

On commitments in multi-agent systems

Michal Pechoucek

Agent Technology Group, Czech Technical University in Prague

April 28, 2008

What is a commitment?

Commitments are:

- Knowledge structure defining agent's long term behavior
- Knowledge structure specifying agent's relationship with others
- representation of the agent's intentional state

What is a commitment?

Commitments are:

- Knowledge structure defining agent's long term behavior
- Knowledge structure specifying agent's relationship with others
- representation of the agent's intentional state

We distinguish between:

- **Specific** commonly used commitments
- **General** commitments
- **Recursive** commitments

Commitments can be *individual* or *social* (commitments representing relationship towards a goal within a group of agents)

Specific commitments

The *commitment* is an agent's state of 'the mind' where it commits to adopting the single specific intention or a longer term desire. An agent A can get committed to its intention φ in several different ways:

- **blind commitment** – also referred to as fanatical commitment, the agent is intending the intention until it believes that it has been achieved

$$(\text{Commit } A \varphi) \equiv \text{AG}((\text{Int } A \varphi) \leadsto (\text{Bel } A \varphi))$$

Specific commitments

- **single-minded commitment** – besides above it intends the intention until it believes that it is no longer possible to achieve the goal

$$(\text{Commit } A \varphi) \equiv \text{AG}((\text{Int } A \varphi) \curvearrowright ((\text{Bel } A \varphi) \vee (\text{Bel } A \neg \text{EF}\varphi)))$$

- **open-minded commitment** – besides above it intends the intention as long as it is sure that the intention is achievable

$$(\text{Commit } A \varphi) \equiv \text{AG}((\text{Int } A \varphi) \curvearrowright ((\text{Bel } A \varphi) \vee \neg(\text{Bel } A \text{EF}\varphi)))$$

General commitments

- **Commitment** is defined as $(\text{Commit } A \varphi \psi \lambda)$, where

- **Convention** is defined as $\lambda = \{\langle \rho_k, \gamma_k \rangle\}_{k \in \{1, \dots, l\}}$

provided \curvearrowright stands for *until*, A stands for *always in the future*, Int is *agent intention* and Bel is *agent's belief* then for $\lambda = \langle \rho, \gamma \rangle$ the commitment has the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\text{Commit } A \varphi \psi \lambda) &\equiv \\
 &((\text{Bel } A \psi) \Rightarrow A((\text{Int } A \varphi) \wedge \\
 &\quad ((\text{Bel } A \rho) \Rightarrow A(\text{Int } A \gamma)) \curvearrowright \gamma) \\
 &\curvearrowright \gamma)
 \end{aligned}$$

General commitments

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\text{Commit } A \varphi \psi \lambda) &\equiv \\
 &((\text{Bel } A \psi) \Rightarrow A((\text{Int } A \varphi) \wedge \\
 &\quad ((\text{Bel } A \rho_1) \Rightarrow A(\text{Int } A \gamma_1)) \curvearrowright \gamma_1) \\
 &\dots \\
 &\quad ((\text{Bel } A \rho_l) \Rightarrow A(\text{Int } A \gamma_l)) \curvearrowright \gamma_l) \\
 &\curvearrowright \bigvee_i \gamma_i)
 \end{aligned}$$

Terminal condition

- How a terminal condition is expressed in the general commitment?

Terminal condition

- How a terminal condition is expressed in the general commitment?
- $\langle \textit{false}, \textit{commitment_finished} \rangle$

Terminal condition

- How a terminal condition is expressed in the general commitment?
- $\langle false, \text{commitment_finished} \rangle$
- **blind commitments** is expressed as $(\text{Commit } A \varphi \psi \{ \langle false, (\text{Bel } A \varphi) \rangle \})$

Terminal condition

- How a terminal condition is expressed in the general commitment?
- $\langle false, \text{commitment_finished} \rangle$
- **blind commitments** is expressed as $(\text{Commit } A \varphi \psi \{ \langle false, (\text{Bel } A \varphi) \rangle \})$
- **single-minded commitment** is expressed as $(\text{Commit } A \varphi \psi \{ \langle false, (\text{Bel } A \varphi) \rangle, \langle false, (\text{Bel } A \neg \text{EF} \varphi) \rangle \})$

Terminal condition

- How a terminal condition is expressed in the general commitment?
- $\langle false, \text{commitment_finished} \rangle$
- **blind commitments** is expressed as $(\text{Commit } A \varphi \psi \{ \langle false, (\text{Bel } A \varphi) \rangle \})$
- **single-minded commitment** is expressed as $(\text{Commit } A \varphi \psi \{ \langle false, (\text{Bel } A \varphi) \rangle, \langle false, (\text{Bel } A \neg \text{EF}\varphi) \rangle \})$
- **open-minded commitment** is expressed as $(\text{Commit } A \varphi \psi \{ \langle false, (\text{Bel } A \varphi) \rangle, \langle false, \neg(\text{Bel } A \text{EF}\varphi) \rangle \})$

Joint Commitment

- every precondition is satisfied
- every agent has got the intention until termination condition
- re-evaluation conditions are followed

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\text{J-Commit } \Theta \varphi \psi \lambda) &\equiv \\
 \forall A : (A \in \theta) &\Rightarrow \\
 \psi \wedge A((\text{Int } A \varphi) \wedge & \\
 ((\text{Bel } A \rho) \Rightarrow A(\text{Int } A \gamma) \curvearrowright \gamma) & \\
 \curvearrowright \gamma) &
 \end{aligned}$$

Joint Commitment

for $\lambda = \{ \langle \rho_k, \gamma_k \rangle \}_{k \in \{1, \dots, l\}}$ the commitment has the form:

$$(\text{J-Commit } \Theta \varphi \psi \lambda) \equiv \forall A : (A \in \theta) \Rightarrow \psi \wedge A((\chi_1 \wedge \chi_2) \curvearrowright \chi_3)$$

where

$$\chi_1 = (\text{Int } A \varphi)$$

$$\chi_2 = ((\text{Bel } A \rho_1) \Rightarrow A((\text{Int } A \gamma_1) \curvearrowright \gamma_1)) \wedge ((\text{Bel } A \rho_2) \Rightarrow A((\text{Int } A \gamma_2) \curvearrowright \gamma_2)) \wedge \dots \wedge ((\text{Bel } A \rho_n) \Rightarrow A((\text{Int } A \gamma_n) \curvearrowright \gamma_n))$$

$$\chi_3 = \gamma_1 \vee \gamma_2 \vee \dots \vee \gamma_n$$

Blind Social Commitment

blind social commitment: each agent is trying to accomplish the commitment until it becomes true:

$$\lambda_{blind} = \{ \langle (\text{Bel } A \varphi), (\text{M-Bel } \Theta \varphi) \rangle \}$$

$$\psi_{blind} = \neg(\text{Bel } A)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\text{J-Commit } \Theta \varphi \psi \lambda) &\equiv \forall A : (A \in \Theta) \Rightarrow \\
 &(\neg(\text{Bel } A \varphi) \wedge (A((\text{Int } A \varphi) \wedge \\
 &\quad ((\text{Bel } A \varphi) \Rightarrow A((\text{Int } A (\text{M-Bel } \Theta \varphi)) \\
 &\quad \curvearrowright (\text{M-Bel } \Theta \varphi)))) \\
 &\quad \curvearrowright (\text{M-Bel } \Theta \varphi))).
 \end{aligned}$$

Minimal Social Commitment

minimal social commitment, also related to as **joint persistent goal**:

- initially agents do **not believe** that goal is true but it is **possible**
- every agent has the goal *until termination condition is true*
- until termination: if agent believes that the goal is either *true or impossible* than it will want the goal that it becomes a **mutually believed**, but keep committed
- the **termination condition** is that it is *mutually believed* either goal is true or impossible to be true.

$$\psi_{soc} = \neg(\text{Bel } A \varphi) \wedge (\text{Bel } A \text{EF}\varphi)$$

$$\lambda_{soc} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \langle (\text{Bel } A \varphi), (\text{M-Bel } \Theta \varphi) \rangle, \\ \langle (\text{Bel } A \text{AG}\neg\varphi), (\text{M-Bel } \Theta \text{AG}\neg\varphi) \rangle \end{array} \right\}$$

Minimal Social Commitment

$$\begin{aligned}
 &(\text{J-Commit } \Theta \varphi \psi_{soc} \lambda_{soc}) \equiv \forall A, A \in \Theta : [\neg(\text{Bel } A \varphi) \wedge (\text{Bel } A \text{EF}\varphi)] \Rightarrow \\
 &A \left[\left(\begin{array}{l} (\text{Int } A \varphi) \wedge \\ ((\text{Bel } A \varphi) \Rightarrow A((\text{Int } A(\text{M-Bel } \Theta \varphi)))) \curvearrowright \chi \wedge \\ ((\text{Bel } A \text{AG}\neg\varphi) \Rightarrow A((\text{Int } A(\text{M-Bel } \Theta \text{AG}\neg\varphi)))) \curvearrowright \chi \end{array} \right) \curvearrowright \chi \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\chi \equiv ((\text{M-Bel } \Theta \varphi) \vee (\text{M-Bel } \Theta \text{AG}\neg\varphi))$$

Commitment Recurrence

- for more general representation of *failure* situations, richer and more expressive representation of decommitments is needed

$$(\text{Commit } A \psi \varphi \lambda^*), \lambda^* = \{ \begin{array}{l} (\text{Commit } x_1 \rho_1 \gamma_1 \lambda_1^*), \\ (\text{Commit } x_2 \rho_2 \gamma_2 \lambda_2^*), \dots, \\ (\text{Commit } x_k \rho_k \gamma_k \lambda_k^*) \end{array} \}.$$

- It also allows the newly adopted commitments to be assigned to different actors.
- The delegation kind of decommitment between two agents A and B would have the following form:

$$(\text{Commit } A \psi \varphi \{(\text{Commit } B \rho \varphi \emptyset)\}),$$