On the Cognitive Use of the Environment through Artifacts



Mirko Viroli DEIS, Cesena Alma Mater Studiorum - Università di Bologna mirko.viroli@unibo.it joint work with Alessandro Ricci, Andrea Omicini

Outline

- The framework of artifacts for modelling/engineering the environment
- Cognitive selection and use of artifacts

 impact on agent programming
- A ready-to-use incarnation
 - Prolog-Java programs as cognitive agents
 - TuCSoN tuple centres as artifacts
- An example

ENVs for rational agents!

- ENV is emerging as a key concept in MASs!!!
- Filling the "Agent/ENV gap"
 - > MAS research: intentional stance + social interaction
 - > ENV research: providing services to black-box agents
- Main challenge
 - A true theory of agent-to-ENV interaction..
- We address the problem at 2 levels
 - > Modelling:
 - how to model an ENV from a rational agent viewpoint?
 - Engineering
 - how to design a good ENV for rational agents?

Human Environments

- We take the setting of Activity Theory (AT)
 - Theory of human working activity
- Main Observation
 - "human activities can be understood only by considering both humans and their context/environment, seen as set of mediating artifacts they use"
- What are these artifacts anyway?
 - Disembodied ones: languages and protocols
 - Embodied ones: maps, checklists, blackboards, communication media, semaphores,
- Note:
 - Which cognitive process when using artifacts?

Agent Environments

- The same framework is likely fruitful for agents
- Standard approach
 - agents implicitly use disembodied artifacts
 - Ianguage (speech acts) and protocols
 - now moving to institutional aspects..
- We investigate explicit use of (embodied) artifacts
 - entities of the environment (that are not agents)
 - agents may exploit them to achieve goals
- MASs applications are already full of artifacts!
 - resources: physical resources, third-party Web services
 - coordination: blackboards, connectors, stigmergic ground
 - organization: e-institutions, agent coordination contexts,...

The MAS picture

- A rational agent may achieve its goals by either:
 - communicating with other agents (e.g. by goal-delegation)
 - interacting with artifacts in the ENV



Agents vs. Artifacts

- Differently from other agents:
 - artifacts have an interface by which operations can be executed (artifacts cannot say no!)
 - back to objects? Somehow...



ENV model, artifact model

How a rational agent models an artifact?

- We look for the minimum set of features
- 1. A mechanism to **interact** with artifacts
 - usage interface (**UI**): which interaction modality?
 - a set of operations, which are invoked and then completes
- 3. A mechanism to **select** an artifact to use
 - function description (**FD**): why using that artifact?
 - a description of what can be expected from the artifact
- 4. A mechanism to correctly **use** an artifact
 - operating instructions (**OI**): how using that artifact?
 - > a description of the procedure to use the artifact

Intentional stance

- To reason about cognitive exploitation of artifacts, we need to resort to the so-called intentional stance (a main pillar of AOSE)
 - to understand, analyse, and predict a complex system it is useful to ascribe to it mental properties such as beliefs, desires, intentions, goals, hopes, fears,..
- Applied to agents, it does not mean they MUST be internally built as such
 - they are not required to explicitly represent the above properties, and behave accordingly
- It is just an interpretation mean
 - maybe more useful if the agent is a BDI one

More on FD and OI

- Assume a general model for rational agents
 - beliefs (+ intentions) explicitly represented
 - awareness of the artifacts existence
 - scheduling actions and perceiving their completions
 - some computability power (e.g. logic agents)
- FD: why using the artifact?
 - described e.g. by a list of triples
 - preconditions on beliefs and intentions, effects on beliefs
 - an artifact can realise many functions..
 - ... each defines a role for the agent while interacting
- OI: how using the artifact?
 - described by a transition system, i.e. a relation
 - OldOIState x (Action x Precondition x Effect) x NewOIState
 - it is an operational semantics for an OI language...
 - ...also seen as a precompiled plan to use

Degrees of cognition

- Programmed use
 - agents exploit artifacts without any cognition about that
- Cognitive use
 - agents do have a representation of the OI state (in beliefs)
 - use it to step-by-step select actions to execute
 - accordingly exploit preconditions and effects
- Cognitive selection & use
 - also have a representation of the FD for some artifacts
 - decide which is compatible with current beliefs + intentions
- Engineering principles promoting opennes and cognition..
 - design artifacts along with FDs and OIs!
 - let them be inspected through the Usage Interface!

A Framework in TuCSoN



Details..

- TuCSoN coordination artifacts
 - [TuCSoN by DEIS @ SourceForge]
 - UI: out(tuple), in(tuple), rd(tuple)
 - FD: as tuples fd(Role,BelPre,BelEff,IntPre).
 - OI: as tuples *oi(Role, OIState)*
- Prolog(-Java) agents
 - [tuProlog by DEIS @ SourceForge]
 - Java programs holding a Prolog theory
 - beliefs and behaviour
 - interactions: execution of TuCSoN operations

A case-study

- Blackboard for knowledge sharing
 - CLIENTs:
 - put a request for some information, then
 - retrieve a reply, then
 - remove the request
 - SERVERs:
 - read pending requests, then
 - put replies or ignore them



- We stick to the "cognitive use" scenario
 - the agent knows that he wants to interact with the artifact being a client or server
 - he inspects operating instructions, and then execute them
- We realise general OI-players!!
 - the two kinds of agent differ only in their initial motivations

A language for OIs

- OIs are a sort of manual for using a device
 - see [Viroli&Ricci@AAMAS2004]
 - once one decides to use a device, he takes the manual and follows instructions
 - in which language should them be written?
- We realised a process algebraic language in Prolog
 - action execution: act(Act, Precondition, Effect)
 - parallel (//) and choice (+) binary composition
 - sequential composition: [OI₁,OI₂,..,OI_n]
 - an operator for recursion: rec(X,OI)
- The OI semantics expressed by a predicate
 - transition(oldOI,Act,newOI,Pre,Eff)
 - either already known to the agent...
 - .. or its clauses could be even dynamically inspected

OI semantics

transition(act(A,pre(Pre),eff(Eff)),A,zero,Pre,Eff).
transition(act(A,pre(Pre)),A,zero,Pre,[]).
transition(act(A,eff(Eff)),A,zero,[],Eff).
transition(act(A),A,zero,[],[]).
transition([Act],A,zero,Pre,Eff):-!,transition(Act,A,zero,Pre,Eff).
transition([Act,Act2],A,Act2,Pre,Eff):-!,transition(Act,A,zero,Pre,Eff).
transition([Act|S],A,S,Pre,Eff):-transition(Act,A,zero,Pre,Eff).

transition(S1+S2,A,R1,Pre,Eff):-transition(S1,A,R1,Pre,Eff),!.
transition(S1+S2,A,R2,Pre,Eff):-transition(S2,A,R2,Pre,Eff).
transition(S1//S2,A,R1//S2,Pre,Eff):-transition(S1,A,R1,Pre,Eff),!.
transition(S1//S2,A,S1//R2,Pre,Eff):-transition(S2,A,R2,Pre,Eff).

OI semantics (1/2)

```
transition(act(A,pre(Pre),eff(Eff)),A,zero,Pre,Eff).
transition(act(A,pre(Pre)),A,zero,Pre,[]).
transition(act(A,eff(Eff)),A,zero,[],Eff).
transition(act(A),A,zero,[],[]).
```

OI semantics (2/2)

```
transition(S1+S2,A,R1,Pre,Eff):-
             transition(S1,A,R1,Pre,Eff),!.
transition(S1+S2,A,R2,Pre,Eff):-
             transition(S2,A,R2,Pre,Eff).
transition(S1//S2,A,R1//S2,Pre,Eff):-
             transition(S1,A,R1,Pre,Eff),!.
transition(S1//S2,A,S1//R2,Pre,Eff):-
             transition(S2,A,R2,Pre,Eff).
transition(rec(X,S),A,R,Pre,Eff):-
      copy_term(S,S2),transition(rec(X,S,S2),A,R,Pre,Eff).
transition(rec(X,S,X),A,rec(X,S,R),Pre,Eff):-
      !,copy_term(S,S2),transition(S2,A,R,Pre,Eff).
transition(rec(X,S,R),A,rec(X,S,R2),Pre,Eff):-
      transition(R,A,R2,Pre,Eff).
```

OI semantics



Client and Server

// CLIENT before	// CLIENT after
bel(using_artifact(art@localhost)).	bel(using_artifact(art@localhost)).
bel(role(client)).	bel(role(client)).
bel(id('id1')).	bel(id('id1')).
bel(unknown(temp)).	bel(val(temp,5)).
bel(unknown(pressure)).	bel(val(pressure,21)).

// SERVER

```
bel(using_artifact(art@localhost)).
bel(role(server)).
bel(id('id2')).
```

```
bel(val(wind,-1)).
bel(val(temp,5)).
bel(val(pressure,21)).
```



```
oi(server,rec(x,[
        act( rd(request(Id,Property))),
        ([
            act( out(reply(Property,Value)),
            pre([holds(val(Property,Value))])),
            x
        ]+x)
])).
```

Agents as OI-players

bel(using_artifact(art@localhost)).
bel(role(client)).
bel(id('id1')).

```
bel(unknown(temp)).
bel(unknown(pressure)).
bel(val(wind,-1)).
```

% Artifact to use % Role to play % Identity

```
% Knowledge
```

start :- bel(using_artifact(Art)), bel(role(R)),
 exec(Art?rd(oi(R,S))), % Inspect OIs
 updateOI(S), % Store OIs
 loop.

loop:- bel(using_artifact(Art)),oi(S), transition(S,Act,S2,Pre,Eff),hold(Pre), % Seek for next Act exec(Art?Act), % Execute Act apply(Eff), updateOI(S2), % Update state !,loop.

loop.



oi(client,rec(x,OI_client,[
 act(rd(reply(temp,Value))),
 act(in(request(Id,temp))),x
])).



oi(client,rec(x,OI_client,[
 act(rd(reply(temp,Value))),
 act(in(request(Id,temp))),x
])).



oi(client,rec(x,OI_client,[
 act(rd(reply(temp,Value))),
 act(in(request(Id,temp))),x
])).

oi(server,rec(x,OI_server,[
 ([act(out(reply(temp,Value)),
 x]+x)

])).



oi(client,rec(x,OI_client,[
 act(rd(reply(temp,Value))),
 act(in(request(Id,temp))),x
])).

oi(server,rec(x,OI_server,[
 ([act(out(reply(temp,Value)),
 x]+x)

])).



oi(client,rec(x,OI_client,[
 act(rd(reply(temp,Value))),
 act(in(request(Id,temp))),x
])).

oi(**server**,rec(x,*OI_server*,[×

])).



oi(client,rec(x,OI_client,[
 act(rd(reply(temp,Value))),
 act(in(request(Id,temp))),x
])).



oi(client,rec(x,OI_client,[
 act(rd(reply(temp,Value))),
 act(in(request(Id,temp))),x
])).



oi(client,rec(x,OI_client,[
 act(in(request(Id,temp))),x
])).



oi(client,rec(x,OI_client,[
 act(in(request(Id,temp))),x
])).



oi(client,rec(x,OI_client,[
 act(in(request(Id,temp))),x
])).



oi(client,rec(x,OI_client,[
 act(out(request(Id,Property))),
 act(rd(reply(Property,Value))),
 act(in(request(Id,Property))),x
])).



Features

- It scales with the number of clients and servers
- The artifact can be specialised
 - currently it is a simple blackboard
 - rules can be added to improve "effectiveness"
- Example: retracting replies
 - server replies remain indefinitely in the artifact...
 - .. should automatically retract them after a while!!!
 - can be realised in ReSpecT by rule:

Conclusions

- Certain responsibilities are better delegated to artifacts, as specialised tools
- Thanks to features such as UI, FD and OI agents can exploit artifacts rationally
 - this can be smoothly realised using logic agents
- Future work in this direction
 - evaluating support in agent languages such as 3APL, Jason,.. and in full BDI frameworks
 - towards cognitive selection, use, manipulation, construction
 - integration with self-organisation

On the Cognitive Use of the Environment through Artifacts



Mirko Viroli, Alessandro Ricci DEIS, Cesena Alma Mater Studiorum - Università di Bologna mirko.viroli@unibo.it joint work with Andrea Omicini

AgentLink III TF3

Mirko Viroli