CS344M Autonomous Multiagent Systems

Todd Hester

Department or Computer Science The University of Texas at Austin

Good Afternoon, Colleagues

Are there any questions?



Good Afternoon, Colleagues

Are there any questions?

- Subsumption vs. deliberative today
- RoboCup strategies now vs. CMU-98









• Programming assignment 4 assigned



Todd Hester



• Programming assignment 4 assigned

• Week 4 and 5 readings are up





• Programming assignment 4 assigned

• Week 4 and 5 readings are up

• Warren Powell talk - Friday 11 am (PAI 3.14)



- **Distributed Computing :** Processors share data, but not control. Focus on low-level parallelization, synchronization.
- **Distributed AI :** Control as well as data is distributed. Focus on problem solving, communication, and coordination.
- **Distributed Problem Solving :** Task decomposition and/or solution synthesis.
- Multiagent Systems : Behavior coordination or behavior management.
 - No necessary guarantees about other agents.
 - Individual behaviors typically simple relative to interaction issues.



- Study, behavior, construction of **possibly preexisting** autonomous agents that interact with each other.
 - incomplete information for agents
 - no global control
 - decentralized data
 - asynchronous computation



Why Multiagent Systems?

- Some domains require it. (Hospital scheduling)
- Interoperation of legacy systems
- Parallelism.
- Robustness.
- Scalability
- Simpler programming.
- "Intelligence is deeply and inevitably coupled with interaction." *Gerhard Weiss*



- Hierarchy: authority from above
- Community of Experts: specialists, mutual adjustment
- Market: bid for tasks and resources; contracts
- Scientific community: full solutions (perhaps with varying information) combined



 How to break down and resynthesize the problem among agents



- How to break down and resynthesize the problem among agents
- Communication/interaction protocols



- How to break down and resynthesize the problem among agents
- Communication/interaction protocols
- Maintain coherence, stability: guarantees?
 - Coherence is a global property



- How to break down and resynthesize the problem among agents
- Communication/interaction protocols
- Maintain coherence, stability: guarantees?
 - Coherence is a global property
- Representation by agents of each other and interactions



- How to break down and resynthesize the problem among agents
- Communication/interaction protocols
- Maintain coherence, stability: guarantees?
 - Coherence is a global property
- Representation by agents of each other and interactions
- Reconciling different points of view



- How to break down and resynthesize the problem among agents
- Communication/interaction protocols
- Maintain coherence, stability: guarantees?
 - Coherence is a global property
- Representation by agents of each other and interactions
- Reconciling different points of view
- Engineering



Dimensions and issues

- cooperative vs. competitive
- communication
- trust
- recursive modeling
- coalititions
- game theory



Dimensions and issues

- cooperative vs. competitive
- communication
- trust
- recursive modeling
- coalititions
- game theory

Convoy example



Individual Agents

What did Sycara say about reactive vs. deliberative agents?



What did Sycara say about reactive vs. deliberative agents?

"Sophisticated individual agent reasoning can increase MAS coherence because each individual agent can reason about nonlocal effects of local actions, form expectations of the behavior of others, or explain and possibly repair conflicts and harmful interactions."

"Reactive agents do not have representations of their environment and act using a stimulus-response type of behavior; they respond to the present state of the environment in which they are situated."



Individual Agents

- Purely reactive agents have disadvantages
 - Can't react to nonlocal info or predict effects on global behavior
 - hard to engineer
- Hybrid approach better (three layers)
- Hard to evaluate agent architecture against one another



• Omniscience for one agent creates bottleneck



Todd Hester

- Omniscience for one agent creates bottleneck
- Self-interested agents: each agent maximizes own local utility
 - Will that be good for global performance?



- Omniscience for one agent creates bottleneck
- Self-interested agents: each agent maximizes own local utility
 - Will that be good for global performance?(invisible hand)



- Omniscience for one agent creates bottleneck
- Self-interested agents: each agent maximizes own local utility
 - Will that be good for global performance?(invisible hand)
 - Pitfall:



- Omniscience for one agent creates bottleneck
- Self-interested agents: each agent maximizes own local utility
 - Will that be good for global performance?(invisible hand)
 - Pitfall: tragedy of the commons
 - Pitfall: no stability
 - Pitfall: lying



- Omniscience for one agent creates bottleneck
- Self-interested agents: each agent maximizes own local utility
 - Will that be good for global performance?(invisible hand)
 - Pitfall: tragedy of the commons
 - Pitfall: no stability
 - Pitfall: lying
- Market-based methods/auctions



- Omniscience for one agent creates bottleneck
- Self-interested agents: each agent maximizes own local utility
 - Will that be good for global performance?(invisible hand)
 - Pitfall: tragedy of the commons
 - Pitfall: no stability
 - Pitfall: lying
- Market-based methods/auctions
- Negotiation, game theory



- Complex individual agents
- Teamwork modeling
 - Modeling of teammates and opponents
 - Ad-hoc teams
- Recent: emphasis on flexibility in dynamic environments



- Complex individual agents
- Teamwork modeling
 - Modeling of teammates and opponents
 - Ad-hoc teams
- Recent: emphasis on flexibility in dynamic environments
- (pursuit slides)



- Middle agents (brokers)
- Standard languages
- Ontologies

More next week



Mataric: Adaptive Group Behavior

• Built using subsumption architecture



Todd Hester

Mataric: Adaptive Group Behavior

- Built using subsumption architecture
- More complex behaviors than in Brooks' article
 - Multiagent



Mataric: Adaptive Group Behavior

- Built using subsumption architecture
- More complex behaviors than in Brooks' article
 - Multiagent
- Hit a complexity limit?
 - (Subsumption or 3T more prevalent?)



• Necessary and sufficient, not "optimal"



- Necessary and sufficient, not "optimal"
 - Task dependent
 - Combinations: complementary, contradictory



- Necessary and sufficient, not "optimal"
 - Task dependent
 - Combinations: complementary, contradictory
- Example: locomotion



- Necessary and sufficient, not "optimal"
 - Task dependent
 - Combinations: complementary, contradictory
- Example: locomotion
 - Safe-wandering, following, dispersion, aggregation, homing



- Necessary and sufficient, not "optimal"
 - Task dependent
 - Combinations: complementary, contradictory
- Example: locomotion
 - Safe-wandering, following, dispersion, aggregation, homing
 - What 2 multiagent architectures does she compare?



- Necessary and sufficient, not "optimal"
 - Task dependent
 - Combinations: complementary, contradictory
- Example: locomotion
 - Safe-wandering, following, dispersion, aggregation, homing
 - What 2 multiagent architectures does she compare?
 - Anything special about this domain? Or could it apply just as well to others?





Basis behaviors for other tasks



Todd Hester

Basis behaviors for other tasks

- Can human behavior be thought of as arising from a set of basis behaviors?
- What kinds of basis behaviors would they be?



Todd Hester

Basis behaviors for other tasks

- Can human behavior be thought of as arising from a set of basis behaviors?
- What kinds of basis behaviors would they be?
- Would they be the same as the ones Mataric listed?
- Are there others?



Group 1: homogeneous, non-communicating Group 2: homogeneous, communicating Group 3: heterogeneous, non-communicating Group 4: heterogeneous, communicating

