning, where a person travels from different locations and wants to meet a friend who is available only at a specific time, and trip planning, where a person wants to visit different locations, spend an amount of days in each place, and can only travel from a location to another if there is a direct flight between the two.

As reported in Figure 3 (top), our framework has higher accuracy than the vanilla model on all the tasks (+12%), and significantly outperforms it on the meeting planning task. In other words, planning with PDDL offers a consistent advantage over using the LLM alone.

We also test our tool on PlanBench (Valmeekam et al. 2023), an extensible benchmark suite based on the kinds of domains used in the automated planning community that contains problems such as logistics, depots, etc. As shown in Figure 3, our framework’s accuracy and verified accuracy are always higher than those of the vanilla LLM (with an average increase of performance of +15%, and a very large improvement in the obfuscated deceptive logistics), showing that automated planning can be severely enhanced by solvers and automated refinement.

Blocksworld and the Tower of Hanoi

We further assess the planning capabilities of LLM+PDDL on Blocksworld and the Tower of Hanoi, two standard benchmarks in planning. We sample several Blocksworld and Tower of Hanoi problems with increasing complexity (i.e., the optimal number of steps to solve an instance, which we enforce as part of the instructions to the model), and compare the accuracy of our method with that of the same vanilla LLM (GPT-5-mini).

On Blocksworld with solutions that require exactly 2 – 4, 6 – 8, and 10 – 12 actions per problem, which we denote




Figure 4: Results for GPT-5-mini on increasingly difficult Blocksworld and the Tower of Hanoi problems. For Blocksworld, “Easy”, “Medium”, and “Hard” correspond to problems where the optimal solution, which we enforce, consists of 2 – 4, 6 – 8, and 10 – 12 actions.

as “Easy”, “Medium”, and “Hard”, our framework pairs the performance of GPT-5-mini on “Easy” and “Medium” instance; yet, it consistently outperforms it on “Hard” problems (+10%), as we show in Figure 4.

On the Tower of Hanoi, where recent influential papers show that LLMs cannot solve instances larger than 6 disks (Valmeekam et al. 2023), we achieve 90% of accuracy (+6% on average and +14% on 7 disks), compared to 73% of vanilla GPT-5-mini.³

Our framework also enables plan optimisation. We use the A* algorithm provided by FD and, in addition, implemented an agent that, at each iteration, reduces the size of the PDDL problem if the computation exceeds a timeout. Table 1 reports our results for the Google Natural Plan benchmark with GPT-5-mini. The average reduction when cost minimality is enforced is 45.8%. On Blocksworld, across all the difficulty levels (as reported in Figure 4), we obtain an average reduction of 45.2%. Similarly, in Hanoi, where the optimal plan for n disks is $(2^n - 1)$, our framework found the optimal plan even without optimization, and in more than 95% of instances with a very small budget of 2 refinements.

³In their paper, Fig. 1, Claude 3.7 with high reasoning (a feature that highly improves the performance of an LLM but we do not employ in our experiments) has 60% of accuracy on instances with 7 disks. Their paper does not test any ChatGPT LLMs, which have, on average, much higher accuracy (as our results show).

Agent Frequency




Figure 5: Frequency of each agent for the Google Natural Plan Benchmark and Planbench.

Dataset	No Opt.	Optimised	Reduction (%)
Calendar Scheduling	1.63	1.24	23.9%
Meeting Planning	210.46	79.00	62.5%
Trip Planning	13.24	11.22	15.2%
Average Reduction			45.8%

Table 1: Comparison of average cost for non-optimised vs optimised PDDL plans for the Google Natural Plan benchmark with GPT-5-mini. The average reduction when cost minimality is enforced is 45.8%.

Which Agents Matter Most?

Our agentic framework repairs syntax, resolves inconsistencies, and adapts problems to planning solvers. This section examines which agents are chosen and when, revealing where planning pipelines encounter difficulty and how effectively the framework adapts across domains.

Figure 5 illustrates, for the Google Natural Plan Benchmark and Planbench, which agents are helpful in planning, and in what circumstances.

In the Google Natural Plan Benchmark, the agent that the orchestrator picks up more frequently is the one that fixes PDDL syntax errors. On the other hand, in calendar scheduling, it is also frequent for the orchestrator to choose the agent that performs checks and fixes temporal inconsistencies between actions (in that case, what each person decides as an available slot to meet, which constitutes the main challenge in the task). In meeting planning, the second most frequent pick up is the adapter for the FastDownwards solver, showing that while the orchestrator is confident that the current solution is correct, it does so by specifying a PDDL domain and problem that do not conform with the underlying solver. Finally, in trip planning, the second most frequent choice of

the orchestrator is the agent that revises the human specification and checks for inconsistencies between it, the JSON representation, and the PDDL formulation.

In the Planbench, and similarly to the Google Natural Plan Benchmark, the agent that the orchestrator picks up more frequently is the one that fixes PDDL syntax errors. For depots and the obfuscated deceptive logistics, the second most frequent pick up is the adapter for the FastDownwards solver, showing that while the orchestrator is confident that the current solution is correct, it does so by specifying a PDDL domain and problem that do not conform with the underlying solver. For logistics and mystery blocksworld, the second most frequent choice of the orchestrator is the agent that revises the human specification and checks for inconsistencies between it, the JSON representation, and the PDDL formulation.

In conclusion, these results show that our framework adapts to different configurations seamlessly and by choosing the agent that, at each step, maximises the probability of producing a correct PDDL formulation that compiles and runs without syntax errors.

Discussion: On Benchmarking LLMs for Planning

In this section, we point out a few issues and discuss some aspects of benchmarking LLMs for planning tasks: while they are relevant to interpreting the results of our paper, they go beyond and constitute a call to action to develop better methods for testing these models on tasks that require reasoning and planning under constraints.

Agentic systems are brittle. An interesting aspect of our framework is its sensitivity to slight variations in the input prompt and the agents’ pool. Just by introducing an agent that assesses the temporal constraints of a solution,

we realised that the orchestrator selects that agent in most cases: while this benefits the performance in many tasks (e.g., logistics, obfuscated deceptive logistics, meeting planning, calendar scheduling, etc.), it shows the brittleness of agentic-based systems to slight variations of the initial conditions. Our prompt for the orchestrator, available in the Appendix, clearly states that the agent to use next should be chosen based on the output of the PDDL solver, the validator, and the current PDDL plan. Despite that, the orchestrator always selects the temporal consistency agent for some tasks, alongside the one that reduces the complexity of the PDDL problem when it is too large.

Planning benchmarks are ambiguous, if not wrong. In the Google Natural Plan Benchmark, we found several examples where the ground truth label is wrong or misleading. Since both our method and the vanilla models perform very well on the calendar scheduling but poorly on trip planning, we manually inspected the datasets. In the calendar scheduling, several ground truth labels report only one solution, while multiples are correct. In trip planning, the ground truth solution ambiguously assumes that if a person wants to spend x days in place A and y days in place B , the solution counts the trip between A and B as a day spent in both (while this may be reasonable in some cases, it is not when, for example, a trip between two cities takes 10 hours). GPT-5-mini, as well as GPT-5, makes a different assumption: traveling from A to B counts only as a day spent in A . This assumption reduces the models’ accuracy.

On the other hand, Planbench has much better-defined tasks, problems, and solutions, but it covers only classic planning tasks such as logistics, depots, etc.

We thus raise the attention of the research community to benchmarks that, if not inspected manually, can mislead our interpretation of LLMs’ planning capabilities. We advocate for benchmarks rigorously validated by humans before release.

The issues of LLMs as-a-judge. Last but not least, we want to emphasize how difficult (and potentially, ill-posed) it is to use an LLM-as-a-judge to evaluate the correctness of a plan. As discussed in other works (Gu et al. 2025), unless an LLM has performance that is proven to be superior to that of the model they judge, there is a risk that the judge itself cannot solve the task, and thus understand whether a solution is correct or wrong. Finding better ways to evaluate a plan (e.g., asking a model to output a formatted solution that is tested against the ground truth), is an open problem in planning as well as benchmarking (Malfa et al. 2023) the research community is still addressing.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this work, we introduced a fully automated, end-to-end framework for multi-agent planning that unifies natural language understanding, dynamic agent orchestration, symbolic reasoning, and plan interpretation. Our approach is the first to demonstrate how LLM-based agents can, as part of a single end-to-end pipeline, dynamically create multi-agent workflows, iteratively refine PDDL specifications, and

leverage solvers to guarantee cost-optimality. By automatically translating resulting plans back into natural language, we further ensure the accessibility, interpretability, and auditability of the outputs.

Across benchmarks such as Google Natural Plan, Planbench, Blocksworld, and the Tower of Hanoi, our framework shows clear gains in accuracy and reliability compared to existing baselines. These results underscore the importance of combining the generative flexibility of LLMs with the rigour and guarantees of symbolic planning. Beyond empirical performance, our framework showcases a novel paradigm for addressing ambiguity, hallucinations, and leveraging asynchronous coordination.

Looking ahead, our work opens several promising directions. Scaling dynamic orchestration to larger agent populations, integrating multimodal inputs, and exploring applications in embodied or real-world robotic systems are natural next steps. Additionally, a deeper theoretical analysis of the properties of dynamically generated workflows may provide new insights into the intersection of learning-based orchestration and symbolic guarantees.

In conclusion, this paper establishes a new direction for planning with LLMs and PDDL in an end-to-end fashion: a practical, interpretable, and formally grounded system that moves the field closer to deploying autonomous agents capable of translating high-level goals into reliable collaborative plans without human intervention.

Acknowledgments

ELM was supported by the Alan Turing Institute. SM was supported by the EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Autonomous Intelligent Machines and Systems n. EP/Y035070/1, in addition to Microsoft Ltd. MW was supported by an AI 2050 Senior Fellowship from the Schmidt Sciences Foundation. ELM and SM are affiliated with the Institute for Decentralized AI, which they thank for its support.

References

- Ahn, M.; Brohan, A.; Brown, N.; Chebotar, Y.; Cortes, O.; David, B.; Finn, C.; Fu, C.; Gopalakrishnan, K.; Hausman, K.; et al. 2022. Do as i can, not as i say: Grounding language in robotic affordances. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01691*.
- Blum, A. L.; and Furst, M. L. 1997. Fast planning through planning graph analysis. *Artificial intelligence*, 90(1-2): 281–300.
- Chan, J. S.; Chowdhury, N.; Jaffe, O.; Aung, J.; Sherburn, D.; Mays, E.; Starace, G.; Liu, K.; Maksin, L.; Patwardhan, T.; et al. 2024. Mle-bench: Evaluating machine learning agents on machine learning engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.07095*.
- Chase, H. 2022. LangChain.
- Chevalier-Boisvert, M.; Bahdanau, D.; Lahlou, S.; Willems, L.; Saharia, C.; Nguyen, T. H.; and Bengio, Y. 2019. BabyAI: First Steps Towards Grounded Language Learning With a Human In the Loop. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

- Erdogan, L. E.; Lee, N.; Kim, S.; Moon, S.; Furuta, H.; Anumanchipalli, G.; Keutzer, K.; and Gholami, A. 2025. Plan-and-act: Improving planning of agents for long-horizon tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.09572*.
- Farquhar, S.; Kossen, J.; Kuhn, L.; and Gal, Y. 2024. Detecting hallucinations in large language models using semantic entropy. *Nature*, 630(8017): 625–630.
- Fikes, R. E.; and Nilsson, N. J. 1971. STRIPS: A new approach to the application of theorem proving to problem solving. *Artificial intelligence*, 2(3-4): 189–208.
- Foerster, J.; Assael, I. A.; De Freitas, N.; and Whiteson, S. 2016. Learning to communicate with deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29.
- Ghallab, M.; Howe, A.; Knoblock, C.; McDermott, D.; Ram, A.; Veloso, M.; Weld, D.; and Wilkins, D. 1998. Pddl—the planning domain definition language. *Technical Report, Tech. Rep.*
- Grosz, B. J. 1996. Collaborative systems (AAAI-94 presidential address). *AI magazine*, 17(2): 67–67.
- Gu, J.; Jiang, X.; Shi, Z.; Tan, H.; Zhai, X.; Xu, C.; Li, W.; Shen, Y.; Ma, S.; Liu, H.; Wang, S.; Zhang, K.; Wang, Y.; Gao, W.; Ni, L.; and Guo, J. 2025. A Survey on LLM-as-a-Judge. *arXiv:2411.15594*.
- Gundawar, A.; Valmeekam, K.; Verma, M.; and Kambhampati, S. 2024. Robust Planning with Compound LLM Architectures: An LLM-Modulo Approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.14484*.
- Hazra, R.; Dos Martires, P. Z.; and De Raedt, L. 2024. Saycanpay: Heuristic planning with large language models using learnable domain knowledge. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, 20123–20133.
- Helmert, M. 2006. The fast downward planning system. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 26: 191–246.
- Hoffmann, J. 2001. FF: The fast-forward planning system. *AI magazine*, 22(3): 57–57.
- Kambhampati, S.; Valmeekam, K.; Guan, L.; Stechly, K.; Verma, M.; Bhambri, S.; Saldyt, L.; and Murthy, A. 2024. LLMs Can’t Plan, But Can Help Planning in LLM-Modulo Frameworks. *ArXiv*, abs/2402.01817.
- Leibo, J. Z.; Dueñez-Guzman, E. A.; Vezhnevets, A.; Agapiou, J. P.; Sunehag, P.; Koster, R.; Matyas, J.; Beattie, C.; Mordatch, I.; and Graepel, T. 2021. Scalable evaluation of multi-agent reinforcement learning with melting pot. In *International conference on machine learning*, 6187–6199. PMLR.
- Liu, B.; Jiang, Y.; Zhang, X.; Liu, Q.; Zhang, S.; Biswas, J.; and Stone, P. 2023. Llm+ p: Empowering large language models with optimal planning proficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11477*.
- Lowe, R.; Wu, Y. I.; Tamar, A.; Harb, J.; Pieter Abbeel, O.; and Mordatch, I. 2017. Multi-agent actor-critic for mixed cooperative-competitive environments. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Mahdavi, S.; Aoki, R.; Tang, K.; and Cao, Y. 2024. Leveraging Environment Interaction for Automated PDDL Translation and Planning with Large Language Models. *arXiv:2407.12979*.
- Malfa, E. L.; Petrov, A.; Frieder, S.; Weinhuber, C.; Burnell, R.; Nazar, R.; Cohn, A. G.; Shadbolt, N.; and Wooldridge, M. 2023. Language Models as a Service: Overview of a New Paradigm and its Challenges. *arXiv:2309.16573*.
- McDermott, D.; Ghallab, M.; Howe, A.; Knoblock, C.; Ram, A.; Veloso, M.; Weld, D.; and Wilkins, D. 1998. PDDL — The Planning Domain Definition Language. Technical Report CVC TR-98-003 / DCS TR-1165, Yale Center for Computational Vision and Control, New Haven, CT. Technical report.
- Oliehoek, F. A.; Amato, C.; et al. 2016. *A concise introduction to decentralized POMDPs*, volume 1. Springer.
- Oswald, J.; Srinivas, K.; Kokel, H.; Lee, J.; Katz, M.; and Sohrabi, S. 2024. Large language models as planning domain generators. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, volume 34, 423–431.
- Shojaee, P.; Mirzadeh, I.; Alizadeh, K.; Horton, M.; Bengio, S.; and Farajtabar, M. 2025. The illusion of thinking: Understanding the strengths and limitations of reasoning models via the lens of problem complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.06941*.
- Shorten, C.; Pierse, C.; Smith, T. B.; Cardenas, E.; Sharma, A.; Trengrove, J.; and van Luijt, B. 2024. Structuredrag: Json response formatting with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.11061*.
- Shridhar, M.; Thomason, J.; Gordon, D.; Bisk, Y.; Han, W.; Mottaghi, R.; Zettlemoyer, L.; and Fox, D. 2020a. Alfred: A benchmark for interpreting grounded instructions for everyday tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 10740–10749.
- Shridhar, M.; Yuan, X.; Côté, M.-A.; Bisk, Y.; Trischler, A.; and Hausknecht, M. 2020b. Alfworld: Aligning text and embodied environments for interactive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03768*.
- Silver, T.; Dan, S.; Srinivas, K.; Tenenbaum, J. B.; Kaelbling, L.; and Katz, M. 2024. Generalized planning in pddl domains with pretrained large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 38, 20256–20264.
- Sukhbaatar, S.; Fergus, R.; et al. 2016. Learning multiagent communication with backpropagation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29.
- Tambe, M. 1997. Towards flexible teamwork. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 7: 83–124.
- Toledo, E.; Hambardzumyan, K.; Josifoski, M.; Hazra, R.; Baldwin, N.; Audran-Reiss, A.; Kuchnik, M.; Magka, D.; Jiang, M.; Lupidi, A. M.; et al. 2025. AI Research Agents for Machine Learning: Search, Exploration, and Generalization in MLE-bench. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.02554*.
- Valmeekam, K.; Marquez, M.; and Kambhampati, S. 2023. Can Large Language Models Really Improve by Self-critiquing Their Own Plans? *ArXiv*, abs/2310.08118.

Valmeekam, K.; Marquez, M.; Olmo, A.; Sreedharan, S.; and Kambhampati, S. 2023. Planbench: An extensible benchmark for evaluating large language models on planning and reasoning about change. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36: 38975–38987.

Valmeekam, K.; Olmo, A.; Sreedharan, S.; and Kambhampati, S. 2022. Large Language Models Still Can’t Plan (A Benchmark for LLMs on Planning and Reasoning about Change). In *NeurIPS 2022 Foundation Models for Decision Making Workshop*.

Wu, G.; Zhao, C.; Silva, C.; and He, H. 2024. Your co-workers matter: Evaluating collaborative capabilities of language models in blocks world. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00246*.

Yao, S.; Zhao, J.; Yu, D.; Du, N.; Shafran, I.; Narasimhan, K. R.; and Cao, Y. 2022. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *The eleventh international conference on learning representations*.

Zheng, H. S.; Mishra, S.; Zhang, H.; Chen, X.; Chen, M.; Nova, A.; Hou, L.; Cheng, H.-T.; Le, Q. V.; Chi, E. H.; et al. 2024. Natural plan: Benchmarking llms on natural language planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04520*.

Zuo, M.; Velez, F. P.; Li, X.; Littman, M. L.; and Bach, S. H. 2024. Planetarium: A rigorous benchmark for translating text to structured planning languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.03321*.

A Appendix

The Agents in the Agentic Framework

We implemented several agents, each specialised in a specific task. The core implementation of our framework stands on the following agents.

- **FastDownwardsAdapter**: it adapts the current PDDL domain and problem to be compliant with the syntax of a specific solver (e.g., FastDownwards).
- **DeepThinkPDDL**: it identifies inconsistencies between the constraints, the goal, and the final plan.
- **DeepThinkConstraints**: it focuses on the constraints expressed in the natural language prompt and the JSON representation, to see if they match the PDDL domain and problem.
- **SyntaxPDDL**: it ensures that the PDDL domain and problem are syntactically correct and can be executed by the solver. It specifically focuses on the output of the validator (e.g., uVAL).
- **TemporalConsistency**: it assesses whether the events/actions in the PDDL problem are temporally consistent with the input prompt and the JSON representation.
- **AgentNaturalLanguage**: it turns the final plan into natural actions and the response for the user.
- **NoOpAgent**: it recognises the task has been solved in advance (i.e., without using the whole budget), and terminates the computation.

An overall overview of their usage in the Google Natural Plan Benchmark and Planbench is reported in Figure 6.

Other agents that are effective in boosting the accuracy of the model in particular scenarios, but are less employed in our experimental evaluation, are:

- **AgentAsynchronicity**: it optimises the plan so that asynchronous actions are executed at the same time step, if possible. If the solver does not support asynchronous actions, it defines a dummy time variable that allows for async actions (though that is not directly employed by the solver).
- **AgentEnforceMultiAgency**: it checks whether the PDDL domain and plan correctly implement the specification as a multi-agent system (this is useful when the specification requires multiple actors to perform async actions).
- **AgentHallucinations**: it detects and fixes hallucinations (arising from the LLM, usually) in the authored PDDL domain and problem.




Figure 6: The overall frequency of each agent in the framework, across the Google Natural Language Benchmark and Planbench.

The Agentic Orchestrator

The prompt used to call the orchestrator consists of a system prompt that instructs the LLM with the general task to solve, and the prompt, which includes instructions on how to interpret the PDDL logs to call the next agent, alongside a description of each agent’s capabilities.

System Prompt:

```

1   You are a orchestrator that coordinates multiple specialised agents. Each agent has a
    defined role. Read their descriptions, examine the current planning artefacts, and
    decide which agent is best suited to act next.
2   Always discard abstract classes or classes with abstract methods and report the
    selected class name between <class></class> tags.
3   Fast Downward only supports classical STRIPS features; reject or repair PDDL that
    introduces unsupported requirements such as :fluents, axioms, or conditional
    effects.
4   Pay special attention to artefacts that defer constraints through bookkeeping tokens,
    post-hoc penalties, or lax goal conditions. Prefer agents that encode the
    constraints directly.

```

Prompt:

```

1   You are choosing the next agent to improve the current PDDL artefacts.
2
3   Human specification of the task:
4   <human_specification>{human_specification}</human_specification>
5
6   JSON plan specification of the task:
7   <specification>{specification}</specification>
8
9   Current PDDL domain:
10  <domain>{pddl_domain}</domain>
11
12  Current PDDL problem:
13  <problem>{pddl_problem}</problem>
14
15  Previously hypothesised solution. Confirm or revise as needed. Think about this
    carefully!
16  <proposed_solution>{proposed_solution}</proposed_solution>
17
18  Plan produced for the {target_solver} solver (may be empty):
19  <plan>{pddl_plan}</plan>
20
21  Logs from the solver execution:
22  <logs>{pddl_logs}</logs>
23
24  Validator feedback (may be empty):
25  <errors>{syntax_errors}</errors>
26
27  Available agents and their capabilities (exclude abstract classes):
28  <agents>{agents}</agents>
29
30  Agents previously selected (helps maintain diversity):
31  <history>{history}</history>
32
33  Consider selecting the agent for refinement, depending on the issues that you see in
    the artefacts:
34  1. Constraints: ensure the domain and problem satisfy every agent's constraints.
35  2. Syntax: enforce compliance with the target solver's PDDL requirements.
36  3. Temporal/Causal coherence: disallow token-based bookkeeping, enforce explicit
    ordering, and prevent oscillating transitions when the specification expects
    contiguous or monotonic progress.
37
38  Select the class best positioned to address the most pressing issue given the current
    artefacts.
39  Only select the agent <class>NoOpAgent</class> when every objective above is
    demonstrably satisfied.

```

Planning Copilot

To activate the Planning Copilot, it is sufficient to download the webapp from here [\[\]](#) and run “setup.py”. Then, by navigating to the local url address “192.168.0.0:500”, the interface will display (Figure 7). By clicking on “API Key”, it is possible to insert a

valid ChatGPT key and use the app. The reasoning process and the produced answer to the first example of the Google Natural Plan benchmark is showed in Figures 8, 9, and 10.


Planning Copilot

API KeyClear

Craft a domain/problem from natural language and get the validated plan.

Describe the task

e.g. Schedule a 30 minute meeting for Alice, Bob, and Carol next Monday afternoon...



Representation model

gpt-5-mini

Planning model

gpt-5-mini

Solver

FastDownwards

Optimise plan?

No, keep it quick

Refinement budget

5

Plan

Waiting for your task

Describe a scheduling or planning scenario and I'll validate or repair it using the multi-agent pipeline.

Powered by MultiAgentPlanning

Figure 7: The interface of the Planning Copilot.

Planning Copilot

API KeyClear

Craft a domain/problem from natural language and get the validated plan.

Describe the task

You are an expert at scheduling meetings. You are given a few constraints on the existing schedule of each participant, the meeting duration, and possibly some preferences on the meeting time. Note there exists a solution that works with existing schedule of every participant. TASK: You need to schedule a meeting for Michelle, Steven and Jerry for one hour between the work hours of 9:00 to 17:00 on Monday. \n\nHere are the existing schedules for everyone during the day: \nMichelle has meetings on Monday during 11:00 to 12:00; \nSteven has blocked their calendar on Monday during 9:00 to 9:30, 11:30 to 12:00, 13:30 to 14:00, 15:30 to 16:00; \nJerry has blocked their calendar on Monday during 9:00 to 9:30, 10:00 to 11:00, 11:30 to 12:30, 13:00 to 14:30, 15:30 to 16:00, 16:30 to 17:00; \n\nFind a time that works for everyone's schedule and constraints.

Representation model

gpt-5-mini

Planning model

gpt-5-mini

Solver

FastDownwards

Optimise plan?

No, keep it quick

Refinement budget

3

Plan

Iteration progress

0%

Thinking and logs...

HUMAN-SPECIFICATION

You are an expert at scheduling meetings. You are given a few constraints on the existing schedule of each participant, the meeting duration, and possibly some preferences on the meeting time. Note there exists a solution that works with existing schedule of every participant. TASK: You need to schedule a meeting for Michelle, Steven and Jerry for one hour between the work hours of 9:00 to 17:00 on Monday. \n\nHere are the existing schedules for everyone during the day: \nMichelle has meetings on Monday during 11:00 to 12:00; \nSteven has blocked their calendar on Monday during 9:00 to 9:30, 11:30 to 12:00, 13:30 to 14:00, 15:30 to 16:00; \nJerry has blocked their calendar on Monday during 9:00 to 9:30, 10:00 to 11:00, 11:30 to 12:30, 13:00 to 14:30, 15:30 to 16:00, 16:30 to 17:00; \n\nFind a time that works for everyone's schedule and constraints.

ENVIRONMENT-JSON

```
{
  "name": "YouAreAnExpert20251015091846".
```

Figure 8: The framework produces the first JSON representation and PDDL domain and problem.

YOU

You are an expert at scheduling meetings. You are given a few constraints on the existing schedule of each participant, the meeting duration, and possibly some preferences on the meeting time. Note there exists a solution that works with existing schedule of every participant. TASK: You need to schedule a meeting for Michelle, Steven and Jerry for one hour between the work hours of 9:00 to 17:00 on Monday. \n\nHere are the existing schedules for everyone during the day: \nMichelle has meetings on Monday during 11:00 to 12:00; \nSteven has blocked their calendar on Monday during 9:00 to 9:30, 11:30 to 12:00, 13:30 to 14:00, 15:30 to 16:00; \nJerry has blocked their calendar on Monday during 9:00 to 9:30, 10:00 to 11:00, 11:30 to 12:30, 13:00 to 14:30, 15:30 to 16:00, 16:30 to 17:00; \n\nFind a time that works for everyone's schedule and constraints.

▼ Domain

```
(define (domain scheduling)
  (:requirements :typing :negative-preconditions)
  (:types person time)
  (:predicates
    (free ?p - person ?t - time)
    (meeting-scheduled)
    (scheduled-at ?t - time)
  )
  (:action schedule
    :parameters (?t - time)
    :precondition (and (not (meeting-scheduled)) (free michelle ?t) (free steven ?t) (free jerry ?t))
    :effect (and (meeting-scheduled) (scheduled-at ?t))
  )
)
```

▼ Problem

```
(define (problem YouAreAnExpert20251015091846)
  (:domain scheduling)
  (:objects
    michelle steven jerry - person
    t0900 t0930 t1000 t1030 t1100 t1130 t1200 t1230 t1300 t1330 t1400 t1430 t1500 t1530 t1600 - time
  )
  (:init
    (free michelle t0900)
    (free michelle t0930)
    (free michelle t1000)
    (free michelle t1200)
    (free michelle t1230)
    (free michelle t1300)
    (free michelle t1330)
    (free michelle t1400)
    (free michelle t1430)
    (free michelle t1500)
  )
)
```

▼ Plan

```
(schedule t1430)
; cost = 1 (unit cost)
```

PLANNER

..

Figure 9: The framework displays the current SAS plan.

YOU

You are an expert at scheduling meetings. You are given a few constraints on the existing schedule of each participant, the meeting duration, and possibly some preferences on the meeting time. Note there exists a solution that works with existing schedule of every participant. TASK: You need to schedule a meeting for Michelle, Steven and Jerry for one hour between the work hours of 9:00 to 17:00 on Monday. \n\nHere are the existing schedules for everyone during the day: \nMichelle has meetings on Monday during 11:00 to 12:00; \nSteven has blocked their calendar on Monday during 9:00 to 9:30, 11:30 to 12:00, 13:30 to 14:00, 15:30 to 16:00; \nJerry has blocked their calendar on Monday during 9:00 to 9:30, 10:00 to 11:00, 11:30 to 12:30, 13:00 to 14:30, 15:30 to 16:00, 16:30 to 17:00; \n\nFind a time that works for everyone's schedule and constraints.

► Domain

► Problem

► Plan

PLANNER

Step 1 – schedule t1430 t1500

Action: Schedule a one-hour meeting for Michelle, Steven, and Jerry on Monday starting at 14:30 and ending at 15:30 (uses the consecutive 30-minute slots beginning at 14:30 and 15:00; all three participants are free at those times).

Artifacts stored in: results/miscellanea/YouAreAnExpert20251015091846/FastDownwards

Figure 10: The final SAS plan is back-translated into natural language.

The JSON Representation

The orchestrator generates, with a specialised module, the JSON representation of the environment, including the agents, their goals, and their constraints. The JSON file makes explicit the information that is available to each agent, and decides the order of execution to generate the first PDDL domain and problem, which are then fed to the solver and calidator to output the SAS plan. The JSON representation generated by GPT-5-mini for the Google Natural Plan calendar meeting is the following (all the others are available in the code folder “environment/static”):

```
1 {
2   "name": "CalendarSchedulingExample0",
3   "author": "Human",
4   "agents": {
5     "number": 5,
6     "names": [
7       "michelle",
8       "steven",
9       "jerry",
10      "auditor",
11      "orchestrator"
12    ],
13    "michelle": {
14      "private_information": [
15        "Busy on Monday 11:00-12:00"
16      ],
17      "goal": "Provide Michelle's accurate free time windows within the work hours
18              so a one-hour meeting with Steven and Jerry can be scheduled."
19    },
20    "steven": {
21      "private_information": [
22        "Busy on Monday 09:00-09:30",
23        "Busy on Monday 11:30-12:00",
24        "Busy on Monday 13:30-14:00",
25        "Busy on Monday 15:30-16:00"
26      ],
27      "goal": "Provide Steven's accurate free time windows within the work hours so
28              a one-hour meeting with Michelle and Jerry can be scheduled."
29    },
30    "jerry": {
31      "private_information": [
32        "Busy on Monday 09:00-09:30",
33        "Busy on Monday 10:00-11:00",
34        "Busy on Monday 11:30-12:30",
35        "Busy on Monday 13:00-14:30",
36        "Busy on Monday 15:30-16:00",
37        "Busy on Monday 16:30-17:00"
38      ],
39      "goal": "Provide Jerry's accurate free time windows within the work hours so a
40              one-hour meeting with Michelle and Steven can be scheduled."
41    },
42    "auditor": {
43      "private_information": [
44        "I audit temporal and causal consistency, remove bookkeeping shortcuts
45        such as quota tokens or post-hoc penalties, and ensure all intervals
46        are represented explicitly.",
47        "I produce cleaned, normalized availabilities and highlight any implicit
48        assumptions in inputs."
49      ],
50      "goal": "Audit the provided availabilities for temporal consistency and return
51              a cleaned, explicit availability set for each participant along with
52              notes about corrections or assumptions."
53    },
54    "orchestrator": {
55      "private_information": [],
56      "goal": "Consume participants' availabilities and the auditor report and
57              produce a final PDDL domain and PDDL problem targeting the FastDownwards
```

```

49         solver that schedules a contiguous one-hour meeting within the work hours
50         satisfying all calendars."
51     },
52     "environment": {
53         "init": {
54             "day": "Monday",
55             "work_hours": [
56                 "09:00",
57                 "17:00"
58             ],
59             "meeting_duration": "01:00",
60             "time_granularity_minutes": 30
61         },
62         "public_information": [
63             "A one-hour meeting must be scheduled on Monday between 09:00 and 17:00.",
64             "Meeting participants: Michelle, Steven, Jerry.",
65             "Time granularity for proposed slots is 30 minutes and meetings must be
66             contiguous.",
67             "There exists at least one feasible one-hour slot that works with all
68             participants' existing schedules."
69         ]
70     },
71     "workflow": {
72         "michelle": {
73             "provide_availability": {
74                 "input": [],
75                 "output": "availability_michelle",
76                 "system_prompt": "You are Michelle's calendar agent. Using your private
77                 busy times and the environment work hours, produce Michelle's free
78                 time intervals on Monday within 09:00-17:00. Provide a concise machine-
79                 readable list of intervals in 24-hour HH:MM format as an array of
80                 pairs, for example: [[09:00,11:00],[12:00,17:00]]. Do not produce PDDL."
81             }
82         },
83         "steven": {
84             "provide_availability": {
85                 "input": [],
86                 "output": "availability_steven",
87                 "system_prompt": "You are Steven's calendar agent. Using your private busy
88                 times and the environment work hours, produce Steven's free time
89                 intervals on Monday within 09:00-17:00. Provide a concise machine-
90                 readable list of intervals in 24-hour HH:MM format as an array of
91                 pairs. Do not produce PDDL."
92             }
93         },
94         "jerry": {
95             "provide_availability": {
96                 "input": [],
97                 "output": "availability_jerry",
98                 "system_prompt": "You are Jerry's calendar agent. Using your private busy
99                 times and the environment work hours, produce Jerry's free time
100                intervals on Monday within 09:00-17:00. Provide a concise machine-
101                readable list of intervals in 24-hour HH:MM format as an array of
102                pairs. Do not produce PDDL."
103            }
104        }
105    },
106     "auditor": {
107         "audit": {
108             "input": [
109                 "availability_michelle",
110                 "availability_steven",
111                 "availability_jerry"
112             ]
113         }
114     }
115 }

```

```

97         "output": "audit_report",
98         "system_prompt": "You are an expert auditor of temporal constraints.
    Receive the three participants' availability lists. Normalize times to
    the environment granularity, remove any implicit bookkeeping
    shortcuts (for example, blackboxed quota tokens or implicit
    overlapping allowances), ensure no busy interval overlaps contradict
    the stated busy times, and produce a cleaned availability structure
    for each participant. Output a JSON-like object with keys '
    cleaned_availabilities' mapping participant name to list of intervals
    and 'notes' listing any corrections or assumptions made. Do not
    produce PDDL."
99     },
100 },
101 "orchestrator": {
102     "pddl": {
103         "input": [
104             "availability_michelle",
105             "availability_steven",
106             "availability_jerry",
107             "audit_report"
108         ],
109         "output": "pddl_orchestrator",
110         "system_prompt": "You are an expert at multi-agent PDDL and the
    FastDownwards solver. Your task is to produce a PDDL domain and a PDDL
    problem that, when solved with FastDownwards, finds a contiguous one-
    hour meeting time on Monday between 09:00 and 17:00 that is within all
    participants' cleaned availabilities. Use temporal PDDL features or
    explicit time-slot encoding as appropriate for FastDownwards. Keep
    participant actions distinct and model the meeting as a single
    scheduling action with duration 1 hour. Always enclose the PDDL domain
    between <domain></domain> tags and the PDDL problem between <problem>
    </problem> tags. The domain and problem must be complete and self-
    contained for FastDownwards. If any input availability is partial or
    ambiguous, use only the audited cleaned availabilities and do not
    assume additional free time."
111     },
112     "prompt": "You are the orchestrator. Use the following public environment
    information: {environment->public_information} Use participants'
    availabilities: {availability_michelle}, {availability_steven}, {
    availability_jerry} and the auditor's cleaned output: {audit_report}.
    Produce a PDDL domain and a PDDL problem suitable for FastDownwards that
    schedules the one-hour meeting for Michelle, Steven and Jerry. Enclose the
    domain between <domain></domain> and the problem between <problem></
    problem>."
113 },
114 "constraints": [
115     "michelle.provide_availability->auditor.audit",
116     "steven.provide_availability->auditor.audit",
117     "jerry.provide_availability->auditor.audit",
118     "michelle.provide_availability->orchestrator.pddl",
119     "steven.provide_availability->orchestrator.pddl",
120     "jerry.provide_availability->orchestrator.pddl",
121     "auditor.audit->orchestrator.pddl"
122 ],
123 },
124 }

```