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Preface

The engineering of multi-agent systems (MAS) is a multi-faceted, complex task. These systems consist of multiple, autonomous, and heterogeneous agents, and their global behavior emerges from the cooperation and interactions among the agents. MAS have been widely studied and implemented in academia, but their full adoption in industry is still hampered by the unavailability of comprehensive solutions for conceiving, engineering, and implementing these systems.

Being at the border between software engineering and artificial intelligence, they can benefit from both disciplines, but at the same time they lack proper mainstream solutions. For example, even if the artificial intelligence side has been proposing conceptual models for years, there is still a lack of proper abstractions unanimously recognized as effective design solutions for the conceptions of agents and of their interactions. Similarly, there is still a significant gap between the availability of “standard” software engineering implementation and validation solutions, and their adoption in the conception of MAS. More recently, the emergence of self-adaptive software systems, and more in general of the idea of software systems that can change their behavior at runtime has imposed MAS as one conceptual solution for their realization, but it has also emphasized the need for proper and sound engineering solutions. Conversely, design artifacts (e.g., agent or MAS models) can be also used to support and assist the testing and debugging of conventional software, while the use of agent-oriented programming languages results in programs that are more readily verifiable. There many pieces belong to the same puzzle, but significant work is still needed to put them together.

As said, many solutions have already been proposed. They address the use of common software engineering solutions for the conception of MAS, the use of MAS for ameliorating common software engineering tasks, and also the proper blending of the two disciplines to conceive MAS-centric development processes. Academia has been working on ideas and solutions; industry should have exploited them to improve the state of the art. The cross-fertilization is needed to make the two sides of the same coin cooperate, and a single, common venue can help exchange ideas, compare solutions, and learn from one another.

The International Workshop on Engineering Multi-Agent Systems (EMAS) aims to be this comprehensive venue, where software engineering and artificial intelligence researchers can meet together and discuss the different viewpoints and findings, and where they can also try to present them to industry. EMAS was created in 2013 as a merger of three separate workshops (with overlapping communities) that focused on the software engineering aspects (AOSE), the programming aspects (ProMAS), and the application of declarative techniques to design, program, and verify (DALT) MAS. The workshop is traditionally co-located with AAMAS (International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-agent Systems) and thus this year it is in Istanbul (Turkey).

This year the workshop is a single-day event. It got 19 submissions, and after a thorough review process, the program committee selected 11 papers for presentation. Even if accepted papers are fewer than in previous years, we are
pretty confident that they can offer an interesting perspective of the work that has been done for conceiving sound and complex MAS, and they will also offer the opportunity for fruitful and interesting discussions.

We would like to thank all the members of the Program Committee for their excellent work during the reviewing phase. Moreover, we would like to thank all the members of the Steering Committee of EMAS for their valuable suggestions and support.

We hope to see you all in Istanbul.

March 26th, 2015
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Abstract. Creating intelligent agents involves a knowledge representation (KR) to formally represent and manipulate information relevant for agents. In practice, agent programming frameworks are dedicated to a specific KR, limiting the use of other possible ones. In this paper we address the issue of creating a flexible choice for agent programmers regarding the technology they want to use. We propose a generic interface, that provides an easy choice of KR for agent systems. Our proposal is governed by a number of design principles, an analysis of functional requirements that cognitive agents pose towards a KR, and the identification of various features provided by KR technologies that the interface should capture. We provide two use-cases of the interface by describing its implementation for Prolog and OWL with rules.
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1 Introduction

In agent systems knowledge representation is used to store, retrieve and update information relevant for agents. In principle, knowledge can be represented in many different ways, but in practice programmers tend to be limited to a specific approach regarding knowledge representation that a particular agent programming framework offers. In many agent frameworks (e.g. Jason [5], 2APL [7] and GOAL [13]) Prolog (or a variant) has become the de-facto standard. However, there may exist a variety of reasons for preferring different knowledge representation approaches, but it is typically not possible to switch to a different language within an agent framework. Agent development frameworks often include assumptions regarding the specific approach to knowledge representation they use, and are as such committed to this.

In this paper we propose a design for a Knowledge Representation Interface (KRI) that facilitates an easy choice of KR for agent frameworks. Currently, this interface presupposes the adoption of the chosen KR by all agents in an agent system. In principle, it is conceivable that a single agent would use multiple KRs, or multiple interacting agents would each utilize different KRs. The combination of multiple KRs into a single agent framework poses a number of issues that are investigated by [8]. This work is orthogonal to our work as our aim is to facilitate
the easy integration of an arbitrary single KR technology into a cognitive multi-agent system. Investigating issues relating to multiple interacting agents that each may use a different KR technology also is outside the scope of this work. Here, instead, we focus on the design of an interface that allows for flexible choice of KR for all agents of an agent systems.

Our proposed interface design is applicable to a range of agent frameworks that facilitate agents with mental states, and all classes of KR that comply to the definition of [8], as described in detail in section 3.

1.1 Motivation

A generic interface for flexible use of KRs in agent frameworks is useful for several reasons. Motivations include the following aspects:

Expressivity Knowledge representation languages differ in the expressivity that they offer. Depending on the task, domain, or scenario, one language might be more appropriate than another.

Agent programmer A programmer of the agent system may have a personal preference based on, e.g., ease of use, familiarity, or other factors. For example, a programmer may be familiar with one language but not with another, and might prefer using the agent framework in combination with the KR language he or she knows best.

Modularity The Dagstuhl report on “Engineering Multi-Agent Systems” [10] advocates a component-based agent design, as this would provide flexibility, reduce overhead, bridge the gap to other architectures and could facilitate more widespread adoption of agent systems in real-world applications. A separation of the agent framework and the KR it uses – that is agnostic with respect to the underlying agent programming language – subscribes to this modular approach.

Legacy systems When using agent programming as part of real-world applications, one commonly has to access existing infrastructure, which typically may include industry-standard approaches for data storage (e.g. Oracle database). Rather than implementing some kind of bridge between these legacy databases and the knowledge representation language used in the agent framework on an ad-hoc basis, a much better approach would be the use of a generic interface, so that the agent framework can use the legacy database directly.

Multiple sources An agent may need to combine knowledge from multiple sources, that are either distributed or not. A generic interface supporting a variety of KR languages, allowing the use of several KR sources from several locations is useful in this context. A particular case is when dealing with large multi-agent systems that may include different manifestations of the agents, such as embodied in robots, software agents and modeling users.

Reusability A wide range of agent frameworks could benefit from providing a flexible choice of various logic-based KR technologies. Reusability prevents the need for reinventing the wheel, as the interface eliminates the need to
implement a framework-specific integration for a KR. Moreover, the effort
to support this interface for a particular agent framework is a one time
investment that enables the use of any KR for which the proposed interface
has been implemented.

1.2 Scope and Methodology

The aim of this paper is to introduce a KRI that is reusable across a range
of agent platforms which can benefit from providing a flexible choice of various
logic-based KR systems. The interface is aimed to be generic, and can be applied
to agent frameworks that fit our basic assumptions. By supporting the interface,
an agent framework facilitates the choice of a technology that provides the re-
quired expressivity or other feature, and the choice of a preferred knowledge
technology by its user.

Creating a generic KRI poses a number of challenges. For instance, it is im-
portant to identify the right abstraction level for the KRI specification. Striking
the right balance between a high level description (to be as inclusive as possible)
and a low level description that may be close to a particular KR language (to be
able to specify the details) is essential for the interface design. Leading in this
will be the functionalities required by the agent frameworks.

We use the following methodology to derive the interface. First, we explore
related literature, describing the various approaches of how each agent framework
incorporates a specific KR. Usually the choice of representing knowledge through
a certain language is implicitly integrated within a given framework, rather than
being explicitly considered, let alone providing users with any sort of choice.
To the best of our knowledge, no work has yet been done on the design and
development of a generic interface that facilitates the use of a range of KRs.

Having identified the need for such a KRI (based on the motivations described
above), and given the apparent lack of such a construct in related work, we then
present the design of the KRI, governed by the following three aspects: 1) a
number of design principles serving as guidelines, 2) the concept of cognitive
agents and related assumptions that we make about agent frameworks, and
3) the identification of features provided by various KR technologies that are
considered as requirements for a KRI.

After having presented the KRI, we describe its application with two imple-
mentation: in the first implementation the KRI is instantiated with SWI Prolog
(representing a logic programming KR language), and in the second it is instan-
tiated with the ontological web language OWL with SWRL rules (a description
logics language), with Pellet [29] as the reasoning engine. After that we assess the
KRI usability for these two cases, and based on this draw conclusions regarding
the interface’s effectiveness and limitations.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses related
work on the usage of knowledge representation systems into agent frameworks
with a focus on the agent programming literature. In section 3 we introduce
a number of design principles and present a structural analysis of agents and
features of KR technologies that guide the design of the proposed interface.
Section 4 presents the design of the KR interface itself and motivates the choices that we have made. In section 5 we discuss two instantiations of the interface (Prolog and OWL). Section 6 briefly discusses a preliminary analysis of the interface that was implemented for Prolog, and OWL with rules. Finally, we conclude the paper with future work in section 7.

2 Related Work

In this section we discuss related work with respect to the choice and possible use of KR languages in agent frameworks. It is useful to note here that some agent frameworks such as JACK [31] and Jadex [26] have taken a more pragmatic road, and use object oriented technology in combination with, e.g., XML, to implement the beliefs and goals of an agent, rather than using a knowledge technology in the sense that we use it here (cf. Davis [9]). The focus of our paper is more on generic logic-based agent frameworks that use an existing technology for representing an agent’s environment.

Most work on logic-based agent programming frameworks has built on top of logic programming or some kind of variant thereof, e.g. 2APL [7], GOAL [13], Jason [5]. Alternatively, several works have described approaches towards the integration of semantic web technologies (such as OWL) into agent-based frameworks. For example, for Jason there exist the JASDL extension [17], which allows for integration with OWL, and as such lets agents incorporate OWL knowledge into their belief base. The Java-based agent framework, JIAC [14], also uses OWL for representing agent knowledge. While comparable in the sense that these systems allows for the use of OWL in the agent framework, the KR interface that we propose here is aimed to be more general, and allow a range of KRs to be used in an agent framework.

The work in [20] defines a version of the BDI agent-oriented programming language AgentSpeak based on description logic, rather than one based on predicate logic (e.g. Prolog). The work reported in [12] proposes the use of a semantic web language as a unifying framework for representing and reasoning about agents, their environment, and the organizations they take part in. The work is presented as a first step towards the use of ontologies in the multi-agent framework JaCaMo, but does not discuss the particulars to achieve this.

Probabilistic approaches have also been considered as KRs in conjunction with multi-agent systems. E.g. [30] propose an extension of the 3APL language based on a probabilistic logic programming framework, while [28] discuss the use of Bayesian networks for representing knowledge in agent programs.

Access to external data sources by agents in the IMPACT agent framework [11] is achieved through an abstraction layer, dubbed body of software code, that specifies a set of all data-types and functions the underlying data source provides.

The work described in [8] investigated the issue of integrating multiple KR technologies into a single agent. The paper proposes techniques for combining knowledge represented in different knowledge representation languages. This is
orthogonal to our work as our aim is to facilitate the easy use of an arbitrary single KR within a cognitive agent system.

The usefulness of facilitating the use of a particular KR in other frameworks has been recognized in the literature, and has driven several efforts in defining an Application Programming Interface (API) for several technologies. [3] and [15] for instance, have proposed an API for description logics and OWL respectively, and [6] proposes an API for a Fuzzy Logic inference engine. These APIs are facilitating all aspects of a specific KR. In contrast, in this paper we aim at a generic KRI to connect arbitrary agent frameworks with arbitrary KRs that comply to our minimal assumptions.

Although most work has focused on the integration of logic programming and semantic web technologies and Bayesian networks, we are not aware of any work that has investigated the use of these technologies in agent frameworks in a generic manner.

3 Dimensions of the KRI design

Our aim is to design a standardized, extensible and easy to use interface that allows for a flexible choice of KR languages in agent frameworks. To this end, we first present a methodological approach for the design of such a framework. In section 4 we propose an interface specification that facilitates choice of KRs. In order to design such an interface, three design dimensions are taken into account. The first dimension concerns the design principles, which we discuss in section 3.1. The second dimension concerns the concept of a cognitive agent and related assumptions that we make about agent frameworks. In section 3.2 we present a structural and generic analysis of the features and components that are typically required by agent frameworks. The third dimension concerns the features that are made available by existing knowledge representation technologies that can be supported by the proposed interface. In section 3.3 we analyze and identify these KR features. Taken together, these three dimensions define the design space of the proposed interface.

3.1 Design Principles

For creating a generic KR interface for agent frameworks, reuse is a key concern. We want the interface to serve all agent frameworks that could benefit from an easy choice of KRs. To this end, we present and briefly discuss various reuse design principles that we have taken into account in the design of the interface.

One of the most important reuse principles in the design of a well-defined interface concerns abstraction. Abstraction plays a central role in software reuse, and is essential for the reuse of software artifacts [18]. By means of abstraction, important aspects are put in focus while unimportant details are ignored [18, 1]. Each KR technology introduces a specific language and a key issue for our interface specification is how to abstract from differences in the grammar between KR languages. We want to be largely agnostic about the particular type
of agent framework that a knowledge representation is used in. We will only assume, for example, that an agent decides what to do next based on a state representation expressed in some KR language and will make no stronger assumptions about the particular structure of the mental state of an agent (see for a more detailed discussion section 3.2). Similarly, we want to be largely agnostic about the particular type of KR languages. We assume, for example, that a KR language provides variables, but will not assume that such a language provides rules (which would exclude, e.g., SWRL and PDDL without axioms; see for a more detailed discussion section 3.3). The interface that we propose here provides an abstraction in the sense that it is a high-level, succinct, natural, and useful specification that facilitates easy use of KRs in agent frameworks.

Two closely related design principles that are very important when designing for reuse are the principles of generality and genericity [1]. Generality refers to the abstraction of commonalities and the ignoring of (detailed) differences that relate to the how, when, or where things are done by a technology. Generality is important when looking at different KR technologies, as our aim is to be as general as possible and support any KR class that fits our assumptions. An obvious example is to abstract from the particulars of how a reasoning engine made available by a technology answers a query; an interface should only assume that some engine is made available. Genericity refers to the abstraction of specific parameters of a technology and the introduction of generic parameters that represent generic types. The use of generic parameters is an aid to reusability, because it allows to define generic functionality instead of functionality that is tight to technology specific features.

The principle of modularity refers to considerations of size and number of a reusable software components. The general principle dictates to split large software components into smaller subcomponents; the basic idea being that adequate modular design increases reusability. In order to obtain a loosely coupled system, we design a modular interface whose components are determined by the functional requirements it has to fulfill.

3.2 Cognitive Agent Frameworks: Functional Requirements

In this section we examine which features are required for using a KR within an agent system. Importantly, an interface only provides an effective specification if it includes all of the information that is needed to realize its purpose. In other words, the KRI needs to provide support for all of the functions that an agent is supposed to be able to implement. To identify these functional requirements, we discuss and make explicit the notion of an agent that has been used for the interface specification defined in the next section.

Because we do not want to commit to any particular agent concept, we start from the very abstract concept of an agent as an entity that perceives and acts in its environment of [27]. Starting from this notion of agent, we assume that an agent maintains a state in order to represent its environment by means of a knowledge representation language. As is usual in most agent literature on cognitive agents, we call this agent state a mental state, even though we do not
Fig. 1. A Cognitive Agent Architecture, consisting of a Mental State and Decision Making module. Optional components are automated planning (PL), machine learning (ML) model checking (MC), and other modules. Mental states are realized with a KR, accessed through an interface.

make any additional assumptions on the structure of this state. Mental states in agent frameworks differ significantly, and we do not want to commit to any particular framework. A state of a Jason agent, for example, consists of events, beliefs, and plans [4], whereas a state of a GOAL agent consists of knowledge, beliefs, and declarative goals [13].

A cognitive agent (cf. Figure 1) maintains a mental state in order to be able to evaluate whether certain conditions hold, by querying its state. Querying is one of the most important uses of a KR technology, as it provides an essential capability required for effective decision making of an agent, which we identify here as the main functional component of an agent. Another reason for an agent to maintain a mental state is to maintain an accurate and up to date representation of the state of its environment by updating its state with information received through percepts or other events. The basic notion of agent of [27] already implies that an agent is connected to an environment. Such an agent needs to be able to align percepts it receives from an environment with its mental state. An agent also needs to be able to evaluate when it can perform an action, and represent what the effects of an action are. In other words, an agent needs some kind of action specification to be able to interact with its environment. Finally, we also assume that an agent can be part of a multi-agent system, and is able to exchange messages with other agents. Figure 1, which represents the basic agent architecture that is used in the design of the interface, illustrates this.

Summarizing, we identify the following list of capabilities that are required for creating a functional cognitive agent in a multi-agent framework:

1. represent the contents of a mental state
2. store the contents of a mental state
3. query the contents of a mental state in order to evaluate conditions by means of some form of reasoning
4. update the contents of a mental state to reflect changes in an environment
5. process percepts received from an environment
6. process actions by evaluating preconditions and reflecting postconditions
7. process messages exchanged between agents

Next, we discuss the functional requirements that these items introduce towards the KR language and technology, and its consequences regarding the design of a generic interface.

Item 1 above does not introduce any requirements as representing is the main purpose of a knowledge representation language. We do not assume, for example, that an agent’s state must be consistent in a specific sense. Item 2 requires that a KR provides support for the (temporary) storage of the contents of an agent’s state. This item does not require such a store to be persistent. Item 3 requires support from a KR technology to evaluate queries on the mental state of an agent. Without any additional assumptions on the structure of a mental state, this item does not introduce new requirements, as querying is a common feature provided by the KR. Item 4 requires support from a KR technology to update, i.e., to add and remove, contents of a mental state. This is a basic requirement, that only requires that a KR makes available the capabilities of adding and removing content from a store. Item 5 requires support in principle for representing any information that an agent receives from its environment, and updating the representation of the environment that the agent maintains, these functionalities being already mentioned in Item 1 and 4. Item 6 requires that the knowledge representation language can also be used to represent the actions that the agent can perform. We assume an action can be expressed as a list of preconditions and postconditions. It is essential to be able to evaluate whether an action can be performed, processing preconditions being fulfilled by the querying functionality of Item 3. The ability to process the effects of an action, i.e., its postconditions, is fulfilled by item 4 that requires support for updating a mental state. Item 7 requires support for representing and processing the content of a message that agents exchange. We assume here that communication between agents does not introduce any additional requirements besides those already introduced by previous items 1 - 4.

Apart from very generic features and components of cognitive agents such as mental state, we also take into account that agent frameworks might support additional optional components that are only available in some frameworks but not all. The components drawn with dotted lines in Figure 1 represent these components. For example, an agent framework might support automated planning (PL), model checking (MC), and even learning mechanisms, such as, for example, reinforcement learning (RL). These components do not exhaust the possible optional components as indicated by the three dots. It is likely that such optional components introduce additional demands on the interface, since they provide support to an agent framework through the interface.
3.3 Features of Knowledge Representation Technologies

Figure 1 includes an abstract definition of a knowledge representation technology as a tuple \( \langle L, \models, \oplus \rangle \), where \( L \) is a language, \( \models \) is an inference relation, and \( \oplus \) is an update operator (definition taken from [8] and based on [9]). The inference relation evaluates a subset \( L_q \subseteq L \) of expressions of the language called queries on a store or set of language elements. We consider our interface to be applicable to the classes of KR that comply to this definition.

This notion of a KR technology covers most, but not all existing technologies, including, for example, logic programming (Prolog), answer set programming (ASP), database languages (e.g., SQL, Datalog), semantic web languages (e.g., OWL, SWRL), description logic programming (DLP), planning domain definition language (PDDL), fuzzy logic, and Bayesian networks. Using this abstract definition as a starting point, we identify more concrete features and functions that are supported by KR technologies that can be included in an interface specification. Each of these technologies is characterized by a particular logical language and a corresponding inference mechanism, even though these widely vary between different technologies.

Having described KR technologies in a general sense above, we now define those aspects that have an impact on the design of a generic KR interface, either on its structure or its provided functionality.

**Language.** Although expressivity is a very important aspect of any knowledge representation language, we do not explicitly list it here, as it does not appear to be useful to control expressivity by means of a KR interface. It is essential for a KR to provide a parser, necessary to be able to operate with the textual representation of the language, and perform syntax checking. Syntax highlighting is an extra feature that the parser can provide.

Support for data types may widely differ between KRIs, but it is important for the engineering of practical agent systems. Typically, basic data types such as (big) integers, floats, booleans, strings, and lists are distinguished from more complex data structures such as stacks in programming languages. Representing data types in the KR language is a very basic feature, and hence it is considered a requirement for our interface.

**Storage.** The main purpose of a storage is to store knowledge. As a basic feature of any KR system is a knowledge base, creating a store is an important requirement towards a generic abstraction. In addition, modifying a store poses the requirement to be able to insert into and delete from a knowledge store.

Even though we did not identify a functional requirement for stores to be persistent in Section 3.2, still, a knowledge technology may provide support for persistence, and a KR interface may make this capability available to an agent. An example for such a knowledge technology is persistent triple stores for ontologies. This feature should be included in order to create multi-agent systems, where the knowledge base of an agent (or multiple agents sharing a database) needs to be preserved for a later use.

*Integrating knowledge from other sources* can be realized in many forms, such as accessing existing (legacy) databases, or accessing information on the web.
One example is the linked open data repositories of the Semantic Web. This feature, however favorable, cannot be considered as a general requirement.

**Reasoning.** Querying is the basic operation to retrieve information from a knowledge base. We can assume the basic form of querying is to retrieve ground data that matches a query pattern with free variables. Without querying there can be no interaction with a knowledge base, hence it is a main requirements towards a KR interface.

Parallel querying is to be able to ask multiple queries simultaneously. This feature is available for some technologies only (like triplestores), but not for others (such as Prolog), where one needs to first exhaust all solutions of a query at a time, hence it is considered an extra feature, and not a basic requirement.

We assume that a substitution based parameter instantiation mechanism is supported, as is usual for logic-based languages for all practical purposes. Note that this does not mean that we make any strong assumptions about the domains of computation. Query results are in the form of bindings between variables and some arbitrary terms. A substitution to represent a variable to term binding therefore is the basic form of expressing a query result.

**Other.** Error handling provides support for errors that might occur during parsing, knowledge base creation, modification, or other language-related operations. Some form of error handling is indispensable from an interface.

A knowledge technology that supports modularization facilitates the structuring of knowledge into different modules. This feature may greatly enhance the simultaneous development of knowledge by a team of developers. A modular architecture might greatly influence our design of interface, as mappings between the modules of the knowledge and the interface might be identified.

Three forms of logical validation can be supported by a KR: consistency, satisfiability and validity checking. As these validation forms are either provided by the technology or not, we cannot generalize it into a feature requirement.

Summarizing the above, we identified the following list of basic features and extra features:

**Basic Features**

1. Parsing
2. Data types (including checking)
3. Creating a store
4. Modifying a store
5. Querying
6. Parameter instantiation
7. Error handling

**Extra Features**

1. Persistent storage
2. Integrate other knowledge sources
3. Parallel querying
4. Modularization
5. Logical validation

4 The KR Interface

Next, we describe the KR Interface (KRI) designed, a Java-based API to address the issues of creating a generic, a specific KR-independent abstraction. Throughout the description of the interface we show how each design choice was
based on the generic features of KRs, described in section 3.3, and how it fulfills the functionality requirements that an agent programming framework poses in section 3.2.

Based on the principle of modularization, we want to ensure a separation of concerns related to language, storage, reasoning, and others. We propose a structured interface design, such that it facilitates these sub-interfaces, as described next in detail.

**Language.** The language module of the interface contains the abstract grammatical constructs of a knowledge representation technology. This fulfills the requirement of being able to express all items on the list of section 3.2, since the language concepts need to be able to represent the contents of an agent’s mental state, queries and updates, percepts of the environment, and agent messages.

Our generic language proposal, shown as a conceptual hierarchy in Figure 2, abstracts any language construct into the higher level *Expression* concept, corresponding to a well-formed sentence or formula in the knowledge representation language. An expression can be of type: *Term*, *Update*, *Query* and *DatabaseFormula*. A *Term* can be simple: *Var*, and *Constant* or complex: a *Function*.

From a knowledge representation language’s point of view, differentiation between the concepts of *querying* and *updating* is dictated by the syntax, and hence can differ per language. From an agent programming’s perspective such a distinction is necessary to require that performing a query never results in an update. It would be difficult to understand the behavior of a system that can change the state as a side-effect of performing a query.

![Fig. 2. Language concepts architecture](image)

The *Term* concept represents a language construct of a formula or sentence (ground formula, i.e. without free variables). It can be simple or complex. A variable is a simple term expressed with the concept *Var*. The interface does not enforce variables to be present, however, most languages that support parameter instantiation and querying, need to represent variables. Another simple term is a *Constant*, which is a basic unstructured name that refers to some object or entity, e.g. a number. A *Function* is the representation of a complex term, with a functor and arguments. No restriction on the type or the number of arguments is imposed.
A **Substitution** is a mapping of distinct variables to terms. A substitution binds the term to the variable if it maps the variable to the term. A substitution may be empty. Its functionality includes the usual map operations. It fulfills Item 6 of the language features’ list, namely, to have some form of substitution-based parameter mechanism, as we have assumed a set of substitutions to be also the result of a query.

An **Expression** is any grammatically correct string of symbols of a KR language, fulfilling the responsibility of Item 1 of section 3, to be able to represent the contents of an agent’s mental state. Every expression has a different signature, a definition of the form `operatormapname/arity`, where the operator name is the functor, and the arity is the number of arguments associated with the operator. In case we need to unify two expressions, the most general unifier method returns a substitution that makes two expressions equal. To apply a substitution to an expression means to substitute variables in the expression that are bound by the substitution with the term bound to the variable, or, only rename it in case the substitution binds a variable to another one.

It is important for an agent to be able to understand which expressions it can use to query, put in a database, and to update a database with. A **DatabaseFormula** stands for an expression that can be inserted into a storage facility. The **Query** concept is used to query the database, and hence it should contain at least one free variable. An **Update** is semantically equivalent with the combination of a delete and an insert operation. To reflect this, it offers two methods to retrieve the list of database formulas to be added and to be deleted from the knowledge base. For example, in Prolog these classes are different, but may overlap: database formulas are facts (positive literals), a query is an arbitrary conjunction of literals, and an update is a conjunction of basic literals, where basic means the predicate used in the literal is not defined by a rule.

Based on the assumption that every KR should provide its own parsing mechanism identified in Item 1 of the identified KR features’ list, the interface should provide a parser for parsing the source (files) represented in the KR language. In case a parser initialization error occurs, proper error handling should be defined and provided.

The **Parser** class fulfills the functionality of a KR to provide its own parser, Item 1 of section 3.3. We abstract a parser to receive an input source file, and return language constructs of our KR interface; database formulas, queries, updates, terms, etc. In case an error occurs during parsing, a method to get the errors returns the source object, which can be inspected for error handling purposes.

Basic **data types**, such as numbers (integers, floats), strings, booleans, are provided together with the functionality of returning the data type of a constant, and data type checking, thus fulfilling the requirement mentioned as Item 2 of section 3.3.

**Storage.** To create a storage, the main class of the interface provides the way to create a database in the specific KR it hides away. Using the `getDatabase(Collection<DatabaseFormula> content)` method, it creates a new `Database`
with the provided content, that is a list of database formulas to be inserted in
the database before it being returned. Thus it fulfills the requirement of creating
a store by Item 3 of section 3.3.

The Database class fulfills the second item of the functional requirements
listed in section 3.2. It holds the content represented in the KR language, viewed
as a set of DatabaseFormula-s. It provides the functionality to store new infor-
mation in the database by inserting a formula in it, deleting a formula from it,
fulfilling the update operation, listed as Item 4 of section 3.2, and Item 4 of
3.3. Upon insertion of a formula or an update, the database should entail the
information added. The converse applies to deleting a formula, after removal of
the formula, in principle, the database should no longer entail the information
removed from the database. Any occurring error during insertion, deletion, or
destruction of the database is signaled by throwing a database exception.

**Reasoning.** In order for an agent to inspect its knowledge base, querying
functionality has to be provided by the KR, as we mentioned in our assumptions
sections, Item 3, and our KR features section, Item 5. The `query(Query query)`
method fulfills that functionality, and returns as a result a set of Substitutions.
In case of an error, a query failed exception is thrown.

**Other.** The KRException and its more specific classes capture the several
different types of exceptions, and take the responsibility of error reporting, Item
7 of KR features support list. Separate error types are differentiated for parsing,
database operations, failed query errors. In case of parsing, error handling is
capable to refer to the source (file) where the error occurred. Two exception types
are created for the interface initialization and for requesting a not supported KR
language.

5 KR Interface Implementations

In this section we describe the two use cases we studied in depth, and imple-
mented the interface with: Prolog and OWL with SWRL rules. Implementing the
KR interface with a new language puts our design choices to the test. We want
to investigate how much the interface fits other, different logic-based languages,
and provide a first proof of concept for our proposal.

5.1 Prolog Implementation

Prolog was the default logic used for knowledge representation in the GOAL
agent framework, as it is a first natural choice for agent system programming,
due to its computational powers and the features of logic programming.

Next we describe how we instantiated the interface with SWI-Prolog using
the JPL API. The high-level API’s class hierarchy consists of the top-level
classes: `Term`, `Query`, `JPLException`. The abstract superclass `Term` consists of
subclasses for variables, compounds, atoms as a specialization of compounds,
integers and floats. A `Query` is a wrapper around a term, but it also has a
mechanism to hold the retrieved results and much more.
A clear match of terminology could be found between the way the KRI captures language constructs and the hierarchy of the JPL API. An Expression is a JPL term representing a Prolog expression, the most general language construct in Prolog. The Var is mapped to a JPL variable, Constants to integers, floats, and strings, and a Function is matched to a Compound term. A JPL term is the representation of both a Term, a DBFormula, and a Query. We chose not to map the JPL’s query class to the KRI’s Query. The former attaches more functionality of the querying process to the class than what the representation a query formula would necessitate. The solution to use a term as a query conveniently matches the JPL idea. Then, performing the check if a term is valid to be inserted in a database, or can be used as a query is delegated to the parser for efficiency reasons (to avoid such checks at runtime).

An Update is a term that is assumed to be a conjunction that can be split into a list of conjuncts. We needed to separate the literals to be added or deleted, so we distinguished the positive from the negative literals (with a preceding not operator) to denote the two lists. A Substitution is a mapping of distinct variables to terms. We do not use JPL variables as keys, because it has no implementation for hash code, and therefore putting these in a map will fail. Thus, we were forced to using strings.

The main issue encountered during the implementation was the question of a parser. Existing Prolog implementations do not completely conform to the ISO/IEC 13211-1 International Standard. We created our own lexer and parser, following the standard in most cases. Our reasons for deviating have been pragmatically motivated: we wanted to keep our grammar simple, and we did not want it to support certain options that quickly lead to unreadable code, such as using graphic tokens as predicate names, or redefine operators’ precedence.

The module feature of Prolog has been used to implement different types of stores. As a conclusion of this choice, modules cannot be made available to an agent programmer any more, as it would potentially clash with the modules that are introduced automatically by the interface.

SWI-Prolog has one fast database to hold all formulas. To be able to differentiate different Databases for various mental state construction, we need to specify for each clause which database it belongs to. Our solution was to prefix each database formula with the database name.

Destroying a database removes all predicates and clauses from the SWI-Prolog database, but this is not fully implementable in SWI-Prolog. The JPL interface does not support removing the dynamic declarations. The suggested practice is to reset a database to free up some memory, but after resetting not to re-use this database, but to make a new one.

SWI-Prolog needs access to various libraries at runtime and to load these dynamically. If many agents try to do this at the same time, this creates access errors. A possible solution is to load these libraries upfront when we need them, that implies a check whether we need a library of course. The benefit is that we only need to synchronize the creation of databases and not all query calls. As a pragmatic choice, we solved this issue by adding synchronized querying.
5.2 Ontological Language Implementation

We implemented the proposed KR interface using the OWL ontological language with DL-safe SWRL rules, such an agent being considered a novelty in the field of agent programming. The web ontology language standard (OWL) is a W3C standard recommendation [19] for formalizing an ontology. It is based on the underlying logic called: Description Logic (DL) [2], which has become one of the main knowledge representation formalism. The Semantic Web Rule Language (SWRL) [16] is an OWL-based rule language, and is an extension to the existing ontology language OWL, to provide more expressivity through rules. In order to preserve decidability, SWRL rules are restricted to so called DL-safe rules [21], which requires each variable in a rule to occur in a data atom in the rule body. A data atom is one that refers to existing named individuals in the ontological knowledge base.

In order to instantiate the interface, two APIs are available for the ontological language: the OWL API [15], that contains representation for SWRL rules as well, or the SWRL API [23] of Protégé-OWL, which is built on top of the OWL API, but extends it further with a query language and provides a parser.

In the following we describe the identified matching between the KRI constructs and the ontological rule language. The higher level concept Expression was mapped to SWRLRule, that consists of a head and a body. The Function concept was mapped to SWRLAtom, since atoms are the building blocks of rules, a Constant to a SWRLArgument, representing a data object or an individual object. A variable is corresponding to SWRLVariable.

In order to create a shared, persistent storage, and to access the Semantic Web, a Database is mapped to an RDF repository (or triple store). The Resource Description Framework (RDF) is a serialized representation of an ontology, in triple format [24]. The most performant reasoners are available for triple store technologies, and can be queried using the query language SPARQL [25], the adopted standard by the community.

The choice of query language for OWL and SWRL was not a straightforward decision. Query languages for Semantic Web ontologies are categorized into two: RDF-based and DL-based. The default and mostly used querying mechanism is the RDF-based SPARQL, but since it operates on the RDF serialization of OWL, it has no semantic understanding of the language constructs that those serializations represent. On the other hand, the Semantic Query-enhanced Web Rule Language (SQWRL) [22] is a DL-based query language designed on top of the SWRL rule language, with a working implementation provided by the Protégé-OWL API, which would be a very convenient choice in our case.

Faced with the decision between using two different languages for representing knowledge and querying on one hand, or not benefiting from the available advanced triplestore technologies on the other hand, we decided to try to keep the advantages of both. We created a transformation from SWRL rules into SPARQL queries, by treating them as query bodies, with all free variables being considered as part of the query pattern. Having established a querying mecha-
nism, an Update then consists of an addition and a deletion operation, provided by the SPARQL Update syntax’s insert and delete.

6 Evaluation of the KR Interface

In this section we reflect on the outcomes of our work: the KRI design, and how well it performed when put to the test by implementing it with two different KRs. We assess whether our proposal provides a design that is generic enough to correctly represent logic programming (SWI-Prolog) and description logics (OWL-DL with DL-safe SWRL rules). Even though they are based on different kinds of logics, the interface proved to be generic and able to capture all possible language constructs.

The KRI can make use of the extra features that come along with the two languages, e.g., it allows for ontological language with rules to use triple store technologies existing on the web, accessing the Semantic Web thus becoming implicitly available to agents. Another example is parallel querying, that again, agents are at liberty to perform using OWL and SWRL, which comes from exploiting the benefit of a triple store for an agent’s mental database. A third benefit of OWL agents that the interface makes possible, is the creation of a shared database, so many agents can operate on the same set of knowledge, incrementing data reuse and sharing. On the other hand, when choosing Prolog as the KR, the agent is powerful in computational tasks, and can work easily with lists. This support that would not have been available when choosing OWL, since lists are not by default present in OWL, and are not supported by reasoners that can handle rules. The major benefits of the two languages could be exploited through the instantiation of the interface, which shows that our proposal does not limit the use of a KR for agents.

Revisiting the creation of mental states for agents, GOAL poses a difficult requirement: it should be possible to query the combination of a knowledge and belief base (and knowledge and goal base), i.e., query the union of two bases. It was possible to do this with the proposed KRI, since most KR technologies provide either some mechanism to import knowledge from one base into another (e.g., modules in SWI-Prolog) or allow for multi-base querying (federated SPARQL queries for OWL).

An implementation of a specific KR with the interface was highly dependent on the available Java API for the technology. In case several APIs for a language were available, we assessed which one fits best our needs, and can provide most features. Then, the concept hierarchy had to be matched to the interface’s corresponding elements, and the functionality correspondence validated. In general the proposed KRI turns out to be generic enough to be implemented for different knowledge representation technologies. Following the design principles described in section 3.1 and incorporating features identified in section 3.3, the KRI satisfies all requirements deemed fundamental to represent mental states for agents in an agent system (section 3.2); moreover, different types of states (cf. Jason vs GOAL, section 3.2) can be implemented.
7 Conclusions and Future Work

In conclusion, this paper introduced a generic KRI that is reusable across a range of agent frameworks that can benefit from the use of different KR languages. Our contribution is a methodological analysis of the features and requirements between knowledge representation technologies and cognitive agent programming frameworks. We proposed a generic interface to create an abstraction layer and a modular setup to how agents can use a language for representing knowledge. The need for such a KR interface and the apparent lack of such a construct in related work has motivated the design of the interface, governed by the following three aspects (as described in section 3): 1) a number of design principles serving as guidelines, 2) the concept of cognitive agents and related assumptions that we make about agent frameworks, and 3) the identification of features provided by various KRIs that are considered as requirements for a KRI. We put this interface to the test with two knowledge representations, namely Prolog and OWL with SWRL rules, in the agent programming framework GOAL. Based on these two cases we conclude that the KRI is generic enough to support a variety of KR languages, and could be easily applied in the GOAL agent framework.

In the future we will focus on the improvement points identified during the process, and move to a next step of having different agents with different knowledge representation technologies able to communicate and work together in a multi-agent system through our proposed interface.
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Abstract. Agent-based technologies, originally proposed with the aim of assisting human activities, have been recently adopted in industry for automating business processes. Business Process Model and Notation (BPMN) is a standard notation for modeling business processes, that provides a rich graphical representation that can be used for common understanding of processes but also for automation purposes. We propose a normal form of Business Process Diagrams based on Activity Theory that can be transformed to a Causal Bayesian Network, which in turn can be used to model the behavior of activity participants and assess human decision through user agents. We illustrate our approach on an Elderly health care scenario obtained from an actual contextual study.
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1 Introduction

BPMN is a standard notation for modeling business processes that provides a rich graphical representation that can be used for common understanding of processes [13]. Furthermore, BPMN has been used for process automation with support of agent technologies [10].

BPMN uses gateways for representing decisions, which are usually labeled with textual descriptions indicating the criterion followed. These decisions are based on information that is available at the moment of decision making and may refer to information of the process in course or to historical information (\textit{data-based decisions}).

But when the BPMN workflow describes a human activity in terms of user tasks this decision criterion might be unknown or inaccessible to the modeler, e.g. the buying decision of a customer. For dealing with the uncertainty introduced by human intervention, approaches like [6] have proposed annotating edges with the probability of each alternative. Nevertheless, this approach does not permit to determine if the cause of such variability comes from some part of the process under the control of some participant, i.e. capture causal relationships between
non-consecutive nodes. And despite BPMN has been recently used for agent-based software engineering, decision making under uncertainty has not been addressed in current approaches [3, 7, 12, 10].

For these reasons, we propose a normal form of BPMN Process Diagrams for modeling human activities suitable for generating a probabilistic representation of activity’s dynamic suitable for discovering causal relationships. Possible scenarios specified in the BPMN workflow can be used for predicting the behavior of human participants based on observable events. The BPMN normal form is inspired by Activity Theory [4], providing goal-oriented BPMN Process Diagrams capable of representing collective human activities.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we present other applications of BPMN for agent-based software engineering and introduce probabilistic formalisms traditionally used for agent decision making. In section 3 we discuss the pertinence of using BPMN for modeling human activities and propose a BPMN normal form suitable for its transformation to a Bayesian Network. We provide an automatic transformation procedure that produces a probabilistic representation of activity’s dynamics that can be used for agent decision making based on previous activity developments. In section 4, we present other probabilistic approaches to BPMN and compare our selection of BPMN elements with other agent engineering approaches. Finally, in section 5, we present our conclusions and future work.

2 Background

We revise current applications of BPMN for agent-based system engineering, and review probabilistic graphic models used for decision making.

2.1 Business Process Diagrams for Agent Engineering

Business Process Model and Notation (BPMN) is a standard notation used by organizations for understanding internal business procedures in a graphical notation. Due to its expressivity and its growing adoption by industry, it has been also used as a tool for modeling MultiAgent Systems [3, 7, 12, 10].

Endert et al [3] proposed a mapping of Business Process Diagram (BPD) elements to agent concepts. In particular they considered a BPMN fragment constituted by: event nodes (start, intermediate and end), activity nodes, subprocess nodes, split and merge gateways (XOR, OR, AND), and pools. They map each pool to an agent and the process itself constitutes a plan; properties of start (and end) events constitute inputs (respectively outputs) for the plan. Independent subprocesses are mapped to goals and embedded subprocesses are mapped to plans. Activity nodes are represented by plan operations, whereas control flows are mapped to sequences, if-else blocks and loops. Data flow, i.e. arguments passed to messages and operations, is captured in node attributes and it is used for modeling agent beliefs.
Hinge and colleagues developed a tool for annotating BPMN in order to provide a semantic description of events and actions [7]. Actions are described by their direct effects: the observable conditions that hold immediately after action execution. These annotations are used for calculating the current development of a process, this is, determining which events and actions have occurred by observing the accumulation of effects on a knowledge base. The knowledge base is considered non-monotonic as long as this approach counts with a procedure for detecting the removal of facts.

Muehlen and Indulska evaluated the combination of modeling languages for business processes and business rules [12]. Their overlap analysis look for the minimization of redundancy on constructors and the maximization of modeling expressivity. Modeling constructors were grouped in four categories: sort of things, states, events and systems. They conclude that the highest representation power is given by the combination of BPMN for representing the business process and SWRL [8] for representing business rules. Nevertheless, their analysis reveals that this combination, despite it is the most complete, lacks of a representation of states.

Jander and colleagues proposed Goal-oriented Process Modeling Notation (GPMN), a language for developing goal-oriented workflows [9]. The process is initially modeled by decomposing a main goal into subgoals, and then each subgoal is linked to a BPMN diagram that represents the plan to achieve that goal. This graphical language includes activation plans which decide subgoal parallelization or serialization, replicating the functionality of gateways in the goal hierarchy tree. A goal can be connected to multiple plans, enabling means-end reasoning.

Finally, Kuster and colleagues provide a full methodology for process oriented agent engineering that complements BPMN process diagrams with: declaration of data types (ontology engineering), a model for agent organization and distribution, low-level algorithms for activity nodes (service engineering), and use cases diagrams that link roles and process diagrams [10]. This framework implements the mapping of BPMN to agents described in [3] for agent engineering.

These approaches show how BPMN workflows can be used for designing agent specifications from the description of their interactions in a process. Nevertheless they assume that all the information needed by agent for making a decision is available, which in turn produces reactive agent specifications but is not sufficient for coping with uncertainty.

2.2 Decision Making based on Bayesian Networks

Bayesian Networks (BNs) have been used for quite a while for representing decision making under uncertainty and learning through observation/experience. BNs are suitable for identifying causal dependencies between random variables representing events and actions occurred at different time steps. Despite Markovian Decision Processes (MDPs) have gained popularity for their capacity for providing efficient probabilistic inference in long term processes, their represen-
tation lacks of memory, i.e. it only captures conditional dependencies between contiguous time steps.

**Bayesian Networks.** A Bayesian Network is a probabilistic graphical model that represents a set of events denoted by random variables, and their conditional dependencies via a directed acyclic graph (DAG), denoted:

\[
M = \langle V, G_V, P(v_i|pa_i) \rangle
\]

where \( V \) is a set of random variables, \( G_V \) is the graph consisting of variables in \( V \) and directed arcs between them, and \( P(v_i|pa_i) \) is a conditional probabilistic distribution where the probability of \( v_i \) depends on the value of its parents (\( pa_i \)) in \( G_V \).

A random variable \( V_i \) is a numerical description of the outcome of an experiment, and can be either discrete or continuous. The set of possible values a discrete random variable may hold, or domain \( Dom(V_i) = \{ v_{i1}, ..., v_{in} \} \), represents the possible outcomes of a yet-to-be-performed experiment, or the potential values of a quantity whose already-existing value is uncertain.

The realization of a random variable \( V_i \) to the value \( v_{ij} \in Dom(V_i) \) is represented as \( V_i = v_{ij} \), or \( v_i \) if the realization value is not relevant in a given context.

Random variables satisfy the probability theory requisite which dictates that in an experiment, a random variable can be realized to a single value of its domain. This means that all events represented by a random variable are disjoint.

\( G_V \) is an independence map (I-Map), i.e. a minimal graph where the presence of an arc from \( V_i \) to \( V_j \) indicates conditional dependence whereas its absence indicates conditional independence. An I-Map is called minimal because indirect dependencies are not included.

Bayesian Networks can be modeled from two distinct perspectives: evidential or causal. If arrows go from effects to causes the perspective is evidential, e.g. determining the disease based on the patient symptoms. A network is modeled from a causal perspective if arcs go from causes to effects. For instance, in Dynamic Bayesian Networks a different set of random variables represents the state of the system at time \( t, t+1, ..., t+n \); arcs can go from a variable in \( t \) to another in \( t+i \), but the opposite is not allowed.

Bayesian networks are used to find out updated knowledge of the state of a subset of variables \( \bar{v}_1 \) when another variables \( \bar{v}_2 \) (evidence) are observed, denoted \( P(\bar{v}_1|\bar{v}_2) \). This process of computing the posterior distribution of variables given certain evidence is called probabilistic inference.

**Influence Diagrams.** An Influence Diagram is a generalization of a Bayesian Network devised for modeling and solving decision problems using probabilistic inference. Nodes may represent decisions (rectangles), uncertain conditions (ovals) or the utility obtained in a given scenario (diamond).
Arcs ending in decision nodes denote the information taken into account for making the decision. Arcs between uncertain nodes propagate uncertainty or information like in Bayesian Networks.

Decision nodes and their incoming arcs determine the alternatives. Uncertainty nodes and their incoming arcs model the information. Value nodes and their incoming arcs quantify the preference on the outcome. An alternative is chosen based on the maximum expected utility in the given scenario, calculated by the a posteriori probability of all nodes (including unknown values).

**Causal Bayesian Networks.** Judea Pearl introduced the notion of Causality on Bayesian Networks under the concept of intervention, where the value of a variable could be subject to alteration through a mechanism \( F \) or let its value being freely set [15]. Pearl and Robins proposed that nodes in a Bayesian network can be classified into purely observable variables, or Covariates \( Z \), and controllable variables \( X \) which are subject to intervention, denoted by \( do(x_i) \) [16]. From this distinction they establish a graphical method for identifying the set of covariates \( W_k \subset Z \) that must be observed for determining the causal effect of a sequence of interventions \( do(x_1), ..., do(x_k) \) on \( Y \), i.e. \( P(y|do(x_1), ..., do(x_k), w_k) \). This sequence of interventions constitutes a plan, which probability of success can be evaluated a priori and be revised once that the network is updated with information.

### 3 Probabilistic Decision Making on Business Process Diagrams

An Activity of Daily Living (ADL) modeled as a BPMN workflow is used for illustrating the proposed normal form. Then a procedure for transforming this workflow to a Bayesian Network is provided and some examples of probabilistic inference are given to validate the model.

The subset of graphical elements of the BPMN 2.0 specification [13] we use in our example and in our normal form is shown in Figure 1. BPMN Business Process Diagrams (BPDs) basically describe a process in terms of events and actions connected through control flows that indicate valid sequences in the process development. Gateways are special nodes connected through control flows that indicate whether the process develops in parallel (AND), alternatively (XOR) or optionally (OR). The beginning of the process is denoted by an initial event node and its conclusion by a set of end event nodes.

#### 3.1 An example of an ADL modeled in BPMN

We motivate the discussion using as example the medical consultation of an elder person, taken from an actual contextual study based on Activity Theory [5]. In this activity, the subject is an older adult who has a medical appointment (the object). The objective of the activity is having a medical appraisal and its...
outcome includes getting a prescription, supply medicines and schedule a next appointment. The community involved in the activity includes a family member (optionally) and the doctor.

This diagram is used for compensating the lack of a formal representation of the activity’s dynamic in Activity Theory (AT) [4]. At some extent, control flows and gateways formalize the set of rules specified in the AT specification.

Figure 2 shows the activity diagram modeled with BPMN. It illustrates two alternative ways the elder may choose for getting to the hospital: going by himself, or being carried out by a family member. It also shows five possible outcomes for the activity: 1) treatment finished, 2) taking new medication, 3) taking medication and follow up, 4) medication not available at the hospital’s pharmacy, and 5) missing the appointment (failure outcome).

3.2 A Probabilistic BPMN normal form

The proposed normal form has the purpose of illustrating alternative sequences of actions performed by activity participants, mediated by intermediate events that the subject or other participants can observe. XOR gateways are used for representing disjoint alternatives. Activity’s development has a triggering condition (initial event) and a set of successful or failure outcomes (end events). The resulting graph must be acyclic for facilitating its translation to a Bayesian Network through a graphical procedure. A BPMN BPD satisfies the probabilistic normal form if it observes the following constraints:

1. A Business Process Diagram $W$ is represented by a set of pools ($P$), lanes ($L$), nodes ($N$) and control flows ($F$).

$$W = \{P, L, N, F\}$$

2. Nodes ($N$) allowed in the diagram are: start events ($N^S$), intermediate events ($N^I$), end events ($N^E$), atomic actions ($N^A$) and gateways ($N^G$).

$$N = N^S \cup N^I \cup N^E \cup N^A \cup N^G$$
Fig. 2. Business Process Diagram of the Medical Consultation Activity.
3. The diagram must have a single pool (p ∈ P) containing at least one lane (li ∈ L, i ≥ 1). Each lane represents a human participant in the activity, and nodes must be allocated in a single lane (in(n, li), n ∈ N).

4. All sequence flows are unconditional, denoted as F(n_i, n_j) ∈ F where n_i, n_j ∈ N. Conditional or default control flows are not allowed; instead, intermediate event nodes are used for representing both data-based and event-based control flow.

5. A single start event s ∈ N^S is defined (|N^S| = 1), given that the activity is modeled from the perspective of a single individual (the subject), and it must be labeled with the condition perceived by the subject that triggers activity’s development.

6. Intermediate event nodes (i ∈ N^I) are labeled with a natural language description that corresponds to the condition (partial world state) that must hold for proceeding with the activity’s course.

7. Similarly, atomic action nodes or tasks (a ∈ N^A) are labeled with a verb expressed in active voice that denotes the action performed by a participant, indicating other actors involved in collective actions, as well as required artifacts and locations.

8. Two consecutive action nodes must be mediated by at least one intermediate event node and as many gateways as needed, i.e. two action nodes are not connected directly through sequence flows. Observable intermediate events will permit monitoring the activity development and introducing agent assistance [2].

\[ \forall a \in N^A, (F(n, a) \in F \vee F(a, n) \in F) \rightarrow n \not\in N^A \]

9. Each split or merge of control flows must be mediated by a splitting gateway (N^G_S ⊆ N^G) or a merging gateway (N^G_M ⊂ N^G), respectively. Gateways can be of type Parallel-AND (A), Optional-OR (O), or Exclusive-XOR (X). Gateways with both multiple incoming and outgoing flows are not permitted.

\[ \forall g \in N^G, type(g, t) \rightarrow t \in \{A, O, X\} \]

10. Splitting gateways XOR (g ∈ N^G_X, type(g, X)) must be followed by intermediate event nodes (F(g, i) ∈ F, i ∈ N^I) or other XOR gateways, denoting alternative ways on which the activity can develop. Event node labels indicate the reason for selecting each alternative.

11. The diagram might have multiple end nodes, but two end nodes cannot represent the same outcome; their labels must reflect some difference. Control flows and gateways must be used for connecting all possible workflows ending in the same outcome.

\[ \forall e_1, e_2 \in N^E \rightarrow Label(e_1) \neq Label(e_2) \]

12. The graph G_N constituted by all F(n_i, n_j) ∈ F must not have any directed cycle or loop, i.e. it must be a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG).

13. All other nodes, gateways and control flows are disallowed in the diagram. BPMN artifacts (associations, groups and text annotations) are ignored.
3.3 Translating BPDs to Bayesian Networks

Next we describe the rules and the procedure used for translating a BPD satisfying the previous normal form to a Bayesian Network. In short, events and actions are mapped to observable and controllable random variables, respectively, whereas control flows and gateways are used for building the conditional dependency graph and the probabilistic distribution of the model.

Events. Events represent partial world states in the activity context, hence their representation is associated to observable random variables \(Z_i\), whereas their occurrence is represented probabilistically by the realization of these variables \(Z_i = z_i\).

The start event is detected by the activity subject and it is represented by the boolean variable \(Z_S\), which realization to True holds on any process execution. \(Z_S\) has no parents and it is used for start process monitoring. In our example, the start event is the doctor’s appointment time \((Z_S = Z_1)\).

\[
s \in N^S \rightarrow \text{define}(Z_S), \text{Dom}(Z_S) = \{True, False\}, \text{map}(s, Z_S = True)\quad (1)
\]

The function \(\text{define}(V_i)\) is used for declaring random variables, whereas the function \(\text{map}(n, V_i = v_i), n \in N\), establishes the correspondence between elements of both representations.

A BPD might include multiple end nodes as shown in our example. Given that each end node corresponds to different outcomes of the activity, all of them are represented by a single random variable \(Z_E\). Each outcome node \(e\) represents a possible realization of \(Z_E\). In our example \(Z_7\) represents \(Z_E\), with \(\text{Dom}(Z_7) = \{7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5\}\).

\[
\forall e \in N^E \rightarrow e \in \text{Dom}(Z_E), \text{map}(e, Z_E = e)\quad (2)
\]

Intermediate event nodes are used in the BPD for two reasons: 1) observing the evidence of actions performed by people in the real world (event-based control flow), and 2) controlling the workflow based on data produced during process execution (data-based control flow). Additionally to generic intermediate event nodes that can be expressed with expressions in First Order Logic, timeout nodes are introduced for representing temporal reasoning for process monitoring.

Intermediate event nodes are classified as subgoals or alternative events. Subgoal events are event nodes that must be performed in order to continue with process execution in a given workflow. A subgoal event is represented by a boolean random variable, where its realization to True indicates that the condition/event was met and False if it did not occurred during process execution. The node representing the scheduling of the Next appointment \((Z_6)\) is an example of a subgoal event.

\[
\forall i \in N^I, F(n, i) \in F, (n \notin N^G \land (n \in N^G, \neg \text{type}(n, X))) \rightarrow \text{define}(Z_i), \text{Dom}(Z_i) = \{True, False\}, \text{map}(i, Z_i = True)\quad (3a)
\]

\[
\text{define}(Z_i), \text{Dom}(Z_i) = \{True, False\}, \text{map}(i, Z_i = True)\quad (3b)
\]
Alternative events are mutually exclusive world states denoted by intermediate event nodes preceded by a XOR gateway, and are represented by a single observable random variable. We define the set $\text{Alt}$ for identifying these gateways in further steps of the transformation. For instance, the events Follow up finished ($Z_{4,1}$), Doctor prescribes more/new medication ($Z_{4,2}$), and Doctor prescribes medicine and follow up ($Z_{4,3}$), are represented by the random variable $Z_4$. Successor intermediate events mediated exclusively by XOR gateways are included in the set of disjoint events as well (see 4c–4e).

$$\forall g \in N_S^G, \text{type}(g, X), F(g, i) \in \mathbf{F}, i \in N^I \rightarrow \text{define}(Z_g), i \in \text{Dom}(Z_g), \text{map}(i, Z_g = i), g \in \text{Alt}$$ (4a)

$$\forall g \in N_S^G, \text{type}(g, X), F(g, g_1) \in \mathbf{F}, g_1 \in N_G^G, \text{type}(g_1, X), \ldots.$$ (4b)

$$F(g_{k-1}, g_k) \in \mathbf{F}, g_k \in N_G^G, \text{type}(g_k, X), F(g_k, i) \in \mathbf{F}, i \in N^I \rightarrow \text{define}(Z_g), i \in \text{Dom}(Z_g), \text{map}(i, Z_g = i), g \in \text{Alt}$$ (4c)

$$\exists p_i = \text{path}(Z_S, Z_E) \in G_V, Z_j \not\in p_i \rightarrow \text{False} \in \text{Dom}(Z_j)$$ (5)

Actions. Action nodes in BPDs might represent atomic actions or subprocesses. In this analysis we only consider atomic actions, which correspond to the definition of action given by Leontiev [11], i.e. something that the person makes consciously to achieve a goal. This action might require the participation of other actors, like in the auscultation made by the doctor to the elder ($X_3$), or be performed individually, like when the elder going by himself to the hospital ($X_1$).

Similarly to subgoal events, atomic actions are represented by boolean random variables, denoted $X_i$, where the value True denotes the execution of the action, and False represents its omission. If the action is not performed, the value of the variable is set to False at the end of activity’s monitoring.

$$\forall a \in N_A \rightarrow \text{define}(X_a), \text{Dom}(X_a) = \{\text{True, False}\}, \text{map}(a, X_a = \text{True})$$ (6)

Control Flows. Control flows encode necessary conditions for the development of a process, this is, the occurrence of previous events or actions enables event
observation or action execution. For instance, medical consultation \((X_3)\) requires
the patient being at the hospital \((Z_3 = 3.1)\), and the next appointment \((Z_6)\)
requires that the elder had request it \((X_5)\).

A control flow \(V_i \rightarrow V_j\) indicates: 1) temporal precedence of the action/event
\(V_i\) with respect to another action/event \(V_j\), and 2) conditional dependence of \(V_j\)
on \(V_i\). For this reason, the equivalent representation of the BPD is a Bayesian
Network modeled from a causal perspective.

In order to identify conditional dependencies between events and actions, we
use control flows incoming and outgoing to their corresponding random variables.
A copy of the DAG constructed with these control flows, denoted \(G'_N: N \times N\),
is modified according to rules (7a) – (7d) in Figure 3 for removing unnecessary
gateways and unifying end nodes in a single one. In these rule we use graph
operations such as adding/removing arcs and absorbing nodes. Absorbing \(n\)
consists on adding control flows \(F(n_i, n_j)\) for the cross product given by every
pair \(F(n_i, n_j) = F(n, n_j)\), and then removing the node \(n\) and those arcs connected
to it.

\[
\forall i \in N^I, F(g, i) \in G'_N, g \in Alt \rightarrow \text{absorbe}(i, G'_N) \tag{7a}
\]
\[
\forall g \in N^G_M \rightarrow \text{absorbe}(g, G'_N) \tag{7b}
\]
\[
\forall g \in N^G_S, g \notin Alt \rightarrow \text{absorbe}(g, G'_N) \tag{7c}
\]
\[
\forall e_i \in N^E, i > 1, F(n, e_i) \in G'_N \rightarrow \text{remove}(F(n, e_i), G'_N), \text{add}(F(n, e_1), G'_N) \tag{7d}
\]

**Fig. 3.** Transformation of \(G_N\) to \(G'_n\).

The resulting DAG \(G'_N\) and those mappings generated in the first stage of the
process are used for defining the arcs that constitute the conditional dependence
graph between random variables \(G_V: V \times V\).

\[
\forall F(n_i, n_j) \in G'_N, \text{map}(n_i, V_i = v_i), \text{map}(n_j, V_j = v_j) \rightarrow \text{add}(\text{Arc}(V_i, V_j), G_V) \tag{8}
\]

At this point, the conditional dependence graph \(G_V\) of the medical consultation
activity is shown in Figure 4. Random variables labeled \(Z_i\) represent
observable variables, whereas \(X_i\) denote atomic actions. Note that alternative
event nodes are grouped in random variables \(Z_2, Z_3, Z_4\) and \(Z_5\).

**Gateways.** Gateways, on the other hand, codify how likely is that two or more
events/actions occur during process execution, which corresponds to the definition
of the Conditional Probabilistic Distribution (CPD), i.e. \(P(v_i | p_{a_i})\).

The different process developments (scenarios) that can be generated according
to gateway constraints provide the joint probabilistic distribution of the
process. This distribution assumes that all scenarios are equally likely and it is
used for learning the CPDs of random variables using the dependencies given
Fig. 4. The Medical Consultation Activity’s conditional dependence graph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
<th>X8</th>
<th>X9</th>
<th>X10</th>
<th>X11</th>
<th>X12</th>
<th>X13</th>
<th>X14</th>
<th>X15</th>
<th>X16</th>
<th>X17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5. Valid process developments.
by the graph in Figure 4. Figure 5 shows the 15 scenarios that can be generated from the process in Figure 2, where columns indicate the realization of random variables in each scenario.

Table 1 shows the structures supported by our normal form, aligned with the corresponding transformation rules. The column Mappings shows the correspondence between BPD nodes and random variables, indicating the rule applied, and the last column indicates which nodes prevail in the reduced graph $G'_N$, indicating the rule that makes the reduction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Mappings</th>
<th>in $G'_N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trigger</td>
<td>$n_i \in N \setminus N^c$</td>
<td>map(s, Z=\text{True})</td>
<td>1 $s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>$n_i \in N \setminus N^c$</td>
<td>map(e_i, Z=\text{eq.})</td>
<td>2 $e_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>$n_i \leftrightarrow n_j \in N^d$</td>
<td>map(i, Z=\text{True})</td>
<td>3 $i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>$n_i, n_j \in N \setminus N^c$</td>
<td>map(a, X=\text{True})</td>
<td>6 $a$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1. Valid structures in the BPD normal form.

#### 3.4 The Activity Causal Bayesian Network

The Bayesian Network produced by the transformation process described above is defined as follows.

**Definition 1.** An Activity Causal Bayesian Network (ACBN) is represented by

$$D = \langle G_V, X, Z, Z_S, Z_E, P(v_i|pa_i) \rangle$$

where $G_V$ is a minimal DAG which arcs denote temporal precedence and conditional dependence between observable events ($Z$) and actions ($X$), $P(v_i|pa_i)$ encodes conditional probabilistic dependencies between random variables $V = Z \cup X$, and $G_V$ has at least one directed path from the initial condition $Z_S \in Z$ to the outcome variable $Z_E \in (Z \setminus Z_S)$.
The Causal Bayesian Network of the activity modeled in Figure 2 has seven observable conditions or events ($Z_1 - Z_7$) and five human actions ($X_1 - X_5$). The initial condition is the appointment time ($Z_1$) and the outcome variable is $Z_7$. Its graph $G_V$ is shown in Figure 4 and the corresponding $P(v|pa_i)$ is learned from the process instances shown in Figure 5.

**Probabilistic inference.** Figure 6 shows an example of probabilistic inference for a partially observed activity instance where the observed evidence ($e$) is: the family member arrived late to elder’s house ($Z_2 = 2.2$), the elder arrived to the hospital on time ($Z_3 = 3.1$), and the doctor prescribed new medication only ($Z_4 = 4.2$). Posterior probabilities for the other variables are shown in Fig. 6.

![Fig. 6. Probabilistic inference on a valid scenario.](image)

Posterior probabilities of human actions ($X_i$) indicate how likely is their execution despite the model is only feed with information of observable events. For instance, it predicts that the elder will refill medicine ($P(X_4 = True|e) = 0.9285$) but he will not request a new appointment ($P(X_5 = False|e) = 0.9285$), which is consistent with the BPMN workflow. On the other hand, the probability of the elder going to the hospital alone ($X_1 = True$) is slightly higher than he being carried out by his family member ($X_2 = True$), which can be explained...
by the fact that the last arrived late to elder’s home but the elder arrived on time at the hospital.

The probability of the elder getting all the medicine ($Z_7 = 7.3$) or part of it ($Z_7 = 7.2$) are slightly higher than the other outcomes. Both probabilities increase if more evidence is given (e.g. $Z_5$ and $Z_6$). Given that the Bayesian network was trained with valid process developments only, it predicts well the outcome on similar scenarios (see $P(z_7|e)$ in Fig. 6), but it assigns the same probability to all the five outcomes in invalid scenarios, which represents an uncertain outcome.

4 Discussion

First we analyze other probabilistic approaches to BPMN. Then we compare our selection of BPMN elements with other approaches that transform BPDs to agent-based system specifications. Finally we discuss the applications of probabilistic workflows as agent engineering tool.

4.1 Probabilistic approaches to BPMN

In 2008, Prandi and colleagues [17] proposed a formal semantics for BPMN based on the process calculus COWS. Each BPD node is considered as a COWS service and the translation describes the message flow between them. They provide a COWS formula for each node-centered structure supported by their normal form and produce a single composite formula that represents the flow of tokens across the BPD. BPDs are formalized as Continuous Time Markov Chains, a model used for automated verification of Web Service composition. Thanks to the implementation of COWS in the probabilistic model checker PRISM, the probability of observing certain event or condition at a time $t$ can be estimated.

Tasks, annotated with a duration range, occur at a different time in each alternative workflow produced by gateways present in the workflow; hence the probability of observing an event or action at a time $t$ is expressed probabilistically.

Herbert and Sharp [6] proposed stochastic BPMN workflows, an extension of Core BPMN that includes: probabilistic flows (sequence flows with a given probability) and rewards associated to the execution of tasks. Using PRISM, authors transform BPMN workflows into Markovian Decision Processes (MDPs). A PRISM module is generated for each task based on a structure supported by their normal form; code templates codify transitions between states (represented by tasks), mediated by actions (represented by gateway conditions and task completion). PRISM is then used for generating all valid action sequences and calculating: 1) transitory and steady state probabilities of process conditions, 2) the probability of occurrence of an event (at a time $t$), 3) best and worst scenarios, and 4) the average time of process execution.

On the other hand, Bobek and colleagues [1] proposed a transformation of BPMN workflows to Bayesian Networks (BNs). The translation is straightforward, each node (action, event or gateway) is translated into a Boolean random
variable whereas control flows are used for constructing the conditional dependency graph. The Bayesian Network is trained with BPMN workflows obtained from a process library, producing CPTs that indicate how likely is to observe a node \( N_1 \) followed by another node \( N_2 \). The resulting BN is used for recommending missing nodes during a new process specification. This approach lacks of a mechanism for recognizing disjoint events and detecting equivalent events/tasks across different BPDs.

### 4.2 Translatable Fragments of BPMN workflows

The BPMN fragment of our approach differs from the one used in the translation of BPMN to BPEL [14] in two aspects. First, in [14] exist two types of end events, one for indicating that the participation of a component has finished, and another for indicating process termination. Given that we model the process from the perspective of the activity’s subject, end events represent the different ways on which the process might terminate, successfully or on failure for the subject. Second, in our approach we don’t consider data/event-based XOR gateways as long as an equivalent expressivity is provided by XOR gateways followed by intermediate events that might represent the event to observe for deciding which branch is followed during process execution.

Unlike the mapping of BPMN to agents proposed in [3], we only consider a single pool on which every lane represents a role. The use of multiple pools forces to specify illocutions between agents as part of the activity description, which produces a low-level specification which is not the purpose of our approach at this point. In contrast, BPEL, used for specifying systems based on Web Services, does not capture the attribution of agent capabilities (perceptions and actions) grouped around roles, which is evidenced on that it does not consider BPMN pools and lanes on its translation [14].

A limitation of our normal form is that we do not permit the representation of cycles in the BPMN workflow as long as it would produce non-acyclic graphs. This can be solved by replacing the feedback arc by a subprocess that replicates the cyclical section and it is called recursively until reaching the stop condition.

Another limitation is that the definition of random variables from intermediate events relies in a single fixed structured (XOR gateways); this mechanism can be generalized by calculating the different ways on which the graph can be traversed and determining which events never occur together, establishing a criterion for grouping proximate disjoint nodes.

### 4.3 Probabilistic workflows as agent engineering tool

Modeling human activities using BPMN from an Activity Theory perspective provides a goal-oriented plan representation for the User agent representing to the activity’s subject in a MAS. The corresponding ACBN can be used for modeling other participants and providing recommendations to the user. Given that human actions are not directly observable, observable events between them can be used for estimating what happened or what will occur next.
As we show in [2], the causal network can be further used for introducing the participation of software agents and generating Prometheus scenarios. In this work we propose the use of BPMN as a user-friendly way of specifying the activity dynamics and its probabilistic distribution.

In this paper we illustrate how the BPD can be modeled from the perspective of a single actor (the subject) meanwhile it captures his interactions with other participants. Modeling a complex system where other actors should achieve their own goals requires capturing in a single BPD the perspective of other participants, or modeling their perspectives in separate BPDs and calculating their intersections. For instance, the participation of the Doctor is conditioned to his presence at the hospital previous to the appointment time; this is not represented in Figure 2, but such precondition should be available in the Doctor’s consultation workflow.

5 Conclusions

We introduced a BPMN Business Process Diagram (BPD) normal form based on Activity Theory that can be used for representing the dynamics of a collective human activity from the perspective of a subject. We introduce a novel automatic procedure that transforms this workflow into a Causal Bayesian Network that can be used for modeling human behaviors and assessing human decisions.

The resulting Bayesian Network is not only consistent with the valid process developments encoded in the BPD, but it can be further complemented with causal dependencies discovered by algorithms like Pearl’s Inferred Causation [15] from actual process developments in order to improve goal achievement’s prediction.

Providing a semantic representation of event and action nodes will permit to overcome the limitations of other approaches for detecting equivalent nodes and will provide the platform for the composition of workflows, the generation of agent role descriptions and plans, and the implementation of a process monitoring procedure. Using these descriptions, the proposed transformation can be extended with a proper translation of loops and subprocesses, which in turn could be used for providing a work around for cycles.
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ACE: a Flexible Environment for Complex Event Processing in Logical Agents
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Abstract. In this paper we propose the general software engineering approach of transforming an agent into an Agent Computational Environment (ACE) composed of: 1) the “main” agent program; 2) a number of Event-Action modules for Complex Event Processing, including generation of complex actions; 3) a number of external contexts that the agent is able to access in order to gather information. In our view an ACE is composed of heterogeneous components: therefore, we do not make assumptions about how the various components are defined, except that they are based upon Computational Logic. In order to show a concrete instance of ACE, we discuss an experiment based upon the DALI agent-oriented programming language and Answer Set Programming (ASP).

1 Introduction

Event processing (also called CEP, for “Complex Event Processing”) has emerged as a relevant new field of software engineering and computer science [1, 2]. In fact, a lot of practical applications have the need to actively monitor vast quantities of event data to make automated decisions and take time-critical actions (the reader may refer to the Proceedings of the RuleML Workshop Series). Several products for event processing have appeared on the market, provided by major software vendors and by start-up companies. Many of the current approaches are declarative and based on rules, and often on logic-programming-like languages and semantics: for instance, [3] is based upon a specifically defined interval-based Event Calculus [4].

Complex Event Processing is particularly important in software agents. Naturally most agent-oriented languages, architectures and frameworks are to some extent event-oriented and are able to perform event-processing. The issue of Event Processing Agents (EPAs) is of growing importance in the industrial field, since agents and multi-agent systems are able to manage rapid change and thus to allow for scalability in applications aimed at supporting the ever-increasing level of interaction.

This paper is concerned with logical agent-oriented languages and frameworks, i.e., those approaches whose semantics is rooted in Computational Logic. There are several such approaches, some mentioned below (for a recent survey cf., e.g., [5]). For lack of space, we are not able here to discuss and compare their event-processing features. Rather, we recall only the ones that have more strongly influenced the present work.

A recent but well-established and widely used approach to CEP in computational logic is ETALIS [6–8], which is an open source plug-in for Complex Event Processing implemented in prolog which runs in many Prolog systems. ETALIS is in fact based...
on a declarative semantics, grounded in Logic Programming. Complex events can be derived from simpler events by means of deductive rules. ETALIS, in addition, supports reasoning about events, context, and real-time complex situations, and has a nice representation of time and time intervals aimed at stream reasoning. Relations among events can be expressed via several operators, reminiscent of those of causal reasoning and Event Calculus.

In logical agents, some relevant work about CEP is presented in [9] and [10], which discuss the issue of complex reactivity, by considering the possibility of selecting different reactive patterns by means of simple preferences. [11] introduces more complex forms of preferences among applicable reactive behaviors. Such preferences can be also defined in terms of “possible worlds” elicited from a declarative description of a current or hypothetical situation, and can depend upon past events, and the specific sequence in which they occurred. [12] and [13, 14] discuss event-based memory-management, and temporal-logic-based constraints for complex dynamic self-checking and reaction.

In this paper, we propose a novel conceptual view of Complex Event Processing in logical agents and a formalization of the new approach. We observe that a complex event cannot always result from simple deterministic incremental aggregation of simple events. Rather, an agent should be able to possibly interpret a set of simple events in different ways, and to choose among possible interpretations. We also consider complex actions, seen as agent-generated events. To this aim, we propose to equip agents with specific modules, that we call **Event-Action modules** (whose first general idea was provided in [15, 16]), describing complex events and complex actions. Such modules are activated by a combination of simple events, and may return: (i) possible interpretations of a set of simple events in terms of complex events; (iii) detection of anomalies; (iv) (sets of) actions to perform in response. An Event-Action module is re-evaluated whenever new instances of the “triggering” events become available.

Each agent can be in principle equipped with a number of such modules, possibly defined in different heterogeneous languages/formalisms. Also, in order to reason about events, an agent may have to resort to extracting knowledge from heterogeneous external sources, that in general cannot be “wrapped” and considered as agents. We draw inspiration from the Multi-Context Systems (MCS) approach, which has been proposed to model information exchange among heterogeneous sources [17–19]. MCSs are defined so as to drop the assumption of making such sources in some sense homogeneous: rather, the approach deals explicitly with their different representation languages and semantics. Heterogeneous sources are called “contexts” and in the MCS understanding are fundamentally different from agents, as they do not have reactive, proactive and social capabilities, but can simply be queried and updated. MCSs have evolved from the simplest form [17] to managed MCS (mMCS) [20], and reactive mMCS [19] for dealing with external inputs such as a stream of sensor data. MCSs adopt “bridge rules” for knowledge interchange, which are special rules assumed to be applied whenever applicable, so that contexts are constantly “synchronized”.

In this paper we propose the software engineering approach of transforming an agent into an Agent Computational Environment (ACE) composed of: 1) the “main” agent program, or “basic agent”; 2) a number of Event-Action modules; 3) a number of external contexts that the agent is able to access. We assume the following. (1) Agents
and modules can query (sets of) contexts, but not vice versa. (2) Agents and modules are equipped, like contexts in MCSs, with bridge rules for knowledge interchange. Their application is however not only aimed at extracting knowledge from contexts, but also at knowledge interchange among the basic agent and Event-Action modules. On the one hand modules can access the agent’s knowledge base, on the other hand the agent can access modules’ conclusions. 3) We do not make assumptions about how the various components are defined, except that they are based upon Computational Logic. We propose a full formalization with a semantics, where again we draw inspiration from MCSs’ equilibrium semantics, on which we make necessary non-trivial enhancements, though aiming at a smooth extension which introduces as little additional technical machinery as possible. The approach proposed here constitutes a substantial enhancement towards [15, 16], and the formalization and semantics are fully novel.

To demonstrate practical applicability of ACES, we discuss a prototypical example that we have been experimented using the DALI agent-oriented language [21, 22]. In this setting we adopt Answer Set Programming for implementing Event-Action modules. Answer Set Programming (ASP, cf., among many, [23–25]) is in fact a well-established logic programming paradigm, where a program may have several (rather than just one) “model”, called “answer set”, each one representing a possible interpretation of the situation described by the program. We show how ASP-based Event-Action modules can be defined in a logic-programming-like fashion (we adopt in particular a DALI-like syntax) and then translated into ASP and executed via an ASP plugin integrated into the DALI interpreter. We provide a sketch of the translation.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we provide the necessary background on MCSs. In Section 3 we present the proposal, its formal definition and its semantics. In Section 4 we discuss one particular instance, based upon ASP modules. Finally, in Section 5 we conclude.

2 Background

Managed Multi-Context systems (mMCS) [18, 20, 19]) model the information flow among multiple possibly heterogeneous data sources. The device for doing so is constituted by “bridge rules”, which are similar to datalog rules (cf., e.g., [26] for a survey about datalog and the references therein for more information) but allow for knowledge acquisition from external sources, as in each element of their “body” the “context”, i.e. the source, from which information is to be obtained is explicitly indicated. In the short summary of mMCS provided below we basically adopt the formulation of [19], which is simplified w.r.t. [20].

Reporting from [18], a logic \( L \) is a triple \((KB_L; Cn_L; ACC_L)\), where \( KB_L \) is the set of admissible knowledge bases of \( L \), which are sets of \( KB \)-elements (“formulas”); \( Cn_L \) is the set of acceptable sets of consequences, whose elements are data items or "facts" (in [18] these sets are called “belief sets”; we adopt the more neutral terminology of “data sets”); \( ACC_L : KB_L \rightarrow 2^{Cn_L} \) is a function which defines the semantics of \( L \) by assigning each knowledge-base an “acceptable” set of consequences. A managed Multi-Context System (mMCS) \( M = (C_1, \ldots, C_n) \) is a heterogeneous collection of contexts \( C_i = (L_i; kbi; bri) \) where \( L_i \) is a logic, \( kbi \in KB_L \) is a knowledge base
(below “knowledge base”) and $br_i$ is a set of bridge rules. Each such rule is of the following form, where the left-hand side $o(s)$ is called the head, also denoted as $hd(o)$, the right-hand side is called the body, also denoted as $body(o)$, and the comma stand for conjunction.

$$o(s) \leftarrow (c_1 : p_1), \ldots, (c_j : p_j),\ not\ (c_{j+1} : p_{j+1}), \ldots, not\ (c_m : p_m).$$

For each bridge rule included in a context $C_i$, it is required that $kb_i \cup o(s)$ belongs to $KB_{Li}$ and, for every $k \leq m$, $c_k$ is a context included in $M$, and each $p_k$ belongs to some set in $KB_{Li}$. The meaning is that $o(s)$ is added to the consequences of $kb_i$ whenever each $p_r, r \leq j$, belongs to the consequences of context $c_r$, while instead each $p_w, j < w \leq m$, does not belong to the consequences of context $c_w$. While in standard MCSs the head $s$ of a bridge rule is simply added to the “destination” context’s knowledge base $kb$, in managed MCS $kb$ is subjected to an elaboration w.r.t. $s$ according to a specific operator $o$ and to its intended semantics: rather than simple addition. Formula $s$ itself can be elaborated by $o$, for instance with the aim of making it compatible with $kb$’s format, or via more involved elaboration.

If $M = (C_1, \ldots, C_n)$ is an MCS, a data state or, equivalently, belief/knowledge state, (according to everyone’s favorite terminology) is a tuple $S = (S_1, \ldots, S_n)$ such that each $S_i$ is an element of $Cn_i$. Desirable data states are those where each $S_i$ is acceptable according to $ACC_i$. A bridge rule $\rho$ is applicable in a knowledge state iff for all $1 \leq i \leq j : p_i \in S_i$ and for all $j + 1 \leq k \leq m : p_k \not\in S_k$. Let $app(S)$ be the set of bridge rules which are applicable in a data state $S$.

For a logic $L$, $F_L = \{s \in kb \mid kb \in KB_L\}$ is the set of formulas occurring in its knowledge bases. A management base is a set of operation names (briefly, operations) $OP$, defining elaborations that can be performed on formulas, e.g., addition of, revision with, etc. For a logic $L$ and a management base $OP$, the set of operational statements that can be built from $OP$ and $F_L$ is $F_L^{OP} = \{o(s) \mid o \in OP, s \in F_L\}$. The semantics of such statements is given by a management function, which maps a set of operational statements and a knowledge base into a modified knowledge base. In particular, a management function over a logic $L$ and a management base $OP$ is a function $mq : 2^{F_L^{OP}} \times KB_L \rightarrow 2^{KB_L} \setminus \emptyset$. The management function is crucial for knowledge incorporation from external sources, as it is able to perform any elaboration on the knowledge base given the acquired information.

Semantics of mMCS is in terms of equilibra. A data state $S = (S_1, \ldots, S_n)$ is an equilibrium for an MCS $M = (C_1, \ldots, C_n)$ iff, for $1 \leq i \leq n, kb'_i \in ACC_i(mq_{L}(app(S), kb_i))$. Thus, an equilibrium is a global data state composed of acceptable data states, one for each context, encompassing inter-context communication determined by bridge rules and the elaboration resulting from the operational statements and the management functions.

Equilibria may not exist (where conditions for existence have been studied, and basically require the avoidance of cyclic bridge-rules application), or may contain inconsistent data sets (local inconsistency, w.r.t. local consistency). A management function is called local consistency (lc-) preserving iff, for every given management base, $kb'_i$ is consistent. It can be proved that a mMCS where all management functions
are lc-preserving is locally consistent. Algorithms for computing equilibria have recently been proposed (see, e.g., [27] and the references therein). Notice that bridge rules are intended to be applied whenever they are applicable. In [19], where mMCS are adapted so as to continuous reasoning in dynamic environments, where contexts’ contents are updated by external input, the notion of a “run” is in fact introduced. A run of mMCS $M$ under a sequence $\text{Obs}_0, \text{Obs}_1, \ldots$ of observations is a sequence $R = \langle S^0, KB^0 \rangle, \langle S^1, KB^1 \rangle \ldots$ such that $\langle S^0, KB^0 \rangle$ is a full equilibrium of $M$ under $\text{Obs}_0$, and for $i > 0$ $\langle S^i, KB^i \rangle$ is a full equilibrium of $M$ under $\text{Obs}_i$, a full equilibrium being obtained by taking the observations into consideration in every context for bridge rules application (as observation literals can occur in bridge rule bodies).

3 Agents as Computational Environments

In the approach that we present here, an agent is equipped with a number of Event-Action modules for performing Complex Event Processing, and with a number of contexts which are known to the agent and to which the agent may resort for gathering information. We assume the agent to be based upon its own underlying logic, and so are the Event-Action modules and the contexts. Different Event-Action modules may be based on different logics, depending upon the task they are supposed to perform: for instance, some modules might be aimed at event interpretation, some others at learning patterns from event occurrences, some others at evaluating possible courses of action, etc.

In order to finalize an agent’s operation, we assume that each Event-Action module admits just one acceptable sets of consequences, differently from MCSs where each context may in principle admit several. In such case, we assume to choose one by means of some kind of selection function. In [19] the problem is mentioned in the conclusions, referring to unwanted sources of non-determinism that may arise. They thus suggest to adopt a global preference criteria to fix the problem, and also mention some existing preference functions that might be exploited. However, as seen below we will take the problem as solved for contexts to which agents are able to refer to, so we will care only about consequences selection for Event-Action modules.

Let a logic $L$ be defined as reported in previous section.

**Definition 1.** Let a preferential logic $L^P$ be a quadruple $(KB_{L^P}; Cn_{L^P}; ACC_{L^P}; P)$ where $ACC_{L^P}$ is a function which selects the “preferred” one among acceptable set of consequences of given knowledge base, according to the preference criterion $P$.

As seen, we leave the preference criterion as an open parameter, as each module may in principle employ a different one. In general, a preference criterion is some kind of device which induces a total order on $Cn_{L^P}$. On one extreme it can even be random choice, though in general domain/application-dependent criteria will be defined.

Similarly to what is done in Linear Time Logic (LTL) we assume a discrete, linear model of time where each state/time instant can be represented by an integer number. States $t_0, t_1, \ldots$ can be seen as time instants in abstract terms, as we have $t_{i+1} - t_i = \delta$, where $\delta$ is the actual interval of time after which we assume a given system to have evolved. In particular, agent systems evolve according to the perception of events (among which we include communications with other agents).
Definition 2. Let $\Pi = \Pi_1, \Pi_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of sets of events, where $\Pi_i$ is assumed to have been perceived by given agent at time $i > 0$. Each event in $\Pi$, say $E$, can be denoted as $E : t_i$ where $t_i$ is a time-stamp indicating time $i$. By $E : [t_i, t_j]$ with $1 \leq i \leq j$ we mean that $E$ persists during an interval, i.e., we have $E : t_s$ for every $i \leq s \leq j$.

A number of expressions can be defined on events, for instance: $E_1, \ldots, E_k : [t_i, t_j]$ to mean that all the $E_i$s, $i \leq k$, persist in given interval; $E_1, \ldots, E_k \setminus E : [t_i, t_j]$ intending that all the $E_i$s persist in given interval, where $E$ does not occur therein. We do not go into the detail, but we assume that some syntax is provided for defining Event Expressions, where each such expression can be evaluated to be true or false w.r.t. $\Pi$.

Definition 3. Let $\Pi = \Pi_1, \Pi_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of sets of events as defined above. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a set of event expressions and let $ev^{\mathcal{E}} : E, \Pi \rightarrow \{\text{true, false}\}$ be an evaluation function which establishes whether $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$ is true/false w.r.t. $\Pi$.

Below we define Event-Action modules, which include an event expression that functions as a trigger, meaning that the module is evaluated whenever the given event expression is entailed by the present event sequence. Event-Action modules may resort to bridge rules for obtaining knowledge from both external contexts, and from the agent’s knowledge base. They elicit, by means of some kind of reasoning, complex events that may have occurred and/or actions that the agent might perform. In case several possibilities arise, preferences are employed to finalize the reasoning.

Definition 4. We let an Event-Action module be defined as $M = (L_M^p, kb_M, br_M, tr_M)$ where $L_M^p$ is a preferential logic, $kb_M \in KB_{L_M^p}$ is a knowledge base and $br_M$ is a set of bridge rules of the form defined for mMCS (seen in previous section). $tr_M$ is an event expression which triggers the module evaluation, belonging to given set $\mathcal{E}$ associated to evaluation function $ev^{\mathcal{E}}$.

Definition 5. An Event-Action module $M$ is active w.r.t. sequence $\Pi$ of sets of events (or simply “active” if leaving $\Pi$ implicit) iff $ev^{\mathcal{E}}(tr_M, \Pi) = \text{true}$, i.e., if $\Pi$ enables the module evaluation.

Complex events and/or actions derived from the module will be included in the set of consequence deriving from its application, that also involves, as seen below, bridge-rules application.

An agent program can be defined in any agent-oriented computational-logic-based programming language, such as, e.g., DALI (cf. [21, 22, 28]), AgentSpeak (cf. [29, 30] and the references therein), GOAL (cf. [31] and the references therein) 3APL (cf. [32] and the references therein), METATEM (cf. [33] and the references therein) or any other agent-oriented language [34], KGP (cf [35] and the references therein). So, to our purposes we provide a very simple general definition of a basic agent, able to encompass any of the mentioned approaches. Only, we add bridge rules, in a form which allows an agent to access contexts, and Event-Action modules results. Precisely, in literals which occur in the the body of such rules we allow expression to appear of the form: (i) $m : ec_m : p$ meaning that Event-Action module $m$ has (not) concluded $p$ as a complex event; $m : acl_m : p$ meaning that Event-Action module $m$ has (not) concluded $p$ as an action to perform.
Definition 6. We let a basic agent be defined as $A = (L_A; kb_A; br_A)$ where $L_A$ is a logic, $kb_A \in KB_{L_A}$ is a knowledge base (encompassing the agent program), and $br_A$ is a set of bridge rules of the form:

$$\sigma(s) \leftarrow B_1, \ldots, B_j, \not\neg C_{j+1}, \ldots, \not\neg C_m.$$ 

where, for $j > 0$, $m \geq 0$, each of the $B$s and $C$s can be in one of the following forms:

(i) $(c : p)$ where $c$ is a context; (ii) $m : ce_m : p$ or $m : act_m : p$ where $M$ is an Event-Action module.

Definition 7. An Agent Computational Environment (ACE) $A$ is a tuple

$$\langle A, M_1, \ldots, M_r, C_1, \ldots, C_s \rangle$$

where, for $r, s \geq 0$, $A$ is a basic agent, the $M$s are Event-Action modules and the $C$s are contexts in the sense of MCSs\(^1\). We put the following restrictions on bridge rule bodies: (i) bridge rules in $A$ are of the form seen above; (ii) both contexts and basic agent $A$ can be mentioned in bodies of bridge rules in the $M$s; (iii) only contexts can be mentioned in bodies of bridge rules in the $C$s.

That is, contexts can only query other contexts; Event-Action modules can query contexts, but also the basic agent (thus, they have some access to its knowledge base); the basic agent can query every component (and will in general interact with the environment and with other agents).

Definition 8. Let $A = \langle A_1, \ldots, A_h \rangle$ be an ACE, defined as above (i.e., the $A$s include the basic agent, and, possibly, Event-Action modules and contexts). A data state of $A$ is a tuple $S = (S_1, \ldots, S_h)$ such that each of the $S$s is an element of $Cn_i$.

As for MCSs, desirable data states are those where each $S_i$ is acceptable according to $ACC_i$ taking bridge rules application into account. However, bridge rules applicability here is different. In fact, it is required that each Event-Action module which is queried is also active.

Definition 9. Let $S$ be a data state of ACE $A$, and let $\Pi$ be a sequence of sets of events. A bridge rule $\rho$ is applicable in $S$ given $\Pi$ iff every Event-Action module mentioned in the body is active w.r.t. $\Pi$, and for every positive literal in the body referring to component $A_i$ the atom occurring therein belongs to $S_i$, and for every negative literal in the body referring to component $A_i$ the atom occurring therein does not belong to $S_i$. Let $app(S, \Pi)$ be the set of bridge rules which are applicable in a data state $S$ w.r.t. sequence of events $\Pi$.

We can extend to ACEs the definition of equilibrium already provided for MCSs.

Definition 10. A data state $S = (S_1, \ldots, S_n)$ of ACE $A$ is an equilibrium w.r.t. sequence of sets of events $\Pi$, denoted as $\Xi^\Pi_A$, iff for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $kb_i = S_i \in ACC_i(\text{msg}_i(app(S, \Pi), kb_i)).$

---

\(^1\) The acronym “ACE” emerged by chance: nevertheless, with the occasion the author wishes to dedicate the ACE approach to the memory of Alan Turing.
where for every component based upon a preferential logic (i.e., at least Event-Action modules) $ACC_i$ is, as said before, univocal. It is easy to see that if the set of contexts included in ACE $A$ constitutes in itself an mMCS which admits equilibria, then also $A$ does so. As soon as the sequence of set of events acquires more elements over time, this determines new equilibria to be formed.

**Definition 11.** Given ACE $A$ and sequence of sets of events $II = II_1, II_2, \ldots, P_k, \ldots$, the corresponding ACE-Evolution is the sequence of equilibria $\Xi_A^{II_1}, \Xi_A^{II_1, II_2}, \ldots, \Xi_A^{II_1, II_2, \ldots, P_k}, \ldots$

This implies that each Event-Action module is either evaluated or not in different stages of an ACE’s evolution. In case a bridge rule queries a module which at that stage is not active, no result will be returned. This is a departure from MCSs, where each literal in a bridge rules is supposed to always evaluate to either true or false. In case of ACEs, some bridge rules will be “idle” at some evolution stages, i.e., unable to return results. Results may anyway have been returned previously or may be returned later, whenever the involved modules become active. Event-Action modules might be for instance defined in ETALIS, or in Reactive Answer Set Programming [36], or in Abductive Logic Programming or in many other formalisms.

For lack of space we cannot discuss verification. However we may notice that by adopting LTL (i.e., Linear Temporal Logic), interesting properties of an ACE can be defined and verified. For instance, for proposition $\varphi$ it can be checked whether $\varphi$ holds for agent $A$ in some equilibrium reached at a certain time or within some time interval.

### 4 Event-Action Modules in DALI and ASP

The ACE framework is especially aimed at designing agent-based computational environments involving heterogeneous components. Purposely, the proposal does not make assumptions about the logics and the preference rules the various component are based upon. In order to make the proposal less abstract by demonstrating its practical applicability, in this section we however report about an experiment that we have been developing in DALI, where: the basic agent is a DALI agent; contexts are simple Prolog knowledge bases; Event-Action modules are defined in a DALI-like syntax, and are then translated into Answer Set Programming (ASP), and thus executed by means of the ASP plugin which has been integrated into the DALI interpreter. ASP is in fact quite suitable for obtaining plausible scenarios from a set of constraints, and several approaches to preferences have been defined for ASP: cf., e.g., [19] and the references therein, and also [37–39] and [40, 41]).

In the examples below syntax is reminiscent of DALI, which is a Prolog-like language with predicates in lowercase and variables in uppercase. Postfix $E$ designs a predicate as an event, postfix $A$ as an action. Special keywords indicate, for the convenience of programmers and readers, different parts of each module. However, there is no special reason for adopting these keywords rather than a different syntax.
4.1 Examples of Event-Action Modules

Deriving Complex Events
The following example illustrates an Event-Action Module evaluating symptoms of either pneumonia, or just flu, or both (clearly, we do not aim at medical precision). An Event-Action Module will be activated whenever the triggering events occur within a certain time interval, and according to specific conditions: in the example, the module is evaluated whenever in the last two days both high temperature and intense cough have been recorded. For the sake of conciseness the example is propositional, thus referring to an unidentified single patient. In general, it might refer to any patient/person $P$.

EVENT-ACTION-MODULE diagnosis

TRIGGER
$(\text{high}\_\text{temperature}_E \ \text{AND} \ \text{intense}\_\text{cough}_E) : [2\text{days}]$

COMPLEX EVENTS
$suspend\_flu$ OR $suspend\_pneumonia$
$suspend\_flu : high\_temperature_P$.  
$suspend\_pneumonia : high\_temperature_P: [4\text{days}], \text{intense}\_\text{cough}_P$.  
$suspend\_pneumonia : diagnosis(\text{clinical}\_\text{history}, \text{suspend}\_pneumonia) : diag\_knowledge\_base$.

PREFERENCES
$suspend\_flu : patient\_is\_healthy$.  
$suspend\_pneumonia : patient\_is\_at\_risk$.

ACTIONS
stay\_in\_bed$A : suspend\_flu$.  
$\text{take}\_\text{antibiotic}_A : suspend\_flu$.  
$\text{high}\_\text{temperature}_P: [4\text{days}], \text{not}\ suspend\_pneumonia$.  
$\text{take}\_\text{antibiotic}_A : suspend\_pneumonia$.  
$\text{consult}\_\text{lung}\_\text{doctor}_A : suspend\_pneumonia$.

MANDATORY
$suspend\_pneumonia : high\_temperature_P: [4\text{days}]$.  
$suspend\_flu_P, \text{take}\_\text{antibiotic}_P : [2\text{days}]$.

From given symptoms, either a suspect flu or a suspect pneumonia or both can be derived. This is stated in the COMPLEX EVENTS section, which in general lists the complex events that the module might infer from the given definition. For suspecting pneumonia high temperature should have lasted for at least four days, accompanied by intense cough. Pneumonia is also suspected if the patient’s clinical history suggests this might be the case. This is an example of a bridge rule, as the analysis of clinical history is demanded to an external context, here indicated as $diag\_knowledge\_base$. Notice that, in our implementation, every predicate not defined within the module is obtained from the agent’s knowledge base via a standard bridge rule, that might look, for agent $A_g$, of the form $A : A_g$. As stated before in fact, in an ACE every Event-Action module has access, via bridge rules, to the basic agent knowledge base.

Explicit preferences are expressed in the PREFERENCES section. A conclusion is preferred if the conditions are true: therefore, in this case it is stated that hypothesizing a flu should be preferred in case the patient is healthy, while pneumonia is the preferred option for risky patients. Actions to undertake in the two cases are specified, and the agent can access them via bridge rules. In this case, if a flu is suspected then the patient...
should stay in bed, and if the high temperature persists then an antibiotic should also be assumed (even if pneumonia is not suspected). In case of suspect pneumonia, an antibiotic is mandatory, plus a consult with a lung doctor.

The MANDATORY section of the module includes constraints, that may be of various kinds: in this case, it specifies which complex events must be mandatorily inferred in module (re)evaluations if certain conditions occur. Specifically, pneumonia is to be assumed mandatorily whenever flu has been previously assumed, but high temperature persists despite at least two days of antibiotic therapy (postfix $P$ indicates events perceived in the past).

**Monitoring the Environment** The next Event-Action-module models an agent’s behavior if encountering a traffic light. The triggering events are the presence of the traffic light, and the color of the traffic light as perceived by the agent. The objective of the module is to assess whether the observed color is correct (CHECK section), to detect and manage possible anomalies, and to determine what to do then. The module evaluates as correct any color which is either red or yellow or green. Section ANOMALIES detects violations to the the expected color or color sequence which is, namely, yellow after green, red after yellow and green after red. Actions for both the normal and anomalous case are specified. Postfix $P$ indicates previous value of an event.

Thus if the agent meets a traffic light which is, say, red, then the agent stops, and the event \( \text{colorE}(\text{tl}, \text{red}) \) is recorded as a past event \( \text{colorP}(\text{tl}, \text{red}) \). If, after some little while, the event \( \text{colorE}(\text{tl}, \text{green}) \) arrives, then the module is re-evaluated and the agent passes. The ANOMALIES section copes with two cases: (i) the color is incorrect, e.g., the traffic light might be dark or flashing; (ii) the agent has observed the traffic light for a while, and the color sequence is incorrect. This is deduced by comparing the present color \( \text{colorE}(\text{tl}, c) \) with previous color \( \text{colorP}(\text{tl}, c') \). Actions to undertake in case of anomaly are defined, that in the example imply passing with caution and reporting to the police in the former case, and choosing another route and reporting to the police in the latter. Anomaly detection is in our opinion relevant, as anomalies in event occurrence may be considered themselves as particular (and sometimes important) instances of complex events.

**EVENT-ACTION-MODULE traffic**

\[
\text{TRIGGER} \ \text{traffic_lightE}(\text{tl}) \ \text{AND} \ \text{colorE}(\text{tl}, C)\\
\text{CHECK}\\
\text{color_ok}(\text{tl}, C), C = \text{red} \ \text{XOR}\\
\text{color_ok}(\text{tl}, C), C = \text{green} \ \text{XOR}\\
\text{color_ok}(\text{tl}, C), C = \text{yellow} : - \text{colorE}(\text{tl}, C)\\
\text{ANOMALIES}\\
\text{anomaly1}(\text{tl}) :-\\
\text{colorE}(\text{tl}, C), \text{not color_ok}(\text{tl}, C).\\
\text{anomaly2}(\text{tl}) :-\\
\text{colorE}(\text{tl}, \text{red}), \text{not colorP}(\text{tl}, \text{yellow}).\\
\text{anomaly2}(\text{tl}) :-\\
\text{colorE}(\text{tl}, \text{yellow}), \text{not colorP}(\text{tl}, \text{green}).\\
\text{anomaly2}(\text{tl}) :-\\
\text{colorE}(\text{tl}, \text{green}), \text{not colorP}(\text{tl}, \text{red}).
\]
**ACTIONS**

stopA :- color(ok(tl, red)).
stopA :- color(ok(tl, yellow)).
passA :- color(ok(tl, green)).

**ANOMALY_MANAGEMENT_ACTIONS**

pass_with CautionA,
report_to_policeA(tl) :- anomaly1(tl).
stopA,
change_wayA,
report_to_policeA(tl) :- anomaly2(tl).

**Generating Complex Actions**

The last example is related to what happens when two persons meet. In such a situation, it is possible that the one who first sees the other smiles, and then either simply waves or stops to shake hands: section RELATED EVENTS specifies, as a boolean combination, events that may occur contextually to the triggering ones. There are some conditions, for instance that one possibly smiles and/or waves if (s)he is neither in a bad temper nor angry at the other. Also, one who is in a hurry just waves, while good friends or people who meet each other in a formal setting should shake hands. Actions simply consist in returning what the other one does, and it is anomalous not doing so (e.g., if one smiles and the other does not smile back). In the formalization below, the expression meet_friend(A, F) means that agent A meets agent F: then, each one possibly makes some actions and the other one will normally respond. This module is totally revertible, in the sense that it manages both the case where “we” meet a friend and the case where vice versa somebody else meets us. This is the reason why in some module sections events have no postfixes. In fact, meet_friend(A, F), smile, wave and shake_hands are present events if a friend meets “us”, and are actions if “we” meet a friend.

Postfixes appear in the ACTIONS and ANOMALY sections, where all elements (whatever their origin) have become past events to be coped with. The PRECONDITIONS section expresses action preconditions, via connective :< . Section MANDATORY defines obligations, here via a rule stating that it is mandatory to shake hands in a formal situation. The anomaly management section may include counter-measures to be taken in case of unexpected behavior, that in the example may go from asking for explanation to getting angry, etc.

**EVENT-ACTION-MODULE meet**

**TRIGGER** meet_friend(A, F).

**RELATED EVENTS**

smile(A, F) OR
(wave(A, F) XOR shake_hands(A, F))

**PRECONDITIONS**

smile(A, F) :< not angry(A, F), not bad_temper(A).
wave(A, F) :< not angry(A, F).
shake_hands(A, F) :<
  good_friends(A, F),
  not angry(A, F), not in_a_hurry(A), not in_a_hurry(F).

**MANDATORY**

shake_hands(A, F) :- formal_situation(A, F).
4.2 ASP Representation of DALI Event-Action Modules

Each Event-Action module can be translated in a fully automated way into an ASP module. Sections ACTIONS, ANOMALY_MANAGEMENT_ACTIONS and PRECONDITIONS, do not even need translation, as they include only plain logic programming rules. The way of evaluating Event-Action modules within the DALI ACE basic functioning is the following.

– At each agent’s evolution step, i.e., when new events have been perceived, ASP modules corresponding to Event-Action modules are (re-)evaluated given the history of all events perceived, and the agent’s current knowledge base. It is required to evaluate whether the condition in the TRIGGER headline is satisfied, which is specified in terms of a boolean combination of present and/or past events. DALI is equipped with timestamps and time intervals as is thus able to perform the evaluation.

– A module will admit as a result of evaluation none, one or more answer sets. Non-existence of answer sets can result from constraint violation, and implies that no reaction to triggering events can be determined at present.

– If the module admits answer sets, one answer set among the available ones must be selected. Answer set selection is performed according to the preferences expressed in section PREFERENCES. If there are answer sets which are equally preferred, the current solution in the prototypical implementation is random choice.

The answer set programming (module) II corresponding to a given Event-Action module is obtained by translating into ASP the contents of sections COMPLEX_EVENTS, CHECK, RELATED_EVENTS, ANOMALIES and MANDATORY. The translation can be fully defined and automated. In particular, it can be performed by exploiting the following ASP patterns. Notice that we do not need stream or reactive answer set programming, as triggers and time intervals are coped with by the underlying DALI interpreter, while each module is evaluated in the standard ASP fashion whenever the conditions for doing so occur.
**conj** In ASP, the conjunction among a number of elements $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ is simply expressed as $\text{conj} \leftarrow a_1, \ldots, a_n$.

**or-xor** Disjunction among two elements $a$ and $b$ is expressed by the cycle $a \leftarrow b \ b \leftarrow a$. This disjunction is not exclusive, since either $a$ or $b$ or both might be derived elsewhere in the program. To obtain exclusive disjunction, a constraint $\leftarrow a, b$ must be added. A constraint in ASP can be read as *it cannot be that.* In the case of exclusive disjunction, it cannot be that both $a$ and $b$ belong to the same answer set. Disjunction (also exclusive) can be expressed also on several elements.

**choice** Choice, or possibility, or hypothesis, expressing that some element $a$ may or may not be included in an answer set, can be expressed by means of a cycle involving a fresh atom, say $na$. The cycle is of the form $a \leftarrow na \ na \leftarrow a$. Therefore, an answer set will contain either $a$ or $na$, the latter signifying the absence of $a$.

**choyf** Makes the choice pattern stronger: element $a$ can be in fact chosen only if certain conditions $\text{Conds}$ are satisfied, is expressed by a choice pattern plus a rule $c \leftarrow \text{Conds}$ and a constraint $\leftarrow a, \text{not c}$. The constraint states that $a$ cannot be hypothesized in an answer set if $c$ does not hold, i.e., if $\text{Conds}$ are not implied by that answer set.

**mand** Mandatory presence in an answer set of atom $a$ defined by rule $a \leftarrow \text{Body}$ whenever $\text{Body}$ is implied by that answer set can be obtained as follows. In addition to the defining rule $a \leftarrow \text{Body}$, a constraint must be added of the form $\leftarrow \text{not a, Body}$ stating that it cannot be that an answer set implies $\text{Body}$ but does not contain $a$. The constraint is necessary for preventing $a$ to be ruled out by some other condition occurring elsewhere in the program.

Specifically, the translation can be performed by means of the following guidelines (a full and formal definition of the translation, not possible here for lack of space, is deferred to an extended version of this paper).

- Events in the RELATED EVENTS section can be expressed by means of the choice pattern, and their combinations via the conj and or-xor patterns. Constraints in the MANDATORY can be expressed by means of the mand pattern.
- Section COMPLEX EVENTS is coped with by the choice and choyf patterns.
- Sections CHECK and ANOMALIES can be translated by a plain transposition of their rules into ASP, possibly exploiting the conj and or-xor patterns.

## 5 Related Work Concluding Remarks

In this paper we have proposed ACE, as a framework for the design of component-based agent-oriented environments where a “main” agent program, the basic agent, is enriched with a number of Event-Action modules for Complex Event Processing and complex actions generation, and with a number of external data sources it can access. These components are in principle heterogeneous, though we assume them to be based upon Computational Logic. We have proposed a formalization and a semantics for ACE. We have also discussed a prototypical experimentation of the approach in the DALI agent-oriented programming language employing ASP as a plugin.
A research work which is related to the present one is DyKnow [42], a knowledge processing middleware framework providing software support for creating streams representing high-level events concerning aspects of the past, current, and future state of a system. Input is gathered from distributed sources, can be processed at many different levels of abstraction, and finally transformed into suitable forms to be used by reasoning functionalities. A knowledge process specification is understood as a function. DyKnow is fully implemented, and has been experimented in UAVs (unmanned aerial vehicles) applications. ACE can be considered as a generalization of such work, in that ACE is: (i) agent-oriented; (ii) aimed at managing heterogeneity in the definition/description of knowledge sources, that moreover can interact among themselves and with external sources; (iii) aimed at providing a uniform semantics of single components and of the overall system; (iv) aimed at allowing for verification of properties.

Several future directions are ahead of us. First of all, preferences are one way of selecting among plausible alternatives. However, we plan to consider also informed choice deriving from a learning process: i.e., an agent should learn with experience what is the “best” interpretation to give to a situation, or which are the preference criteria to (dynamically) adopt. Learning should be a never-ending process, as different outcomes might be more plausible in different contexts and situations. Verification of ACE systems is a very relevant aspect to be coped with. We believe that both a priori verification and run-time assurance should be combined for ensuring desirable properties of this kind of systems. Formalization and verification of MASs (Multi-Agent Systems) composed of ACE agents is a further important issue that we intend to consider.
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Abstract. In the contemporary autonomous systems the role of complex interactions such as (possibly relaxed) dialogues is increasing significantly. A diversity of dialogue types: information seeking, inquiry, persuasion, negotiation or deliberation, allows agents to achieve various communicative goals. In particular inquiry aims at the growth of collective knowledge when solving a theoretic problem, and therefore is vital in information-rich environments, such as multi-agent systems. Moreover, aiming at a realistic approach towards modeling agency, incomplete and possibly contradictory information has to be considered.
In this paper we provide a paraconsistent and paracomplete implementation of inquiry dialogue under realistic assumptions regarding availability and quality of information. Various inquiry strategies for dealing with unsure and inconsistent information are analyzed, leading to different dialogue outcomes. These outcomes are further evaluated against the (paraconsistent and paracomplete) distributed beliefs of the group.
A specific 4-valued logic underpins the presented framework. Thanks to the qualities of the implementation tool: a rule-based query language 4QL, our solution is both expressive and tractable.

1 Paraconsistent Nonmonotonic Dialogues

The synergistic effect of collaborating agents is much attainable by their proper communication. However, in dynamic and unpredictable environments up-to-date, sure and complete information is hardly obtainable. This typically leads to conflicts, uncertainty and paracompleteness, particularly when handling information originating from multiple sources of diverse credibility, quality or significance. In the current paper we develop a new approach to logical modeling of conversing agents, assuming that they are prepared to handle inconsistency and lack of information. Therefore a non-classical logic is needed, preferably a paraconsistent and paracomplete one. Introducing two new truth values: unknown (u) and inconsistent (i) promotes fulfillment of this requirement.
In line with other paraconsistent (i.e., tolerating inconsistency) approaches to modeling dialogues [24, 20, 4], inconsistency does not immediately trivialize reasoning and is treated as first-class citizen along with true (t) and false (f). Specifically the following choices have been made in our approach.

– The solution is based on the four-valued logic of [23], which provides intuitive results\(^1\) in realistic modeling of agency.

\(^1\)To model phenomena such as lack and inconsistency of information, a commonly used logic is Belnap’s four-valued logic (see N.D. Belnap. A useful four-valued logic. 1977). However,
- Obtainment of undecided, unknown or inconsistent conclusions does not enforce termination of the reasoning process.
- Such conclusions can be handled using various nonmonotonic methods or possibly their combinations. However, this does not necessarily lead to knowledge completion or disambiguation.

Entailment in logic amounts to deriving conclusion on the bases of theories that can be seen as complex knowledge bases. To reduce complexity, rather than querying arbitrary theories, we tailor them to their tractable version, like specific rule-based knowledge bases. Thus, instead of reasoning in logical systems of high complexity, we query paraconsistent knowledge bases. (For example we do not expect robots to prove theorems but rather to act on the grounds of their knowledge bases.) Only recently has a tool existed that allows for creation of paraconsistent belief bases and for querying them in polynomial time: 4QL - a DATALOG-like four-valued rule-based query language.

The research methodology sketched above is a foundation of a series of papers on modeling communication in multi-agent systems. This paper’s contribution is an implementation of a tractable, paraconsistent and paracomplete multi-party inquiry dialogue suitable for agents situated in information-rich environments. The goal of inquiry is to collectively solve a theoretic problem. Such a dialogue typically aims at widening the common knowledge of the group of agents. Therefore, it becomes a powerful tool for multi-agent systems, where it is a common situation that agents are ignorant about the solution to some question or open problem.

As an example, consider a multi-agent system that consists of a group of diverse swarm agents, each specialized in gathering different type of information via a system of questionnaires (or polls), and an assistant agent whose goal is to find or verify certain information for the human user. Assume that the human user wants to know whether it is safe to travel to place X at the moment (safe(X))? Suppose, none of the individual agents knows the answer to that question. Engaging in inquiry on the topic safe(X) will allow agents to share only the relevant pieces of their (possibly) vast knowledge and collectively arrive at a conclusion which would serve as a recommendation for the human user. In such dialogues conflicts may naturally appear on many different levels [9]: in the information available to individual agents, between different agents in areas we focus on it often provides results deviating from intuitions (see [8, 27] for details).

Consider the following example recalled after [17]. Assume a family owns two cars: a and b. The question, whether the family has a safe car corresponds to the logical value of the expression safe(a) ∨ safe(b). Car a has gone through safety tests at two different stations s1 and s2. It has passed the safety tests at s1 but failed the tests at s2. Car b has not gone through any safety test yet. The results of the tests determine the truth values of safe(a) and safe(b): safe(a) has the value i while safe(b) has the value t. If the join operation ∨ is defined by Belnap’s truth ordering, then safe(a) ∨ safe(b) = i ∨ t = t. However, the safety of car a is unclear, since the results of both safety tests are contradictory, and we know nothing about safety of car b! A more intuitive result here would be i. Asking instead, if all cars of the family are safe, safe(a) ∧ safe(b), evaluates to f in Belnap’s logic (i ∧ u). However, actually we do not have any information about the safety of car b. If in reality it would have failed the safety tests then the expression above would evaluate to f. But, if car b would have passed the tests then the expression would become i. Therefore, the above case seems to be better described by u than by the answer obtained in the Belnap’s logic.
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and between agents and groups. Notice however that it is not the goal of inquiry but rather persuasion to resolve such conflicts.

In contrast to the classical case [30], our treatment of inquiry permits 4-valued statements. Based on the initial valuation of the statement to prove, two types of inquiry are distinguished: Inquiry-What and Inquiry-That. In this context several inquiry strategies to handle missing and inconsistent information are investigated and their formal properties and computational complexity results are provided. Specifically, the outcomes of inquiry dialogues conducted under the proposed strategies are compared against the (possibly inconsistent and incomplete) distributed knowledge of the conversing group [12]. In this regard the soundness of a strategy means that whenever a dialogue terminates with a given conclusion, this very conclusion would be obtained by an individual whose knowledge base is the union of all the agents belief bases. On the contrary, completeness of the strategy means that if a solution is obtainable from the union of agents beliefs, the inquiry under such strategy will reach it. Accordingly, the main result of this paper is Theorem 4 about soundness and completeness of the open-minded inquiry strategy.

Enriching the modeling perspective usually allows to us contemplate several new cognitive situations when considering communication (see e.g., [11]). Such effect occurs also in the context of inquiry. Our results imply that the normative models of dialogues should be reconsidered in the 4-valued approach.

The paper is structured as follows. First, in Section 2, the necessary notions from theory of [16, 23] underpinning our solution are recalled. Section 3 is dedicated to our formalization of inquiry dialogue, its strategies and properties. Finally, discussion and conclusions are given in Section 4.

2 Language and Implementation Tool

The following definitions are adapted from [16, 23], where more intuition and examples can be found. In what follows all sets are finite except for sets of formulas. We deal with the classical first-order language over a given vocabulary without function symbols. We assume that Const is a fixed set of constants, Var is a fixed set of variables and Rel is a fixed set of relation symbols.

Definition 1. A literal is an expression of the form $R(\bar{\tau})$ or $\neg R(\bar{\tau})$, $\bar{\tau}$ being a sequence of parameters, $\bar{\tau} \in (\text{Const} \cup \text{Var})^k$, where $k$ is the arity of $R \in \text{Rel}$.

Ground literals over Const, denoted by $\mathcal{G}(\text{Const})$, are literals without variables, with all constants in Const. If $\ell = \neg R(\bar{\tau})$ then $\neg \ell \overset{\text{def}}{=} R(\bar{\tau})$.

Though we use classical first-order syntax, the semantics substantially differs from the classical one as truth values $t, i, u, f$ (true, inconsistent, unknown, false) are explicitly present; the semantics is based on sets of ground literals rather than on relational structures. The intuition behind these four logical values is the following:

- $a$ is $t$: fact $a$ holds (all sources claim $a$),
- $a$ is $i$: fact $a$ does not hold (all sources claim $\neg a$),
- $a$ is $u$: it is not known whether $a$ holds (no sources claim $a$ nor $\neg a$),
- $a$ is $i$: information about $a$ is inconsistent (some sources claim $a$, other claim $\neg a$).
The semantics of propositional connectives is summarized in Table 1. The definitions of \( \land \) and \( \lor \) reflect minimum and maximum with respect to the ordering:

\[
f < u < i < t,
\]

as argued in [2]. Whenever truth values are restricted to \( \{ f, t \} \), the semantics is compatible with the semantics of the classical first-order logic.

Table 1: Truth tables for \( \land, \lor, \rightarrow \) and \( \neg \) (see [23, 16]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Truth Value</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \land )</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lor )</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rightarrow )</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \neg )</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let \( v : \text{Var} \rightarrow \text{Const} \) be a valuation of variables. For a literal \( \ell \), by \( \ell(v) \) we mean the ground literal obtained from \( \ell \) by substituting each variable \( x \) occurring in \( \ell \) by constant \( v(x) \).

**Definition 2.** The truth value \( \ell(L, v) \) of a literal \( \ell \) w.r.t. a set of ground literals \( L \) and valuation \( v \), is defined by:

\[
\ell(L, v) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 
  t & \text{if } \ell(v) \in L \text{ and } (\neg \ell(v)) \not\in L; \\
  i & \text{if } \ell(v) \in L \text{ and } (\neg \ell(v)) \in L; \\
  u & \text{if } \ell(v) \not\in L \text{ and } (\neg \ell(v)) \not\in L; \\
  f & \text{if } \ell(v) \not\in L \text{ and } (\neg \ell(v)) \in L.
\end{cases}
\]

For a formula \( \alpha(x) \) with a free variable \( x \) and \( c \in \text{Const} \), by \( \alpha(x)^c \) we understand the formula obtained from \( \alpha \) by substituting all free occurrences of \( x \) by \( c \). Definition 2 is extended to all formulas in Table 2, where \( \alpha \) denotes a first-order formula, \( v \) is a valuation of variables, \( L \) is a set of ground literals, and the semantics of propositional connectives appearing at righthand sides of equivalences is given in Table 1.

The rule-based query language 4QL [23] allows for negation both in premises and conclusions of rules. In particular, negation in rule heads may lead to inconsistencies. Even though openness of the world is assumed, rules can be used to close it locally or globally. In 4QL, beliefs are distributed among modules. Each module can be treated as a finite set of literals. If \( S \) is a set, then \( \text{FIN}(S) \) represents the set of all finite subsets of \( S \). In what follows let \( \mathbb{C} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \text{FIN}(\mathcal{G}(\text{Const})) \) be the set of all finite sets of ground literals over constants in \( \text{Const} \).

For specifying rules and querying modules, we adapt the language of [23], where the notion of multisource formulas was defined as follows.
Table 2: Semantics of first-order formulas.

- if $\alpha$ is a literal then $\alpha(L,v)$ is defined in Definition 2;
- $(\neg \alpha)(L,v) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \neg(\alpha(L,v))$;
- $(\alpha \circ \beta)(L,v) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \alpha(L,v) \circ \beta(L,v)$, where $\circ \in \{\lor, \land, \to\}$;
- $(\forall x \alpha(x))(L,v) = \min_{a \in \text{Const}} (\alpha_x^a)(L,v)$, where $\min$ is the minimum w.r.t. ordering (1);
- $(\exists x \alpha(x))(L,v) = \max_{a \in \text{Const}} (\alpha_x^a)(L,v)$, where $\max$ is the maximum w.r.t. ordering (1).

Definition 3. A **multisource formula** is an expression of the form: $m.A$ or $m.A \in T$, where:
- $m$ is a module name;
- $A$ is a first-order or a multisource formula;
- $T \subseteq \{t, i, u, f\}$.

We write $m.A = v$ (respectively, $m.A \neq v$) to stand for $m.A \in \{v\}$ (respectively, $m.A \notin \{v\}$).

The intuitive meaning of a multisource formula $m.A$ is:

“return the answer to query expressed by formula $A$, computed within the context of module $m$.”

The value of ‘$m.A \in T$’ is:

\[
\begin{cases}
    t & \text{when the truth value of } A \text{ in } m \text{ is in the set } T; \\
    f & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

Let $A(X_1, \ldots, X_k)$ be a multisource formula with $X_1, \ldots, X_k$ being its all free variables and $D$ be a finite set of literals (a belief base). Then $A$, understood as a query, returns tuples $\langle d_1, \ldots, d_k, tv \rangle$, where $d_1, \ldots, d_k$ are database domain elements and the value of $A(d_1, \ldots, d_k)$ in $D$ is $tv$.

Definition 4.

- **Rules** are expressions of the form:

\[
\ell :\leftarrow b_{11}, \ldots, b_{1i_1} \mid \ldots \mid b_{m1}, \ldots, b_{mi_m},
\]  

(2)

where the conclusion $\ell$ is a positive or negative literal and the premises $b_{11}, \ldots, b_{1i_1}, \ldots, b_{m1}, \ldots, b_{mi_m}$ are multisource formulas and ‘,’ and ‘|’ abbreviate conjunction and disjunction, respectively.
- A **fact** is a rule with empty premisses (such premisses are evaluated to $t$).
- A **module** is a syntactic entity encapsulating a finite number of facts and rules.
A 4QL program is a set of modules, where it is assumed that there are no cyclic references to modules involving multisource formulas of the form $m.A \in T$.

Notice that it is the concept of modules and multisource formulas that allows us to deal with unknown or inconsistent conclusions without enforcing termination of the reasoning process.

The semantics of 4QL is defined by well-supported models [16, 23], i.e., models consisting of (positive or negative) ground literals, where each literal is a conclusion of a derivation starting from facts. For any set of rules, such a model is uniquely determined and computable in deterministic polynomial time.

**Definition 5.** Let $P$ be a 4QL program, $A$ a formula, and $M_P$ the well-supported (unique) model of $P$. Then: $P \models A$ iff for any valuation $v$ we have $M_P \models v(A)$.

As an example, consider program $P = \{\text{top}, \text{su}\}$:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{top} &= \{ \text{enter}(b) \leftarrow \text{isAt}(s,b), \neg\text{has}(s,h), \} , \\
\text{isAt}(s,b) &\leftarrow \text{isArmed}(s) , \text{hearShotsAt}(b) , \\
\text{isAt}(s,b) &\leftarrow \text{su} . \text{isAt}(s,b) \in \{u,i,t\} , \\
&\quad \neg\text{has}(s,h) , \\
\text{isArmed}(s) \}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{su} = \{ \text{isAt}(s,b) \leftarrow \text{see}(s,b), \neg\text{conditions}(\text{fog}) , \\
&\quad \text{see}(s,b), \\
&\quad \neg\text{conditions}(\text{fog}) \}
\]

The program $P$ consists of two modules: $\text{top}$ and $\text{su}$ (for surveillance). The literals $s, b, h$ represent suspect, building and hostage, respectively. The program uniquely determines the following well-supported model for module $\text{su}$:

\[
M_{\text{su}} = \{ \neg\text{conditions}(\text{fog}), \text{see}(s,b), \text{isAt}(s,b) \}
\] (4)

and the following well-supported model for module $\text{top}$:

\[
M_{\text{top}} = \{ \text{enter}(b), \neg\text{enter}(b), \text{isAt}(s,b), \\
&\quad \text{isArmed}(s), \text{has}(s,h), \neg\text{has}(s,h) \}. 
\] (5)

**Definition 6.** Let $\ell$ be a ground literal and $P$ a 4QL program. A derivation of $\ell$ from $P$, denoted $P \vdash \ell$ is a finite sequence of ground (multisource) literals $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n$ where $\gamma_n = \ell$ such that for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$:

- $\gamma_i$ is either a fact in $P$, or
- there is a rule in $P$ with head $\gamma_i$ and body $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k$ such that every (multisource) literal in the body is an element of the sequence $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{i-1}$.

To implement dialogues the functionality of adding a rule to a 4QL program is required.

**Definition 7.** We define an operation of adding a rule $M_i, \ell :\! :\!\! - \! b$ to a 4QL program $P = \{M_1, \ldots, M_n\}$ as follows:

\[
P' = P \cup \{M_i, \ell :\!\!\!\! - \! b\} = \{M_1, \ldots, M_{i-1}, M_i \cup \ell :\!\!\!\! - \! b, M_{i+1}, \ldots, M_n\}
\]
3 Inquiry

The purpose of inquiry is to collectively solve a theoretical problem [30]. In multi-agent systems, inquiry "starts when some agents are ignorant about the solution to some question or open problem. The main goal is the growth of knowledge, leading to agreement about the conclusive answer of the question. This goal may be attained in many different ways, including an incremental process of argument which builds on established facts in drawing conclusions beyond a reasonable doubt. Both information retrieval and reasoning may be intensively used in this process" [10]. In its paradigmatic form, inquiry seeks to prove a statement as true or false. In such setting, inquiry has the property of cumulativeness: "once a statement has been accepted as true at any point in the argumentation stage of the inquiry, that statement must remain true at every point in the inquiry through the argumentation stage until the closing stage is reached" [31]. However, in real-world situations such requirement is too strong and unrealistic. A more relaxed version of cumulativeness can be found in [4], where agent's beliefs do not change during the dialogue. We are making the same assumption here.

Although the classical inquiry focuses on proving or disproving a statement \( s \), our paraconsistent and paracomplete framework allows for contemplating other possibilities, like the following questions and corresponding 4QL formulas:

1. 'prove that suspect is at home': \( \text{isAt(suspect,home)} = t \)
2. 'prove that suspect is not at home': \( \text{isAt(suspect,home)} = f \)
3. 'is suspect at home?': \( \text{isAt(suspect,home)} = u \)
4. 'where is the suspect?': \( \text{isAt(suspect,Loc)} \in \{t,i\} \)

While undoubtedly (1) and (2) are obvious inquiry goals, the interpretation of the last two is not that straightforward. Until valuation for (3) is established, no classical inquiry on this subject (finding a proof) can commence. This scenario resembles discovery dialogue, where what we want to discover is not previously known, and "the question whose truth is to be ascertained may only emerge in the course of the dialogue itself" [18]. In our setting, the dialogue aiming at discovering the value of a statement is just another variation of inquiry, so is structured exactly the same. Thus, two types of inquiry dialogues are distinguished:

1. Inquiry-WHAT, where initial valuation of \( s \) is \( u \) and the goal of the dialogue is to establish the valuation \( v_f \) of \( s \).
2. Inquiry-THAT, where initial valuation of \( s \) is \( t, f \) or \( i \), and the goal of the dialogue is to confirm or refute this by providing the proof for \( s \).

Inquiry-WHAT succeeds if \( v_f \neq u \) and Inquiry-THAT succeeds if the final valuation \( v_f \) is equal to the initial valuation of \( s \). An outcome of a successful inquiry is the valuation of the goal and the proof of it.

Recall that we are dealing with a 4-valued logic, where except for \( t \) and \( f \), there are - equally meaningful - \( u \) and \( i \) truth values. Please note that identifying formulas which have unknown or inconsistent valuations e.g., "\( \text{isAt(suspect,home)} = u \)" with expressions of the form "\( \text{isAt(suspect,home)} = u \in \{t,f\} \)" is not intended.
A common approach to modeling inquiry is maintaining two stores (see, e.g. [4, 22] and references therein): a Commitment Store \((CS)\), reflecting the current accumulated belief base, and a Query Store \((QS)\), reflecting current open questions. The Commitment Store is usually associated with each individual agent while the Query Store is associated with the dialogue \((CS_d, QS_d)\). We maintain both stores associated with the dialogue and do not make any assumptions about agents keeping their own Commitment Stores. Further, our Commitment Store does not only consist of beliefs but also of reasoning rules. It is created empty when the dialogue begins (as no locutions have been uttered yet) and updated with every assertion relevant to dialogue. In short, the inquiry Commitment Store is just an evolving 4QL program (see also [1]).

We assume that agents assert only relevant information, i.e., rules whose conclusions match the current entries in \(QS\). For a literal \(l \in QS\), relevant responses would include both \(l \vdash b\) and\( \neg l \vdash b\). Accordingly, two locutions crucial to inquiry are:

- **assert**\((S_i, r, d)\): participant \(S_i\) asserts a rule \(r\) in the dialogue \(d\). If the rule is relevant, it is added to \(CS_d\) and its premises are added to \(QS_d\).
- **requestAll**\((S_i, d)\): participant \(S_i\) requests the content of \(QS_d\).

**Definition 8.** Locution \(m^t\) is relevant to inquiry dialogue \(d\) at time \(t\) iff \(m^t = assert(S_i, M_i \cdot \ell \vdash b^\prime, d)\) and \((\neg)M_i \cdot \ell \in QS^t_d\), where \(QS^t_d\) is the Query Store of \(d\) at time \(t\). We will alternate between the notions of locution, message, move and utterance.

The assumption about relevance of the locutions can be replaced by a filtering mechanism. Then, instead of requiring that agents make specific moves, we allow them to utter any locutions, filtering out the irrelevant ones\(^3\). This makes agents communication more flexible. However, when abusing this mechanism, agent’s credibility may be reduced.

**Definition 9.** Commitment Store of a dialogue \(d\) at time \(t\) is a 4QL program denoted as \(CS^t_d = (M^t_1, \ldots, M^t_k)\):

\[
\begin{align*}
CS^0_d &= \emptyset \\
CS^t_d &= CS^{t-1}_d \cup \{M_i \cdot \ell \vdash b\}, \text{ such that } m^t = assert(S_i, M_i \cdot \ell \vdash b^\prime, d) \text{ is relevant to } d \text{ at time } t, \\
CS^t_d &= CS^{t-1}_d \text{ otherwise.}
\end{align*}
\]

Next, the Query Store, is a repository of active, unresolved leads in the inquiry. It contains literals which compose the derivation of the inquiry goal \(s\). At the beginning the Query Store contains \(s\) as a single entry. The mechanism of updating \(QS\) is in fact a paraconsistent and paracomplete distributed version of backward chaining\(^4\), as discussed in Section 3.2. However, in contrast to the classical backward chaining, here we have a number of additional options to investigate. Consequently, there may be

---

\(^3\) Such a filter is easy to implement: upon receiving a message, \(QS\) is inspected to verify if the rule head is in the scope of inquiry.

\(^4\) Hybrid backward-forward chaining techniques may be used if **assert** locution contains a set of rules, e.g., a subset of proof constructed bottom-up. This is a topic for future research.
various policies for adding literals to $QS$ (selecting threads to follow) and removing them from $QS$ (closing explored threads). Functions open and close (see Definition 10) correspond to such methods.

**Definition 10.** Let:

- $CSt_d$ be the Commitment Store of dialogue $d$ at time $t$,
- $m^t$ be the message received at time $t$,
- $close : Fin(C) \times Fin(C) \rightarrow Fin(C)$ be a method for removing entries from the Query Store,
- $open : Fin(C) \times Fin(C) \rightarrow Fin(C)$ be a method for adding entries to Query Store.

Then, Query Store of an inquiry dialogue $d$ on subject $s$ at time $t$ is a finite set of literals denoted as $QS^t_d$ such that:

- $QS^0_d = \{s\}$
- $QS^t_d = QS^{t-1}_d \cup B' \setminus B''$, where
  - $m^t = assert(S, "M_{t} :- b^t", d)$,
  - $B' = open(b, CSt_d)$,
  - $B'' = close(QS^{t-1}_d \cup B', CSt_d)$,
- $QS^t_d = QS^{t-1}_d$ otherwise.

Note that backward chaining is a common mechanism used in deductive argumentation approaches for driving the argumentation process (see e.g., [3, 4, 20]).

### 3.1 Dialogue Outcome vs. Distributed Knowledge

Our setting consists of a finite set of $n$ cooperative agents. The assumption that agents do not withhold information implicitly constraints the number of requestAll locutions per one assertion. Agents’ belief bases are encoded as finite, ground 4QL programs $P_1, \ldots, P_n$, that share a common ontology and do not change during the course of dialogue. The well-supported models $M_{P_1}, \ldots, M_{P_n}$ of the programs express agents’ final beliefs. The union of individual agents’ belief bases (i.e., their distributed knowledge [12]) is expressed by the sum of their 4QL programs: $\bigcup_{i=1..n} P_i$. In between joining and leaving a dialogue, an agent has to utter at least one assert locution. Also, agents cannot repeat assertions. These assumptions allow us to verify quality and completeness of the obtained results.

Since 4QL programs are finite and agents cannot repeat utterances, there must be a moment $t$ when no agent has anything more to utter because either it has run out of relevant moves or because the dialogue goal $s$ has been achieved, whichever comes first. Thus, dialogue terminates at time $t$.

In what follows we consider the outcomes of terminated inquiry dialogues. The knowledge accumulated in the course of such dialogue $d$ is expressed by the Commitment Store of that dialogue at the termination time $t$: $CSt_d$. The final conclusion depends on the dialogue strategy (see below) and is expressed as follows.
Definition 11. For an inquiry terminating at time $t$, with the goal $s$ of initial valuation $v_i$, the value of the dialogue conclusion is $v_f = v(s, \mathcal{M}_{CS_d})$, where $\mathcal{M}_{CS_d}$ is the well-supported model of $CS_d^i$. Dialogue is:

- successful iff
  - $v_i = u \land v_f \neq u$ [Inquiry-WHAT], or
  - $v_i \neq u \land v_f = v_i$ [Inquiry-THAT],
- unsuccessful otherwise.

The value of the goal $s$ obtained from the union of agents’ programs is expressed as $v(s, \mathcal{M}_{\cup_{i \in 1..m} \mathcal{P}_i})$.

Definition 12. Let:

- $open : \text{Fin}(\mathcal{C}) \times \text{Fin}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fin}(\mathcal{C})$,
- $close : \text{Fin}(\mathcal{C}) \times \text{Fin}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fin}(\mathcal{C})$

be two methods for adding and removing entries to Query Store. Then:

$ST = \langle open, close \rangle$ is a strategy for conducting dialogue $d$.

Definition 13. A strategy $ST$ is sound iff whenever dialogue $d$ on subject $s$ conducted under this strategy terminates at $t$ with conclusion $k$, then if $v(s, \mathcal{M}_{CS_d}) = k$ then $v(s, \mathcal{M}_{\cup_{i \in 1..m} \mathcal{P}_i}) = k$.

Definition 14. A strategy $ST$ is complete iff whenever dialogue $d$ on subject $s$ conducted under this strategy terminates at $t$ with conclusion $k$, then if $v(s, \mathcal{M}_{\cup_{i \in 1..m} \mathcal{P}_i}) = k$ then $v(s, \mathcal{M}_{CS_d}) = k$.

3.2 Opening and Closing Inquiry Threads

In classical backward chaining, the inference engine selects rules whose consequents match the goal to be proved. If the antecedent of the rule is not known to be true, then it is added to the list of goals. In our paraconsistent and nonmonotonic distributed version of backward chaining, the conditions under which antecedent can be added to the list of goals differ depending on the method used. Consequently, there may be various policies for adding literals to $QS$ (selecting threads to follow via function $open$). From a variety of possibilities, here we investigate two such methods. A literal can be added to the Query Store if:

A1. Its valuation in the $CS$ model is $u$, meaning that only threads lacking any evidence whatsoever are explored.

A2. Always, meaning that every premise is investigated further, even one that is tentatively assumed to be $t$, $f$ or $i$.

Definition 15. Let $CS_d^i$ be the Commitment Store of an inquiry dialogue $d$ at time $t$ and $\mathcal{M}_{CS_d}$ be its well-supported model. Let $m^t = \text{assert}(S, "M_i, \ell : b^i \in d\) be the message received at time $t$, such that: $b = b_{i1}, \ldots, b_{ij} \in \mathcal{P}_{m1, \ldots, m_{n_1}}$. Then,

$$open(b, CS_d^i) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \{b_{i1} : j \in 1..m, k \in 1, \ldots, i_j \text{ and } \mathcal{M}_{CS_d}(b_{i1}) = u \} \quad [A1] \\ \{b_{i1} : j \in 1..m, k \in 1, \ldots, i_j \} \quad [A2] \end{cases}$$
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Notice that in the nonmonotonic paraconsistent backward-chaining, obtaining a truth value for \( p \) does not necessarily close the line of reasoning about \( p \), since the evidence put forward by other agents may change the value of \( p \) in a number of ways. This is why we conduct inquiry until all relevant information is shared by the agents.

The conditions under which a goal can be abandoned also differ depending on the policy employed. We distinguish two methods for removing literals from \( QS \) (closing explored threads via function \( close \)):

**R1.** Once its valuation in the \( CS \) model is not \( u \), meaning that a thread is terminated whenever any evidence for it is found. In some cases it may be closed prematurely, without exposing other evidence relevant to the thread.

**R2.** Never, meaning the threads are never abandoned, as the information regarding them may grow. This will not lead to infinite dialogues, since agents cannot repeat utterances and their programs do not change during dialogue.

**Definition 16.** Let \( CS_d^t \) be the Commitment Store of an inquiry dialogue \( d \) at time \( t \) and \( M_{CS_d^t} \) be its well-supported model. Let \( QS_{d^{t-1}} \) be the Query Store of an inquiry dialogue \( d \) at time \( t - 1 \) and \( M_{QS_{d^{t-1}}} \) be its well-supported model. Then,

\[
\text{close}(QS_{d^{t-1}}, CS_d^t) \equiv \begin{cases} \emptyset & [\text{R2}] \\ \{ x \in M_{QS_{d^{t-1}}}: M_{CS_d^t}(x) \neq u \} & [\text{R1}] \end{cases}
\]

### 3.3 Inquiry Strategies

The immediate question is which combination of methods for updating \( QS \) makes sense (see Table 3) and how do resulting inquiry strategies differ. Unlike other approaches, we do not assume that the distributed knowledge of the group is complete. If the statement \( s \) cannot be proved by agents, the conclusion would simply be \( u \). All the results presented in the current Section are summarized in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>narrow-minded</td>
<td>pragmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>forgetful</td>
<td>open-minded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theorem 1.** Narrow-minded strategy is neither sound nor complete. Moreover, it is type 1 nondeterministic.

**Proof.** Due to the non-monotonicity of our inquiry, applying the narrow-minded strategy may result in overlooking some important information. As the counterexample, assume three agents \( A_1, A_2, A_3 \) are engaged in an inquiry dialogue with the goal \( enter(b) \). Their programs are shown in Table 4 and the dialogue conduct is presented in Table 5.
Table 4: Programs of Agents $A_1, A_2, A_3$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$A_1$</th>
<th>$A_2$</th>
<th>$A_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\text{enter}(b) :– \text{isAt}(s,b), \neg \text{has}(s,h)$</td>
<td>$\neg \text{su.isAt}(s,b)$</td>
<td>$\text{hearShotsAt}(b)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\text{isAt}(s,b) :– \text{su.isAt}(s,b) \in {u,i,t}$</td>
<td>$\text{isArmed}(s)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\text{isAt}(s,b) :– \text{isArmed}(s), \text{hearShotsAt}(b)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$\neg \text{has}(s,h)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Example of a Narrow-Minded Inquiry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$QS_d^i$</th>
<th>$m_i$</th>
<th>$M_{CS}^i$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\text{enter}(b)$, $\text{isAt}(s,b)$, $\text{has}(s,h)$</td>
<td>$A_1(1)$</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\text{enter}(b)$, $\text{isAt}(s,b)$, $\text{su.isAt}(s,b)$</td>
<td>$A_1(2)$</td>
<td>$\text{isAt}(s,b)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\text{enter}(b)$, $\text{has}(s,h)$</td>
<td>$A_2(1)$</td>
<td>$\neg \text{su.isAt}(s,b)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$\text{enter}(b)$</td>
<td>$A_1(4)$</td>
<td>$\neg \text{su.isAt}(s,b)$, $\neg \text{has}(s,h)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For brevity, we denote assertions in Table 5 as $A_j(k)$, standing for the $k$-th rule of agent $A_j$. Dialogue terminates in step 4, since only agent $A_1$ has a rule with conclusion $\text{enter}(b)$ but it has already uttered it. Notice that at $t = 2$ we had to remove $\text{isAt}(s,b)$ from the Query Store, as it became true in $M_{CS}^i$. Therefore, agent $A_1$ didn’t have a chance to use rule (3) in the dialogue. Obviously, $v(\text{enter}(b), M_{CS}^i) = u$, whereas the conclusion obtained by merging agents’ programs is $v(\text{enter}(b), M_{\bigcup_{j \in [1,2]P_j}}) = t$. If instead in the step $t = 2$ agent $A_1$ would have uttered rule (3), then Query Store and in consequence, the whole dialogue, would look differently, leading to a true conclusion even if agent $A_1$ didn’t have a chance to utter rule (1).

**Theorem 2.** Forgetful and narrow-minded strategies are equal if the update of the Query Store is an atomic operation.

**Proof sketch.** In the forgetful strategy, we add all literals from the rule body to $QS$ only to remove the known ones afterwards. Therefore, what remains are the unknown literals. In case agents cannot query $QS$ in between adding and removing literals, these two strategies are indistinguishable.

**Theorem 3.** Pragmatic and open-minded strategies are equal in terms of dialogue conduct.

**Proof.** Let’s consider the pragmatic strategy and a goal $s$. In the first step, the rule $s :– b$ is considered. All rule premisses $(b)$ are either empty (when $s$ is a fact) or unknown (since $CS$ is empty). Therefore, in the first step all premisses $(b)$ are added to $QS$ and the initial rule $s :– b$ (or fact $s$) is added to $CS$. Obviously for a literal to be $t$, $f$ or $i$, it has to be a rule conclusion or a fact. Since only rules, whose conclusions are in $QS$ are admitted to $CS$, there cannot be a $t$, $f$ or $i$ literal which is in $CS$ but was not in $QS$ beforehand.

$^3$ Type 1 nondeterminism in logic programs means freedom to choose the rule to apply [21].
Theorem 4. Open-minded strategy is sound and complete.

Proof sketch. Assume that \( v(s, M_{CS_t}) = k \) and \( v(s, M_{\bigcup_{i \in 1..n} P_i}) \neq k \). At the time of dialogue termination, \( CS \) contains all relevant messages. Each of these was uttered by at most one agent. Therefore, we can assign each message to a set \( CS_i \) where \( i \) was the sender. Obviously, \( CS_i \subseteq P_i \). Therefore we have:

\[
CS = \bigcup_{i \in 1..n} CS_i \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in 1..n} P_i.
\]

Since \( v(s, M_{CS_t}) = k \) and \( v(s, M_{\bigcup_{i \in 1..n} P_i}) \neq k \), that means that there is a part of the union of programs \( S \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{i \in 1..n} P_i \setminus CS \), such that, adding \( S \) to \( CS \) would change the valuation of \( s \). However, that would mean that there exists a rule (or a fact) in \( S \) whose conclusion is in premises of \( CS \). That means, that rule is a part of the derivation for \( s \) but was not uttered by the agent, which contradicts our assumptions.

Proof of completeness is analogous. \( \triangleleft \)

3.4 Complexity

The complexity of the proposed inquiry strategies will be investigated from two angles:

- **communication complexity**, which concerns only the amount of communication among the agents (assuming agents have unlimited computational power) [15],
- **computational complexity**, which considers the amount of computation (assuming communication is free) required to:
  - achieve dialogue termination,
  - obtain a conclusion of a terminated dialogue.

In what follows we deal with terminated dialogues and thus we write \( CS \) and \( QS \) instead of \( CS_t \) and \( QS_t \), respectively.

Theorem 5. If the size of the domain of the proof of \( s \) is \( N \), then the size \( |QS| \) of the Query Store at the end of the open-minded inquiry is \( N/2 \leq |QS| \leq N \).

Proof. Since all literals from rule bodies are added to \( QS \) and they are never removed from \( QS \), in fact they all take part if proving the goal \( s \). Moreover, negative and positive literals from the proof are added to \( QS \) only once (either \( l \) or \( \neg l \)).

Theorem 4 allows us to conclude:

Theorem 6. If the size of the proof of \( s \) is \( M \), then the size \( |CS| \) of the Commitment Store at the end of the open-minded inquiry is \( |CS| = M \).

Proof. To consider how much data exchange is needed for termination of the open-minded inquiry, let’s consider the following. Each agent \( A_i \) will utter \( l_i \) times a requestAll locution, receiving each time a bundle of data of size \( |r_j| \) in response (\( j \in 1..l_i \)). Since \( QS \) is monotonic, if we assume that consecutive responses to requestAll for a single agent \( A_k \) are disjunctive (incremental), they altogether form the whole \( QS \):

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} |r_j| \leq |QS|.
\]

The total amount of information shared in the dialogue by all requestAll locutions is:

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} |r_j| \leq n \times |QS| \leq n \times N
\]
If the responses $r_j$ are cumulative (redundant), total amount of information shared by all request locutions is:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} \sum_{k=1}^{j} |r_k| = n \times O(|QS|^2) = n \times O(N^2)$$

The total amount of information shared by all assert locutions uttered in the dialogue is:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{a_i} |1| = |CS| = M$$

For computing the communication complexity, we assume there is $n$ agents, each holding a certain amount of (relevant) information, such that the union of all agents belief bases is of size $M$ (from Theorem 6).

**Theorem 7.** Communication complexity of inquiry is: $O(nM)$.

**Proof.** Now let’s consider how many dialogue utterances are needed for termination of the open-minded inquiry. In the worst case, $QS$ gets updated very slowly, one literal per one assert locution. In general in such dialogue there can be up to $n - 1$ requests per one assert. Thus, there can be at most $M$ asserts, $M \times (n - 1)$ requests and at most 2 join and leave locutions per one assert. Altogether $(n + 2) \times M$ locutions exchanged before dialogue termination. Therefore the communication complexity is $O(nM)$. 

Theorem 7 allows us to conclude that the way information is distributed among agents does not affect communication complexity of our inquiry.

In order to analyze computational complexity of obtaining termination or conclusion of a terminated dialogue, the following assumptions are made. The size of the domain of the proof is $N$, which is the upper limit on the size of Query Store (see Theorem 5). The computational complexity for obtaining termination or conclusion of a terminated dialogue is expressed in terms of data complexity [26, 19], i.e., the complexity of evaluating a specific query on a database, assuming that the query is fixed and database is arbitrary. The data complexity is thus given as a function of the size of the database.

**Theorem 8.** Computational complexity of termination of open-minded inquiry is: $O(1)$.

**Proof.** Handling each assert amounts to adding a rule to $CS^t$, which is in $O(1)$. Handling each request is in $O(1)$ as it amounts to sending the whole $QS^t$ back to the agent.

Theorem 8 shows that the major factor in the complexity of the termination problem of the open-minded inquiry is the communication complexity.

**Theorem 9.** Computational complexity of a narrow-minded inquiry is: $O(nM) \times O(N^k)$.

---

6 Notice that even for hybrid forward-backward chaining, this is the pessimistic time complexity.
Proof. In contrast, for the narrow-minded strategy, the well-supported model of the $CS$ has to be computed after each `assert`. Computing the well-supported model of $CS$ is in $O(N^k)$, where $N$ is the size of domain\(^7\), therefore each such step takes $O(N^k)$. However, at the termination time, the conclusion is known (obtainable in $O(1)$).

**Theorem 10.** Obtaining the conclusion of a terminated open-minded inquiry is $O(N^k)$.

Proof. Recall that computing the well-supported model of $CS$ is in $O(N^k)$, where $N$ is the size of domain. For open-minded strategy the computation of the well-supported model is only needed after the dialogue terminates, i.e., once per dialogue.

Overall, the characteristics of the open-minded and narrow-minded inquiry dialogues that we present in this paper are given in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Open-minded</th>
<th>Narrow-minded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open vs. Closed System</td>
<td>open (at least one <code>assert</code> per <code>join</code>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing</td>
<td>one-to-all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>asynchronous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties</td>
<td>sound and complete</td>
<td>not sound and not complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Complexity</td>
<td>$O(nM)$</td>
<td>$O(nM)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational Complexity (Termination)</td>
<td>$O(1)$</td>
<td>$O(nMN^k)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining Conclusion of a Terminated Dialogue</td>
<td>$O(N^k)$</td>
<td>$O(1)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated Data Size</td>
<td>$M + nO(N^2)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 Related Work and Conclusions

Exploring paraconsistency and paracompleteness in argumentation is not new (see Chapter 6 in [13] for general nonmonotonic reasoning techniques and e.g., [14, 5, 6] for paraconsistent reasoning techniques). Currently there is a number of formalisms that do not trivialize when inconsistent premises (for a survey of approaches see [29, 3]). In [4] a formal bi-party inquiry dialog system is proposed where DeLP is used to deal with ignorance and inconsistency. In [24] the logic of multi-valued argumentation (LMA) is used and agents can argue using multi-valued knowledge base. In [20] ASPIC+, a framework for structured argumentation with possible inconsistent knowledge bases and defeasible rules is given. However, none of these formalisms handles inconsistency or lack of information the way 4QL does. Usually the inconsistent premisses yield conclusions (e.g., ’undecided’) which cannot be further dealt with.

\(^7\) Here $k$ depends on the arity of relations as in Definition 1.
As indicated in [7, 25], several new issues arise when contemplating the plurality of dialogue participants. Multi-party issues were also studied in [32], where a distributed argumentation system was given together with a multi-party dialogue game for computing the defensibility of an argument from consistent knowledge bases. In [28], a simple multi-party inquiry dialogue assumed communication in turns with no termination criterion.

Leaving behind the realm of classical two-valued logical approaches to bi-party dialogues, we arrived at a solution for multi-party, paraconsistent and paracomplete inquiry. We investigated four inquiry strategies, conditional on different policies for opening and closing threads. The outcomes of dialogues conducted under these strategies were evaluated against the paraconsistent and paracomplete distributed knowledge of the group.

The outcome of our research calls for reconsidering normative models of dialogues by introducing two additional logical values: i and u. Specifically, the novelty lies in understanding the very nature of the dialogue’s goal. Further, the philosophical underpinnings of inquiry are enhanced, whereas classically inquiry has been simply concerned with proving the truth of falsity of a given statement. Although we provided a better understanding of normative models of dialogues by distinguishing between two fundamentally different types of them, inquiry and discovery, we recognize that more investigation is needed. Yet, we strongly believe that contemplating dialogues in this richer modeling paradigm allows for a more precise discernment between them.

In future work, we intend to investigate hybrid forward-backward chaining techniques for a dialogue system, where the locutions can contain a set of rules. Next, we plan to research methods for handling inconsistencies and uncertainty in the Commitment Store via a challenge locution.
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Abstract. The aim of this paper is to present a platform for helping agent researchers to become familiar with Smart Grids. Agent technology has been recognised as one of the enablers for Smart Grids. A Smart Grid intends to make an advanced use of available metering and generation capabilities in order to use more efficiently the electricity. Contributions of agent researchers to this domain are still reduced and this may be because of the highly specialised knowledge that is required to run current Smart Grid simulators and the cost of commercial ones. This paper aims to share the experience acquired during a project where distributed control approaches were devised using open source solutions. An important result is a simulator for Smart Grids that facilitates the research of how agents can operate such grids. This paper introduces an example case study and discusses how agents can be applied in these situations.

1 Introduction

In the last few years, power grids have gone through several changes to make them work as "Smart Grids". For instance, several elements have been added such as sensors and meters, network nodes with computation capabilities, switches or actuators, and so on. Together, they allow the grid setup to be highly configurable [7].

Traditionally, the term "electrical grid" is assigned to the interconnected energy transmission system. However, the concept "Smart Grid" has been more oriented to the entire electrical system including generation, transmission and distribution. Regarding distribution, several efforts target the increase of manageability and efficiency by dividing the smart distribution grid into sub-systems. Such sub-systems are called "Microgrids" and consist of energy consumers and producers at a small scale that are able to manage themselves [18]. Inside Microgrids, it is usual to find a number of Distributed Energy Resources (DERs), such as solar power plants or wind generators. Examples for Microgrids may be, for instance, villages, industry sites, or a university campus. Furthermore, a Microgrid can either be connected to the backbone grid, to other Microgrids, or it can run in island mode. Moreover, since the distribution system is considered
as the largest and most complex part of the entire electrical system [9], most literature is focused on Smart Grids located at this level.

Conventional power grid control is usually done in an automated and centralised manner, with some human-in-the-loop operations, because of the rapid changes in power consumption that may be met. There are security concerns that are implemented right at the transformation centres before achieving the customers location. Power grids processing power is usually located into SCADA systems, which are centralised ones gathering information from connected sensors and, sometimes, issuing orders. Besides, power grids are not flexible enough to support future demands from customers. A customer may install one day a photovoltaic panel to address new needs. Such operation is inexpensive from the customer’s point of view but adds instability to the power grid. Therefore, all kW produced needs to be consumed by someone or something. Having a thousand customers doing something like this means trouble in a conventional power grid. Power which is not consumed by anyone has to be dissipated by some specialised and expensive equipment. If the operational parameters of those equipments are exceeded, surely the safety mechanisms may cut down parts of the grid to protect them from the extra surge. All this could be avoided if additional measurement and control elements were added, which is what Smart Grids intend.

Rather creating isolated control artifacts for groups of Microgrids, or DERs inside them, it is more convenient to consider the Microgrid as a collection of interested parties that perform control functions to accommodate some higher level goal. The benefit comes mainly from the scalability of the resulting system (it can grow to have more control/DER elements) and the fault tolerance (parts can fall into island/disconnected mode in a controlled way). In order to operate with a Smart Grid, an advanced metering infrastructure is needed. Metering is made through devices which are in fact ARM-based computers, and they may even run Linux distributions. Hence, there is an important amount of new hosting devices where new information processing capabilities are available.

An agent researcher will recognise this setup as one scenario where agent technology, inherently distributed and capable of decentralised control, may be a key one [8]. Among current studies, it is appropriate to cite the two made by the IEEE Power and Energy Society Multi-Agent Systems Working Group (MASWG). The MASWG issued two reports [10] [11] using as main information sources FIPA standards and frequently cited development tools. They discuss how this technology could change the way of designing power grid control. Though helpful, these reports, and other existing ones, are not using the agent technology to its full extent. As defended in [8], one of the key features of agent technology is its capability to provide a decentralised control by means of a peer-to-peer coordination, which is opposite to the client-server paradigm currently applied through SCADA systems. Therefore, agent researchers have an opportunity to contribute to this area more intensively.

These researchers will have to overcome the lack of tools for performing actual research without prior knowledge of how a power grid works. Authors usually devise their own simulators, most using MatLab or SimuLink, and find ways
to feed that data to the agents. Discrete event simulations play an important role. Nevertheless, an agent researcher may need something else. The hypothesis of this work is that preliminary research is easier with real time simulators. With event-driven simulation, weeks can be simulated in just a few minutes. For someone willing to experiment with agent coordination capabilities, this way of working is not the most friendly one. Real time simulation is in fact useful when the situation requires a software-in-the-loop or a hardware-in-the-loop approach. Those situations have in common that there is an external element interacting with the simulation, being it hardware or software [3]. In the case of this paper, such external element are the agents.

The contribution of this paper is a testbed where agent researchers can experiment, run fast or slow experiments, and visually check what is happening. The testbed was developed during the MIRED-CON project, which aimed to an intelligent decentralised control of Microgrids. Agents in the experiment can be disconnected or connected to the simulation cycle, however in this paper will focus on a disconnected approach because it is easier to integrate with different agent platforms.

The testbed is developed using plain Java and RMI as technology. Hence, it ought to be compatible with different agent solutions, such as JADE or Jack, as long as they allow referring to external Java Objects. The proof of concept is made with INGENIAS methodology [14] and JADE based agents. It shows how to define agents and connect them to the simulation platform. The testbed comes with a few pre-defined Microgrids, but the notation is friendly enough to ensure that new ones can be created. The case of study is a work in progress where agents are expected to coordinate so that any additional energy is sent to the main power substation and, at the same time, the least energy is demanded from utility companies.

The paper is organised as follows. First, section 2 introduces the Smart and Microgrids and how agents are supposed to operate within it. Section 3 explains the testbed elements and how agents are expected to interact with them. Section 4 presents the case study with INGENIAS and shows some snapshots of the tool. The case study uses a simple Microgrid operated by agents that intend to reduce the billing costs and avoid producing more energy than required. Other similar frameworks are discussed into section 5.

2 Agents in a Microgrid

Before studying the role of agents in a Microgrid, the basic elements of a Microgrid are introduced. In a Microgrid, see figure 1, there are elements producing energy (DERs from now on), elements consuming this energy (loads from now on), power lines transporting the energy, transformation centres (TC from now on) isolating low voltage sections from medium/high voltage sections, and metering infrastructure or Smart Meters (SM from now on). Batteries are another case because they can act either as loads (while charging) or as DERs (while discharging). Microgrids can be connected to a main power line through a sub-
station. When the energy generated inside the Microgrid is not enough to supply the consumption, the lack of energy is demanded from the power line through this substation. Readers should be aware that no one “demands” energy from the power line. There is no actual request. It just happens.

Communication can be assumed to be widely available, though not always reliable. When there is no mobile networks, such as GPRS, Power Line Communication (PLC) can be an option. Hence, TCP/IP may be used just anywhere.

Agents can be hosted in any of the previous elements that is capable of having processing and has communication capabilities. Both conditions are met more easily in the SMs and they are intended to be deployed almost anywhere. If possible, a SM is needed per DER to measure how much power is consumed (a photovoltaic panel usually comes with a battery, so it consumes too) or produced; a SM per load (loads tend to be buildings); and one SM per TC. A TC may act as hub for the SMs underneath so that its SM may be more complex than others.

It can be assumed that, be it inside SM or be it inside some built-in processing power of the above mentioned elements, the agents can be hosted anywhere in the Microgrid and communicate with each other anytime.

What agents can do inside the Microgrid is a subject of further discussion. Reports from the MASWG [10] [11] point out possible uses. Protection is not one
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**Fig. 1.** Elements in a Microgrid
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of them. For instance, if it is not safe to operate a DER, the agent would not be in charge of forbidding its use, but a lower level hardware implemented mechanism. It seems that a main function of agents would be defining/choosing the strategy of the Microgrid and delivering orders accordingly. The term “strategy” has been chosen on purpose since agent actions have to fit into a medium/long term scenario. The electricity consumed everywhere comes from markets where energy production quotas are bought and sold. Selling the excess of energy production can be an alternative which requires scheduling in advance the operation of DERs. Sometimes, it may be cheaper to buy the energy than producing it, e.g. because the fuel used by a generator is more expensive. To add more complexity, energy production is subject of government regulations. For instance, in the case of Spanish regulations, a producer must be registered within a listing of producers and must ensure some operational parameters. When a Microgrid delivers energy when it is not supposed to, or delivers too much energy, a fine is issued. The reason is to harmonize the production with the consumption.

Agents can also take decisions about which DER ought to produce the required energy at a given moment. To satisfy the demand of a load, it is more efficient to increase the production of the closer DERs. The power line and TCs interconnecting the DER to the load are not one hundred percent efficient. There is some amount of energy which is lost during its distribution. The longer the distance, the higher the loss.

3 The Agent Testbed

The testbed is made by starting from a core that delivers the Microgrid simulation service. This service is based on GridLAB-D [5], an agent based Microgrid simulator that performs a static analysis of the grid. It focuses on the stable states a power grid achieves. It does not address problems with harmonics or the intermediate states that arise, for instance, when a new element starts producing energy. As a consequence, it is fast. GridLAB-D runs a discrete event agent based simulation to obtain, in a few minutes, weeks of simulation data.

In this contribution, and through some Java layers, the GridLAB-D was transformed into a real time simulation platform. This platform allows to run in real time the system together with the associated agents, deliver orders and get results. Time can be accelerated, but unless agents are involved in the simulation cycle, the result may not be meaningful.

The interest of the real time version is the possibility of using the simulator as a Smart Grid emulator. With this transformation, the agent based simulator GridLAB-D can be used to experiment with agents working in real time with the system in a “software-in-the-loop” manner. Agents communicate with GridLAB-D through some interfaces that allow to send orders or to poll about the current state. Notification services are possible, but they are not implemented by default.

In an event driven solution, however, agents would have to strictly stick to the simulation cycle and perform calculations just as the simulator progresses.
This new system is called Smart Grid Simulator (SGSimulator from now on) whose behaviour is briefly described in figure 2. The agent sends orders to the simulator through a proxy which uses RMI to deliver orders to the simulator. The reason for this is to allow each agent to be hosted in a different machine and provide a suitable entry point so that this simulator can be used by other agent platforms. Integrating the proxy will be enough to start delivering orders and polling about the current status.

The orders are processed as they arrive in the simulator. There is a possible delay since the order is delivered until the order is processed, just as in real systems. GridLAB-D executes the orders as delivered by the SGSimulator and returns a sufficiently large set of measurements. This set is then used to deliver measurements in real time to the agent. The set needs to be updated only when the pre-defined simulation time lapse is exhausted or there is an order that alters the future states of the Microgrid.

![Collaboration Diagram](image)

**Fig. 2.** Collaboration diagram showing how agents send orders and receive data from the simulator

In the MIRED-CON project, it was intended that the conditions met by the agents were as close as possible to the real Microgrid. From this perspective,
it was necessary to simulate: delays in the order processing, missing or ignored orders, and orders which do not produce the expected results in time.

4 Case study with INGENIAS

Figure 3 introduces the case study Smart Grid. At the bottom left, there is a depiction of the simulated Smart Grid. It is made of seven buildings which consume energy. These buildings are connected to transformers which are hosted into transformation centres. There are three transformation centres and one substation. Controllable elements in the grid will be the battery, battery 31, a photovoltaic panel, Solar 11, and a wind generator, Wind 21. If the Smart Grid Simulation is run without agents, no element will be switched on.

The status of each controllable element is shown in the middle of the screen. All of them are off in figure 3. The weather is measured at the top right of the figure. Wind and sun are changing along the day according to a predefined profile. To simplify the problem, the chart represents which amount of the expected power is being generated. When the sun is at 25%, it means photovoltaic panels (PV from now on) produce 25% of their maximum output. The bottom right part of the figure shows a panel from which different parts of the Smart Grid can be disconnected. This feature is used to simulate the disconnection of elements.

Finally, the top left of the figure shows a chart with the status of the Smart Grid. Meaningful data obtained from the system is the amount of consumed power in the grid (consumption curve), power generated within the grid (grid generation curve), the amount of power demanded from the main power line (substation demand), and losses due to the distribution of the energy (losses curve).

The default scenario runs with a simulation cycle at one minute per second. Each second in real time is equivalent to one minute in simulated time. This configuration was chosen to facilitate observing the effect of orders. Agents can get in and out anytime. As a proof of concept, the agents from figure 4 are launched. The approach consists in defining one agent per controllable device. From the existing three, the PV and battery are chosen. These are under transformation centres CT-1 and CT-3, respectively. Agents have access to the devices by means of a SMClient instance, which is automatically created and connected to the Smart Grid Simulator. The SMClient is translated as set of Java classes accessible by agents playing the role TCManager. The role TCManager, or Tranformation Centre Manager, aims to reduce the power grid consumption and reduce the monthly expenses.

The battery controller agent runs a task to check the status of the battery and operate it. This task is executed repeatedly. Rather than having a fine grain decomposition of this task, for this paper it was decided to just put together the pieces into a single task. This task uses the SMClient to perform status queries to the simulator and to send orders to the battery. Nothing prevents that this task sends orders to other elements or that the agent gains global knowledge of the whole simulator rather than its closest scope. Whether the simulation works with total or partial information, and total or partial controlling capabilities
Fig. 3. Smart Grid Simulator dash control without agents

Fig. 4. Agents and roles in the system
is a decision left to the developer. For this particular case, only the current
transformation centre sensors are used.

![Diagram](image.png)

**Fig. 5. Delivering power capability**

The deployment of elements is discussed in figure 6. There is only one instance
of the agent types from figure 4 and each one is individually initialised. The
initialisation is not shown here, but it consists in creating specific pieces of
information and connecting them to the intended initial mental state, in this case
represented by BatteryInitialMentalState and PVInitialMentalState entities.

The result is introduced in figure 7. It can be seen that orders are delivered
to the elements and that the PV and the battery are being managed. The coded
behaviour is a naive one. The PV is turned on and, in the meantime, the battery
is charged. After being charged, the battery is told to discharge. Depending
on the battery type, it is necessary to wait until it is fully loaded to start the
discharging cycle. When the battery is charging, it increases the demand from
the substation. It would be better to charge the battery when there is an excess
of energy produced by the PV panel. Future versions of this system will take
into account this and will charge the battery during the night, when energy is
cheaper.

The demonstration is GPL v3 software and can be downloaded from GitHub
in [https://github.com/escalope/sgsim-ingenias](https://github.com/escalope/sgsim-ingenias). The real time simulator
is published at [http://sgsimulator.sf.net](http://sgsimulator.sf.net).
Fig. 6. Agents and roles in the system

Fig. 7. Smart Grid Simulator dash control with agents controlling PV panel and Battery
5 Related Work

The need of a testbed for agents in Smart Grids has not been defended in the literature, yet. Multi-Agent based systems have been produced without such testbeds.

For instance, Oyarzabal et al. [13] addresses a Microgrid management system built using a JADE based system. Agents in the experiments took data from real hardware and measurements were taken each 20 seconds. The contribution of this paper would have facilitated earlier experimentation in cases like this. Besides, it is cheaper to run a simulator than creating a real Microgrid. It is less reliable too. A working solution in the simulator may not work in a real setup. However, adapting a working solution surely will take less effort than developing everything from scratch in the real scenario. Other researchers created their own simulator, for instance, with MatLAB. This is the case of IDAPS [15], where a similar deployment to the one presented in this paper is discussed.

The alternative for most agent researchers is reusing existing simulators. There are several works proposing powergrid simulators, such as GridLAB-D [5] which is the one used in this contribution. The two main open source ones are GridLAB-D and OpenDSS [6]. The latter considers the transitory analysis, which may enable the developer to study the effect of switching on elements, like engines. There is the DSSIM-PC which is an initiative to make OpenDSS a non-deterministic real time simulator [12].

Literature cites other real time simulators, like eMEGAsim [4] and GridSim [1]. None of them could be found to deliver open source software and enable a similar experimentation as the one done in this contribution. The eMEGAsim uses FPGAS and multiple CPUs to run Simulink instances and provide almost real time data of systems. Its goal is not to reproduce control elements but to address hardware-in-the-loop experiments. Simulated elements are run together with real ones. The control devices are then embedded inside the simulated elements rather than decoupled as in this contribution. GridSim [1] is a complete tool made of three parts: a framework for collecting data (GridStat), a framework for simulating the communication network (GridNet), a cloud extension (GridCloud), and the powergrid itself (GridSim). It considers too the transitory states of the system through a modified version of an commercial product and combining the generated output in a similar way as SGSimulator does. It is not evident from the documentation if distributed control is allowed. The paper cites explicitly a control center which is where all data from current SCADAS is stored. On the other hand, the GridSim site suggests that there is a power control software inside each substation in the simulated system. In any case, it is not considered control at the DER or transformation centre level, or event at a lower scale, as shown in the case study of this contribution. This may allow a higher capability of SGSimulator for a finer grain decentralisation.

Not all works remark what kind of simulation is used, though. The work [17] shows a project for a decentralized control system where consumer energy demands aligns with the actual production. The way the grid is simulated is not explained. The evaluation framework, from [2], points out at issues in Smart
Grids and how MAS could deal with them. Several MAS related works in the literature are cited and evaluated according to this evaluation framework. The underlying simulation framework is not considered in most cases, focusing on the features each MAS implements. Only Matlab/Simulink is cited in the case of IDAPS work. Nevertheless, prospective works like [16], remark the importance of having simulation systems that can accurately represent both the grid and the reaction of consumers.

6 Conclusions

The paper has introduced some basic concepts about the role of agents in the control of Microgrids. In particular, it has discussed where agents can be hosted and what they are expected to do. In this paper, agents are expected to hosted by Smart Meters which are essential elements in Smart Grids. The paper has also introduced the Smart Grid Simulator and how agents can be connected to it. As a proof of concept, INGENIAS methodology and JADE agents have been used to model and run the agents used in the simulation. Other agent platforms and methodologies could be applied provided they integrate with RMI technology.

The case of study is a simple one and will be extended in future works. One of the intended extensions is a full Smart Grid decentralised control. Nevertheless, the starting point may allow other researchers to perform similar studies with different platforms.
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Abstract. Due to their immense complexity, large-scale multiagent systems are often unamenable to exhaustive formal verification. Statistical approaches that focus on the verification of individual traces can provide an interesting alternative. However, due to its focus on finite execution paths, trace-based verification is inherently limited to certain types of correctness properties. We show how, by combining sampling with the idea of trace fragmentation, statistical model checking can be used to answer interesting quantitative correctness properties about multiagent systems on different observational levels. We illustrate the idea with a simple case study from the area of swarm robotics.
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1 Introduction

Due to their distributed nature and their capability to exhibit emergent behaviour, multiagent systems can be hard to engineer and to understand. Similar to other software systems, however, questions of correctness arise and verification plays an important role. Formal verification aims to answer correctness questions in a rigorous and unambiguous way. Temporal logic model checking, for example, aims to find an accurate solution to a given correctness property by exhaustively searching the state space underlying the system under consideration (the model) and thus exploring all possible execution paths [1]. This approach is, in general, only feasible if the state space of the model is of manageable size. In the presence of non-determinism which may, for example, arise from the different possible interleavings of individual agent actions or from uncertainty w.r.t. the representation of individual agent behaviours, the state space may grow exponentially which renders formal exhaustive verification infeasible for non-trivial systems. This exponential blow-up in the number of states is a well-known problem and commonly referred to as ‘state space explosion’. In order to address this issue, a wide range of techniques has been developed. For example, if one can assume that agents are homogeneous, then the symmetry within the system can be exploited to reduce the complexity of verification significantly [4, 10–12, 18]. It is clear, however, that such simplifying assumptions are not always possible.

Another interesting alternative way to circumvent combinatorial explosion that works for probabilistic systems is to use a sampling approach and employ statistical techniques to obtain approximate verification results. In this case, $n$ finite execution paths or traces are sampled from the underlying state space and a property $\phi$ is checked on
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each of them. By increasing the number of traces that \( \phi \) is checked on, the probability of \( \phi \) can be estimated to the desired level of precision. Techniques for statistical inference, e.g. hypothesis testing, can then be used to determine the significance of the results. Approaches of this kind are summarised under the umbrella of statistical model checking [15]. Due to its approximate nature, statistical model checking allows for the verification of large-scale (or even infinite) systems in a timely manner. Traces are typically obtained through simulation, either by repeatedly executing an existing real-world system, or by ‘unrolling’ a formal state transition representation of a system for a certain number of time steps (as in the case of statistical model checking).

Consider, for example, a robot swarm whose efficiency is defined by its emergent collective behaviour. Due to the high level of interconnectivity and the global focus, it is not sufficient to verify individual robots in isolation. On the other hand, aspects such as a high level of heterogeneity, a complex environment, or simply an interest in the individual behaviours may also render the application of pure macro-level verification insufficient or even impossible. In this case, statistical verification represents an interesting alternative. However, because of its focus on finite execution paths, trace-based verification is inherently limited to linear time properties and lacks some of the quantitative capabilities of its non-statistical counterpart [13]. For example, due to the lack of branching information, properties about the transition behaviour are not verifiable in a trace-based context. Furthermore, statistical verification generally ignores the internal structure of the traces which limits its use for complex multiagent systems.

On the other hand, the statistical approach provides interesting opportunities. In this paper, we present our research efforts with respect to the aforementioned problems by showing how trace-based verification in combination with statistical analysis can be used to answer interesting quantitative correctness properties about multiagent systems.

The contributions of this paper can be summarised as follows.

1. In Section 3, we show that simulation traces of multiagent systems represent sets of sets of samples obtained from different sample spaces, the choice of which depends on the question to be answered. We formally introduce the notion of trace fragments and describe how they correspond with fine-grained correctness properties. We also introduce the idea of in-trace sampling.

2. In Section 4, we introduce a simple specification language in order to illustrate the requirements that a specification language needs to satisfy in order to allow for the formulation of properties about multiagent systems on different observational levels. Making use of in-trace sampling, the language also allows for the formulation of properties about the average behaviour of individual agents.

3. In Section 5, we show how a combination of trace fragmentation and statistical verification can be used to estimate residence probabilities and transition probabilities, and to detect correlations between different types of events.

The usefulness of quantitative analysis is illustrated with a small case study from the area of swarm robotics in Section 6.
2 Related work

Whilst the classical, non-probabilistic approach to model checking produces a clear yes/no answer to a given correctness property, quantitative analysis aims to use verification techniques to produce numeric insights into the system under consideration, e.g. transition probabilities, costs or rewards. It is thus not surprising that quantitative analysis forms an important part of probabilistic approaches to model checking. PRISM [14], for example, the most widely used probabilistic model checker, allows for the verification of a wide range of quantitative properties, among them best, worst, and average-case system characteristics [13]. PRISM uses BDD-based symbolic model checking and allows for the verification of properties formulated in a variety of different logics — among them probabilistic versions of Computation Tree Logic (CTL) and Linear Temporal Logic (LTL), as well as Continuous Stochastic Logic (CSL) — on different types of models, e.g. Discrete-Time (DTMC) and Continuous-Time Markov Chains (CTMC) and Markov Decision Processes (MDP). It is, for example, possible to integrate costs and rewards into the verification process which allows for the formulation of properties about expected quantities, e.g. the “expected time”, or the “expected number of lost messages”. Due to its exhaustive nature, PRISM generally suffers from the same combinatorial issues as other non-probabilistic model checkers. In order to circumvent this problem, it also allows for simulation-based (i.e. trace-based) verification using different statistical model checking approaches [17]. In this context, both conventional probabilistic linear-time properties, i.e. \( P_{\omega}(\phi) \), and reward-based properties, i.e. \( R_{\omega}(\phi) \), can be answered. At the current stage, PRISM views traces as monolithic entities and does not exploit their internal structure. This limits its usefulness for the verification of complex multiagent systems.

Apart from the work on simulation-based verification using PRISM, quantitative analysis in the context of trace-based verification has been largely neglected to date. An interesting idea has been presented by Sammapun et al. [19]. The authors propose a trace decomposition based on the idea of repetitive behaviour. The decomposition is performed by means of conditional probabilities. This is then extended with hypothesis testing in order to determine the confidence in the estimation. As opposed to our approach which assumes the presence of a (possibly large) number of individual sample traces, the work of Sammapun et al. is focussed on a pure runtime verification setting in which only one consistently growing trace is available. The decomposition is used to obtain from the runtime trace a number of individual sample traces which are then used to answer conventional probabilistic linear-time properties such as done by PRISM.

A related approach has been presented by Finkbeiner et al. [5]. They propose an extension of LTL which allows for the formulation of additional statistics over traces, e.g. the “average number of X” or “how often does X happen”. Similar to the work of Sammapun et al., they focus on a single trace obtained by observing a running system.

3 Events, properties, and their probability

In the previous sections, we used the term ‘events’ loosely when speaking about the formulation of properties. The purpose of this section is to give a formal definition for the notion of events and their association with formulable correctness properties.
3.1 Structure and probability of simulation traces

The purpose of this section is to formally associate the set of traces of a multiagent system obtained through simulation with a probability space. This allows us to talk about events and their probability. We show that, by varying the set of outcomes that one focusses on, events of different granularity become detectable.

Let us start with a formal representation of our multiagent system. We are not concerned with advanced modalities like knowledge or strategies here, so we assume that the state of an individual agent is defined as a simple set of attributes and their values. The state space of the multiagent system can then be described as a simple state transition system. Let $S_i = \text{denote the set of states of agent } i$. For $n$ agents, $S \subseteq S_1 \times S_2 \times ... S_n$ then denotes the set of global states\footnote{For simplicity, we omit the environment in our formal description.}. We assume that the multiagent system is probabilistic in nature, i.e. in the presence of multiple successor states, a probabilistic choice about which state the system transitions into will be made. Let therefore $P : S \times S \to [0, 1]$ be a probabilistic transition function such that $\forall s : S \cdot \sum_{s' \in S} P(s, s') = 1$. The multiagent system can then be described formally as a probabilistic transition system $M = (S, P, s_0)$ where $s_0 \in S$ is the initial state. We denote each possible finite path $\omega = (s_0, s_1, ..., s_k)$ of length $k$ through $M$ as a simulation trace. In the presence of individual agents, simulation traces have an internal structure. Given $n$ agents, a simulation trace can be subdivided into $n$ agent traces.

In the presence of transition probabilities, it is intuitively clear that each simulation trace $\omega$ occurs with a certain probability, denoted $Pr(\omega)$, which is the product of all individual transition probabilities:

$$Pr(\omega) = P(s_0, s_1) \cdot P(s_1, s_2) \cdot ... \cdot P(s_{n-1}, s_n) = \prod_{0 \leq i < n} P(s_i, s_{i+1}) \quad (1)$$

In the presence of long simulation runs, restricting the focus of attention to the probability of full traces may be too coarse-grained. Traces represent (possibly long) sequences of system states which themselves also have a complex internal structure; in the course of a simulation run, numerous events take place which constitute themselves as changes to the state of the system. A trace represents all the states of the underlying run and can thus be seen as a rich source of analysis. In addition to the probability of the trace itself, it is therefore useful to also determine the probability of all individual events represented by it. However, in order to talk about events and their probability, we first need to make sets of traces measurable. To this end, we associate a probability space with the set of simulation traces. A probability space is a triple $(\Omega, \Sigma, Pr)$ where $\Omega$ is the sample space, $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P} \Omega$ is a $\sigma$-algebra and $Pr : \Sigma \to [0, 1]$ is a probability measure. The sample space $\Omega$ can be seen as the set representing all possible outcomes of an experiment. Imagine, for example, throwing a die. In this case, the sample space is $\Omega = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$. We can now start to define possible events within the set of outcomes. A single event represents a set of outcomes which all satisfy a common criterion. For example, getting an even number when throwing a die is represented by the set $\{2, 4, 6\}$. Formally, the set of events forms a $\sigma$-algebra $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P} \Omega$ on $\Omega$, where $\Sigma$ is a subset of the power set of $\Omega$. A $\sigma$-algebra $\Sigma$ also needs to satisfy the following
requirements: (i) $\Sigma$ contains the empty set $\emptyset$, (ii) $\Sigma$ is closed under complements: if $A$ is in $\Sigma$ then so is its complement $\overline{A} = (\Omega \setminus A)$, and (iii) $\Sigma$ is closed under countable unions: if $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ are in $\Sigma$ then so is their union $A = \bigcup A_n$. Furthermore, in order to assign a probability with an event, we need a probability measure $Pr : \Sigma \rightarrow [0, 1]$ which is a function that assigns to each event $E \in \Sigma$ a number between 0 and 1. $Pr$ also needs to satisfy the following requirements: (i) $Pr$ is countably additive: for all countable collections $A = \{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n\} \in \Sigma$, $Pr(\bigcup A_i) = \sum (Pr(A_i))$, and (ii) $Pr(\emptyset) = 0$ and $Pr(\Omega) = 1$. A probability space is then defined as a triple $(\Omega, \Sigma, Pr)$ comprising the sample space $\Omega$, $\sigma$-algebra $\Sigma$ and probability measure $Pr$. In the context of probability theory, the events $\omega \in \Sigma$ are said to be measurable [1].

3.2 Simulation and sampling: trace fragmentation

In order to talk about events in the context of simulation runs, the set $Tr_s$ of simulation traces which a simulation can produce needs to be made measurable by associating it with a probability space. We start with the sample space. A trace obtained through a single simulation run (if properly randomised, which we assume here) can be seen as a single sample drawn from the set of finite traces as defined by the logic within the model. However, at the same time, a single trace of length $k$ also represents a set of $k$ samples drawn from the set of states defined by the model. Furthermore, it also represents a set of $\binom{n}{k}$ samples drawn from the set of state tuples, a set of $\binom{n}{k}$ samples drawn from the set of state triples, and so on. Even more, given $n$ agents, each simulation trace also represents $n$ samples drawn from the set of agent traces, each of which itself represents a set of $k$ samples from the set of agent states, etc.

In general, the description of a probabilistic state-based model yields a large range of different sets of outcomes that one can draw from: a set of agent or group states (one for each possible group of agents), of agent or group state pairs, of agent or group state triples, etc. Each individual simulation run represents one or many samples from each of those sets. As described above, each set of outcomes corresponds with a different probability space and thus allows for the detection of different events. Just by interpreting the same outcome in different ways, different types of events become detectable.

It becomes clear that a single simulation trace already represents a rich source of analysis. Let us now briefly look at the types of outcomes that one is typically interested in. We can assume that, in a simulation context, we are mostly interested in events defined over coherent trace fragments, rather than over arbitrary tuples of states. Informally, a coherent trace fragment is any sequence of states which exists in the underlying state space. Fragments of length 1 represent individual states, fragments of length 2 represent states and their direct successors, fragments of length 3 represent states and their two subsequent states, etc. Formally, the set $F_k$ of coherent trace fragments of length $k$ is defined as the set of sub-sequences of states, i.e. sub-traces, of length $k$:

$$F_k := \bigcup_{\omega \in Tr_s} \{p \in \omega \mid \#p = k\}$$

Each fragment size represents a certain level of granularity with respect to the simulation outcome. Before defining the sample space of a simulation, it is therefore important to clarify the granularity necessary to answer a given question. For example,
some questions are formulated over entire simulation traces, i.e. members of the set \( \mathcal{F}_t \). Typical representatives of this group are temporal questions that involve statements like, for example, eventually or always. In this case, the set from which samples need to be drawn is the set of all full traces, i.e. \( \Omega = \mathcal{F}_t \). The \( \sigma \)-algebra \( \Sigma \) (the set of possible events defined as a subset of \( \mathcal{P} \Omega \)) thus represents the set of all possible sets of traces.

For other questions, a finer level of granularity is needed. Consider, for example, a question about the existence of a particular state transition. On a full simulation trace, the state transition of interest may occur several times. In order to detect all occurrences (and thus measure the event’s probability), it is not sufficient to look at complete traces. Instead, we need to look at trace fragments of length 2, i.e. at tuples of immediately succeeding states drawn from the set \( \mathcal{F}_2 \). This is necessary since any state transition is described by its start and end state. If questions about the probability of a single agent attribute valuation are to be answered, i.e. questions about a particular property of an individual state, then the set that samples need to be drawn from is the set of trace fragments of length 1, i.e. the set of individual states.

We can generalise that, in order to answer any question, we need trace fragments of length \( k \) where \( 0 < k \leq t \) and \( t \) is the maximum number of time steps in the simulation. The sample space is then defined as the set of all fragments of length \( k \), i.e. we have \( \Omega = \mathcal{F}_k \). The \( \sigma \)-algebra \( \Sigma \) is a subset of the power set of \( \Omega \) and thus represents the set of all possible sets of trace fragments of length \( k \), i.e. \( \Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P} \mathcal{F}_k \).

In order to define a probability measure for any event in \( \Sigma \), we first need to define the probability of a certain trace fragment. The probability of fragment \( f = (s_j, s_{j+1}, ..., s_k) \) of trace \( t = (s_0, s_1, ..., s_n) \) where \( 0 \leq j \leq n \) and \( j \leq k \leq n \) is the probability of trace \( t \) divided by the number of coherent fragments of \( t \) of size \((k-j)\):

\[
Pr(f) = \frac{\prod_{0 \leq i < n} P(s_i, s_{i+1})}{n - (k - j) + 1} \tag{3}
\]

The probability measure for any event \( \sigma \in \Sigma \) (which represents a set of trace fragments) can then be defined as the sum of the probabilities of each trace fragment \( \omega \in \sigma \):

\[
Pr(\sigma) = \sum_{\omega \in \sigma} Pr(\omega) \tag{4}
\]

The association of a probability space with a simulation transition system makes it possible to talk about events and their probability. Events are described by properties. A property refers to a set of possible outcomes of a simulation. Consider, for example, a property \( \varphi \) which states that the system will eventually reach a given state \( s \). This clearly needs to be answered on full simulation traces, i.e. the set of outcomes is defined as the set of all trace fragments of length \( t \) where \( t \) is the maximum trace length. \( \Sigma = \{ \sigma \in \mathcal{F}_t \mid \sigma \models \varphi \} \) is then defined as the set of those trace fragments \( \sigma \) that satisfy this condition (denoted \( \sigma \models \varphi \)) and thus eventually end up in state \( s \). On the other hand, let \( \psi \) denote a property that states that the population transitions from state \( x \) to state \( y \). This represents a statement about the full population, yet, due to its focus on transitions, it requires trace fragments of length 2 in order to be answered correctly, i.e. we have \( \Sigma = \{ \sigma \in \mathcal{F}_2 \mid \sigma \models \psi \} \). As a final example, let \( \psi \) denote a property which
states that a single agent transitions from state $x$ to state $y$. Similar to the previous property, it describes a state transition and thus requires trace fragments of length 2. However, it is also of individual nature, i.e. the set of outcomes that it refers to is the set of all fragments of length 2 of individual agent traces. By formulating the properties in the appropriate way, we can answer quantitative properties about the behaviour of the full population, about the behaviour of groups within the population or about the behaviour of individual agents. By evaluating an individual property on independent and randomly chosen agent traces, we can even answer questions about the average behaviour of individual agents. We refer to this process as in-trace sampling.

Since, as described above, the traces of a simulation are measurable, the probability of any property $\phi$ is defined as the sum of the probabilities of all trace fragments of length $k$ in the associated $\sigma$-algebra $\Sigma = \{ \sigma \in \mathcal{F}_k \mid |\sigma| = \phi \}$:

$$Pr(\phi) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma} Pr(\sigma)$$

(5)

In order to make clear what fragment size a property is being verified upon (and thus, which interpretation of the sample space is being chosen), we add the sample size as a subscript variable to $Pr$. For example, we refer to the probability of a property $\phi$ that is to be evaluated upon trace fragments of size 2 as $Pr_2(\phi)$. We omit the subscript if (i) the formula is to be evaluated upon sets of full traces, or, (ii) if the fragment size does not matter for the purpose of description.

This concludes the description of events, properties and their probability in an abstract way. Let us briefly summarise the ideas described above. Essentially, a simulation trace, i.e. the output of a single simulation run, can be seen as a single sample from the set of finite traces defined by the underlying model. Following this interpretation, the set of outcomes, i.e. the set that events and thus also properties are being formulated upon, is fixed as the set of finite traces. However, a single simulation trace can also be interpreted as a set of sample states drawn from the set of states, as a set of sample state tuples drawn from the set of state tuples, as a set of sample state triples drawn from the set of state triples, and so forth. Furthermore, sampling can be performed on the macro, meso and micro level and thus refer to the behaviour of the population, of groups of agents or of individual agents. Depending on how the set of possible outcomes is interpreted, different events can be defined which, ultimately, allows for the expression of richer properties. Given a property $\phi$, its meaning and, of course, also its probability may vary depending on which set of outcomes it is interpreted on. It is therefore important to make the fragment size a central parameter of the verification algorithm.

### 3.3 Complexity

At this point, it is useful to briefly discuss the implications of trace fragmentation on the complexity of verification. Any trace of length $t$ contains $t - k + 1$ coherent fragments of length $k$. Let $c$ denote the complexity of checking a temporal property in a given language (e.g. LTL) on a trace of length $t$. Checking the same property on trace fragments of length $k$, increases the complexity to $(t - k + 1) \cdot c$. Fragmentation thus adds a factor that is linear in the length of the trace to the overall complexity of verification.
4 Formulating multiagent correctness properties

In order to be able to exploit the ideas described above and formulate properties about multiagent systems on different observational levels, we need an appropriate specification language. For illustration, we define below a simple LTL-based property specification language $\mathcal{L}$ which allows for the formulation of properties about individual agents as well as about arbitrary groups of agents. $\mathcal{L}$ here is a simplified version of simLTL [7], the specification language used in the verification tool MABS [6]. The syntax of $\mathcal{L}$ is subdivided into two separate layers, an agent layer and a population layer, which allows for a distinction between agent properties $\phi_a$ and population properties $\phi_p$. The syntax of agent and population formulae is defined as follows.

$$
\phi_a ::= p | \text{true} \mid \neg \phi_a \mid \phi_a \land \phi_a \mid \phi_a \lor \phi_a \mid X\phi_a \mid \phi_a \U att > val \\
\phi_p ::= p | \text{true} \mid \neg \phi_p \mid \phi_p \land \phi_p \mid \phi_p \lor \phi_p \mid X\phi_p \mid \phi_p \U \phi_p \mid att > val
$$

Here, $p$ denotes a Boolean proposition, $att : \text{Name}$ denotes an attribute name and $val : \text{Value}$ denotes an attribute value (see Section 3), and $\in \in \{=, \neq, <, \leq, >, \geq\}$ is a comparison operator. Other logical connectives such as ‘$\Rightarrow$’ or ‘$\Leftrightarrow$’ can be derived in the usual manner: $\phi_1 \Rightarrow \phi_2 \equiv \neg \phi_1 \lor \phi_2$ and $\phi_1 \Leftrightarrow \phi_2 \equiv (\phi_1 \Rightarrow \phi_2) \land (\phi_2 \Rightarrow \phi_1)$.

$\phi_a$ describes the syntax of an agent property, i.e. a property formulated about the behaviour of an individual agent; $\phi_p$ describes the syntax of a population property, i.e. a property formulated about the behaviour of the entire population. The syntax of any formula $\phi \in \mathcal{L}$ is defined as follows:

$$
\phi ::= \langle\phi_a\rangle\phi_p \mid \text{[ag]}\phi_a
$$

$\langle\phi_a\rangle\phi_p$ describes a selective population property which is true if and only if $\phi_p$ is true for the group of all agents that satisfy property $\phi_a$. $\text{[ag]}\phi_a$ describes an indexed agent property; $\text{ag} : Ag$ denotes an identifier that specifies which agent trace within the current simulation trace formula $\phi_a$ is to be evaluated upon.\(^2\)

The semantics of $\mathcal{L}$ are defined on traces, i.e. sequences of system states.\(^3\) For formula $\phi^\delta$ and state $s$, $\text{true}$ always holds, $p$ holds iff it is true in $s$, $\phi_1 \land \phi_2$ holds iff $\phi_1$ holds and $\phi_2$ holds, $\phi_1 \lor \phi_2$ holds iff either $\phi_1$ or $\phi_2$ holds, $\neg \phi$ holds iff $\phi$ does not hold and $X\phi$ holds iff $\phi$ holds in the direct successor state of $s$. For formulae $\phi_1$ and $\phi_2$, $\phi_1 \U \phi_2$ holds in state $s$ iff $\phi_1$ holds in $s$ and $\phi_2$ holds at some point in the future. $att \succeq val$ holds if the value of $att$ in $s$ is $\succeq val$.

The ability to formulate properties about groups of agents as well as about individual agents is important, yet there is more to be done. In a multiagent context, we often have to deal with large populations of agents. In this case, in addition to the probability of a property about a particular agent, there is also interesting to obtain the probability of a property about the average agent. For example, instead of asking for the probability

\(^2\)For the sake of simplicity, we assume that agents are numbered from 1 to $n$ and that the number of agents is fixed.

\(^3\)The finiteness of traces has important implications on the semantics. A discussion of this issue is beyond the scope of this paper; for more information, please refer to the literature [2].

\(^4\)We omit the subscript if we do not want to distinguish between agent and group properties.
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of the income of agent 1 falling below \( x \), we may be interested in the probability of an agent’s income falling below \( x \) on average. This can be achieved through \textit{in-trace sampling}, i.e. the repeated evaluation of an agent property on randomly selected agent traces as described in Section 3. In order to integrate this mechanism into our language, we simply assume that, if the agent identifier is omitted, then the property is checked on a uniformly randomly chosen agent trace.

5 Quantitative trace-based analysis

The purpose of this section is to illustrate the usefulness of trace fragmentation in combination with sampling for the purpose of quantitative analysis. In Section 3, the probability of a property has been defined as the sum of the probabilities of all traces (or, more precisely, trace fragments) in the associated \( \sigma \)-algebra. Or, in other words, the probability of \( \phi \) being true in a set of traces \( T_r \) denotes the ratio between those traces \( tr \in T_r \) for which \( \phi \) holds (denoted \( tr \models \phi \)) and those traces \( tr' \in T_r \) for which \( \phi \) does not hold (denoted \( tr' \not\models \phi \)). It remains to discuss, how this probability can be computed practically. Clearly, if a complete set of traces is available, then the exact probability can be obtained in a straightforward way, by simply counting those traces for which \( \phi \) holds and dividing their number by the overall number of traces. In general, however, complete sets of traces cannot be assumed to be available. Given the vast size of real-world state spaces, the number of possible traces will be too large and we can only expect to have access to a small subset. In this case, statistical analysis is used to \textit{estimate} the actual probability of a property [15]. In the remainder of this paper, when we refer to a probability \( Pr(\phi) \), we thus always mean the estimated probability.

5.1 Analysis types

Up until now, we have completely ignored the fact that properties correspond with trace \textit{fragments} rather than with full traces, as described in Section 3. In this section, we bring together the two ideas of (i) \textit{probability estimation} and (ii) \textit{trace fragmentation} in order to describe advanced types of quantitative analysis. In the following paragraphs, we are mostly interested in the relationship between \textit{states} of a system. States correspond with trace fragments of length 1 which, in turn, correspond with atemporal properties (i.e. properties that do not contain a temporal operator). To that end, we denote with \( L^a \) the \textit{atemporal subset} of \( L \). Furthermore, we abbreviate \((\phi_1 \land X \phi_2)\) with \( \phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2 \).

\textit{State residency:} We start with the notion of a \textit{state residency probability}, i.e. the probability of \textit{being} in a certain state. Informally, of all the time spent in any state, the residency probability of state \( s \) describes the fraction of time that is spent in \( s \). Properties about individual states are inherently atemporal in nature and thus correspond with trace fragments of length 1. Given an atemporal property \( \phi \), the probability of an agent (or any groups of agents) being in a state that satisfies \( \phi \) can then be obtained by simply calculating the probability of \( \phi \) on trace fragments of length 1, i.e. \( Pr_1(\phi) \). The \textit{state residency probability} \( srp \) can thus be formally defined as follows:
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\( srp : \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \)
\( \forall \phi : \mathcal{L}^n \cdot srp(\phi) = Pr_1(\phi) \)

Transition residency: In addition to the probability of being in a certain state, it is crucial to ask properties about the transitions between states. Similar to the residency w.r.t. states defined above, we may, for example, be interested in how much of its time a given agent spends in a particular transition. This can be calculated by simply obtaining the probability of a temporal succession property describing on trace fragments of size 2 (because of the ‘next’ operator). For example, if we are interested in the transition from \( \phi_1 \) to \( \phi_2 \) (where both \( \phi_1 \) and \( \phi_2 \) are atemporal), then the transition residency probability can be obtained by calculating \( Pr_2(\phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2) \). This leads to the following formal description of the transition residency probability \( trp \):

\[
trp : \mathcal{L}^n \times \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}
\]
\[
\forall \phi_1, \phi_2 : \mathcal{L}^n \cdot trp(\phi_1, \phi_2) = Pr_2(\phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2)
\]

Transition probability: The purpose of the next type of quantitative analysis is to determine a particular transition probability, i.e. the probability of transitioning into a particular successor state in which \( \phi_2 \) holds, given that we are currently in state in which \( \phi_1 \) holds. The transition probability is obtained by dividing the probability of transitioning from \( \phi_1 \) to \( \phi_2 \) by the residency probability of \( \phi_1 \), i.e. \( trp(\phi_1, \phi_2)/Pr_2(\phi_1) \). It is important to note that both probabilities need to be obtained on trace fragments of size 2 (even the second, atemporal one!). A formal definition of the transition probability \( tp \) can now be given as follows:

\[
 tp : \mathcal{L}^n \times \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}
\]
\[
\forall \phi_1, \phi_2 : \mathcal{L}^n \cdot tp(\phi_1, \phi_2) = trp(\phi_1, \phi_2)/Pr_2(\phi_1)
\]

Correlation analysis: Probabilistic analysis can be used conveniently to determine probabilistic dependence or correlation. Correlation analysis represents an important building block in the quality assurance process. It can give insights into the system’s dynamics by revealing behaviours that are coupled, i.e. whose occurrence is (entirely or to some extent) synchronised. Furthermore, the analysis of correlations may indicate causal relationships and can thus be used to detect symptoms that can motivate further, more tailored experiments. For example, if \( A \) and \( B \) are positively correlated, one can be sure that one of the following three facts is definitely true: (i) \( A \) is a cause of \( B \), (ii) \( B \) is a cause of \( A \) or, (iii) there is a common cause for \( A \) and \( B \). Positive correlation can be defined formally as follows\(^5\):

\[
posCorr : \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \{true, false\}
\]
\[
\forall \phi_1, \phi_2 : \mathcal{L} \cdot posCorr(\phi_1, \phi_2) \iff Pr(\phi_1 \land \phi_2) > Pr(\phi_1) \cdot Pr(\phi_2)
\]

\(^5\) The definition of functions for negative correlation and non-correlation, i.e. statistical independence, are omitted; they can be given accordingly.
This concludes the description of our analyses. As illustrated in the case study in the next section, quantitative analysis becomes most powerful if it is performed on different observational levels.

6 Case study

In order to illustrate the usefulness of quantitative analysis in the context of trace-based verification, we introduce a small example scenario from the area of swarm robotics. The choice is motivated by the fact that, albeit often conceptually startlingly simple, swarm models exhibit a significant level of complexity which typically prevents them from being amenable to conventional formal verification. On the other hand, they may require a high level of provable correctness. We show how, through statistical model checking in combination with quantitative analysis as described above, interesting properties which reach beyond pure reachability and safety checking can be answered efficiently and with a good level of precision. We focus here on foraging, a problem which has been widely discussed in the literature on cooperative robotics [3]. Foraging describes the process of a group of robots searching for food items, each of which delivers energy. Individual robots strive to minimise their energy consumption whilst searching in order to maximise the overall energy intake. The study of foraging is important because it represents a general metaphor to describe a broad range of (often critical) collaborative tasks such as waste retrieval, harvesting or search-and-rescue. A good overview of multirobot foraging has been given by Cao et al. [3].

All experiments described below were conducted on a Viglen Genie Desktop PC with four Intel® Core™ i5 CPUs (3.2 GHz each), 3.7 GB of memory and Gentoo Linux (kernel version 3.10.25) as operating system, using the verification tool MC²MABS [6]. Results are based on experiments involving 100 replications of the given model.

Model description: The model described in this section is based on the work of Liu et al. [16]. In the model, a certain number of food items are scattered across a two-dimensional space. Robots move through the space and search for food items. Once an item has been detected within the robot’s field of vision, it is brought back to the nest and deposited which delivers a certain amount of energy to the robot. Each action that the robot performs also consumes a certain amount of energy. The model is deliberately kept simple. Each robot can be in one of five states: searching for food in the space, grabbing a food item that has been found, homing in order to bring a food item back to the nest, depositing a food item in the nest, and resting in order to save energy. Transitions between states are probabilistic and either fixed or (which is clearly more realistic) dependent upon the state of the other agents, as described in the following section. The overall swarm energy is the sum of the individual energy levels. Furthermore, in order to make things more interesting, we assume that there are initially two different types or makes of agent which only differ in terms of their field of vision.

Instead of viewing a population of robots as an abstract entity in which agents have a certain probability of finding food (as, for example, done in [10]), we focus here on an agent-based representation of the scenario in which the world that robots inhabit is represented explicitly. As opposed to an idealised representation in which, for example,
robots are assumed to be entirely symmetric, this allows us to take into account the heterogeneity that arises from the agents’ situatedness in a environment in which food is randomly distributed. It is common to model the environment as a two-dimensional grid, in our case a grid of $100 \times 100$ cells. Each grid cell can be inhabited by an arbitrary number of agents. Food items are distributed uniformly across the grid. In the current version of the model, there are 1,000 food items distributed across 10,000 grid cells, which amounts to a food density of 10%. Agents of make 0 are able to detect all food items within a radius of 1, agents of make 1 are able to detect all food items within a radius of 4. The behavioural protocol that each agent follows is shown below.

- If **searching**: look for food. If food has been found, move to the cell and start **grabbing**; otherwise remain **searching**. If no food can be found within $T_s$ time steps, start **homing**.
- If **grabbing**: if the food is still there after $T_g$ time steps, grab it and start **depositing**; otherwise start **homing**.
- If **depositing**: start **resting** after $T_d$ time steps.
- If **homing**: start **resting** after $T_h$ time steps.
- If **resting**: start **searching** after $T_r$ time steps.

It is important to stress that our goal is not to construct an overly realistic model here; the main focus is on illustration and the model is thus kept deliberately simple. Despite its conceptual simplicity, however, the model already exhibits a significant level of complexity which prevents it from being amenable to conventional exhaustive verification. Due to the use of floating point variables for the agents’ energy levels, the state space is effectively infinite. Even if limited to a comparatively small value (e.g. 1,000), the number of possible states would be beyond what is currently verifiable formally.

**Verification:** Our goal is to determine whether the model is reasonably robust, i.e. whether agents have enough energy during the simulated timespan. We start with the following (largely arbitrary) parametrisation:

- 100 agents, 1,000 ticks
- Time spent in each state: $T_s = T_g = T_r = T_h = T_d = 5$
- Energy consumed in each state: $E_s = 12$, $E_g = 12$, $E_h = 6$, $E_r = 2$, $E_d = 62$
- Initial level of energy per agent: 40

In order to check if this parametrisation already satisfies the given requirements, we first define the following population-level property stating that the swarm as a whole will never run out of energy (note the use of `$\langle\langle\text{true}\rangle\rangle$’ to refer to the whole population):

$\phi_1 = G(\langle\langle\text{true}\rangle\rangle(swarm\_energy \geq 0))$

Despite every robot having 40 units of initial energy, the verification of Property $\phi_1$ returns a probability of 0 which shows that the parametrisation given above is not suitable for this version of the model. In order to gain a deeper understanding of why this may be the case, it is useful to study how frequently robots switch from one state into another by determining their average transition probabilities. Following the description in Section 5, this requires the comparison of different probabilities, each of which has
been obtained on trace fragments of length 2. We illustrate the formulation for the transition probability from searching to grabbing. In order to verify this property, we need the following two subformulae: \( \phi_G = \text{grabbing} \) and \( \phi_S = \text{searching} \). The overall transition probability for an individual agent is then calculated as follows:

\[
Pr(S \rightarrow G) = tp(\phi_S, \phi_G)
\] (6)

The results for 100 replications are shown in the first section of Table 1. We can see that robots have an equal probability of finding and grabbing food (\( \approx 17\% \)). We can also see that agents have a very low probability of transitioning into the homing state, which is positive since homing is always caused by a timeout and is thus undesirable.

However, when calculating the transition probabilities, we need to take into account that we have two different makes of agent, each of which can be expected to have different probabilities. In order to assess whether this is really the case, we could, for example, check whether being of make 0 is positively correlated (or being of make 1 is negatively correlated, respectively) with finding food. We will instead ‘zoom in’ and assess robots of different makes separately. This can be achieved by using a selection operator \( \langle \rangle \) as described in Section 4. For example, for robots of make 0 (for which we assume that proposition \( \text{make} 0 \) is always true), the properties necessary for calculating the transition probability \( Pr(S \rightarrow G) \) from searching to grabbing can be formulated as follows: \( \psi_S = \langle \text{make} 0 \rangle \text{grabbing} \) and \( \psi_G = \langle \text{make} 0 \rangle \text{searching} \). The overall transition probability can then be calculated similar to the previous property, i.e. \( Pr(S \rightarrow G) = tp(\psi_S, \psi_G) \). The results for all checks are shown in Table 1. It is obvious that robots of make 1 have a significantly higher probability of finding food which, given their larger field of vision, is intuitively correct. What is also interesting, however, is that a robot’s make seems to have a small but obvious impact on its probability of grabbing food; this is indicated by the lower probability of transitioning from grabbing to depositing for robots of make 1. One possible explanation is that, due to their larger field of vision and their consequently higher probability of finding food, robots of make 1 may block each other by ‘stealing’ food that is already aimed for by a different robot. This explanation may also be underpinned by the slightly higher probability of robots of make 1 moving from grabbing to homing than robots of make 0; the only reason for performing this transition is that a food item aimed for is lost to a different agent. Given the small sample size, however, care needs to be taken when interpreting the numbers — especially when differences are very small, as in this case.

---

Table 1. Transition probabilities for all agents, agents of make 0 and agents of make 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Total time</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Total time</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Total time</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S → G</td>
<td>1m 52s</td>
<td>0.1701</td>
<td>2m 40s</td>
<td>0.0363</td>
<td>2m 50s</td>
<td>0.6223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G → D</td>
<td>2m 01s</td>
<td>0.1735</td>
<td>2m 40s</td>
<td>0.1945</td>
<td>2m 40s</td>
<td>0.1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G → H</td>
<td>2m 09s</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>2m 46s</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
<td>2m 42s</td>
<td>0.0090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D → R</td>
<td>2m 02s</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
<td>2m 50s</td>
<td>0.1912</td>
<td>2m 42s</td>
<td>0.2111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R → S</td>
<td>2m 03s</td>
<td>0.1913</td>
<td>2m 55s</td>
<td>0.1950</td>
<td>2m 47s</td>
<td>0.1833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For clarity, we abbreviate states with their capitalised first letters in all subsequent tables.
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Table 2. Expected individual transition prob. and prob. of constant positive swarm energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>(Pr(S \rightarrow G))</th>
<th>(Pr(G \rightarrow D))</th>
<th>(Pr(\phi_1))</th>
<th>(trp(\text{depositing, resting}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3416</td>
<td>0.1889</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1344</td>
<td>0.1853</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3735</td>
<td>0.1711</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6571</td>
<td>0.1631</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8364</td>
<td>0.1630</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers seem to suggest that the size of the field of vision has a positive impact on the food finding probability and a slightly negative impact on the food grabbing probability. This hypothesis can be investigated further by performing a range of experiments in which the vision parameter is constantly increased. The results are shown in Table 2. The numbers in the second column indicate that, in fact, the size of the field of vision has a significant positive impact on the probability of finding food (as expected). This shows that there is a causal dependence between an agent’s field of vision and its probability of finding food. The numbers in the third column indicate that there is a slightly negative correlation between the field of vision and the probability of grabbing food. The fourth column of the table shows the probability of Property \(\phi_1\) which is 0 in all cases; varying the field of vision alone is thus not sufficient for sustaining a positive energy level (at least not in the current scenario).

The numbers suggest that, despite the slight loss in grabbing probability, the swarm designer is best off by giving all robots a high field of vision. In order to confirm this assumption, we can formulate another property which denotes the overall probability of an agent gaining energy. Remember that energy is always gained in the final time step of the depositing state, i.e. before the agent starts resting. In order to determine the overall probability of an agent gaining energy, we can formulate the following property:

\[
trp(\text{depositing, resting}) = Pr_S(\text{depositing} \rightarrow \text{resting})
\]  

Since this is a property whose truth needs to be ascertained on state transitions, it needs to be checked on trace fragments of size 2. It is also important to note that, since it is not conditional upon the agent’s being depositing (i.e. it does not use logical implication), this property does not describe a transition probability in its strict sense. Instead, it describes the overall probability of performing this particular transition and can thus be used to determine the overall probability of an agent gaining energy. For simplicity, we assume that 5 is the maximum level of vision that can be realised technically. The verification results are shown in the last column of Table 2. They strengthen the assumption that the scenario with the largest field of vision is the most efficient one since, in this case, agents are most likely to gain energy.

The numbers so far give a strong indication that the probability of grabbing food should be increased. In order to choose the right strategy for achieving this goal, it is essential to explain its current level first, i.e. to understand why it is so low. The intuitive assumption is that an increased field of vision also increases competition among robots which itself increases the probability of agents missing out when trying to grab food. This assumption can be checked by determining the expected state distribution, i.e. the amount of time a robot is expected to spend in each of the states. The properties are
Table 3. Expected individual state distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>srp(searching)</th>
<th>srp(grabbing)</th>
<th>srp(homing)</th>
<th>srp(resting)</th>
<th>srp(depositing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2952</td>
<td>0.0563</td>
<td>0.2694</td>
<td>0.3234</td>
<td>0.0555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2147</td>
<td>0.1553</td>
<td>0.1668</td>
<td>0.3122</td>
<td>0.1505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1251</td>
<td>0.2486</td>
<td>0.0810</td>
<td>0.3119</td>
<td>0.2337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0873</td>
<td>0.2896</td>
<td>0.0470</td>
<td>0.3083</td>
<td>0.2647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0691</td>
<td>0.3087</td>
<td>0.0330</td>
<td>0.3109</td>
<td>0.2763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Expected state distribution and energy development for \( T_r = 1 \) and \( T_g = 1 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>srp(s)</th>
<th>srp(g)</th>
<th>srp(h)</th>
<th>srp(r)</th>
<th>srp(d)</th>
<th>( Pr_1(\phi_1) )</th>
<th>( Pr_1([\text{energy} &gt; 0]) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>( T_r = 1 )</td>
<td>0.0923</td>
<td>0.4903</td>
<td>0.0466</td>
<td>0.0828</td>
<td>0.3891</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>( T_g = 1 )</td>
<td>0.0923</td>
<td>0.0816</td>
<td>0.0262</td>
<td>0.4135</td>
<td>0.3893</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

formulated with the help of the state residency probability \( srp \) described in Section 5.1.

The expected state distribution can be obtained by checking all properties above on trace fragments of size 1, i.e. on individual states. This is important since the properties are state properties and, in order to determine their probability, we need to sample from the distribution of states. The verification results are shown in Table 3 (the Roman literals denote the individual simLTL properties described in this chapter). It becomes apparent that in case of lower vision, a significantly higher proportion of robots spend their time searching and homing (due to timeouts) than in case of higher vision. However, it also becomes apparent, that in case of higher vision, a significantly higher proportion of agents spend their time grabbing. This suggests that grabbing becomes a bottleneck which impedes foraging. Apart from grabbing, in all scenarios, a significant number of agents spend their time resting.

We now have two possible directions to improve the overall efficiency of the swarm: we can either try to decrease the time individuals spend for resting or we can try to decrease the time spent for grabbing food items. In order to compare the effect of both changes, we determine again the expected state distribution for each of the two cases. The results are shown in Table 4. Reducing the resting time to 1 has the effect of forcing more robots into searching, grabbing and depositing. Likewise, reducing the grabbing time to 1 forces more robots into searching, resting and depositing. Both scenarios only differ with respect to the number of agents grabbing or resting. Taking into account the energy consumption of each agent intuitively suggests that scenario 2 (reduced grabbing time) must be significantly more effective since, in this case, more agents are resting which consumes significantly less energy than depositing. This assumption can be strengthened by looking at the overall probability of Property \( \phi_1 \) (shown in Column 7) of Table 4. In the case of reduced resting time, the probability of the swarm always having positive energy is 0; in the case of reduced grabbing time, the probability is 1.0. In terms of individual energy levels, individual robots have an average probability of always having positive energy of \( \approx 78\% \), as shown by the unindexed individual agent property in Column 8 of Table 4.

For space limitation, the states are abbreviated with lower-case letters, e.g. \( s \) for searching.
We have now reached a situation in which the overall swarm energy level as well as the majority of all individual energy levels are always positive. This concludes our small case study. In fact, there is still a significant number of individual robots (≈ 22%) running out of energy. Their calibration, however, is not further discussed here.

7 Conclusions and future work

Statistical model checking can provide a powerful alternative for the verification of systems that are unamenable to conventional formal verification. Because of its focus on finite traces, statistical verification is typically focused on comparatively simple properties. This critically limits the verifiability of large-scale multiagent systems with their complex, internal structure. In this paper, we showed how, by combining statistical verification with an advanced type of sampling and trace fragmentation, interesting quantitative analyses on different observational levels can be performed. Using a simple case study from the area of swarm robotics, we showed that, albeit approximate in nature, those types of analyses can be helpful to shed light on the dynamics of complex systems and uncover some of their internal mechanisms.

In this paper, we restricted our attention to a small number of quantitative analyses. Combining the expressiveness of temporal logics with statistical verification, a much wider range of analyses is possible. For example, in statistical time series analysis, correlation can be generalised to the temporal case by measuring the autocorrelation of a time series. The same idea could be applied in a trace-based verification scenario. Furthermore, probabilistic analysis provides an interesting basis for the analysis of causal relationships, either in a statistical sense (e.g. Granger causality) or by utilising probabilistic theories of causation [8]. In a verification context, causal analysis is a powerful tool for the explanation of phenomena. We plan to further investigate this idea, with a particular focus on the work of Kleinberg and Mishra [9].
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1 Introduction

Testing multi-agent systems (MASs) is difficult because MASs may have some properties such as autonomy and non-determinism, and they may be based on models such as BDI which are quite different to ordinary imperative programming. There are many test techniques for MASs, most of which attempt to address these difficulties by adapting existing test techniques to the properties and models of MASs [9, 13]. For instance, SUnit is a unit-testing framework for MASs that extends JUnit [17].

Some test techniques for MASs introduce traditional mutation testing, which is a powerful technique for assessing the adequacy of test sets. In a nutshell, traditional mutation testing makes small changes to a program and then examines whether a given test set has the ability to detect each change to the original program. These changes represent potential small slips. Work on traditional mutation testing for MASs includes [1, 10, 14–16].

In this paper, we apply an alternative approach to mutation testing, namely semantic mutation testing (SMT) [5], to MASs. Rather than changing the program, SMT changes the semantics of the language in which the program is written. In other words, it makes changes to the interpretation of the program. These changes represent
possible misunderstandings of how the program is interpreted. Therefore, SMT assesses a test set by examining whether it has the ability to detect each change to the original interpretation of the program.

SMT can be used not only to assess tests, but also to assess the robustness of a program to semantic changes: Given a program, if a change to its interpretation cannot be detected by a trusted test set, the program is considered to be robust to this change.

This paper makes several contributions. First, it applies SMT to three rule-based agent programming languages, namely Jason, GOAL and 2APL. Second, it provides several contexts (scenarios) in which SMT for these languages is useful. Third, it proposes three sets of semantic mutation operators (i.e., rules to make semantic changes) for these languages respectively, and a broader set of semantic mutation operator classes (that serve as a guide to derivation of semantic mutation operators) for rule-based agent languages. Finally, it presents a preliminary evaluation of the semantic mutation operators for Jason, which shows some potential of SMT to assess tests and program robustness.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 describes two types of mutation testing – traditional mutation testing and semantic mutation testing. Section 3 describes SMT for Jason, GOAL and 2APL by showing several contexts in which it is useful and the source of semantic changes required to apply SMT in each context. Section 4 proposes sets of semantic mutation operators for these languages and a set of semantic mutation operator classes for rule-based agent languages. Section 5 evaluates the Jason semantic mutation operators. Section 6 summarizes our work and suggests where this work could go in the future.

2 Mutation Testing

2.1 Traditional Mutation Testing

Traditional mutation testing is a test assessment technique that generates modified versions of a program and then examines whether a given test set has the ability to detect the modifications to the original program. Each modified program is called a mutant, which represents a realistic small fault in the program. Mutant generation is guided by a set of rules called mutation operators. For instance, Figure 1(a) shows a piece of a program and Figure 1(b) – 1(f) show five mutants generated as the result of the application of a single mutation operator called Relational Operator Replacement, which replaces one of the relational operators (<, ≤, >, ≥, =, ≠) with another operator.

After mutant generation, the original program and each mutant are executed against all tests in the test set. For a mutant, if its resultant behaviour differs from the behaviour of the original program on some test, the mutant will be marked as killed, which indicates that the corresponding modification can be detected by the test set. Therefore, the fault detection ability of the test set can be assessed by the mutant kill rate – the ratio of the killed mutants to all generated mutants: the higher the ratio is, the more adequate the test set is. In the example shown in Figure 1, a test set consisting of a single test in which the input is \( x=3, y=5 \) cannot kill the mutants shown in Figure 1(b) and 1(f) because on that test these two live mutants result in the same
behaviour as the original program (i.e., return a). Therefore, the mutant kill rate is 3/5. According to this result we can enhance the test set by adding a test in which the input is x=4, y=4 and another test in which the input is x=4, y=3 in order to kill these two live mutants respectively and get a higher mutant kill rate (the highest kill rate is 1, as this example shows).

![Image of code snippets](image)

Fig. 1. An example of traditional mutation testing

Many studies provide evidence that traditional mutation testing is a powerful test assessment technique, so it is often used to assess other test techniques [2, 12]. However, the mutation operators used to guide mutant generation may lead to a large number of mutants because a single mutation operator has to be applied to each relevant point in the program and a single mutant only contains a modification to a single relevant point (as shown in Figure 1). This makes comparing the behaviour of the original program and that of each mutant on each test is computationally expensive.

Another problem is that traditional mutation testing unpredictably produces equivalent mutants – alternatives to the original program that are not representative of faulty versions, in that their behaviour is no different from the original in any way that matters for the correctness of the program. Thus, no reasonable test set can detect the modifications they contain. Equivalent mutants must therefore be excluded from test assessment (i.e., the calculation of the mutant kill rate). The exclusion of equivalent mutants requires much extra manual work although this process may be partially automated.

### 2.2 Semantic Mutation Testing

Clark et al. [5] propose semantic mutation testing (SMT) and extend the definition of mutation testing as follows: suppose N represents a program and L represents the semantics of the language in which the program is written (so L determines how N is interpreted), the pair (N, L) determines the program’s behaviour. Traditional mutation testing generates modified versions of the program namely N → (N₁, N₂, ..., Nₖ)
while SMT generates different interpretations of the same program namely $L \rightarrow (L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_k)$. For SMT, $L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_k$ represent semantic mutants, the generation of which is guided by a set of semantic mutation operators. For instance, Figure 2 shows a piece of a program, a semantic mutant (i.e., a different interpretation of this program) is generated by the application of a single semantic mutation operator that causes the if keyword to be used for mutual exclusion (i.e., when an if is directly followed by another if, the second if statement is interpreted the same as an else-if statement).

![Fig. 2. An example of semantic mutation testing](image)

SMT assesses a test set in a similar way as traditional mutation testing – comparing the system behaviour each semantic mutant results in with that the original interpretation results in so as to detect the killed mutants. In the example shown in Figure 2, a test set consisting of a single test in which the input is $x=2$ cannot kill the semantic mutant because on that test the mutant results in the same behavior as the original interpretation (i.e., only do A). Therefore, the mutant kill rate is $0/1 = 0$. We can enhance this test set by adding another test in which the input is $x=4$ in order to kill the live mutant.

SMT is a useful test assessment technique because it can simulate a different class of faults than traditional mutation testing – possible misunderstandings of how the program is interpreted rather than small slips. Although semantic changes can be simulated by changes to the program, SMT often requires higher order (traditional) mutation\(^1\) to simulate a semantic change, and empirical studies (e.g., [11]) show that some higher order mutants are harder to kill than first-order mutants. In addition, [5] show that SMT has potential to capture some faults that cannot be captured by traditional mutation testing.

SMT can be used not only to assess tests, but also to assess the robustness of a program to semantic changes. Given a semantic mutant, if it cannot be killed by a trusted

---

\(^1\) Higher order mutation generates a higher order mutant by making more than one change to the program (these changes may form a subtle fault that is hard to detect). In contrast, most traditional mutation is first order, which generates a first order mutant by making only a single and simple change to the program.
test set, it will be considered as “equivalent”, which indicates that the program is robust to the corresponding semantic change, otherwise the program may need to be improved to resist this change. In the example shown in Figure 2, if the program is required to be robust to the semantic change, it can be modified to ensure that only one branch is executed in any case.

SMT has another difference to traditional mutation testing: it generates far fewer mutants because a single semantic mutation operator only leads to a single semantic mutant, namely a different interpretation of the same program (as shown in Figure 2), while a single traditional mutation operator may lead to many mutants each of which contains a modification to a single relevant point in the program (as shown in Figure 1). This makes SMT less computationally costly.

We know that SMT makes semantic changes for assessing tests or program robustness. For a particular language, which semantic changes should be made by SMT are context-dependent. For instance, to assess tests for a program written by a novice programmer, semantic changes to be made can be derived from common novices’ misunderstandings. To assess the portability of a program between different versions of the interpreter, semantic changes to be made can be derived from the differences between these versions.

3 Semantic Mutation Testing for Jason, GOAL and 2APL

We investigate semantic mutation testing for MASs by first applying it to three rule-based programming languages for cognitive agents, namely Jason, GOAL and 2APL. These languages have similar semantics – an agent deliberates in a cyclic process in which it selects and executes rules according to and affecting its mental states. They also have similar constructs to implement such agents such as beliefs, goals and rules. The details of these languages can be found in [4, 6, 8] and are not provided here.

From Section 2 we know that for a particular language, the semantic changes that can most usefully be made by SMT is context-dependent. In the remainder of this section we provide several contexts in which SMT for the chosen agent languages is useful – migration between languages, evolution of languages, common misunderstandings, and ambiguity of informal semantics. We also show the source of semantic changes required to apply SMT in each context.

---

2 A trusted test set is the one that is considered as “good enough” for the requirement. It doesn’t need to be the full test set that is usually impractical; instead it can choose not to cover some aspects or to tolerate some errors.

3 Here the term “equivalent” is different to the one used in the context of test assessment, in which a mutant is equivalent only if there exist no tests that can kill this mutant. In the context of robustness assessment, a mutant is equivalent if only the trusted test set cannot kill it.

4 This rule can be relaxed, namely mutating the semantics of only parts of the program instead of mutating the semantics of the whole program. This is useful e.g., when the program is developed by several people.
3.1 Migration between Languages

When a programmer migrates a program from one language to another, or simply starts to write a new program in a new (to him or her) language, he or she may have misunderstandings that come from the semantic differences between the new language and the old one(s) he or she ever used. Therefore, in order for SMT to simulate such misunderstandings, we should first find out their source, namely the semantic differences, by comparison between Jason, GOAL and 2APL. Since these languages each have large semantic size and distinctive features, we use the following strategies to guide the derivation of the semantic differences.

- Dividing the semantics of each of these languages into five aspects, as shown in Table 1. We do this because first of all, it provides a guide to derivation of semantic differences. Second, we focus on examining four aspects of the semantics, namely deliberation step order, rule selection, rule execution, and mental state query and update, which are important and common to rule-based agent languages. We also roughly examine other aspects of the semantics in order for completeness. Finally, it is reasonable that common aspects of the semantics are more likely to cause misunderstandings than distinctive aspects in the context of migration, because distinctive aspects are usually supported by distinctive constructs that a programmer would normally take time to learn.

- Focusing on semantic differences between similar constructs. As [5] suggests, such differences easily cause misunderstandings because when migrating a program a programmer may just copy the same or similar constructs without careful examination of their semantics given by the new language.

- Examining both formal and informal semantics of these languages. We start with examining the formal semantics because they can be directly compared. We also verify those that are informally defined through programming and examination of the interpreter source code.

- Focusing on the default options of the interpreter. The interpreters for these languages are customizable, for instance, the Jason agent architecture can be customized by inheritance of the Java class that implements the default agent architecture; the GOAL rule selection order can be customized in the GOAL agent description. We think default options are more likely to cause misunderstandings in the context of migration because if a programmer customizes an element it suggests he or she is familiar with its semantics.
Table 1. The aspects of the semantics of Jason, GOAL and 2APL (those marked with an asterisk are the ones we focus on)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Deliberation step order*</td>
<td>Each deliberation cycle consists of a sequence of steps, e.g., rule selection \rightarrow rule execution is a two-step sub-sequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rule selection*</td>
<td>Rule selection is an important deliberation step in which one or several rules are chosen to be new execution candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rule execution*</td>
<td>Rule execution is an important deliberation step in which one or several execution candidates are executed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mental state query and update*</td>
<td>Mental states (i.e., beliefs and goals) can be queried in some deliberation steps such as rule selection and updated by execution of rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other aspects of the semantics not listed above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We present in Table 2 the semantic differences we found between Jason, GOAL and 2APL. These form the source of semantic changes required to apply SMT in the context of migration between these languages.

Difference 1 comes from the order of two important deliberation steps, namely rule selection and rule execution. A Jason agent first selects a rule to be a new execution candidate and then executes an execution candidate. A GOAL agent processes its modules one by one, in each module it first selects and executes event rules and then selects and executes an action rule (both event and action rules are defined in the module being processed). A 2APL agent first selects action rules to be new execution candidates, and then executes all execution candidates, next selects an external event rule, an internal event rule and a message event rule to be new execution candidates.

Difference 2 comes from the rule selection deliberation step. Jason, GOAL and 2APL differ in two aspects of this step, namely the rule selection condition and the default rule selection order. For the rule selection condition, a Jason or 2APL rule can be selected to be a new execution candidate if both its trigger condition and guard condition get satisfied ("applicable"), while a GOAL rule can be selected if it is applicable and the pre-condition of its first action gets satisfied ("enabled"). For the default rule selection order, Jason rules are selected in linear order (i.e., rules are examined in the order they appear in the agent description, and the first applicable rule is selected), GOAL action rules are selected in linear order while GOAL event rules are selected in “linearall” order (i.e., rules are examined in the order they appear in the agent description, and all enabled rules are selected), 2APL action rules are selected in “linearall” order while 2APL event rules of each type (external, internal, message) are selected in linear order.

Difference 3 comes from the rule execution deliberation step. In this step a Jason agent executes a single action in a single execution candidate, a GOAL agent executes all actions in each selected event rule and each selected action rule, a 2APL agent executes a single action in each execution candidate.

5 Unlike Jason and 2APL, a GOAL agent has no intention set or similar structure, so a GOAL rule is immediately attempted to completely execute once selected.
Table 2. Semantic differences between Jason, GOAL and 2APL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Jason</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>2APL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The order of rule selection and rule execution</td>
<td>select a rule → execute a rule</td>
<td>(select and execute event rules → select and execute an action rule) x Number_of_Modules</td>
<td>select action rules → execute rules → select an external event rule → select an internal event rules → select a message event rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rule selection</td>
<td>• applicable • linear</td>
<td>• enabled • linear (action rules) and linear all (event rules)</td>
<td>• applicable • linear (event rules) and linear all (action rules)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rule execution</td>
<td>• one rule/cycle • one action/rule</td>
<td>• one rule/cycle (action rules) and all rules/cycle (event rules) • all actions/rule</td>
<td>• all rules/cycle • one action/rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Belief query</td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>random</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belief addition</td>
<td>start</td>
<td>end</td>
<td>end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Goal query</td>
<td>(E \rightarrow i), linear</td>
<td>random</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Goal addition</td>
<td>end of (E)</td>
<td>end</td>
<td>start or end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Goal deletion</td>
<td>delete the event or intention that relates to the goal (\phi)</td>
<td>delete all super-goals of the goal (\phi)</td>
<td>delete the goal (\phi), all sub-goals of (\phi) or all super-goals of (\phi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Goal type</td>
<td>procedural</td>
<td>declarative</td>
<td>declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Goal commitment strategy</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>blind</td>
<td>blind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference 4 comes from the belief query. In a Jason or 2APL agent, beliefs are queried in linear order (i.e., beliefs are examined in the order they are stored in the belief base, and the first matched belief is returned). In a GOAL agent, beliefs are queried in random order (i.e., beliefs are randomly accessed, and the first matched belief is returned).

Difference 5 comes from the belief addition. In a Jason agent, a new belief is added to the start of the belief base. In a GOAL or 2APL agent a new belief is added to the end of the belief base.

Difference 6 comes from the goal query. For a Jason agent, since it keeps implicit goals or desires in goal type events and goal type intentions instead of keeping explicit goals, it queries a goal by first examining its event base then its intention set, in
each of which it follows linear query order. In a GOAL agent, goals are queried in random order. In a 2APL agent, goals are queried in linear order. Difference 7 comes from the goal addition. In a Jason or GOAL agent, a new goal is added to the end of the event or goal base. In a 2APL agent, a new goal is added to the start or the end of the goal base according to the relevant agent description (i.e., adopta or adoptz).

Difference 8 comes from the goal deletion. Given a goal \( \varphi \) to be deleted, a Jason agent deletes the event or intention that relates to \( \varphi \), a GOAL agent deletes all goals that have \( \varphi \) as a logical sub-goal, a 2APL agent deletes \( \varphi \), all goals that are a logical sub-goal of \( \varphi \), or all goals that have \( \varphi \) as a logical sub-goal according to the relevant agent description (i.e., dropgoal, dropsubgoal or dropsupergoal).

Difference 9 comes from the goal type. Jason adopts procedural goals – goals that only serve as triggers of procedures although it supports declarative goal patterns. GOAL and 2APL adopt declarative goals – goals that also represent states of affairs to achieve.

Difference 10 comes from the goal commitment strategy. Jason doesn’t adopt any goal commitment strategy (i.e., a goal is just dropped once its associated intention is removed as the result of completion or failure) although it supports various commitment strategy patterns. GOAL and 2APL adopt blind goal commitment strategy, which requires a goal is pursued until it is achieved or declaratively dropped.

3.2 Evolution of Languages

When a programmer moves a program from a language to its successor, he or she may have misunderstandings that come from the semantic evolution. Another scenario is that a programmer may want to examine whether a program written in a language is compatible with a newer version of this language. To derive semantic changes required to apply SMT in these scenarios, we should first find out their source, namely the semantic differences between these languages/versions. We take 2APL and 3APL [7] as an example. 2APL is a successor of 3APL that modifies and extends 3APL. Table 3 shows some semantic differences between them. We explain these differences as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2APL</th>
<th>3APL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PR-rules</td>
<td>plan repair</td>
<td>plan revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The order of rule selection and rule execution</td>
<td>see Table 2</td>
<td>select an action rule ( \rightarrow ) select a PR-rule ( \rightarrow ) execute a rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Action rule selection</td>
<td>linearall</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rule execution</td>
<td>all rules/cycle</td>
<td>one rule/cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference 1 comes from the PR-rules. In 2APL, the abbreviation “PR” means “plan repair”, a PR-rule (i.e. an internal event rule) is selected only when a relevant plan fails. In 3APL, “PR” means “plan revision”, a PR-rule is selected when matching some plan.
Difference 2 comes from the order of rule selection and rule execution deliberation steps. The order adopted by a 2APL agent has been described in Sub-section 3.1. In contrast, a 3APL agent selects an action rule then a PR-rule to be new execution candidates then executes an execution candidate.

Difference 3 comes from the action rule selection order. As described in Sub-section 3.1, 2APL action rules are selected in “linearall” order. In contrast, 3APL action rules are selected in linear order.

Difference 4 comes from the rule execution deliberation step. As described in Sub-section 3.1, a 2APL agent executes all execution candidates in a deliberation cycle. In contrast, a 3APL agent executes a single execution candidate.

### 3.3 Common Misunderstandings

A programmer may have misunderstandings that are common to a particular group of people he or she belongs to. Such misunderstandings can be identified by analysis of these people’s common mistakes or faults. We take GOAL as an example: Table 4 shows some possible misunderstandings of the GOAL’s semantics that are derived from some common faults made by GOAL novice programmers [18]. We explain these misunderstandings as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Fault</th>
<th>Possible Misunderstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wrong rule order</td>
<td>By default rules are selected in another available order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A single rule including two user-defined actions</td>
<td>A rule can have more than one user-defined action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Using “if then” instead of “forall do”</td>
<td>Existential quantification can be used for universal quantification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible misunderstanding 1 comes from the fault of the wrong rule order. If a programmer makes this fault in the GOAL agent description, he or she may have the misunderstanding that rules are selected in another available order\(^6\) by default, e.g., action rules are selected in “linearall” order rather than linear order.

Possible misunderstanding 2 comes from the fault of a single rule including two user-defined actions. If a programmer makes this fault, he or she may have the misunderstanding that this is allowed like other agent languages.

Possible misunderstanding 3 comes from the fault of using “if then” instead of “forall do”. If a programmer makes this fault, he or she may have the misunderstanding that existential quantification can be used for universal quantification.

---

\(^6\) GOAL supports four available rule evaluation orders: linear, linearall, random and randomall.
### 3.4 Ambiguity of Informal Semantics

A programmer may have misunderstandings of the semantics that are not precisely or formally defined. For instance, [3] gives two examples of such misunderstandings of Jason as shown in Table 5. We explain these misunderstandings as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Possible Misunderstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goal deletion event</td>
<td>“when an intention fails” ⇒ “when an intention is removed”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Test goal addition event</td>
<td>“when a test goal action fails” ⇒ “when a test goal action is executed”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible misunderstanding 1 comes from the goal deletion event (\(-/e\) or \(-?e\)). A goal deletion event is generated when an intention with the corresponding goal achievement event (\(+/e\) or \(+?e\)) fails. A programmer may have the misunderstanding that this event is generated when this intention is removed as the result of completion or failure.

Possible misunderstanding 2 comes from the test goal addition event (\(+?e\)). A test goal addition event is generated when the corresponding test goal action (\?e) fails. A programmer may have the misunderstanding that this event is generated when this action is executed, which is similar to the achievement goal addition event (\(+/e\)).

### 3.5 Discussion

SMT for Jason, GOAL and 2APL is of particular interest in the contexts discussed above considering:

- These languages are similar. As mentioned above they have similar semantics and constructs. Subtle semantic differences between similar constructs easily cause misunderstandings.
- These languages have elements that are allowed to customize. By mutating the semantics to represent different customizations it is possible to explore the robustness of a program.

### 4 Semantic Mutation Operators for Jason, GOAL and 2APL

According to our derived sources of semantic changes required to apply SMT in different contexts, we derive three respective sets of semantic mutation operators for Jason, GOAL and 2APL as shown in Table 6 – 8. Due to space limitations we don’t explain each semantic mutation operator in details.

We observe that most of these operators act on the four aspects of the semantics we focus on, namely deliberation step order, rule selection, rule execution and mental state query and update (see Table 1). By further analysis we derive a set of semantic mutation operator classes for rule-based agent languages as shown in Table 9. These
classes provide a guide to derivation of semantic mutation operators for these languages.

Table 6. Semantic mutation operators for Jason

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Semantic Mutation Operator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rule selection order change (RSO)</td>
<td>linear $\rightarrow$ linearall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rule execution strategy change (RES)</td>
<td>one rule/cycle $\rightarrow$ all rules/cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rule execution strategy change 2 (RES2)</td>
<td>interleaved execution of rules $\rightarrow$ non-interleaved execution of rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Belief query order change (BQO)</td>
<td>linear $\rightarrow$ random</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belief addition position change (BAP)</td>
<td>start $\rightarrow$ end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Goal query order change (GQO)</td>
<td>linear $\rightarrow$ random</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Goal addition position change (GAP)</td>
<td>end $\rightarrow$ start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Goal deletion event semantics change (GDES)</td>
<td>“when a plan fails” $\rightarrow$ “when a plan is removed”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Test goal achievement event semantics change (TGAES)</td>
<td>“when a test goal action fails” $\rightarrow$ “when a test goal action is executed”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Semantic mutation operators for GOAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Semantic Mutation Operator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rule selection and execution order change (RSEO)</td>
<td>select and execute event rules then an action rule $\rightarrow$ select and execute an action rule then event rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rule selection condition change (RSC)</td>
<td>enabled $\rightarrow$ applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rule selection order change (RSO)</td>
<td>change between linear, linearall, random and randomall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Belief query order change (BQO)</td>
<td>random $\rightarrow$ linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belief addition position change (BAP)</td>
<td>end $\rightarrow$ start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Goal query order change (GQO)</td>
<td>random $\rightarrow$ linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Goal addition position change (GAP)</td>
<td>end $\rightarrow$ start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Goal deletion strategy change (GDS)</td>
<td>delete all super-goals of $\phi$ $\rightarrow$ delete only $\phi$ or delete all sub-goals of $\phi$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The maximum number of user-defined actions change (MNUA)</td>
<td>1 $\rightarrow$ more than 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Quantification type change (QT)</td>
<td>make existential quantification (“if then”) used for universal quantification (“forall do”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8. Semantic mutation operators for 2APL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Semantic Mutation Operator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rule selection and execution order change (RSEO)</td>
<td>change the original order “select action rules → execute rules → select event rules” to “select action rules → select event rules → execute rules” or “select event rules → select action rules → execute rules”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rule selection condition change (RSC)</td>
<td>applicable → enabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rule selection order change (RSO)</td>
<td>change between linear and linearall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rule execution strategy change (RES)</td>
<td>all rules/cycle → one rule/cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belief query order change (BQO)</td>
<td>linear → random</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Belief addition position change (BAP)</td>
<td>end → start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Goal query order change (GQO)</td>
<td>linear → random</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PR-rule semantics change (PRRS)</td>
<td>plan repair → plan revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9. Semantic mutation operator classes for rule-based agent languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Semantic Mutation Operator Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rule selection and execution order change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rule selection condition change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rule selection order change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rule execution strategy change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mental state query order change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mental state addition position change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mental state deletion strategy change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 5 Evaluation of Semantic Mutation Operators for Jason

We have implemented our derived semantic mutation operators for Jason (as shown in Table 6) by modifying the source code of the Jason interpreter. Here we use two Jason projects in a preliminary evaluation of these operators, in order to assess the potential of SMT to assess tests and program robustness.

The Jason projects we chose are two of the examples released with the Jason interpreter. The first project is a simple one called Domestic Robot (DR), in which a domestic robot gets beer from the fridge and then serves its owner the beer until the owner reaches a certain limit of drinking. The robot will ask a supermarket to deliver beer when the fridge is empty. The second project is a relatively complex one called Gold Miners (the 2nd version, “GM II”), in which two teams of gold-mining agents compete against each other to retrieve as many pieces of gold scatters as possible in a grid-like territory, finding suitable paths to then take the retrieved gold to a depot.

We use two sets of randomly generated tests to test these Jason projects respectively (40 tests for DR and 102 tests for GM II). Each test is a starting configuration of the Jason project, which is represented by a set of parameters extracted from the agent description and the environment description such as the limit of drinking and the map size.
We run each Jason project under the original interpreter and each modified version of the interpreter (that implements a semantic mutation operator) against the corresponding test set, after which we collect and analyze the SMT results. We present the final results in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Mutation Operator</th>
<th>Resultant Mutant of DR</th>
<th>Resultant Mutant of GM II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSO</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES2</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BQO</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAP</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDES</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGAES</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is normal for SMT, a semantic mutation operator here leads to a single semantic mutant if the interpretation of the Jason project involves the relevant semantics; otherwise the operator is not applicable to the Jason project (N/A). The resultant mutants are either equivalent to the original interpretation (E), non-equivalent and killed by the test set (K), or non-equivalent and not killed by the test set (NE).

**Test Assessment**

The non-equivalent and un killed mutants indicate the weaknesses in the test sets. In order to kill such a mutant that the RSO operator leads to, we need a test that can capture the differences in the resultant agent behaviour between selecting all applicable plans and selecting only the first applicable plan. These plans must have the same triggering event, the contexts that are not mutually exclusive and the ability to affect the agent behaviour. In the DR project, the only two such plans are the plan to get beer when the fridge is empty (p1) and the plan to get beer when the owner reaches the limit of drinking (p2). Therefore, we can design a test on which the limit of drinking is just reached when there is no beer in the fridge by e.g., modifying the initial amount of beer in the fridge. This test will cause p2 to be executed twice under the mutated interpreter so that the owner will be advised about drinking twice.

In order to kill the non-equivalent mutant that the RES2 operator leads to, we need a test that can capture the differences in the resultant agent behaviour between interleaved execution of plans and non-interleaved execution of plans. These plans must have a chance to compete for execution and the ability to affect the agent behaviour. In the DR project, the only two such plans are the plan to move to the fridge and the plan to notify the current time (as requested by the owner on occasion). Therefore, we can design a test that can detect the difference in the agent behaviour – the robot under the original interpreter has a chance to notify the current time while moving to the fridge, while it always notifies the time after arriving at the fridge under the mutated interpreter. It is worth noting that since the robot takes much longer to stay at the
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fridge (a few seconds) than to move to the fridge (less than one second) on the original test set, the agent has a much bigger chance to notify the time at the fridge than on the move although under the original interpreter. Therefore, we can increase the chance to notify the time on the move by e.g., largely increasing the map size (so that the robot will take longer to move), to make it more likely we will kill the mutant.

In order to kill the non-equivalent mutant that the BAP operator leads to, we need a test that can capture the differences in the resultant agent behaviour between different orderings of beliefs. In the GM II project, there is only one description that causes the order of beliefs to matter – the actions to announce to other teammates all gold deposits that the gold miner agent perceived and that have not been handled or announced yet. Under the original interpreter, the gold miner agent will first announce the gold it perceived most recently; under the mutated interpreter, it will first announce the gold it perceived initially. The different orders of gold announcements may cause other teammates to bid for and be allocated different gold. Therefore, we can add a test that can detect this difference. It is worth noting that this difference to the original behaviour may not be a violation of the correctness requirements; instead it may be just a tiny variation that reflects the non-determinism of multi-agent systems, in which case the mutant is considered as equivalent.

Robustness Assessment

Where our operators produced equivalent mutants, it indicates that the Jason project is robust to the corresponding semantic changes. From these equivalent mutants we can come up with some ideas of how to resist these changes. For instance, in order to resist the semantic changes caused by the BQO and GQO operators while not affecting the agent behaviour under the original interpreter, the agent description has to be improved so that there can be only one matched belief or goal at most for each query. To resist the semantic change caused by the GAP operator, the agent description can be improved so that the agent behaviour is independent of the order of the goal type events and intentions.

Those mutants that are or can be killed indicate that the Jason project is not robust to the corresponding semantic changes. For instance, the DR project does not behave correctly under the semantic change caused by the RSO operator. In order to be robust to this change the agent description can be improved so that there can be only one applicable plan at most in any case. As another example, the DR project does not behave correctly under the semantic change caused by the RES2 operator. In order to be robust to this change the agent description can be improved so that there can be only one non-empty competitive intention at most in any case. Another example is that the GM II project cannot resist the semantic change caused by the BAP operator. In order to be robust to this change the agent description can be improved so that the agent behaviour is independent of the order of the beliefs.
6 Conclusions

Semantic mutation testing (SMT) is a useful technique for assessing tests and the robustness of a program to semantic changes. In this paper we applied SMT to three agent languages, namely Jason, GOAL and 2APL. We showed that SMT for these languages is useful in several contexts – migration between languages, evolution of languages, common misunderstandings, and ambiguity of informal semantics. We derived sets of semantic mutation operators for these languages, and a broader set of semantic mutation operator classes that are applicable to rule-based agent languages. Finally, we used two Jason projects in a preliminary evaluation of the semantic mutation operators for Jason. The results suggest that SMT can indicate some weaknesses in test sets and programs.

Our future work will focus on further evaluation of the semantic mutation operators for Jason. To further evaluate the ability of these operators to assess tests, we will examine their representativeness in comparison to realistic misunderstandings and their power by looking for more hard-to-kill mutants (as we have done in this paper), as suggested by [8]. To further evaluate the ability of these operators to assess program robustness, we will apply them to more Jason projects and provide specific rules to change the agent description in order to improve robustness.
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1 Introduction

Business process modelling has many notions in common with agents-oriented programming: It serves as a high-level abstraction for distributed systems composed of many cooperative or competing actors, communicating via messages and services, and reacting to events. Thus, it is not surprising that process modelling has been adopted for the modelling of multi-agent systems in a number of works (cf. [4], [5], [6], and others).

One common problem with translating processes to agents (or, in fact, most other programming systems) is the mapping of free-form process graphs to block structured programming languages. Also, the mapping is often informal and ambiguous, or it covers just a part of the notation, particularly for more expressive (and thus interesting) notations like BPMN [18].

In this paper, we describe a mapping from BPMN processes to multi-agent systems. The mapping covers diverse aspects of processes and agents, such as actors/roles, reaction rules, behaviours, events, services, and message-based communication [13], and can be applied to different agent programming languages and frameworks. It also includes a formal description of how individual process structures can be mapped to equivalent structures in block-oriented languages.

The mapping has been implemented in three different fashions for the JIAC V agent framework [16]. While each implementation has individual strength and weaknesses, making it suited for different applications, they behave the same
and are all interoperable with each other, such that different parts of the same process can be mapped to different implementation styles.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: In Section 2 we describe the models used for agents and processes. In Section 3, we use those models to define a mapping between them. Then, in Section 4, we present three different implementations of the mapping. Finally, we present related work in Section 5 and conclude in Section 6.

2 Agent and Process Model

In this section, we describe the meta models used for modelling the agent systems and processes. While some models can be found in the literature [3], we decided to provide our own definitions in order to have a uniform representation and to focus on those parts most relevant to the mapping.

2.1 Agent Meta Model

A common problem when dealing with agent systems is that the notion of an agent is not very clearly defined (see [8] for a number of possible definitions). Thus, in the following we provide a semi-formal definition of what constitutes an agent, and what those agents have to provide for the mapping to be applicable. Note that we are not pursuing to provide a general and exhaustive definition for agents, but to have a meta model streamlined for the task at hand: as a foundation for the mapping from processes to agents (Figure 1).

The field of agents is immensely broad, and not only is it near impossible to define an agent meta model that suits all the different aspects of agents, but neither could a process modelling notation like BPMN be used to model all of those aspects. Thus, our goal is to keep this model as simple and as abstract as possible, so that the mapping is applicable to many different agent frameworks, even though it may not cover all of their specialities.
Agent Architecture A multi-agent system $mas = (id, Agents, Roles)$ consists of several defined roles, and a number of concrete agents implementing those roles. Each agent $agent = (id, Rol, Bel)$ is primarily defined by the roles $Rol \subseteq Roles$ it implements. It may also have a number of beliefs $Bel$, both initial and those added at runtime. How those beliefs are represented is not of importance for this mapping. Roles define the behaviour of the agent. Each role $role = (id, Plans, Rules, Goals)$ consists of a number of plans, rules, and optionally goals. While the plans hold the actual actions to be taken, rules and goals specify when those actions should be executed.

Each plan $plan = (id, In, Out, pre, eff, script)$ describes one behaviour, which is detailed in an agent script. Plans have inputs and output lists, holding the names and types of the parameters and return values, as well as a semantic description in the form of preconditions and effects (IOPE). Rules $rule = (cond, plan, map)$ link an execution condition, matched against the agent’s current beliefs, to a plan, and provide a mapping of values and variables from the condition to input parameters of the plan. Goals $goal = (cond, P')$ are defined by a condition, or world state to be achieved, and a number of plans from the agent’s set of plans $P' \subseteq Plans$ available for fulfilling that goal.  

Agent Behaviour The agent’s plans are made up of script elements. How these scripts are implemented in an actual agent framework is irrelevant for the mapping, as long as the following atomic behaviours are supported:

- $send(m)$: Send message $m = (snd, rec, cnt)$ with given content $cnt$ from sender $snd$ to recipient $rec$.
- $receive(m)$: Receive message matching template $m = (snd, rec, cnt)$.
- $invoke(p, i, o)$: Call plan $p$ with input $i$ and store output in $o$.
- $ass(x, y)$: Evaluate expression $y$ and assign result to variable $x$.
- $achieve(g)$: Add goal condition $g$ to agent’s goals and wait for completion.
- $nop$: No Operation.

Further, the following control-flow structures are required, including simple conditions and loops, but also basic threading for parallel execution:

- $seq(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$: Execute scripts $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ sequentially.
- $par(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$: Execute scripts $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ in parallel.
- $cond(c, x, y)$: Execute $x$, if condition $c$ is true, else $y$.
- $while(c, s)$: Execute script $s$, while condition $c$ is true.
- $fork(id, x)$: Execute script $x$ in thread with ID $id$.
- $join(id)$: Wait for thread with ID $id$ to finish.
- $stop(id)$: Interrupt Thread with ID $id$.
- $wait(t)$: Suspend execution for time $t$.

We are only regarding $achieve$ goals here. While there are several types of goals [21], $achieve$ goals and $maintain$ goals are clearly the most interesting of those. Further, $maintain$ goals can easily be emulated with achieve goals and rules, by having a rule set a new achieve goal whenever the condition to be maintained is violated.
While statements such as as fork and join, may not be present in some high-level agent languages, they could be emulated with different language elements, e.g., additional reaction rules. Otherwise, some features of the mapping, particularly the mapping of event handlers, can not be applied.

2.2 Process Meta Model

We decided to use BPMN (Business Process Model and Notation) [18] for modelling multi-agent systems. BPMN is a standardised notation that is widely used in practice [20]. It allows for modelling with a high level of abstraction while being detailed enough to generate readily executable systems. Also, it exhibits several language features that make it particularly useful for modelling distributed and autonomous systems, such as communication, interaction, and event handling.

While the BPMN specification focuses on the notational aspects of the language, there are several other works detailing its formal semantics (see e.g., [7]). Still, we will define our own BPMN-based process meta model (see Figure 2), being streamlined for describing the mapping proposed in this paper.

**Process, Pool, Participant** At the top level, each business process system $bps = (id, BPD, Pt)$ consists of business process diagrams $BPD$ and a set of participant names $Pt$. Process diagrams correspond to use cases and participants to actors having a role in those use cases. Each business process diagram $bpd = (id, Pl, MF, Art)$ (a BPMN diagram), with $bpd \in BPD$, contains one or
more pools $P_I$, message flows $MF$, and optionally artefacts $Art$, such as text annotations.\footnote{Both artefacts and message flows are purely documentary; the actual messages are defined in the respective tasks and events sending and receiving those messages.}

Each pool $pool = (id, wf, pt)$ is defined by a workflow $wf = (O, SF, Prop)$ and the name of the participant $pt \in Pt$ that is responsible for carrying out this workflow. A possible subdivision of pools into lanes is not regarded. The workflow consists of a set of flow objects $O$ that are connected by (conditional) sequence flows $SF \subseteq O \times O \times \{\text{expressions} \cup \{\varepsilon\}\}$. It can also declare a number of properties $Prop \subseteq \text{name} \times \text{type}$, i.e. variables.

**Workflow Elements** The pool’s workflows are made up of activities (task or subprocess), events, and gateways. Tasks, events and gateways are subdivided into different types, each with type-specific attributes $At \subseteq \text{key} \times \text{value}$. Further, tasks and events can have an arbitrary number of assignments $As \subseteq \text{property} \times \text{expression} \times \{\text{before}, \text{after}\}$ that can be executed either before or after the element itself.

A task $task = (id, type_t, As, At_t)$ is an atomic activity. The most important types of tasks ($type_t \in \{\text{service, send, receive, script, . . .}\}$) for this mapping are for sending or receiving messages, invoking other services, or carrying out a given script.

Events $event = (id, type_e, As, At_e)$ of different types ($type_e \in \{\text{message, timer, rule, . . .}\}$) can be used for ‘passive’ behaviours like waiting for a message to arrive, for a specific time, or until some condition is satisfied. Events can be used in the normal flow of control, or in special situations like as event handlers to a subprocess or after an event-based gateway.

Gateways $gateway = (id, type_g, At_g)$ mark the boundaries of loops and conditional blocks. Their type ($type_g \in \{\text{xor, or, and, event, complex}\}$) can be exclusive- or inclusive-or, parallel, event-based, or complex. However, we are not considering the complex type, as its semantics are very vague.

Finally, subprocesses $subp = (id, swf, EH, succ_{EH}, At)$ can be used to aggregate several other activities and events into a sub-workflow $swf = (O', SF', Prop')$, i.e. a nested set of flow objects, sequence flows and properties defined in that subprocess.\footnote{Subprocesses could also be defined recursively, containing a Call activity invoking the parent (sub-)process, but this is not discussed here.} Besides providing structure to the process, subprocesses also define an individual variable scope and can be endowed with event handlers $EH$ that will interrupt the entire sub-workflow in case one of the events is triggered. The successor-relation of those event handlers is given by $succ_{EH} \subset EH \times O$.

2.3 Expressions, Data, Communication

In both models we are making use of expressions, e.g., for assignments and conditions. We are not specifying any particular language to be used for those
expressions; it should provide the usual mathematical and logical operations and grant access to the agent’s beliefs and the properties of the process.

Another important aspect of both multi-agent systems and business processes, are messages, which are defined by their sender, receiver, and content: 

\[ \text{message} = (\text{sender}, \text{receiver}, \text{content}) \]

Those attributes can also be used in expressions, e.g., for memorizing the sender of a message and later sending a reply to that same receiver. Here, sender and receiver can be individual agents/participants or multicast-addresses. The content is not restricted: It could be a FIPA message or any kind of serializable object.

Complementary to messages, services describe a particular action to be invoked:

\[ \text{service} = (\text{id}, \text{provider}, \text{Input}, \text{Output}) \]

They are defined by a service ID, their respective provider, and input and output lists. In a multi-agent system, each plan could be considered as a service, although in practice only a subset of them will be, as some might be private. In BPMN, each pool that has a SERVICE start event will be exposed as a service.

3 Mapping Processes to Agents

In this section, we describe and formalize the mapping from BPMN processes to multi-agent systems according to the meta models defined in the previous section. In a nutshell, participants in the process are mapped to agent roles, their pools to plans, and the pools’ start events to various mechanisms and rules for executing those plans (see Figure 3). For a more in-depth discussion of the mapping, please refer to [14].

We are using the notation \( x \implies z \) to denote that the process-element \( x \) is mapped to agent-element \( z \). Analogously, we are using \( (x, y) \implies z \) to indicate
that the region of the process graph between $x$ and $y$ (i.e. a self-contained subgraph with source $x$ and sink $y$) is mapped to the (possibly complex) element $z$. We use $\varepsilon$ for the empty, or null element.

### 3.1 Mapping of Agent Architecture

The business process system $bps = (id, BPD, Pt)$ is mapped to a multi-agent system, whereas only roles can be created; agents have to be specified later.

$$bps \implies mas = (id, Agents, Roles), \text{ with}$$

$$\begin{align*}
\text{Agents} &= \emptyset \\
\text{Roles} &= \{role | \exists p \in Pt : p \implies role\}
\end{align*}$$

A participant name $pt \in Pt$ is mapped to a role, defined by plans and rules, with that name as its ID. The initial configuration knows neither goals nor beliefs, but both can be added at runtime. For each pool, one plan is created, as well as one rule for each start event in those pools.

$$pt \implies role = (pt, P, R, G), \text{ with}$$

$$\begin{align*}
P &= \{\text{plan} | \exists p = (id', wf', pt) : p \implies plan\} \\
R &= \{\text{rule} | \exists e_s \in O_{wf'} : e_s \implies rule\} \\
G &= \emptyset
\end{align*}$$

Let $bpd = (id_1, Pl, Art)$ be a BPD, and $pool = (id_2, wf, pt)$ a Pool, such that $pool \in Pl$ and $wf = (O, SF, Prop)$. For each pair of start- and end-events $e_s, e_e \in O$, with $Z$ being an agent script element, such that $(e_s, e_e) \implies Z$, a plan is created. The plan’s IOPE remain undefined at first.

$$pool \implies plan = (id_1 id_2, In, Out, pre, eff, Z), \text{ with}$$

$$\begin{align*}
In &= Out = \emptyset \\
pre &= eff = \varepsilon
\end{align*}$$

The start event $e_s = (id, type_e, As, At_e)$ is mapped to a reaction rule, triggering the same plan. The condition is a rule expression depending on $type_e$, and variables from that condition that are used in assignments are mapped to inputs of the plan of the same name.

$$e_s \implies rule = (cond, plan, map), \text{ with}$$

$$\begin{align*}
\text{cond} &= [\text{rule expression, depending on type}] \\
\text{plan} &= p, \text{ such that } pool \implies p \\
\text{map} &= \{(x, x) | \ass(x, y) \in As\} \\
In_{plan} &\leftarrow In_{plan} \cup \{y | (x, y) \in map\}
\end{align*}$$
3.2 Mapping of Agent Behaviours

In the following, we describe the mapping of the actual processes to different agent behaviours, i.e., plans. At first, we will take a look at different process structures, before considering individual elements.

**Mapping of Structures** The transformation of process graphs to structured programs is a complicated task [10]. We are following a bottom-up “structure identification” approach [17], using different rules to match different structures (see Figure 4). Those rules are applied to the elements of a pool $p = (id, wf, pt)$ or subprocess $sp = (id, wf, EH, succEH, At)$ with $wf = (O, SF, Prop)$.

The simplest and yet most important structure is the sequence, connecting a number of flow objects $x_i, y_i \in O$ ($i \leq n$), such that $\forall i < n : (y_i, x_{i+1}, \epsilon) \in SF$ and $\forall i \leq n : \exists z_i : (x_i, y_i) \Longrightarrow z_i$.

$$(x_1, y_n) \Longrightarrow seq(z_1, \ldots, z_n)$$

Different structures, such as conditions and loops, are delimited by pairs of gateways, $g_1 = (id_1, type_1, At_1)$ and $g_2 = (id_2, type_2, At_2)$.

If $type_1 = type_2 = xor$, they correspond to an if/else-style condition. Given $x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2 \in O$, and $(g_1, x_1, c), (g_1, x_2, \epsilon), (y_1, g_2, \epsilon), (y_2, g_2, \epsilon) \in SF$,
with \( z_1, z_2 \) script elements, such that \((x_1, y_1) \Rightarrow z_1 \) and \((x_2, y_2) \Rightarrow z_2\).

\[(g_1, g_2) \Rightarrow \text{cond}(c, z_1, z_2)\]

If \( \text{type}_1 = \text{type}_2 = \text{AND} \), they are mapped to \text{parallel} execution. In this case, all sequence flows are unconditional, i.e. \( c = z \). Also, instead of just two, an arbitrary number of branches (and corresponding script elements \( z_1, \ldots, z_n \)) is allowed in between the gateways.

\[(g_1, g_2) \Rightarrow \text{par}(z_1, \ldots, z_n)\]

An inclusive-or gateway, i.e. \( \text{type}_1 = \text{OR} \), is mapped to a combination of \text{parallel} and \text{conditional} execution. In this case, each of the sequence flows going out of \( g_1 \) requires a condition \( c_i \neq z \).

\[(g_1, g_2) \Rightarrow \text{par}(\text{cond}(c_1, z_1, z), \ldots, \text{cond}(c_n, z_n, z))\]

For an event-based gateway \( \text{type}_1 = \text{EVENT} \), the first element of each branch has to be an event, i.e. for the \( i \)-th branch, \( e_i, x_i, y_i \in O \), \( e_i \) being an event, with \((g_1, e_i, z_i), (e_i, x_i, \varepsilon), (y_i, g_2, \varepsilon) \in SF \), such that \( e_i \Rightarrow X_i \) and \((x_i, y_i) \Rightarrow z_i \). The events are checked in separate threads, and the course of the process depends on the event triggered first.

\[(g_1, g_2) \Rightarrow \text{seq}(A, [B_{1..n}], \text{join}(id_{y_i}), [\text{stop}(id_{eh_1..n})], [C_{1..n}]\))\]

\[A = \text{fork}(id_{y_i}, \text{while}(T, \text{nop}))\]

\[B_i = \text{fork}(id_{eh_i}, \text{seq}(X_i, \text{ass}(t_i, T), \text{stop}(id_{g_i}))\))\]

\[C_i = \text{cond}(t_i, z_i, \varepsilon)\]

If \( \text{type}_1 = \text{type}_2 = \text{XOR} \), and if the second branch is reversed, i.e. \((g_1, x_1, \varepsilon), (g_1, g_2, \varepsilon), (g_2, x_2, \varepsilon), (g_2, g_1, \varepsilon) \in SF \), the structure is mapped to a loop.

\[(g_1, g_2) \Rightarrow \text{seq}(z_1, \text{while}(e, \text{seq}(z_2, z_1)))\]

The mapping of a subprocess \( sp = (id_s, swf, \varnothing, \varnothing, \varnothing) \) without event handlers corresponds to the mapping of its workflow.\(^4\) Let \( swf = (O_{sp}, SF_{sp}, \text{Prop}_{sp}) \), and \( e_s, e_e \in O_{sp} \) unique start- and end events, such that \( (e_s, e_e) \Rightarrow Z \).

\[sp \Rightarrow Z\]

An \textit{ad-hoc} subprocess \( sp = (id_s, swf, \varnothing, \varnothing, At) \) with completion condition \( cc \), i.e. \( (\text{comp-cc}, cc) \in At \), corresponds to the creation of a goal with the same condition. For this, the sub-workflow has to contain only service tasks, their respective plans being available for execution towards the goal, i.e. \( swf = (\{t_1, \ldots, t_n\}, \varnothing, \varnothing) \), with \( t_i = (id_i, \text{service}, \varnothing, \{(\text{name}, (P_i, e, \varepsilon))\}) \).

\[sp \Rightarrow \text{achieve}((cc, \{P_1, \ldots, P_n\}))\]

\(^4\) Depending on the implementation, the workflow might be wrapped into a separate method, service, or class.
A subprocess \( sp = (ids, swf, EH, succEH, \emptyset) \) with event handlers behaves similar to an event-based gateway, even though instead of just waiting for the first event to occur, the subprocess is executed. If one of the events is triggered, the execution of the subprocess together with any remaining event handlers is aborted and the process continues after that event. Also, this adds another branch in case none of the events is triggered. Be \( x_0, y_0, \epsilon, (y_i, g, \epsilon) \in SF, (i \leq n) \) and \( e_i \in EH \) with \( (e_i, x_i) \in succEH \) \((1 \leq i \leq n)\). Let \( Z \) be a script-element such that \( sp \rightarrow Z \).

\[
(sp, g) \rightarrow seq(A, [B_{1..n}], join(id_{sp}), [stop(id_{b1..n})], C)
\]

\[
A = fork(id_{sp}, Z)
\]

\[
B_i = fork(eh_i, seq(X_i, ass(t_i, \top), stop(id_{sp})))
\]

\[
C = seq(ass(n, \top), [D_{1..n}], cond(n, z_0, \epsilon))
\]

\[
D_i = cond(t_i, seq(ass(n, \bot), z_i), \epsilon)
\]

With those rules, the most important process structures can be mapped to equivalent agent script elements. Still, there are types of process graphs that can not be structured in any way [15]. However, this does not pose a significant limitation, as those graphs tend to contain structural errors leading to deadlocks and similar undesirable behaviour.

**Mapping of Elements** At the bottom level, the above structures are made up of individual flow objects, i.e. tasks and events (subprocesses and gateways are part of the structures).

Both tasks and events can contain assignments, that, depending on their assign time, are to be executed either before or after the actual task or event, e.g., for handling the input and output of services. Thus, each flow object of the form \( fo = (id, type, As, At) \) is mapped to a sequence of assignments together with the mapping of the task or event itself, \( Z \), which depends only on its type and attributes, i.e. \( (type, At) \rightarrow Z \).

\[
fo \rightarrow seq(a^b_1, \ldots, a^b_n, Z, a^a_1, \ldots, a^a_n), \text{ with}
\]

\[
a^b_i \in \{ass(prop, expr) \mid (prop, expr, BEFORE) \in As\}
\]

\[
a^a_i \in \{ass(prop, expr) \mid (prop, expr, AFTER) \in As\}
\]

Depending on their respective type and attributes, a task \( task = (id, type_t, As, At_t) \) is mapped to different script elements, e.g., sending a message, invoking a service, or executing some given script.

\[
(type_t, At_t) \rightarrow \begin{cases} send(m) & \text{if } type = \text{SEND}, ('msg', m) \in At_t \\ receive(m) & \text{if } type = \text{REC}, ('msg', m) \in At_t \\ invoke(p, i, o) & \text{if } type = \text{SERVICE}, ('impl', (p, i, o)) \in At_t \\ script & \text{if } type = \text{SCRIPT}, ('script', script) \in At_t \\ nop & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]
Similarly, an event \( \text{event} = (id, \text{type}_e, A_s, A_t_e) \) can be mapped to, e.g., receiving a message, or waiting for a certain time or condition. The same mapping is used whether the event occurs in normal flow or as a subprocess event handler.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(type}_e, A_t_e) \Rightarrow \\
\begin{cases}
\text{wait}(t) & \text{if type} = \text{timer}, (\text{time'}, t) \in A_t_e \\
\text{receive}(m) & \text{if type} = \text{message}, (\text{msg'}, m) \in A_t_e \\
\text{while}(\neg c, \text{nop}) & \text{if type} = \text{rule}, (\text{rule'}, c) \in A_t_e \\
\text{nop} & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

These are the most important types of tasks and events for creating a usable system. Other types, such as \textit{error} events or \textit{user} tasks, are not regarded in this mapping, but can still be used in some of its implementations.

4 Implementation

Currently, the mapping has been implemented in three different ways for the JIAC V multi-agent framework [16]: For creating services in the high-level agent-scripting language JADL++ [14], for generating Java-based agent beans implementing the respective behaviours [12], and in the form of a JIAC-based process interpreter [22]. These implementations are integrated into the BPMN modelling tool VSDT (Visual Service Design Tool) [11].

JIAC V (Java Intelligent Agent Componentware, version 5) is a multi-agent framework that heavily lends from the service-oriented architecture (SOA) paradigm to create transparently distributed multi-agent systems communicating via messages and services, with a particular focus on industrial applications [16]. Consequently, the business process metaphor lends itself well to it.

4.1 Generation of JADL Services

At first, the mapping was realised as a transformation to JADL services. Being a high-level, service-oriented scripting language [9], the adoption of the BPMN notation was natural. JADL scripts can be passed to an agent at runtime, allowing for dynamically changing or extending its behaviour.

Each process is mapped to one JADL service, with its input and output determined by the start events. Most structures, including event-based conditions, can be mapped directly onto corresponding control flow elements. Simple subprocesses are embedded into a nested variable scope within the service, but subprocesses with event-handlers are not supported in this implementation. Tasks and events for sending and receiving messages and for invoking other services are mapped directly onto according high-level language elements, thus making the resulting code particularly easy to understand and to maintain.

The reaction rules derived from the start events are mapped onto a set of Drools\(^5\) rules. JIAC agents can be equipped with a Drools rule engine, syncing

---

\(^5\) JBoss Drools: \text{http://www.jboss.org/drools/}
with the agent’s memory and triggering the respective services in case the start condition – e.g., a message being received, or a timer – is fulfilled, by inserting an according intention into the agent’s memory. The mapping of participants to agent roles is reflected in the creation of according JIAC configuration files, holding the different agent roles, each equipped with a JADL interpreter and a rule engine and the respective services and rules.

4.2 Creation of JIAC Agent Beans

Complementary to this implementation, BPMN diagrams can also be mapped to JIAC agent beans [12]. Those are more versatile and provide better extensibility, making them the best choice for implementing the agent’s core components. Here, each pool is mapped to one agent bean (i.e. a Java class), encapsulating the behaviour for that role in that use case. All of the activities are mapped to activity methods that are orchestrated in a workflow method, representing the workflow as a whole.

The workflow method is made up of standard Java constructs, such as conditions and loops, calling the activity methods accordingly. Subprocesses are mapped to similarly structured nested classes. Parallel execution is implemented via threads, as are event handlers, where the event is monitored in a thread, eventually interrupting the main workflow thread and re-routing the execution accordingly. The activity methods encapsulate both that activities assignments and the actual activity, e.g. sending a message, making the workflow code much more compact and easy to understand by humans. Properties are mapped to Java variables in the appropriate scope.

Start events are implemented making use of different mechanisms of the agent beans. For an unspecified, or none start event, the workflow method is triggered once when the agent starts; a message start event with a service implementation will expose the workflow method as an action; a message start event with a message channel will create an according message observer; and a timer start event will regularly check the time (or time since last execution) and start the workflow method accordingly.

4.3 JIAC Process Interpreter Bean

Finally, the mapping has been implemented as a JIAC-based process interpreter agent bean [22]. This one fundamentally differs form the other two, as no source code is generated, but the BPMN diagram file itself is passed to the bean and interpreted. Thus, no structuring of the process is necessary.

The process interpreter agent provides an action, accepting a BPMN diagram and the name of the participant to play, creating a new interpreter runtime for that process diagram and participant, i.e. role. It also acts as the “link” between the interpreted process and the outside world.

The processes are not started immediately; instead, those interpreter runtimes are responsible for monitoring the start events of that role’s processes, and will create new interpreter instances each time a start event is triggered,
e.g., when some message arrives. They also determine what processes should be exposed as actions of the interpreter agent (for service start events).

At the lowest level, the interpreter instances keep track of the internal state of each process. In each iteration of the interpreter agent’s execution cycle, each process instance performs one ‘step’ in its respective process, keeping track of the current state of the process, evaluating branching conditions and routing the flow of control accordingly, until the last active flow object has been executed.

4.4 Comparison and Application

Each implementation has its strengths and weaknesses.

- While providing for compact and readable code, the mapping to JADL suffers from the language’s lack of expressiveness in some points. Still, it is useful for high-level behaviours and services, and has the additional advantage that JADL scripts can be deployed and undeployed at runtime, thus dynamically changing the agent’s behaviour.
- The generated JIAC agent beans have the highest expressiveness: Not only can nearly the entire BPMN be mapped to an according Java code, but if needed the generated beans can also easily be extended with additional code, e.g., for interaction with a GUI or data base. Those changes are preserved even when the code is generated anew. On the negative side, the agent beans are relatively static and not as easy to add to an agent at runtime.
- Not depending on generated code, the interpreter is not limited to processes following a block-structure but can run arbitrarily structured processes. This comes at the cost that the business process has to strictly contain everything that is needed in order to run, as there is no generated code that could be extended or edited before execution. As with JADL, processes can be dynamically added to and removed from the interpreter agent at runtime. Both arguments make the interpreter best suited for very high-level behaviour and composite services. Finally, the interpreter could be linked with the process modelling tool, showing the current state of the execution (future work).

The three implementations differ in both, their exact coverage of the mapping (see Table 1, including the mapping from BPMN to BPEL [18] for comparison) and their strengths and weaknesses, but they are all compatible with each other, e.g., a message sent by a generated agent bean can be received by the interpreter or a JADL service and vice versa. Thus, is is possible to export one business process diagram to a heterogeneous system, mapping one pool to, e.g., a JADL service and another to an agent bean.

Business process modelling can best be applied either at an early system design stage, to visually model the interaction protocols in the core system [14], or at a later stage, for modelling individual high-level services. Both is supported by the mapping and its implementations.
Table 1. Comparison of mappings: BPMN to X. -/o/x means no/partial/full support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>BPEL</th>
<th>JADL</th>
<th>AgBeans</th>
<th>Interpr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workflow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XOR, AND, OR Gtw.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-bsd. XOR Gtw.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Gateway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Handler</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Handler, Other</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send, Receive Task</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Task</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Task</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Task</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script Task</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subprocess</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call Activity</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Hoc-Subprocess</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensate</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminate</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties, Assignmt.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Lanes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Objects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Starter</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Related Work

In part, BPMN was developed as a graphical notation for the web service orchestration language BPEL, and the resulting mapping from BPMN to BPEL [18] can be considered a point of reference for all other mappings. Here, each pool is mapped to a BPEL process, consisting mostly of assignments, calls to other services, and some event handling. Messages are always service calls or their respective results; other kinds of communication are not supported, and there is no direct mapping from start events to service starting behaviour. Thus, the mapping to BPEL does not use the full potential of BPMN.

The similarities between business processes and agents have already led to different approaches for combining process modelling and agents.
One of those approaches is WADE (Workflows and Agents Development Environment), allowing to model the behaviours of JADE agents as process graphs [6] and generating working Java code from those diagrams. However, the workflow is not mapped to Java control flow statements, but encoded in a special data structure, making the generated code more difficult to follow. Also, the initially used process notation is much simpler than BPMN, limiting the expressiveness of the approach. Later, WADE has been extended to provide better support for long-running business processes, event handling, user-interaction, and Web-service integration [2] and as of today appears to be a very mature product used in many projects.

Another approach is GO-BPMN (Goal-oriented BPMN), using BPMN processes to model the plans that are the leafs in a goal hierarchy [5]. However, only a subset of the BPMN notation is used, describing individual plans and thus only a single agent. Interactions between agents – for which BPMN would be very well suited – are not modelled at all. While the combination of BPMN with agent goals is promising, we believe that BPMN is used at the wrong level of abstraction, abandoning many of its benefits. Similarly, Go4Flex [4] combines BPMN with goal hierarchies for Jadex Agents.

In another work, the authors also present a mapping from AUML interaction diagrams to BPMN [19]. AUML interaction diagrams themselves [1] are well suited for describing the interactions between agents, but following the principle of UML, they show only this one aspect, while leaving the behaviour in between the interactions to be modelled with other means. In contrast, BPMN can be seen as a combination of AUML interaction- and activity-diagrams, conveying the bigger picture of the agents’ actions and interactions.

Finally, there are numerous agent development methods, many of which also use business processes and similar graphical notations. One of those is i∗, which is used, among others, in the TROPOS methodology [23]. Here, the focus lies particularly on the social relationships between the agents, their goals, intentions and resulting ‘strategic dependencies’. While i∗ itself is not used for modelling processes, it could well be used complementary to, e.g., BPMN to model the rationale behind the agents’ behaviours and interactions.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we described a mapping form BPMN processes to multi-agent systems and exemplarily showed how this mapping has been implemented in three different fashions for the JIAC V multi-agent framework: By generating high-level JADL scripts, creating versatile agent beans, or having an agent directly interpret the processes.

Each approach has its strengths and weaknesses: Agent beans are fast and versatile, making them the best choice for the core processes of the multi-agent application, while scripts and interpreted processes are more flexible and thus best suited for dynamic and adaptable behaviours. At the same time, using the same mapping, all implementations are semantically equivalent and interopera-
ble, such that, e.g., one part of a process system can be mapped to agent beans, while another part is interpreted.

The mapping covers most important aspects of processes and agents, such as roles and rules, activities and events, messages and services. It also supports many different process control flow structures, translating them to equivalent block-structures.

While already included in the meta-models and the mapping, the implementation does not yet support goals and semantics. For future work, we are planning to extend the mapping in this direction. The BPMN ad-hoc subprocess is a good candidate for this, providing a completion condition that closely resembles an achieve goal in agent systems, but more work is needed for the mapping to handle ad-hoc subprocesses with more diverse content. Also, this will require the extension of BPMN with service semantics. Both are goals of our ongoing research projects.
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Abstract. This paper presents a method aimed to assist an engineer in transforming agent roles models to a process model. Thus, the software engineer can employ available tools to validate specific properties of the modeled system even before its final implementation. The method includes a tool for aiding the engineer in the transformation process. This tool uses a recursive algorithm for automating the transformation process and guides the user to dynamically integrate two or more agent roles in a process model with multiple pools. The tool usage is demonstrated through a running example, based on a real world project. Simulations of the defined agent roles can be used to a) validate the system requirements and b) determine how it could scale. This way, developers and managers can configure processes’ parameters and identify and resolve risks early in their project.
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1 Introduction

This paper aims to show how a Gaia Multi-Agent System (MAS) analysis (or architectural design) role model can be represented as a business process model. This allows employing available tools to validate specific properties of the modeled system even before its final implementation, and a business partner has greater potential to comprehend the system being modeled through intuitive process visualization.

Rana and Stout [1] highlighted the importance of combining performance engineering with agent oriented design methodologies in order to develop large agent based applications. To derive process performance measures, we need a quantitative process analysis technique. Process simulation appears to be a prominent technique that allows us to derive such measures (e.g. cycle time) given data about the activities (e.g. processing times) and data about the resources involved in the process. Through process simulation an engineer can forecast the process execution time, identify possible bottlenecks and perform tests regarding the response of the process to increasing demand. Process simulation is a versatile technique supported by a range of process modeling and analysis tools [2]. However, to run a process simulation, the engineer needs a process model.
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In this paper we will see how liveness formulas, an important property of agent role models, introduced by the Gaia methodology [3], and later employed by ROADMAP [4], the Gaia2JADE process [5], Gaia4E [6] and ASEME [7], can be transformed to process models. Moreover, we will present a tool that allows these models to be integrated to produce a process model of a multi-agent system using the XML Process Definition Language (XPDL) [8] portable standard. Having transformed the MAS role model to a process model we can use simulation to verify several properties of the modeled system, and also determine its ability to scale, as early as the analysis [3] or architectural design phases [9]. This is demonstrated through a case study based on real world system’s requirements for smart-phone services.

Therefore, this work is expected to have a high impact on a) Agent Oriented Software Engineering (AOSE) practitioners using the Gaia methodology and its successors, who can immediately take advantage of this work to evaluate their models, b) AOSE researchers, and practitioners of other methodologies who can use this transformation combined with method engineering to compile new methodologies, and, c) those who use business process models for agent-based simulations [10, 11] or for communicating them to business people [12], who can now use an AOSE methodology to aid them in their modeling tasks.

In the following section we will briefly discuss the background of this work. Then, in section three, we will present the algorithm for the automatic transformation process and, in section four, the tool that allows integrating many individual agent processes to build a common process that will resemble how the different agents collaborate. In section five we will present the results of a number of simulations. Section six discusses our findings and the tool’s limitations, and, finally, section seven concludes and provides an insight to future work.

2 Background

2.1 The Gaia Liveness formulas and AOSE

The liveness property of an agent role was introduced by the Gaia methodology [3, 9]. Gaia is an attempt to define a general methodology for the analysis and design of MAS. MAS, according to Gaia, are viewed as being composed of a number of autonomous interactive agents forming an organized society in which each agent plays one or more specific roles. The latest version of Gaia defines a three phase process and at each phase the modeling of the MAS is further refined. These phases are the analysis phase, the architectural design phase, and, finally, the detailed design phase. In the analysis phase, Gaia defines the structure of the MAS using the role model. This model identifies the roles that agents have to play within the MAS and the interaction protocols between the different roles. The role model is further refined in the architectural analysis phase [9].

The objective of the Gaia analysis phase is the identification of the roles and the modeling of interactions between the roles found. Roles consist of four attributes: responsibilities, permissions, activities and protocols. Responsibilities are the key
attribute related to a role since they determine the functionality. Responsibilities are of two types: liveness properties – the role has to add something good to the system, and safety properties – the role must prevent something bad from happening to the system. Liveness describes the tasks that an agent must fulfill given certain environmental conditions and safety ensures that an acceptable state of affairs is maintained during the execution cycle. In order to realize responsibilities, a role has a set of permissions. Permissions represent what the role is allowed to do and, in particular, which information resources it is allowed to access. The activities are tasks that an agent performs without interacting with other agents. Finally, protocols are specific patterns of interaction with other roles.

Gaia originally proposed some schemas that could be used for the representation of interactions between the various roles in a system. However, this approach was too abstract to support complex protocols [5]. ROADMAP [4] proposed that protocols and activities are social actions or tasks and ASEME [13] moved one step further by allowing protocols to define the involved roles processes as liveness formulas that would later be included in the liveness of the system role model (a model inspired by the Gaia roles model). This is one assumption of this work, i.e. that the protocols are a send message action, a receive message action or a combination of message send and receive actions and, possibly, other activities for each participating role.

Although the Gaia methodology does not explicitly deal with the requirements capture phase, it supposes that they exist in some kind of form before the analysis phase. ASEME supports the systematic gathering of requirements in free text form and associating them with the goals of specific actors in the System Actor Model [7]. As ASEME has adopted a model-driven engineering approach these requirements influence the role model definition, which emerges in the end of the analysis phase. In both cases, it makes sense to seek to validate or forecast specific properties of the system to be, based on its requirements. This is the actual research question of this work.

The liveness model has a formula at the first line (root formula) where activities can be connected with Gaia operators. Abstract activities must be decomposed to activities again connected with Gaia operators in a following formula. The operators used in the liveness formulas are:

\[ \begin{align*}
  A^+ & \text{ (activity A is executed one or more times)} \\
  A^* & \text{ (activity A is executed zero or more times)} \\
  [A] & \text{ (activity A is optionally executed)} \\
  A \cdot B & \text{ (activity B executes after activity A)} \\
  A | B & \text{ (activity A or B exclusively is executed)} \\
  A || B & \text{ (activities A and B are executed in parallel)} \\
  A \sim & \text{ (activity A is executed forever, the original Gaia operator was the greek character omega “ω”, however for keyboard compatibility we chose to use the tilde)}
\end{align*} \]

Figure 1 shows a Gaia roles model for a role named ComplexProvider. This role employs two protocols, one for servicing a complex service request and one for requesting a simple routing service (activities are underlined in the Protocols and...
Activities field). In its liveness formula it describes the order that these protocols and activities will be executed by this role using three liveness formulas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role: ComplexProvider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description: This role provides an added value service in routing requests. It receives a routing request containing needed information but also the user’s preferences. Firstly it decides the route type to request (public transport, car and/or pedestrian), then it composes a simple routing request and after it gets the results it sorts them according to the user’s preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocols and Activities: ComplexService, ReceiveComplexServiceRequest, DecideRouteType, SimpleService, SortRoutes, SendComplexServiceResponse, SendSimpleServiceRequest, ReceiveSimpleServiceResponse,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities - Liveness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP = ComplexService+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ComplexService = ReceiveComplexServiceRequest, DecideRouteType, SimpleService, SortRoutes, SendComplexServiceResponse,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SimpleService = SendSimpleServiceRequest, ReceiveSimpleServiceResponse,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Part of the Gaia role model for a role.

The liveness property is defined as a string which adheres to a grammar. The latter is defined using the Extended Backus–Naur Form (EBNF), which is a metasyntax notation used to express context-free grammars [14]. In Listing 1 we define the liveness property grammar (char is any lower or upper case alphabetic character).

Listing 1. The liveness property grammar

| Liveness → {Formula} |
| Formula → LeftHandSide, "=" , Expression |
| LeftHandSide → string |
| Expression → Term | ParallelExpr | OrExpr | SequentialExpr |
| ParallelExpr → Term, "||", Term | "||", Term |
| OrExpr → Term, "|", Term |
| SequentialExpr → Term, ".", Term |
| Term → BasicTerm | "(" , Expression , ")" | "[", Expression , "]" | Term , "*" | Term , "+" |
| BasicTerm → string |
| String → char, {char | digit | ":"} |

2.2 Metamodels and Model Transformations

Model transformation is an essential process in Model Driven Engineering (MDE). It is the process of transforming a model to another model. To define a transformation an engineer needs the metamodels of the source and target models. A model is
defined as an abstraction of a software system (or a part of it) and a metamodel is an abstraction defining the properties of the model. A metamodel is itself a model. For example, the metamodel of a text model can be the EBNF grammar.

A model’s metamodel defines the elements that define the model properties, usually in a format defined by a metamodel which is the language for defining metamodels. The Eclipse Modeling Framework (EMF) defines such a language, namely ecore, that is much like a UML Class definition. Ecore defines that a model is composed of instances of the EClass type, which can have attributes (instances of the EAttribute type) or reference other EClass instances (using the EReference type). EAttributes can be instances of terminal data types such as string, integer, real, etc. EMF allows to extend existing models via inheritance, using the ESuperType relationship for extending an existing EClass.

Thus, using EMF technology, in order to define the text to model transformation that is the liveness to XPDL transformation we need the XPDL metamodel.

2.3 Business Process Modeling

Software Engineering (SE) and Business Process Management (BPM) are two disciplines with clear associations. A visible influence of SE to BPM concerns quality assessment, while SE aims its attention to BPM mainly to take advantage of its advanced monitoring and controlling functions [15] and its experiment design principles. For example, following the BPM paradigm, one can find solutions about how business people and software engineers are facilitated in communicating system requirements. Stakeholders are able to get involved in the system’s design, and hence to assure the alignment of the produced software with the business objectives.

Simulation is employed to quantify the impact that a process design is likely to have on its performance, and to numerically indicate the best design alternatives. Regarding business process simulation, various tools exist [16], which facilitate the adoption of BPM as a practical way for designing systems. However, a critical factor in selecting which tool is more appropriate is the modeling language used.

Popular modeling languages in designing software systems, such as the object-oriented ones (e.g. UML), lack process views, an issue that has been early identified by [15]. On the other hand, process models do not usually map clearly to a programming environment. Both approaches have their relative advantages, so it is a hard decision to spare one. This is why there have been efforts to bridge object-oriented models and process models through model transformations [15, 17].

In this work we chose the XML Process Definition Language (XPDL version 2.1) as the target language. XPDL, a standard supported by the Workflow Management Coalition (WfMC, www.wfmc.org), has a good potential for process interchange and heterogeneous system integration since it is used today by more than 80 different products to exchange process definitions and keeps up to date with BPMN 2.0.

The XPDL metamodel that we used for our project [8] is shown in Figure 2. The Package concept represents a set of processes and contains:
• pools, which represent major participant roles in a process, typically separating different organizations. A pool can contain:
  o lanes, which are used to organize and categorize activities within a pool according to function or role.
• workflowProcesses, which aggregate sets of activities and transitions
  o activities are represented by rounded rectangles and correspond to the execution of a task or to the functionality of a gateway, which can be:
    ▪ XOR gateway (one of the outgoing transitions will be followed), which is represented by a diamond shape with the “X” character in the middle
    ▪ parallel gateway (all the outgoing transitions lead to activities that will be executed in parallel), which is represented by a diamond shape with the “+” character in the middle
  o events are represented by circles and are specific kinds of activities that correspond to something that happens. Common events are the start of a process lane and its ending
  o transitions, are represented with a solid line and arrowhead and have source and target (at the arrowhead) activities and define the control flow in the workflow process
• associations, are represented with a dotted line and arrowhead and have source and target (at the arrowhead) activities and define the message flow between different pools. Therefore, they also have source and target pools.

Fig. 2. The XPDL meta-model
3 The Transformation Algorithm

The transformation algorithm uses elements from the liveness formulas grammar (Listing 1) and the XPDL metamodel (Figure 2). It is a recursive algorithm that takes the liveness formula expression elements from left to right and applies the templates shown in Figure 3, gradually building the XPDL process. For all templates, the control flows from left to right, i.e. if a template follows another, then it is connected to its rightmost element. The algorithm is provided in pseudocode at the appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A \cdot A_2 \cdot ... \cdot A_n$</td>
<td>$A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \rightarrow ... \rightarrow A_n$</td>
<td>$[A]$</td>
<td>$\rightarrow A \rightarrow$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1</td>
<td>A_2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>A_n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A^*$</td>
<td>$\rightarrow A \rightarrow$</td>
<td>$A \sim$</td>
<td>$\rightarrow A \rightarrow$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A^+$</td>
<td>$\rightarrow A \rightarrow$</td>
<td>$A^+$</td>
<td>$\rightarrow A \rightarrow$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 3.** Templates of liveness formula (Gaia) operators (Op.) for XPDL model generation.

To implement the algorithm we used the *org.enhydra* Java package defining the metamodel for XPDL 2.1, which is distributed under the GNU Free License by Together Teamsolutions Co., Ltd (*www.together.at*).

Regarding the theoretical properties of the algorithm we believe that it can be easily proved that it is correct using induction and the assumption that if we have a correct XPDL model and replace an XPDL activity with a correct XPDL fragment (or a well-structured fragment, as in [18]) the resulting model is correct. The templates are all correct XPDL diagrams (well structured fragments) if they have a start event on their left and a transition to an end event on their right. Then, for each of these valid models we can easily assert that if we take a random template and replace an activity of the model with it then, again, the model is correct. Then, we hypothesize that after $n$ insertions the model is correct and we insert a new random template. Then we show again that the resulting model is correct.
The reader should note the common templates for the ~ and + operators. Considering the semantics of the ~ operator the exclusive gateway should not be used (the activity should just loop back to itself). In this way, the resulting process model would not be easily ported to existing analysis techniques as it would not pass the Proper Completion test (each workflow ends with an end event) [19]. Given the fact that in a later stage the situation could be remedied by adjusting the gateway to always return the flow to the activity, and that in the second version of Gaia there is a case where the authors allow the indefinite operator to be followed by a sequential activity [9], we believe that our approach is the best compromise for this case.

As far as the algorithm’s complexity is concerned, since we have a recursive function call inside a for loop, the complexity of our algorithm is \( O(n^2) \), where \( n \) is the number of activities and protocols present in the liveness formulas. The algorithm would run forever should there be circular references to \( \text{LeftHandSide} \) from a formula’s \( \text{Expression} \) (or from subsequent formulas), however, we have a pre-processing step guarding against this possibility and preventing the algorithm from executing.

4 The Liveness2XPDL Tool

The tool allows defining one or more agent roles. For each role, the user can edit a liveness formula or import a role model. We researched for the Gaia methodology and its derivatives’ metamodels to create the relevant import functionality. We found documented metamodels for the Gaia [20], ROADMAP [21] and the ASEME [7] methodologies. However, Gaia’s metamodel abstractly defines the LivenessProperty class and ROADMAP’s metamodel file is not available on-line. Thus, we created an importer for the ASEME System Roles Model (SRM) metamodel to demonstrate the capability of our approach in importing meta-models. We consider that since our tool is open source interested developers can create an importer for the metamodel they want or can type their formulas in the text editor.

The tool allows integrating multiple roles in the same XPDL model. We create one Pool instance for each role in a common Package (the transformation algorithm executes as many times as the participating roles with the same Package instance) and then the user defines the associations for message sending and receiving activities. Then, the tool creates the needed references of the associations to the pools and outputs the Package in XPDL XML format.

In this section we demonstrate the usage of the developed tool. We consider a real world system developed in the context of the ASK-IT Integrated Project1 where a personal assistant agent on a lightweight device (e.g. a smart phone) requests services from a mediator agent (or broker). This broker has the capability to service simple requests but can also access a complex service provider agent who can offer high level services. The complex provider also needs simple services from the broker in order to compose a high level service. In our case, we consider a route calculation

---

1 co-funded by the European Union 6th Framework Programme (no IST-2003-511298)
The agent roles models for the personal assistant and the broker are presented in Figure 4 (just the role name and liveness property). The complex provider is the same with the one presented in Figure 1.

**Role: PersonalAssistant**

**Liveness:**

\[
PA = \text{SendServiceRequest. ReceiveServiceResponse}
\]

**Role: Broker**

**Liveness:**

\[
\text{Broker} = (\text{ServicePAs || ServiceCP})^+
\]

\[
\]

\[
\text{ServiceCP} = \text{ReceiveSimpleServiceRequest. InvokeDataManagement. SendSimpleServiceResponse}
\]

**Fig. 4.** The Personal Assistant and Broker role models.

The user starts the Liveness2XPDL tool and imports through the *File* menu the three role models, as presented in Figure 5. Then, the user can select one role and the *Single role transformation* option from the *Transform* menu, or more than one (holding down the control key) and the *Multiple role transformation* option from the *Transform* menu. In Figure 6 the reader can see the single role file for the Complex Provider role after it has been imported to the free Together Workflow Editor ([www.together.at](http://www.together.at)).

**Fig. 5.** The main screen of the Liveness2XPDL tool.
In the case of multiple roles transformation, the tool then prompts the user to select where to save and how to name the output XPDL file. If there are activities that send or receive messages the graphical interface presented in Figure 7 helps the user to create associations.

Finally, in Figure 8 the reader can see the combined roles process model for all the roles used in our project. The modeler has used the graphical tool to define the message flows between the agents. The messages flow between pools (there is one pool for each agent role). The screenshot (shown in Figure 8) has been taken from the Signavio tool, which is freely available to academics (www.signavio.com). To import the model into the Signavio tool we first used the online XPDL to BPMN service provided free by Trisotech (www.businessprocessincubator.com).
5 Simulating The Roles Interactions

In this section, we demonstrate how simulation can aid the system modeler and project manager alike to make important decisions, mainly concerning non-functional requirements.

Initially, there were two reasons for simulating the ASK-IT system. The first was that the ASK-IT service providers needed to know if the system can satisfy non-functional user requirements, one of which was the delivery of the service within ten seconds. The frequency of service requests was calculated to be one request per 30 seconds. The second was to find out how would the system scale when service demand increased for use in preparing the project’s exploitation plan.

The Signavio tool allows simulating a process model involving several roles. For each simulation scenario, it allows to define:

- available resources for each role (how many instances of this role are available)
• the frequency in which a role can appear and start executing
• the percentage of times that a XOR gateway selects one or the other execution path
• activity duration (distribution type, mean and standard deviation values)
• number of simulations for each scenario

For our simulations we used several executions of function prototypes to define the activities durations. Moreover, we added the network latency in the message receiving activities. All the distributions that we used are normal, since it is the most commonly used distribution and there must be specific circumstances to use others. Then, we defined different scenarios by varying the frequency of PAs appearing in the network and asking for services, the number of brokers serving the requests and the number of complex providers.

Our experiments are presented in Figure 9. We have validated the system to respond within 10 seconds in the worst case when we have an incoming request every 30 seconds with one broker and one complex provider. Moreover, we can see what the expected quality of service will be, as the requests frequency rises. As far as system scaling is concerned we see that by adding more broker instances, the system performance has a better gain than by adding complex providers. Finally, we can claim that with three broker instances the system can offer the required quality of service (respond within ten seconds) even if we have a request every two seconds.

6 Discussion

It is not the first time that the AOSE community studies and uses business process models. There are a number of works, e.g., one for improving a process model representing the behavior of agents [11], another for proposing a method for transforming BPMN models to agent-oriented models in the Prometheus methodology [22], and another that provides a mapping of BPMN diagrams to a normalized form checking for certain structural properties, which normalized form can itself be transformed to a petri-net that allows for further semantic analysis [23].

All these works can be aligned with ours using method engineering and provide a number of new paths or possibilities for a system modeler that has come up with the Gaia analysis models. Method fragments [24] are reusable methodological parts that can be used by engineers in order to produce a new design process for a specific situation. This allows a development team to come up with a hybrid methodology that will support the needs of specific programming and modeling competencies. Thus, an AOSE practitioner can transform the process model outputted from our work to a system specification using the Prometheus methodology notation [22] and continue using that methodology. Another might be interested in checking certain structural properties of the process model [23].

Some preliminary results of this work have appeared in EUMAS 2010 (with informal proceedings) [25]. In that work, we provided transformation templates targeting the BPMN v1 metamodel. This work extends that one by targeting the XPDL metamodel, which offers a wide range of possibilities when available tools are
concerned. Moreover, this work caters for integrating multiple roles in a single process model.

Although we have achieved our goals, the Liveness2XPDL tool has specific limitations. Firstly, when the user decides to create multiple associations that define message flows from an activity that will be received by different activities in other pools the method cannot automatically tell whether one of the possible paths will be followed, or all of them. The inter-agent messages definition interface allows defining such associations; however, it is not clear how these can be exploited with simulation.

![Graph showing response times for different broker and provider configurations.](image)

**Fig. 9.** Average and maximum response times in seconds (vertical axis). The horizontal axis represents the time interval between two requests (in a normal distribution).
An important note to the transformation approach concerns the templates’ definitions. Undoubtedly, there is not a single way to express a concept with XPDL (or the BPMN notation). For example, the $A_-$ formula can be represented either with the template illustrated in Figure 3, or by adding the loop symbol in the rectangle. Although some good styles and practices are in use today, in practice there are no rules that guarantee an optimal design. The appropriateness of the model must every time get validated by the end user. In our case, the templates were defined considering the BPMN simulation tools features. For example, for the $A_-$ formula, we chose that particular definition because the loop symbol would introduce sub-processes to the model, and available simulation tools have limited support for such a feature.

Moreover, in XPDL it is acceptable to create more than one transition from an activity to other activities. This option reduces the complexity of the model as it is not mandatory to use XOR gateways. However, a large number of process management tools do not accept this option and most of the times they suggest that a gateway should be placed to avoid errors. This is why we used the XOR gateway in our templates.

Finally, after the process model is produced, the user still has to provide some additional elements concerning the send/receive activities’ configuration. We are currently working towards automating this step based on the following guidelines (which are now manually configured):

- All activities that stand for sending or receiving messages are labeled as message type activities.
- When a receive activity immediately follows a start event, then the start event and the activity are merged into a start event triggered by a message.
- When a receive activity immediately precedes an end event, then the two are merged into an end event triggered by a message.
- When a message is intended to be sent to one or more out of many recipients and this decision has to be evaluated during runtime, then before the “send message” activity a data-based exclusive gateway is added.

7 Conclusion

In this paper we showed how a development team that employs the Gaia methodology, or its derivatives, i.e. ROADMAP [4], the Gaia2JADE process [5], Gaia4E [6] and ASEME [7] can transform the output of the analysis phase model (Role Model) to a process model. Actually, the role’s liveness property is used for the transformation.

Process models are useful paradigms as they, on one hand, allow the usage of a wide range of tools (free or proprietary) for simulation, thus providing the means to explore non-functional properties of the system under construction, even before its implementation. Therefore, project managers and engineers can evaluate the use of methods and technologies in their project, but also information about the deployment and scaling of their application. On the other hand, process models are commonly used by business stakeholders, who can now understand and appreciate a MAS.
analysis model. Finally, such models can be used to define agent and humans interactions based on the associations of the process model.

Herein, we presented the transformation algorithm, demonstrated the developed tool and showed how it can be used to validate a system analysis for a real world application, which was created in the context of ASK-IT project. The open Java sources and executable Java jar file for the Liveness2XPDL tool can be browsed by the interested reader at github².

The approach that we followed has some limitations, but also opens interesting paths for future work. A very promising path lies in developing a code generation tool based on the process model and targeting the WADE³ toolkit of the popular JADE platform. Another path is that of accommodating the definition of human-agent interactions in the modern field of Human-Agents Collectives [26], based on process models.

Appendix: The recursive transformation algorithm.

The pseudocode of the transformation algorithm is presented below. The different model elements are represented as classes and their properties as class properties, accessible using the dot operator, i.e. `<classname>.<property>`. For representing a list we use a `List` class that supports the operations `add` (to add an element to the list) and `size` (to return the number of its elements). The program takes as input an XPDL Package instance and the String liveness property of an SRM Role instance.

```java
Program transform(Liveness liveness, Package package)
    WorkflowProcess workflowProcess = new WorkflowProcess
    package.workflowProcesses.add(workflowProcess)
    Event startEvent = new Event
    startEvent.type = start
    workflowProcess.add(startEvent)
    Activity lastActivity = createProcess(liveness.formula.expression,
        workflowProcess, startEvent)
    Event endEvent = new Event
    endEvent.type = end
    workflowProcess.add(endEvent)
    Transition transition = new Transition
    transition.from = lastActivity
    transition.to = endEvent
    workflowProcess.add(transition)
End Program

Function Activity createProcess(Expression expression, WorkflowProcess workflowProcess, Activity activity)
```

² https://github.com/ASEMEtransformation/Liveness2XPDL
³ WADE is a software platform based on JADE that provides support for the execution of tasks defined according to the workflow metaphor (jade.tilab.com).
List terms = new List
For Each term, In expression
  terms.add(term)
End For
If terms.size() > 1 Then
  If expression Is SequentialExpr Then
    For Each term, In expression
      Activity newActivity = createProcess(term, workflowprocess, activity)
      activity = newActivity
    End for
  End if
  Else If expression Is OrExpr
    Activity xorEntryGateway = new Activity
    xorEntryGateway.gatewayType = XOR
    workflowProcess.add(xorEntryGateway)
    Transition transition = new Transition
    transition.from = activity
    transition.to = xorEntryGateway
    workflowProcess.add(transition)
    Activity xorExitGateway = new Activity
    xorExitGateway.gatewayType = XOR
    workflowProcess.add(xorExitGateway)
    For Each term, In expression
      Activity newActivity = createProcess(term, workflowprocess, xorEntryGateway)
      transition = new Transition
      transition.from = newActivity
      transition.to = xorExitGateway
      workflowProcess.add(transition)
    End for
    activity = xorExitGateway
  Else If expression is ParallelExpr
    //similar with orExpr, parallel gateway type instead of XOR
  End If
End If
For Each term, In expression
  If term Is BasicTerm
    boolean foundLeftHandSideEqualsBasicTerm = false
    For Each formula, In liveness
      If formula.leftHandside = term, Then
        Activity newActivity = createProcess(formula.expression, workflowprocess, activity)
        activity = newActivity
        foundLeftHandSideEqualsBasicTerm = true
      End If
    End If
    If foundLeftHandSideEqualsBasicTerm = false
      Activity newActivity = new Activity
      workflowProcess.add(newActivity)
      Transition transition = new Transition
      transition.from = activity
    End If
  End if
transition.to = newActivity
workflowProcess.add(transition)
activity = newActivity
End If
Else If (term, is of type ´{´ term ´}` ) Then
Activity newActivity = createProcess(term, workflowprocess, activity)
activity = newActivity
Else If (term, is of type ´(´ term ´)` ) Then
//definition of the [A] template
Else If (term, is of type ´*´ ) Then
//definition of the A* template
Else If (term, is of type ´~´ ) Then
//definition of the A~ template
Else If (term, is of type ´+´ ) Then
//definition of the A+ template
End If
End If
End For
return activity
End Function
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Abstract. The impressive development of technologies is reducing the gulf between the physical and the digital matter, reality and virtuality. Mirror worlds (MW) are agent-based systems that live on this edge. They are meant to be a conceptual blueprint for designing future smart environment systems, providing an innovative conceptual framework for investigating inter-disciplinary aspects – from cognition to interaction, cooperation, governance – concerning human-agent mixed-reality and augmented systems. In this paper we focus on the problem of how to concretely design and program mirror worlds, in particular adopting high-level programming abstractions that are provided by state-of-the-art agent-oriented programming models and technologies.

1 Introduction

Mixed reality refers to the merging of real and virtual worlds to produce new environments and visualisations where physical and digital objects co-exist and interact in real time [6]. As defined by P. Milgram and F. Kishino, it is “anywhere between the extrema of the virtuality continuum” [14], that extends from the completely real through to the completely virtual environment with augmented reality (AR) and augmented virtuality ranging between.

The fruitful integration of augmented/mixed-reality technologies and agents and multi-agent systems has been remarked along different perspectives in literature [11]. The most recent works have emphasized the value of (serious) mixed-reality games as a platform to explore scenarios in the real world that are typically hard to study in realistic settings, such as disaster response, to study the joint activities of human-agent collectives [9]. Similarly, mixed-reality testbeds have been deployed for the incremental development of human-agent robot applications [4].

A deeper integration of the research on agents and mixed reality is envisioned in [20, 23, 5] with the concept of mirror world (MW)\(^1\), fostering a new generation of multi-agent applications based on a bidirectional augmentation of the physical and digital matter, the physical and virtual reality. MWs bring together research

\(^1\) the name mirror world has been used in honour of Gelernter’s book [10] that originally inspired the first glimpses of this idea.
contributions from different fields apart agents and MAS, from Ambient Intel-
ligence and smart environments, Internet-of-Things down to mixed/augmented
reality. A MW can be abstractly conceived as a digital world shaped in terms of
a multi-agent system, situated into some virtual environment which is coupled
to some physical one, augmenting its functionalities and the capabilities of the
people that live or work inside it. Besides smart environment applications, they
aim at being laboratories where to explore together inter-disciplinary aspects:
how human/agent action, perception, cognition is enhanced and supported by
MW; how to think about the co-design of physical objects and environments and
related digital counterpart; what models for interaction, coordination, organiza-
tion, and governance are promoted by and can be adopted in these agent-based
mixed-reality systems.

In this paper we focus on the problem of how to concretely design and pro-
gram mirror worlds, in particular adopting high-level programming abstractions
that are provided by state-of-the-art agent-oriented programming models and
technologies. The contribution is the definition of a first programming model
based on the A&A (Agents and Artifacts) meta-model [17], which provides first-
class abstractions to model the environment where agents are situated. We de-
develop a first implementation of the model upon the JaCaMo platform [1], where
the A&A meta-model is integrated with BDI agents, implemented using the Jason
programming language [2]. The result is a first platform that allows for proto-
typing simple mirror worlds, and investigate the value (and current limits) of
the idea in different application domains.

The main motivation and contribution of the work is then to devise a proper
(agent-oriented) programming approach which would allow to effectively develop
mirror worlds and, more generally, distributed open smart environments that
seamlessly integrate different forms of augmentations. Such an approach should
be – on the one hand – general enough to be used for developing systems besides
ad hoc cases, and – on the other hand – effective and specific enough to capture
essential aspects that characterize these kinds of applications.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we provide
a background about the main concepts concerning MWs. Then, in Section 3 we
describe an agent-oriented programming model, based on A&A, and in Section 4
we describe a first implementation based on the JaCaMo platform. In Section 5
we discuss real-world applications as well as the challenges to be tackled in the
mirror-world research agenda.

2 Background: The Mirror World Idea

On the background of MWs there is the broad idea of using agent-oriented
abstractions to shape the continuous real-time distributed flows of situated in-
formation generated by the physical and social layers (as devised by Smart en-
vvironments, Internet of Things, Big Data contexts), as well as of the distributed
intelligent software processes that work on that information in order to provide
some smart service or functionality. A mirror world can be conceived as an open

society of software agents situated into a virtual environment augmenting some physical reality (room, building, city...), to which the environment is coupled. Mirroring is given by the fact that – to some extent – physical things, which can be perceived and acted upon by humans in the physical world, have a digital counterpart (or augmentation, extension) in the mirror, so that they can be observed and acted upon by agents. Viceversa, an entity in the MW that can be perceived and acted upon by software agents may have a physical appearance (or extension) in the physical world – e.g. augmenting it, in terms of augmented or mixed-reality – so that it can be observed and acted upon by humans—for instance, by means of wearable devices like smart glasses.

This implies a form of coupling, such that an action on an object in the physical world causes some kind of changes in one or more entities in the mirror, perceivable then by software agents. Viceversa an action by agents on an entity in the MW can have an effect on things in the physical world, perceivable by people. As MW citizens, agents are responsible of autonomously fulfilling tasks inside a MW, by properly observing/using MW things which are part of their environment and (directly/indirectly) observing and interacting with human inhabitants that act in that environment.

A simple but effective example of MW described in [20] is an extension of the mobile AR game Ghosts in the City (see Fig. 1). The MW is composed by a collection of treasures and ghosts distributed in some part of a city. There are two teams of human players. Their objective is to collect as much treasures as possible – walking around – without being caught by the ghosts. Players have...
smart glasses and a smart-phone, used as a magic wand. Ghosts are agents autonomously moving in the MW – and in the city. Players perceive ghosts by means of their smart glasses – as soon as they are in the same location. Ghosts as well can perceive the players, as soon as they are within some distance. Ghosts aim to catch human players; so they follow them as soon as they can perceive them. A ghost catches a human player by grabbing her body in the MW—this can be physically perceived by humans by means of the magic wand (trembling). Different kinds of ghosts may prefer different (physical) spots, according to some physical parameter of the spot—e.g., humidity, light, temperature. Besides perceiving the world, ghosts with enough energy could also act on it, for instance turning off a physical light (by acting on the counter-part in the MW).

In spite of being a game, the example summarizes the basic kinds of coupling that are possible between the digital layer and the physical one. A deeper discussion about the usefulness of the MW idea can be found in [20].

3 An Agent-Oriented Programming Model

As mentioned in the introduction, the conceptual meta-model adopted for modelling and designing MW, underlying the programming framework, is A&A (Agents and Artifacts) [17]. A&A introduces artifacts as first-class abstractions to model and design the application environments where agents are logically situated. An artifact can be used to model and design any kind of (non-autonomous) resources and tools used and possibly shared by agents to do their job [21]. Artifacts are collected in workspaces, which represent logical containers possibly distributed over the network.

In A&A artifacts are then the basic blocks to modularize in a uniform way the agent environment, which can be distributed across multiple network nodes and that eventually function also as the interface to the physical environment. As described in the literature about environments for MAS [25], such environments can be useful at different levels in engineering MAS, not only for interfacing with the external environment but also as an abstraction layer for shaping mediated interaction and coordination among agents.

From the agent viewpoint, an artifact is characterised by two main aspects: an observable state, represented by a set of observable properties, whose changes can be perceived by agents as observable events; a set of operations, which represent the actions that an agent can do upon that piece of environment. When used by BDI agents, like in the case of the JaCaMo framework (discussed in Section 4), artifacts observable properties are mapped into beliefs that agents have about the environment that they are perceiving, while operations become the external actions that agents can perform.

Originally, such an artifact meta-model has been conceived by taking inspiration from Activity Theory [19] and human environments, mimicking the artifacts that are designed, shared and used by humans (as cognitive agents) to work, to live. So it is not surprising that we found such an abstraction quite natural to
model mirror worlds, where the coupling with human physical artifacts is an essential aspect.

3.1 Modelling MWs with A&A: Mirror artifacts and workspaces

A MW is modelled in term of a set of mirror workspaces. A mirror workspace extends the concept of workspace defined in A&A with an explicit coupling with the physical world. In particular, for each mirror workspace a map is defined, specifying which part of the physical world is coupled by the MW. It could be a part a city, a building, a room. Each point belonging to the map has a geolocation, which can defined in terms of latitude and longitude, or using local reference systems.

Fig. 2 shows an abstract representation of the elements composing a MW, including the infrastructure levels based on JaCaMo platform, which will be discussed in Section 4. A mirror workspace contains a dynamic set of mirror artifacts — besides the normal artifacts. Mirror artifacts are artifacts anchored to some specific location inside the physical world, as defined by the map. Such
location could be either a geo-location, or some trackable physical marker/object. Such a physical location/position is reified into an observable property. The position can change dynamically and can be perceived then by agents observing the artifact.

As depicted in Fig. 2, a MW can include multiple mirror workspaces spread over different computational nodes, used to run the infrastructure.

**Mirror Agents** An agent can perceive/continuously observe a mirror artifact in two basic ways. One is exactly the same as for normal artifacts, that is explicitly focusing on the artifact, given its identifier [21]. The second one instead is peculiar to mirror workspace and is the core feature of agents living in mirror workspaces, that is: perceiving an artifact depending on its position inside the situated workspace. To that purpose, an agent joining a mirror workspace can create a *body* artifact, which is a builtin mirror artifact useful to situate the agent in a specific location of the workspace. We call *mirror agent* an agent with a body in a mirror workspace. A body artifact enables an agent in a mirror workspace to observe all the mirror artifacts that satisfy some observability criteria – such as being at a physical distance less than some radius. These criteria can be controlled by the agent by acting on its body. An agent can have multiple bodies, one for each joined mirror workspace.

**Coupling** Mirror artifacts can be of two different kinds: either completely virtual, i.e. situated in some physical location but uncoupled from any physical device or coupled to some physical artifact. In the first case, the geo-position inside the mirror (and the physical environment) is specified when instantiating the artifact, and it can be updated then by operations provided by the artifact. In the second case, at the infrastructure level, the artifact is meant to be periodically *synched* by some device which is responsible to establish the coupling between the two levels, the mirror and the physical. It can be e.g. a smartphone device with a GPS sensor, or some other localization device. So, for instance, the body of a mirror agent can be bound to the position of the smartphone of a user, and then change as soon as the user moves.

The location of a mirror artifact in the physical world is not necessarily expressed as an absolute geo-position, but could be a relative position with respect to some physical object, such as a *marker* or an existing physical object. In that case AR technologies – hardware (cameras and other sensors mounted on the smartglasses) and software (computer vision algorithms, pattern recognition) – are essential to realize the coupling between the two layers.

Coupling is not limited to the physical location: it could concern any property of the physical world, of some physical entity, that we want to make it observable to agents living in the MW. An examples could be the temperature of a room or the luminosity of a lamp or the force on some object.

**Humans in the Loop** A main ingredient of mirror worlds is the capability of human situated in such environments to perceive the augment layer, by adopting
devices such as smart glasses or AR helmets. This can be modelled by adopting user assistant mirror agents with a body coupled to the physical location of the human user, by means of a smart device—glass, phone, whatever. Such agents can exploit the device to communicate with the user, in terms of messages, cues, etc. In more sophisticated scenario, the user assistant agent can superimpose to the image of the physical reality perceived by the user information or objects that represent some kind of extension of the reality, given the set of mirror artifacts perceived. Existing (mobile) AR frameworks – e.g. Metaio\(^2\) – can be exploited inside the mirror world middleware to implement these functionalities.

**Distribution** In section Section 2 we said that a MW can span from a single room or a even a smaller physical world that includes very few physical objects, to large physical environments, such as a building, a street, a city. In the latter case, the MW can be designed in terms of multiple mirror workspaces, eventually running on different nodes (hosts) of the underlying distributed agent infrastructure. Some workspaces could be run on the same node, other could be spread over different nodes, depending on the strategy adopted to distributed the computational load. In principle, there is no direct link between the physical distributed world on which the MW is mapped and the physical location of the nodes used to run the infrastructure. For that reason, cloud technologies and services could be used at the base layer, in order to deal with scalability and availability issues. Indeed, this could have an impact on the performance and reactivity of the system, raising important issues since MW are meant to be real-time systems, not necessarily hard-real-time but indeed time is an important dimension to consider. These are important aspects that we need to consider in future works.

4 Programming Mirror Worlds in JaCaMo: A First API

A main objective and contribution of this paper is the definition of a first agent-oriented API and platform to explore the development of mirror worlds, based on the meta-model described before. To that purpose, we devised such a framework on JaCaMo \(^1\), which natively supports the development of multi-agent systems based on BDI agents living in artifact-based environments. In particular, JaCaMo is based on the synergistic integration of three different dimensions (and technologies):

- the *agent* dimension — agents are programmed using the Jason agent programming language \(^2\), which is an practical extension and implementation of AgentSpeak(L) \(^1\);  
- the *environment* dimension — artifact-based environments are programmed using the CArtAgO framework \(^2\), which provides a Java API for that purpose;

\(^2\) [http://www.metaio.com/](http://www.metaio.com/)
JaCaMo – and in particular CArtAgO – has been recently extended so as to support situated workspaces and situated artifacts as an extension of normal workspaces and artifacts, as described in previous section. Mirror worlds are realized by situated workspaces equipped by specific maps, establishing a coupling with physical environments such as city zones, buildings, rooms.

In the remainder of the section we show the main features of the API used to develop mirror worlds in JaCaMo, using simple examples. Such an API has been conceived with a main objective in mind, that is: to make the development of such mixed-reality worlds as “natural” as possible for MAS developers. The full code of the examples is available in [8], along with the experimental JaCaMo distribution supporting mirror worlds.

4.1 Hello, Mirror World!

This first example mimics classic mobile augment reality applications. It is a mirror world mapped onto a city zone in the center of a city (Cesena, in this case). Such a MW is dynamically populated of mirror artifacts representing simple messages situated in some specific point of the city. Mobile human users walk around the streets along with their user assistant agents, running on their smartphone. As soon as user agents perceive a situated message, they display it on the smart glasses worn by the users (see Fig. 3). The implementation of the MW in JaCaMo includes:
– a majordomo agent, who is responsible of creating and setting up the MW, composed in this case by a single mirror workspace called mirror-example. The agent creates also some SituatedMessage mirror artifacts, located at some specific geo-coordinates;
– user-assistant agents, running on the smartphone of each mobile user;
– a control-room agent, which is responsible of showing the real-time state of the MW, represented by a map with the current location of the situated message artifacts and of the user-assistant agents (see Fig. 3, right). The agent is responsible also of dynamically creating new situated messages, in the positions specified by human users observing the map, by means of the GUI.

The example is useful to give a taste of the API to create mirror artifacts and agents. Fig. 4 (left) shows the source code of the majordomo agent: The createSituatedWorkspace action is used to create a mirror workspace, specifying a CityMap class representing the type of map to be adopted for this mirror world. The action is provided by a built-in artifact (called workspace), available by default in each workspace. The mirror workspace is created specifying its center, in terms of latitude and longitude. SituatedMessage artifacts are created by using the makeSituatedArtifact action, specifying the logical name of the artifact, its template, its geographical position and an observability radius, in meters. The code of SituatedMessage artifacts is shown in Fig. 5 (left): it has a single observable property called msg, storing a message specified when the artifact is created. Besides mirror artifacts, the agent create also a normal GeoTool artifact called geotool, providing basic functionalities for manipulating geo-positions (such as the toCityPoint action).

Fig. 4 (right) shows the source code of the user assistant mirror agent. The agent, after joining the workspace and locating the available tools (the geo-tool), creates a body, specifying an observability radius – being it a situated artifact – and an observing radius, limiting the range of mirror artifacts that can be automatically detected. A mirror artifact $X$ located in $X_c$, with observability radius $X_r$ is observable by a mirror agent with a body $B$, located in $B_c$, with observing radius $BR$ iff, being $d$ the distance between $X_c$ and $B_c$, then $d <= X_r$ and $d <= BR$. In the example, the observing radius of the user assistant agent is 10 meters. When the user approaches a point in the physical world where a situated message is located, the user assistant agent perceives the message and reacts by simply displaying it on the glasses (lines 24-26). When (if) the human user moves away from the mirror artifact, the belief about the message is removed and the use assistant agent reacts by displaying a further message (lines 28-30).

In order to situate the agent body to the position of the human user, the agent binds the body to a GPSDeviceDriver device artifact (lines 18-19), which realizes the coupling to the position detected by the GPS sensor, available on the smartphone of the user. Finally, a SmartGlassDevice artifact is created (line 7) and used (lines 26,30) as an output device to display messages, by means of the displayMsg operation.
/* Majordomo agent */
/* initial beliefs about some POIs */
poi("sacchi_pasolini",44.13952, 12.24340).
poi("sacchi_uberti",44.14119, 12.24344).
poi("isi_cortile", 44.13983, 12.24289).
poi("pasolini_chiaramonti",44.13964, 12.24250).
poi("pasolini_montalti",44.13948, 12.24384).
/* initial goal*/
!setupMW.
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+!setupMW
<- ?poi("isi_cortile",Lat,Long);
createSituatedWorkspace("mirror-example","CityMap",Lat,Long);
joinWorkspace("mirror-example");
makeArtifact("geotool","GeoTool",[Lat,Long]);
!create_messages;
println("MW ready.").
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+!create_messages
<- ?poi("pasolini_montalti",Lat,Lon);
toCityPoint(Lat,Lon,Loc);
makeSituatedArtifactAtPos("a1","SituatedMessage","hello #1",Loc,1000);
//
?poi("sacchi_pasolini",Lat2,Lon2);
toCityPoint(Lat2,Lon2,Loc2);
makeSituatedArtifactAtPos("a2","SituatedMessage","hello #2",Loc2,1000).

/* User assistant agent */

4.2 Ghosts and Traces
The second example is an extension of the previous one, where some ghost mirror agents are moving around autonomously along some streets of the city, perceiving and interacting with the situated messages as well. The source code of ghost agents is shown in Fig. 6. They have a walk_around goal (line 5), and the plan for that goal (lines 7-24) consists in repeatedly doing the same path, whose list of cities is stored in the path belief (line 3). They move by changing the position of their body, through a moveTowards action (line 23), which is available in any situated artifact, specifying the target point (to define the direction) and the distance to be covered (in meters). Other actions are available, such as a setPosition, directly specifying the new position.

User assistant agents perceive the ghosts as soon as their distance falls inside the observing radius, and show them on the glasses according to the orientation of the user. Viceversa, ghosts perceive the presence of the humans by perceiving the body of the user-assistant agents, as soon as users falls inside the observing radius of their body, which is 10 meters. When a ghost perceives a human (lines 17-20), it reacts by making a trembling on the smartphone owned by the human user, by executing a tremble action on a UserDevice artifact (created by the user assistant agent). In the code, body is an observable property available in every agent body artifact, specifying the name of the agent owning the body.
/* Mirror artifact representing a situated message */

public class SituatedMessage extends SituatedArtifact {
    public void init(String msg){
        defineObsProperty("msg",msg);
    }
}

/* An extension, adding a simple counting functionality */

public class SituatedMessageExt extends SituatedMessage {
    public void init(String msg){
        super.init(msg);
        defineObsProperty("n_touches",0);
        OPERATION void touch(){
            updateObsProperty("n_touches",
                getIntValue()+1);
        }
    }
}

Fig. 5. Code of the mirror artifacts used in the examples: SituatedMessage (left) and its extension SituatedMessageExt (right).

/* ghost agent initial beliefs */

start_pos("pasolini_chiaromonti");
path(
    "sacchi_pasolini","pasolini_montalti").
/* initial goal */
!walk_around.
/* initial workflow */
+!walk_around <- !setup; !moving.
+!moving <- ?path(P); !make_a_trip(P); !moving.
+!make_a_trip([POI|Rest])
  <- ?poi(POI,Lat,Lon); !reach_dest(Lat,Lon);
  +!make_a_trip(Rest).
+!make_a_trip()
  <- !start_pos(Start); ?poi(Start,Lat,Lon);
  !reach_dest(Lat,Lon).
+!reach_dest(Lat,Lon) : myBody(B)
  <- toCityPoint(Lat,Lon,Target);
  computeDistanceFrom(Target,D[art])
  moveTowards(Target,0.5)
  .wait(50); !reach_dest(Lat,Lon)).

Fig. 6. Code of ghost agents.

The SituatedMessageExt artifact (Fig. 5, right) is an extension of the previous one, providing a touch operation which increments an internal counter, whose current value is stored in a n_touches observable property. The action touch is performed by user assistant agents and ghosts each time they start perceiving the situated message.

This example is useful to show a couple of things. The first is the development of situated artifacts that are not simply information augmenting the physical world, but computational entities with a behaviour and a state, which can change dynamically. The second is the development of autonomous agents living in the mirror, able to perceive and being perceived by humans, and act on the mirror world so as to have effect in the physical reality.
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4.3 Coupling with the Physical World

In this last example, some StreetLight mirror artifacts are placed along the streets, representing (and coupled to) physical street lights. Their state (on, off) as well as their luminosity level is made observable by means of a couple of observable properties, light status and light level; instead, a couple of operations are provided to switch on and off the light (switchOn, switchOff). When approaching a light, ghosts perceive the level of luminosity and, if it is higher than a certain threshold, they invert their direction. Other mirror agents could instead act upon StreetLight artifacts so as to have an effect on the physical world, by switching on or off the lights.

This case is useful to show mirror artifacts that have both a physical and a mirror part in sync, so that by observing these artifacts, mirror agents (ghosts in the example) can perceive the physical reality and by acting on them they can have an effect on it. This coupling is implemented by means of embedded devices, connected to the infrastructure.

An important point for artifacts coupled to the physical reality is that the MW infrastructure is responsible to keep track of the synchronization state between the digital and physical part, making it observable (to agents) if the mirror artifact is either synchronized or not, depending on the amount of time elapsed since the last synchronization done by devices. This is important in particular for agents that aim at reasoning on the state of the physical world by considering the actual value of artifact observable state.

5 Discussion

5.1 Real-World Applications

As mentioned in the introduction and in [23], mirror worlds have been conceived in general as a conceptual blueprint to explore the integration of different kind of models and technologies (multi-agent systems, augmented reality, Internet-of-Things,...) for the design and development of forth-coming open smart environments, scaling from rooms to cities. Besides such a broad and general target, we aim at exploring their application in specific case studies that concern the real-time/situated computer supported cooperative work of teams of human agents performing missions across some physical environment. A main example that we are investigating is given by rescue scenarios, in cooperation with an industrial partner and domain experts. The objective is to devise novel information technology supports to improve the action and coordination of rescuers engaged in civil or military missions. To that purpose, we devised the notion of augmented rescue field, as a mirror world layered on top of the physical rescue field, where rescuers move, act and interact. Rescuers participate to such augmented rescue field by means of smart glasses/helmets and a smartphone, connected through a network (local or global, depending on the context). The objective is to support as much as possible their action in a free-hands mode, minimizing the need

3 INMM, http://www.inmm.it
of hands for using devices. Besides the rescuers situated in the field, the team includes also remote operators – both human agents (such as doctors) and software agents – that follow missions using proper control rooms, where they can both observe the augmented rescue field and act on it. The overall objective of the augmented rescue field is to make both the action of the individual rescuer and the coordination of the team more effective, by augmenting their perception, cognitive and social capabilities through the mirror.

5.2 Challenges

The concrete realization of full-fledged mirror worlds put forth many important challenges, to be explored in the MW research agenda. The challenges concern both the practical/implementation level and the conceptual/theoretical one. Some main ones are sketched in the following.

Coupling – The coupling between the physical and digital layer is a challenging and critical point. Such a coupling includes, among the other, issues concerned to localization—every MW application implies the capability to deal with the static/dynamic physical location of people and physical/digital artifact, both outdoor and indoor. This is a well-known challenging problem in literature, and different kinds of technics, algorithms and HW have been proposed for that purpose. More generally, depending on the applications, the coupling could require also forms of physical-world recognition and modeling, and, more general, the real-time recognition and modelling of the context where human users are immersed. The research literature on context-aware computing and applications is a main reference in that case [7].

Distribution and Scale – MW are inherently distributed systems—even the simplest one includes some part running on the mobile user devices and some infrastructure part running on some other node on the network. So typical issues/problems of distributed systems such as intermittent connectivity, failures, latencies, lack of global clocks cannot be abstracted. Also the scale of a MW can vary depending on the specific applications. In the simple examples shown in this paper only one mirror workspace is used. Of course, complex MW may call for modelling them in terms of multiple workspaces, each one mapping some portion of the physical environment coupled by the MW. Large-scale MW will require the adoption of cloud services in the design of some levels of the MW infrastructure.

Time in MW – time, like space, is a main ingredient and aspect of MWs. Time in MW is necessarily distributed, in fact there is not a single global clock at the MW level. A clock exists at the individual mirror artifact level, so observable events produced by actions on mirror artifacts can be ordered in chains. So, in spite of the distribution, some level of causal consistency must be guarantee,
related to chains of events that span from the physical to the digital layers and vice versa. That is, if a mirror artifact produces a sequence of two events concerning the change of its observable state, the same sequence must be observed by any mirror agent observing the artifact (of the same workspace) and then indirectly every human user assisted by such agents.

As a further must-have feature, MW must support agent/human observations and actions changing the physical/digital level with some degree of real-time (not necessarily hard real-time). Latencies introduced by network communications and failures can make this aspect quite hard to deal with.

**Degrees of Mixed/Augmented-Reality** – the support in MW for augmented/mixed reality does not necessarily require the capability of creating views on smart-glasses/helmets that merge the appearance of the physical reality with the rendering of 3D virtual objects or holograms. For many applications, the augmented reality perceived by a user could be limited to either messages that appear on the eyewear devices (Google-glass like), or simple symbols appearing on the FOV (Field-of-View) of the user, possibly associated to some specific element of physical reality part of the view. These functionalities are nowadays supported with a more and more level of sophistication by modern AR technologies, which witnessed an impressive progress in recent years, both at the consumer/business level – e.g. Epson Moverio BT-200, Sony SmartEye-glass, Microsoft Hololens – and at the military level – e.g. DARPA ULTRA-Vis program and prototype [24].

**Organisational models and normative systems for MW** — The definition of proper organizational models appears an important aspect of MW, in order to deal with aspects such as the openness, the autonomy of the agents living in the MW, the size in terms of number of entities composing the MW, and so on. So natural questions are: are current organization (meta-)models proposed by open Multi-Agent System effective for modelling MW organization? Is it useful to support some explicit coupling between organization models adopted in the physical/social layer and the ones to be adopted in the digital one, in the MW? Can we exploit the coupling between the two levels for effectively defining a notion of institutional actions and institutional facts inside MW?

From a modelling and programming point of view, a good starting point for exploring these issues could be applying state-of-the-art organisation-oriented models and programming frameworks. In the case of JaCaMo, for instance, MOISE [13] could be exploited for that purpose.

**Security, Privacy, Ethics** – if these aspects are important and problematic in current Internet/social-network based society, they are even more delicate and challenging in MW, where the coupling with the physical world is a primary aspect—like in scenarios based on Internet-of-Things, smart environments. In the MW case, the discussion of such aspects cannot be fully developed independently from another long-standing discussion about living within systems with
some significant degree of autonomy—which in MW is explicitly modelled in terms of the mirror agents. In MW such an autonomy is useful not so much to increase automation, but to human augmentation (individual and social) – which is strongly related to the augmentation of the physical reality. The idea of human augmentation puts forth interesting questions, which are more and more important as soon as such augmentation becomes essential for people in their everyday life.

5.3 Related Work

In literature, the integration of agents and multi-agent systems and augmented/mixed-reality has been already explored in different ways.

A survey of existing approaches is provided in [12, 3]. In [12], agents embodied in a Mixed Reality Environment (referred as MiRAs, Mixed Reality Agents) are classified as along three axes: agency, weak or strong; corporeal presence, which describes the degree of virtual or physical presence and interactive capacity, which is about the ability of MiRAs to sense and act on the virtual and physical environment. Given that taxonomy, [3] discusses the features in particular of AuRAs (Augmented Reality Agents), which can be categorised as MiRA that can both sense and act in the virtual component of the reality but can only sense in the physical. Among the platforms available for developing AuRAs, the AFAR toolkit makes it possible to develop BDI agents for AR applications on the NeXuS mixed reality framework [16], using AgentFactory as agent programming language [15]. Conceptually, the MW toolkit based on JaCaMo presented in this paper is strongly related to AFAR, since it aims at providing a general-purpose framework and API for developing agent-based applications exploiting various degrees of augmented/mixed reality, and adopting a BDI agent programming language for implementing agents. A main difference is that in MW, the virtual layer is not based only on agents, but also on artifacts, which play a key role also for creating the coupling with the physical world, besides representing the augmented world itself.

The main objectives of AuRAs as described in [3] are to function as embodied interfaces and design paradigm. The former mainly concerns the development of anthropomorphic interfaces, while the latter concerns software agents tasked with delivering relevant content to the user in a AR scenario. The MW idea conceptually extends these objectives by conceiving AR as one of the ingredients to develop – more generally – smart environment applications, integrating AR with pervasive/ubiquitous computing, context-aware computing, Internet of Things.

Finally, recent works have emphasized the value of (serious) mixed-reality games as a platform to explore scenarios in the real world that are typically hard to study in realistic settings, such as disaster response, to study the joint activities of human-agent collectives [9]. Similarly, mixed-reality testbeds have been deployed for the incremental development of human-agent robot applications [4].
6 Conclusion

In this paper we presented a first programming model for developing mirror worlds, and its implementation on top of the JaCaMo platform. Actually, the model is not specifically bound to JaCaMo, but refers in general to the A&A meta-model and agents based on a BDI-like model. Given such orthogonality between the agent/environment/organization dimensions, in principle it is possible to exploit the same API with agents written in different agent programming languages, not only Jason.

As remarked in Section 5, these are just the first steps of the overall MW research agenda [20], which include different kinds of challenges and investigations to be done in future work. However, the availability of a first platform that allows for designing and developing simple MW could be important both for investigating the applicability of the idea to real-world applications, and for exploring further features that concern the future work, by extending and enriching the platform itself.
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Abstract. Reactiveness and performance are important features of Multi-Agent Systems (MAS) and the underlying concurrency model can have a direct impact on them. In multicore programming it is interesting to exploit all the computer cores in order to improve these desirable features. In this paper we perform an experiment to evaluate different concurrency configurations that can be adopted to run an MAS and analyse the effect caused by each configuration on variables like deliberation time and response time. As a result, we identify the advantages and disadvantages for each configuration thus allowing an MAS developer to choose a suitable one depending upon the priorities for the application.

1 Introduction

In MAS applications it is desired that agents react promptly to changes in the environment, reply messages fast, process other high-cost activities, and all that at the same time [23]. The model of concurrency adopted in the MAS can have a direct impact on these issues. However, most researches in MAS focus on high level issues, while the low level issues still need a deeper investigation and advances. Multicore processors, multi-threaded operating systems, thread mapping, context switch overheads are examples of issues that are not comprehensively addressed by MAS platforms [17, 18, 27].

Current agent languages adopt different choices of concurrency features for the MAS developer. Some allow the use of a certain number of threads to exploit the cores of a computer by means of thread pools [30, 4], and such threads are shared among all agents in the MAS in order to maximize the parallelism. Other approaches create separated executions lines (physical threads or processes) for each intention [10, 23, 41, 35, 29]. Yet, others prefer to avoid the internal concurrency³ [8, 9, 33]. In addition, some proposals break the agent reasoning cycle in different components (such as the sense, deliberate, and act) and execute them concurrently [39, 22, 11].

When programming an MAS, different concurrency configurations can lead to different results in terms of performance and reactivity. For concurrency configuration we

¹ The authors are grateful for the support given by CNPq, grants 140261/2013-3, 448462/2014-1, and 306301/2012-1.
² Internal concurrency means that agents can perform several activities concurrently (e.g. execute more than one intention at the same time).
mean here the set of concurrency features, including their parameters, that are used to run the MAS. The analysis and comparison between these configurations — in spite of the specific agent language adopted — is interesting in order to decide which one is the most suitable for the specific application to be developed. While the overall MAS execution time is the main concern for some applications, for others a fast response time of an individual agent is desirable (i.e. the time necessary for the agent to handle some percept or message). However, a configuration that provides a suitable overall MAS execution time could not be good regarding the response time, and vice-versa.

In this paper we develop such analysis and comparison by adopting an abstract MAS architecture (Sec. 2) which allows us to experiment and tune different concurrent configurations. We are interested in evaluating MAS composed of several agents by testing different forms to launch intentions, to perform the reasoning cycle, and to distribute threads among the agents. For this paper, we focus on BDI agents because it is a highly adopted model in current agent languages.

We identify some main concurrency configurations (Sec. 3), which reflect the choices adopted by some agent programming platforms available in literature. We evaluate their performance using a test case, which has been specifically designed in order to stress the impact of concurrency configurations on some variables of interest such as the response time, overall execution time, and deliberation time. The obtained results (Sec. 4) are useful to understand the importance of developing MAS platforms that allow to choose or tune the concurrency configuration to be adopted when running an MAS application. Finally, we present conclusions and further work in Sec. 5.

2 Conceptual Model

In this section, we describe a conceptual model including the main elements that concern BDI agents and MAS that are relevant for a concurrency point of view. While Sec. 2.1 presents a conceptual model for MAS, Sec. 2.2 presents a conceptual model for BDI agents, and Sec. 2.3 presents an agent architecture and a simplified version of the agent reasoning cycle.

2.1 MAS Conceptual Model

An MAS is composed of agents, environment, and thread pools (Fig. 1). Agents are executed by thread pools composed of one or more threads. Multiple agents can be executed by the same threads of a pool and multiple threads of a pool can be used to execute a single agent. The environment can be executed by as many threads as necessary and the form that it uses threads is out of the scope of our work, remaining as a future work. Fig. 2 illustrates the threads, agents, environment, and how they can be related to one another at run-time. Several threads can be used by the MAS in order to better exploit the computer cores. The number of threads can be greater than the number of computer cores, which means that while some threads “own the CPU”, others are “sleeping”. The pentagons represent threads that are being used, while threads without pentagons represent threads that are not currently being used.
Threads can be grouped in thread pools or be independent (e.g. dedicated threads to run some intentions). p1, p2, and p3 represent thread pools, each one composed of five threads, while the system also has four independent threads. Three different relations among agents and threads can be defined. The first relation is the use of dedicated thread pools, which allows each agent to have its own thread pool. This configuration is especially important if the system is composed of few agents that must perform few activities in multi-core computers. In the figure, ag1 and ag2 have their own thread pools, p1 and p2 respectively.

The second relation allows the use of shared thread pools (i.e. different agents share the same threads). It is important when the number of agents increases compared to the number of available cores in the computer. Thus, the overhead caused due context switches can be reduced. In the figure, ag3 and ag4 share p3.

Besides the use of thread pools, agents can also use other threads for more specific works (e.g. to run some intention). This configuration can be especially useful in cases where activities do not depend on the same resources and the number of activities still do not cause a high context-switch overhead. In the figure, while ag1 uses one independent thread, ag3 uses two, besides their thread pools. By default, intentions run concurrently even if they do not have one dedicated thread for each one.

### 2.2 Agent Conceptual Model

The agent model (Fig. 3) considers several BDI elements already adopted in BDI agent languages, such as 2APL [13] and Jason [4]. Thus, we consider concepts like beliefs, goals, intentions, desires, events, and plans. In our model, an agent is basically composed of a belief base, goals, and plan library. For beliefs in the belief base are information that the agent has at some moment. They can be about the agent itself, the environment, or other agents. Goals are state of affairs that the agent wants to pursue (e.g. an environmental state). While intentions represent the goals that the agent has already deliberated and it is committed to achieve, desires represent the goals still not being pursued by the agent, which means that no intention was created for it yet.
The plan library is composed of plans, which are a means to handle some event or achieve some goal, and their conflicts. A plan is composed of a unique identifier, a trigger, a context, and a body. The trigger is an event that the plan can handle (e.g. the adoption of some goal). The context is used to specify the conditions for the application of the plan and is a logical formula that must be evaluated according to the agent beliefs. The body is a sequence of deeds\(^4\). Plans can conflict with other plans, which means that some plans may not be executed concurrently. The aim of defining conflicts is to avoid an undesirable behavior of the system [24]. As plans can be added and removed at run-time, conflicts among plans can also be added and removed at run-time. The policy for adding and removing conflicts are defined by the MAS developer and it is out of the scope of this paper.

At run-time, when an agent intends something, it should start acting in order to achieve that intention. The proper actions for an intention comes from plans that the agent has in its plan library. An intention is thus achieved by means of the execution of plans. Intentions can be created, suspended, or resumed at any time, and it is considered terminated when either the plan was executed successfully, the execution of the plan failed (e.g. the agent failed to perform an action), or the intention was dropped by the agent (e.g. the agent does not intend something anymore).

Several events can happen at run-time. Events can produce desires for the agent (e.g. a message received by the agent can contain a request for the agent to do something, which produces a desire to be pursued). In our model we consider five kinds of events: (1) addition and deletion of beliefs; (2) messages that are sent and received by the agent; (3) percepts that are produced by the environment and perceived by the agent; (4) goals that are adopted, dropped, achieved, failed, suspended, or resumed; and (5) detection of conflicts among intentions (i.e. a new intention becomes active but it conflicts with another already running intention).

\(^{4}\) The term deed is used in the same form as in [15] and it refers to several kinds of formulae that can appear in a plan body.
2.3 Agent Architecture

The agent architecture (Fig. 4) is inspired on some BDI models [37, 22, 11, 13, 4]. While Beliefs, Plans, Threaded Intentions, and Suspended Intentions are placed in data sets (represented by the horizontal rectangles in Fig. 4), Messages, Percepts, Events, and Pooled Intentions are placed in queues (represented by the vertical rectangles in Fig. 4) and processed by the threads in their respective components. These queues are priority queues in order to process emergencies promptly (e.g., an event notifying low battery in a robot). The priority policy is customizable by the MAS developer and agents can perform operations to retrieve and change the priority for events at run-time. The architecture has some functions (represented by octagons in Fig. 4) that define some steps of the reasoning cycle of the agent. Such functions are used, for example, to act in the environment or manipulate the data sets.

```
while TRUE do
    cPercepts ← Percepts.clone()
    cMessages ← Messages.clone()
    while (cPercepts ≠ 0 and cMessages ≠ 0) do
        Sense(cPercepts, cMessages)
        Deliberate()
        Act()
```

**Code 1:** Synchronous execution.

The agent is divided in three main components that can run concurrently, depending on the configuration. The aim of the concurrent architecture is to improve reactivity by allowing the agent to concurrently handle messages and percepts from the environment; handle internal events, belief updates, goal adoptions, etc.; and continue executing its intentions. The Sense Component (SC) is responsible for receiving the inputs from the environment (percepts) and from other agents (messages), updating the belief base, and generating events. The Deliberate Component (DC) is responsible for reasoning about
the events and producing new intentions to handle them. The Act Component (AC) is responsible for executing the intentions. Each component can have its own thread pool, named Sense Threads (ST), Deliberate Threads (DT), and Act Threads (AT).

The three components can also be configured to share the same thread pool. It is especially useful to reduce the number of threads in applications with more agents. For example, the MAS developer can define one single thread for each agent by configuring the ST, DT, and AT to use the same thread pool that has only one thread. In addition, all agents in the MAS could share a common thread pool. Thus, we can run the agent reasoning cycle in two distinct forms: synchronous (Code 1) and asynchronous (Code 2).

In the synchronous form, each component finishes its execution before the other component starts its execution (i.e. the sense-deliberate-act cycle is executed sequentially). In the asynchronous form, the three components run concurrently and do not wait for other components to finish their execution before doing something, whether they already have something to do. However, differently from the synchronous execution, where the reasoning cycle is explicit, in the asynchronous execution the reasoning cycle is implicit by a producer-consumer strategy, where each component produces inputs for the other components. For example, the SC produces events for the DC and the DC produces intentions for the AC. Thus, the reasoning cycle is ensured because for a component to be executed it will depend on the execution of the previous component. Furthermore, if the agent must handle a whole set of percepts before to make decisions, the asynchronous configuration cannot be used. Some concurrency control mechanism or strategy must be also adopted to avoid interferences and races, given the concurrent read/write access to e.g. the belief base, caused by the concurrent execution of the sense, deliberate, act components. A simplified version of each component is explained as follows, however implementation details are not presented in this paper due lack of space.

**Code 3: Sense.**

```plaintext
Procedure Sense(pPercepts, pMessages)
  if lastInputKind = MESSAGE and pPercepts ≠ 0 then
    input ← pPercepts.dequeue()
    lastInputKind ← PERCEPT
  else if pMessages ≠ 0 then
    input ← pMessages.dequeue()
    lastInputKind ← MESSAGE
  if input ≠ NULL then
    IHF(input)
```

**Code 4: Deliberate.**

```plaintext
Procedure Deliberate()
  event ← Events.dequeue()
  if event ≠ NULL then
    relevantPlans ← UE(event, PlanLibrary)
    applicablePlans ← CC(relevantPlans, BeliefBase)
    intention ← CP(applicablePlans)
    EI(intention)
```

**Code 5: Act.**

```plaintext
Procedure Act()
  intention ← PooledIntentions.dequeue()
  if intention ≠ NULL then
    PI(intention)
```

The Sense Component. The SC is responsible for the first steps of the agent reasoning cycle (Code 3). The environment enqueues the messages and percepts for the agent. Percepts and messages are then processed by the available threads in the ST. Each
thread in the ST processes one message or percept at once. Thus, each thread executes the Input Handler Function (IHF) for the percepts, messages, and belief updates.

The IHF adds new beliefs related to percepts that are not currently in the belief base and removes beliefs that are no longer in the percepts from the environment (i.e. outdated information). The addition and removal of beliefs always produce events that are enqueued in the Events queue (by means of the function Enqueue Event (EE)) to be processed afterwards. According to some kinds of message, the IHF adds or removes the beliefs (e.g. agents can induce other agents to believe or to disbelieve something). In addition, all received messages produce events, even if they do not change the belief base (e.g. a message asking for some information). In the synchronous execution, all the percepts and messages in the queue are processed before the DC starts its execution.

The Deliberate Component. The DC is responsible for processing new events by producing new intentions to handle them (Code 4). The events in the Events queue are individually processed by the available threads in the DT. Each thread in the DT processes one event at once. The first step to process an event is to find the relevant plans to handle the event. It is done by retrieving all plans where the trigger can be unified with the event. The function Unify Event (UE) is responsible for finding these plans.

The relevant plans are verified according to their context, by means of the function Check Context (CC). The context of a plan determines if the plan can be applied or not in certain moments. Thus, the CC function selects which plans, from the relevant plans, are applicable considering the current state of the agent (e.g. its beliefs).

Several applicable plans can still be used to handle the event, which means that the agent could choose any of them to handle the event successfully. The function Choose Plan (CP), by default, selects the first non-conflicting plan considering the order in which they appear in the plan library. If all applicable plans conflict with some already running intention, the first one is chosen.

An intention is then produced with the chosen plan and it is added in some of the Intentions data sets of the agent (by means of the function Enqueue Intention (EI)) for a further execution. The EI adds the produced intention in the Threaded Intentions set if it is configured as a threaded intention, otherwise, the produced intention is enqueued in the Pooled Intentions queue. In the synchronous execution, only one event is processed in each reasoning cycle, and after that, the execution moves to the AC.

The Act Component. The AC is responsible for the execution of intentions. They can be executed in two different forms: intentions can be executed by the available threads in the AT (Pooled Intentions) or be executed by dedicated threads (Threaded Intentions). In addition, intentions can be suspended and be placed in the Suspended Intentions set, remaining there until the agent resumes or drops their execution.

Each thread in the AT (Code 5) executes one deed related to certain pooled intention at once by means of the function Process Intention (PI). In execution of PI, the agent can perform some action in the environment, send messages to other agents, update its beliefs, adopt or drop goals, or execute any other internal action. When a deed is executed, it can also produce events. For example, when an agent adopts a new goal, an
event related to it is produced and enqueued in the Events queue. The intention is then updated and placed at the end of the Pooled Intentions queue for the execution of the remaining deeds. In the synchronous execution, only one intention is processed in each reasoning cycle. After processing such intention, the execution moves to the SC and the cycle begins again.

Threaded intentions also execute the PI and produce events. The main difference is that they do not compete with other intentions to use threads, since each threaded intention has its own thread. Even in the synchronous execution, threaded intentions run independently and do not follow the default reasoning cycle.

3 Evaluation of Different Concurrency Configurations

We have implemented a prototype following the model and architecture presented in Sec. 2.3 in order to perform an experiment to evaluate different concurrency configurations. The scenario for the experiment consists on executing agents that must perform certain activities, in this case we use the computation of Fibonacci numbers. The implementation of the plan to compute Fibonacci numbers follows the traditional recursive approach. Thus, while the computation of big Fibonacci numbers demand more time to be executed, the computation of small Fibonacci numbers can be executed in a short time.

All requests to compute the first $n$ Fibonacci numbers are given to the agents in a single shot and placed in the agents perception queue at the beginning of the execution. No new requests are given to the agents during the rest of the execution and all agents work on all requests at once. The concurrent computation of Fibonacci numbers occurs without any interference among themselves. Sec. 3.1 describes how the experiment was conducted and Sec. 3.2 presents an analysis of the results.

3.1 Configurations and Experiment Setup

The experiment was performed on a computer Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-2500 CPU @ 3.30GHz (4 CPU cores) running Linux version 3.9.10-100.fc17.x86_64. Four different concurrency configurations were chosen to run the aforementioned scenario. In Conf. 1, the agent components run sequentially (synchronous execution), like the traditional PRS cycle [21], and each agent has only one thread. Examples of languages that adopt such approach are 2APL [13] and Jason [4]. In Conf. 2, the agent components run sequentially (synchronous execution), like the traditional PRS, and all the agents share the same thread pool composed of four threads (same number of cores in the computer). The use of thread pools is the approach adopted in simpAL [30], but it is also possible in Jason [4]. In Conf. 3, the agent components (SC, DC, and AC) run concurrently (asynchronous execution) and each one has its own thread pool composed of four threads. Moreover, the thread pools are shared among all agents. The asynchronous execution is an approach adopted in works like [39, 22]. In Conf. 4, each intention is launched in different threads, which is an approach adopted in [23, 41].

The configurations are also evaluated according to the number of agents in the MAS. We varied the number of agents from 5 to 10000, using the numbers of 5, 10, 50, 100,
The aim is to evaluate how each configuration behaves when the number of agents changes.

The experiment was designed to analyse three variables. (1) The overall MAS execution time for the whole number of Fibonacci numbers to be computed by all the agents, which is the difference between the arrival time of the first percept and the time when the last intention has terminated. (2) The response time for each Fibonacci number, which is the difference between the arrival time of the percept and the time when the intention related to that percept has terminated. (3) The deliberation time for each Fibonacci number, which is the difference between the arrival time of the percept and the time when an intention is created to handle it. We chose the Fibonacci test case to evaluate such variables because we can easily simulate activities that demand a different execution time, stress the agent with different work loads, and simplify the experiment by using a scenario where interferences or races do not happen.

3.2 Results

The resulting data of the experiment is presented by a series of graphs. Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 present the average response time for each Fibonacci number comparing the impact caused by the number of agents in each configuration. While Conf. 1, 2, and 3 showed the expected exponential growth of the response time to compute Fibonacci numbers\(^5\), Conf. 4 still does not show a perceptible exponential growth considering the maximum number of Fibonacci used in the experiment. Moreover, the exponential growth behavior is only possible because each agent computes the Fibonacci numbers concurrently, by interleaving among the several computations that it must perform. Even in cases where intentions are not launched in dedicated threads, the agent executes a bit of a different intention in each turn. In this case, the interleaving mechanism is controlled in the agent architecture.

The different behavior for Conf. 4 is explained by the thread competition. While Conf. 1, 2, and 3 have fewer threads, Conf. 4 can produce a high number of threads that compete for the same resources (computer cores), resulting in delays to deliberate about new percepts. Thus, while the arrival order of the percepts does not seem to be an important aspect for Conf. 1, 2, and 3, it is important for Conf. 4. As another consequence, with fewer active intentions due to the delay for the thread creation, big Fibonacci numbers can be computed faster than in the other configurations, as shown in Fig. 5. The opposite behavior happens for small Fibonacci numbers. Even if the computation of small Fibonacci numbers is faster than big Fibonacci numbers, the deliberation time can harm the whole response time for small Fibonacci numbers. Therefore, as also shown in Fig. 6, Conf. 4 presents an almost constant response time independently of the Fibonacci number (considering the range of Fibonacci numbers used in this experiment) to be computed because the response time strongly depends on the deliberation time.

The reactivity of the agents could be measured by the experiment in this aspect. Small Fibonacci numbers can be thought as emergencies that the agents must react

\(^5\) This exponential growth is an expected behavior for the configurations used in this experiment because the computation of Fibonacci numbers, implemented following the traditional recursive approach, has an exponential complexity.
Fig. 5: Impact of the number of agents on the response time for each Fibonacci number according to each configuration (cfg).

promptly. We can see that for Conf. 1, 2, and 3 the agents can respond fast to them even if they are concurrently performing other high cost activities (represented by the big Fibonacci numbers). Conf. 4, instead, takes more time to react to emergencies, demonstrating a worse result if reactivity is an underlying requirement for the application.

Fairness is also better in Conf. 1, 2, and 3. If an agent must perform a low cost activity it is fair to think that the agent must respond faster than the execution of a high cost activity. In addition, the computation of big Fibonacci numbers showed that Conf. 2 has the worst response time considering the number of agents lower than 500, while Conf. 1 has the worst response times considering the number of agents higher than 1000. In this point of view, Conf. 3 showed middle term behavior between Conf. 1 and Conf. 2.

Fig. 7 presents the deliberation time for each configuration according to the number of agents. While Conf. 1, 2, and 3 have a fast deliberation time, Conf. 4 can take more
Fig. 6: Impact of the configuration on the response time for each Fibonacci number according to the number of Fibonacci numbers.

time until the creation of some intention to compute a Fibonacci number. This result also highlights the contrast between Conf. 1, 2, and 3 (on the right). Thus, we can see that, after Conf. 4, Conf. 1 has the worst deliberation time, while Conf. 2 has some improvements, and Conf. 3 has the fastest deliberation time. This comparison helps the MAS developer to decide which configuration to adopt for an application where a fast deliberation time is necessary, for example, to handle some emergency.

Another interesting descriptor to evaluate the data produced by the experiment is the standard deviation. Fig. 8 presents the standard deviation of the response time for each Fibonacci number according to the number of agents. By means of the standard deviation we can have an idea of how the response times spreads out for each Fibonacci number. While Conf. 4 has a high and unstable standard deviation, Conf. 1 showed an increasing standard deviation according to the Fibonacci number to compute, and Conf. 2 and 3 showed a lower and more stable standard deviation. A lower standard deviation shows that data are more reliable and it is clustered closely around the mean, which means that we can expect that the computation of new Fibonacci numbers would be close to the mean too.

Finally, Fig. 9 presents a graphic where the overall MAS execution time for each configuration is compared according to the number of agents. While Conf. 4 presents the fastest overall MAS execution time, Conf. 1, 2, and 3 have very close times, with Conf. 1 showing the worst overall MAS execution time. The faster overall MAS execution time for Conf. 4 is explained because each intention runs in an independent
thread and they are not enqueued in the Pooled intentions queue to be shared with other threads. The only overhead is caused by the context switch. In the other configurations, threads select intentions from the Pooled intentions queue. After finishing the execution of the current deed, threads need to enqueue the intention in Pooled intentions queue again. A synchronizing mechanism is necessary to control the access to the Pooled intentions queue in order to keep a consistent execution. Threads need to wait for the Pooled intentions queue be released by the thread that currently owns the access. Thus, up to 10,000 agents, the overhead caused by the Pooled intentions queue is higher than the context switch overheads.

4 Discussion

The experiment showed that each configuration has its advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, launching intentions in dedicated threads (Conf. 4) showed better results for an overall MAS execution time and when the response time should not consider the size of the task, but the order in which the agents receive the percepts. On the other hand, configurations that do not launch intentions in dedicated threads (Conf. 1, 2, and 3) showed better results to react to emergencies. Moreover, considering an asynchronous execution for the reasoning cycle (Conf. 3), the agents showed the fastest deliberation time, while sharing thread pools among the agents (Conf. 2 and 3) is a more suitable configuration if a low standard deviation is important.

The MAS developer should be able to choose the most suitable configuration for the MAS based on the priorities for the application (e.g. fast response time). However, because most of the current agent languages have a limited set of concurrency features, the MAS developer is not able to choose the best configuration. For example, on the one hand, languages like 2APL [13], GOAL [20], JACK [16], JADE [3], Jadex [28], Jason [4], JIAC [36], simpAL [30], among others, do not provide any option to execute the reasoning cycle asynchronously. On the other hand, works that adopt an asynchronous reasoning cycle [39, 22, 19, 11, 12], do not provide any option for a synchronous exe-
Fig. 8: Impact of the number of agents on the standard deviation of the response time for each Fibonacci number according to each configuration (cfg).

The number of threads are also defined differently among the different works. While some languages use a fixed number of threads for running an MAS based on the number of agents (Jadex [28], 2APL [13], GOAL [20]), computer cores (simpAL [30]), or any other policy, other works launch intentions using dedicated threads [23, 41, 12].

Several other features related to concurrency can be identified in the literature, however they were not included in the experiment performed for this paper. For example, some works provide operations that can be performed over intentions at run-time, such as suspend and resume their execution, and inspect their current state [30, 4, 3, 28]. Mechanisms for join/fork are also provided by other works. Hence, it is possible to write a plan A that calls the plan B and C to run concurrently (in the same or different threads) and waits for both plans (B and C) to get done to proceed with the execution of the current plan (plan A) [13, 26]. Another feature is the use of priorities to allow the agent, based on some policy, to decide which activities to prioritize if it needs to...
execute several ones concurrently [40, 14, 32]. Finally, agents can also be composed of other agents. Sub-agents can be responsible for controlling specific parts of higher level agent, such as its beliefs or its reactive behavior [19, 12, 31].

The experiment presented in the paper demonstrated evidences that an agent language that provides richer options regarding to concurrency allows the MAS developer to achieve this aim and improve the MAS execution. It is important to notice that the effects caused by each configuration used in the experiment is strictly related to the scenario of the experiment. Thus, the developer will need to identify the best configuration always based on the application and its priorities. Moreover, even with the possibility to specify a wide set of concurrency configurations, some of these configurations could not be applied in all kinds of scenarios. For example, it does not make sense to run two threaded intentions that compete to use the same resources (e.g. updating the same element of the environment). At some point, one intention would need to wait for the other to release the resource. However, it is possible to use threaded intentions if they do not compete to use the same resources (e.g. working with different elements of the environment). In the case of running threaded intentions it would also be necessary to perform deeper experiments adopting other kinds of configurations to clearly see if it has some advantage or not. The same can be done when the MAS developer intend to run the agent components concurrently (asynchronously). Sometimes all the beliefs must be updated before the agent makes decisions. Otherwise, the agent could use some already outdated belief to select the applicable plans for some event that just happened. In the Fibonacci scenario, there is no need for the agents to handle all the percepts before to deliberate. Therefore, the MAS developer must consider not only the concurrency configuration, but also the characteristics of the MAS application (i.e. the result of the execution must be consistent).

In this paper, we used a very simple reasoning cycle for both synchronous and asynchronous execution, which were enough to run the experiment. Several issues still need...
to be addressed in order to execute more complex scenarios. Some of them are how to
deal with new percepts if the agent has not finished to handle the internal events pro-
duced by the old ones; guarantee that the agent will handle emergencies promptly; and
ensure a consistent context especially when the agent is selecting plans to be executed.

Other works that perform some experiments related to agents are presented in [7, 6,
1, 17, 2, 25, 5, 34, 38]. However, such works are mostly focused on comparing different
languages, except by the work presented in [38], which makes an comparison among a
parallel BDI agent architecture against sequential BDI agent architectures. As in [38],
the aim of our work is to compare different configurations for agents instead of comparing
different languages. The use of different languages to compare different configurations
is not possible due effects caused by both variables (language and configuration).
They can be mixed and the results are not reliable to evaluate the configurations.

5 Conclusions and Future Works

In this paper, we performed an experiment to evaluate different concurrency configu-
rations for an MAS. By means of the experiment, we identified the effects caused by
the use of such configurations and demonstrated the importance for an agent language
to provide richer options regarding to concurrency configurations. In the future, we in-
tend to perform further richer/more complex test cases than the Fibonacci described in
the paper to enhance the evaluation and analysis. Finally, we plan to consider further
configurations, with more specific and complex strategies in handling concurrency. For
example, thread pools with a dynamic number of threads, which is chosen and allocated
at run-time so as to optimize the MAS execution according to some objective function.
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