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The A&A Meta-model

A&A: A conceptual framework for MAS modelling & engineering

Based on the conceptual foundations discussed in the previous block of slides, the A&A meta-model is a conceptual framework characterised in terms of three basic abstractions [Omicini et al., 2008]:

- **agents** represent pro-active components of the systems, encapsulating the autonomous execution of some kind of activities inside some sort of environment

- **artifacts** represent passive components of the systems such as resources and media that are intentionally constructed, shared, manipulated and used by agents to support their activities, either cooperatively or competitively

- **workspaces** are the conceptual containers of agents and artifacts, useful for defining the topology for the environment and providing a way to define a notion of locality
Definition (A&A Agent)

An A&A agent is an *autonomous computational entity*

**genus** agents are computational entities

**differentia** agents are autonomous, in that they encapsulate control along with a criterion to govern it

A&A agents are *autonomous*

- From autonomy, many other features stem
  - autonomous agents *are* interactive, social, proactive, and situated;
  - they *might* have goals or tasks, or be reactive, intelligent, mobile
  - they live within MAS, and *interact* with other agents through *communication actions*, and with the environment with *pragmatical actions*
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Artifacts in the A&A Meta-model

Definition (A&A Artifact)

An A&A artifact is a *computational entity* aimed at the *use* by A&A agents.

- **genus** artifacts are computational entities
- **differentia** artifacts are aimed to be used by agents

Artifacts are *to be used* by agents

- From use, many other features stem
  - which are either essential or desirable, but need not to be used as definitory ones
Artifacts Have a Function

Artifacts are designed for use

- Being *aimed at* the agent’s *use*, artifacts are *designed* to serve some purpose
  - and built as such
- When designed, they are then associated by design to their *function*
- Artifact function does not necessarily determine the actual use of the artifact by an agent
  - however, it incorporates the *aim* of the artifact designer, envisioning the artifact as potentially serving agent’s purposes

Artifacts are transparent & predictable

**transparency** In order to be used by agents, artifact function should be available to / understood by agents

**predictability** In order to promote agent’s use, artifact behaviour should be predictable
Artifacts Are Not Autonomous

- Artifacts are designed to serve some agent’s purpose
  - not to follow their own path of action
- An artifact has an embodied function, made repeatedly and predictably available to agents
- An artifact is a tool in the “hands” of agents
  - it does not need to be self-governed, it just has to be “governed” by agents when they use it
Artifacts Are (Computationally) Reactive

Artifacts are *reactive* in terms of control

- Artifacts behave in response to agent use
  - the behaviour of an artifact just needs to emerge when it is used by an agent
- In terms of control, an artifact just needs to be *reactive*
  - or, to behave as it were
- What about reaction to change?
  - should artifacts be reactive to environment change?
Artifacts Have Operations and Interfaces

- In order to be used, artifacts should make *operations* available to agents.
- Operations change an artifact’s state, make it behave and produce the desired effects on the environment.
- Either explicitly or implicitly, an artifact exhibits its *interface* to agents, as the collection of the operations made available.
Artifacts are Situated

Artifacts & Agent Actions
- Being used, artifacts are the primary target / means of agent’s action
  - Action is what makes agents strictly coupled with the environment
- Artifact’s function is expressed in terms of change to the environment
  - What the artifact actually *does* when used
- Artifact’s model, structure & behaviour are *expressed* in terms of agent’s actions and *environment*
  - Artifacts are *situated*

Artifacts are reactive to change
- Along the same line used for agents, artifacts are then supposedly *reactive to change*
  - Since they are structurally reactive in computational terms, this comes for free—unlike (proactive) agents
Artifacts are not Agents

Agents vs. artifacts

- Agents are autonomous, artifacts are not
- Agents encapsulate control, artifacts do not
- Agents are proactive, artifacts are not
- Agents are opaque, artifacts are transparent
- Artifacts are predictable, agents are not
- Agents may have a goal / task, artifacts do not
- Artifacts have a function, agents have not
- Agents use artifacts, but cannot use agents
- Agents speak with agents, but cannot speak with artifacts
- Agents are designed to govern, artifacts are designed to serve
Artifacts in the A&A Meta-model

**Definition (A&A Artifact)**

An A&A artifact is a *computational entity* aimed at the *use* by A&A agents

- **genus** artifacts are computational entities
- **differentia** artifacts are aimed to be used by agents

**Artifacts are *to be used* by agents**

- From use, many other features stem
  - artifacts have a function, are computationally reactive, are situated and reactive to change, are not autonomous, are transparent and predictable, have operations and interface for agent’s use
  - artifacts are not agents
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Artifacts & Environment I

Artifacts as mediators
- Artifacts mediate between agents and the environment
- Artifacts embody the portion of the environment that can be designed and controlled to support MAS activities

Artifacts as representatives of MAS environment
- As an observable & controllable part of the environment, artifacts can be monitored along with the development of MAS activities
  - to evaluate overall MAS performance
  - to keep track of MAS history
  - to influence MAS behaviour and evolution
Artifacts & Environment II

Artifacts for environment design

- Artifacts are the essential tools
  - for modelling MAS environment
  - to shape MAS environment so as to make it favourable to the development of MAS social activities
As mediating tools, artifacts have both an *enabling* and a *constraining* function.

**Enablers**: Artifacts expand out agent’s ability to manipulate and transform different objects.

**Constrainers**: The environment is perceived and manipulated by agents through the artifact not ‘as such’ but within the limitations set by the artifact itself.

A simple example: an agent-oriented printer driver.

- *Enabler*: Enables agents to use a printer, along with a number of its options.
- *Constrainer*: Limits general agent interaction with the printer to some well-defined interaction patterns.
Desirable Features of A&A Artifacts

How do we like artifacts?

- Artifacts could exhibit a number of relevant features, which would in principle enhance MAS engineers / agents ability to use them for their own purposes [Omicini et al., 2006]
  - inspectability
  - controllability
  - malleability / forgeability
  - predictability
  - formalisability
  - linkability
  - distribution
A&A Artifacts: Inspectability

- The state of an artifact, its content (whatever this means in a specific artifact), its operations, interface and function might be all or partially available to agents through *inspectability*.

- Whereas in closed MASs this information could be hard-coded in the agent—the artifact engineer develops the agents as well—, in open MASs third-party agents should be able to dynamically join a society and get aware at run-time of the necessary information about the available artifacts.

- Also, artifacts are often in charge of critical MAS behaviour [Omicini et al., 2004a]: being able to inspect a part or the whole of an artifact features and state is likely to be a fundamental capability in order to understand and govern the dynamics and behaviour of a MAS.
Controllability is an obvious extension of the inspectability property. The operational behaviour of an artifact should then not be merely inspectable, but also controllable so as to allow MAS engineers (or even intelligent agents) to monitor its proper functioning. It should be possible to stop and restart an artifact working cycle, to trace its inner activity, and to observe and control a step-by-step execution. In principle, this would largely improve the ability of monitoring, analysing and debugging the operational behaviour of an artifact at execution time, and of the associated MAS social activities as well.
A&A Artifacts: Malleability

- Also related to inspectability, *malleability* (also called *forgeability*) is a key-feature in dynamic MAS scenarios, when the behaviour of artifacts could require to be modified dynamically in order to adapt to the changing needs or mutable external conditions of a MAS.

- Malleability, as the ability to change the artifact behaviour at execution time, is seemingly a crucial aspect in on-line engineering for MASs, and also a perspective key-issue for self-organising MASs.
Differently from agents—which as autonomous entities have the freedom of behaving erratically, e.g. neglecting messages—, artifact operations, interface and function description can be used as the stable basis for a contract between an artifact and an agent.

In particular, the description of the artifact function could provide precise details of the outcomes of exploiting the artifact, while description of the artifact operations, interface and behaviour should make the behaviour of an artifact *predictable* for an agent.
A&A Artifacts: Formalisability

- The predictability feature can be easily related with *formalisability*
- Due to the precise characterisation that can be given to an artifact behaviour, until reaching e.g. a full operational semantics model—for instance, as developed for coordination artifacts in [Omicini et al., 2004b]—it might be feasible to automatically verify the properties and behaviour of the services provided by artifacts, for this is intrinsically easier than services provided by autonomous agents.
A&A Artifacts: Linkability

- Artifacts can be used to encapsulate and model reusable services in a MAS.
- To scale up with complexity of an environment, it might be interesting to compose artifacts, e.g., to build a service incrementally on top of another, by making a new artifact realizing its service by interacting with an existing artifact.
- To this end, artifacts should be able to invoke the operation of another artifact: the reply to that invocation will be transmitted by the receiver through the invocation of another operation upon the caller.
Differently from an agent, which is typically seen as a point-like abstraction conceptually located to a single node of the network, artifacts can also be distributed.

In particular, a single artifact can in principle be used to model a distributed service, accessible from more nodes of the network.

Using linkability, a distributed artifact can then be conceived and implemented as a composition of linked, possibly non-distributed artifacts—or vice versa, a number of linked artifacts, scattered through a number of different physical locations could be altogether seen as a single distributed artifact.

Altogether, distribution and linkability promote the *layering* of artifact engineering—as sketched in [Molesini et al., 2006].
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Levels of Use of Artifacts I

Co-ordination: both intelligent and non-intelligent agents could coordinate
Any agent (either intelligent or not) could simply exploit artifacts to achieve its own goals by simply taking artifacts as they are, and use them

Co-operation: intelligent agents could change artifacts to change MAS
Intelligent agents could possibly reason about the nature of the artifacts as well as on the level of achievement of their goals, and take the chance to change or adapt the artifacts, or even to create new ones whenever useful and possible as the result of either an individual or a social activity
Co-operation: MAS engineers could embody social intelligence in artifacts

In the same way, MAS engineers can use artifacts to embody the “social intelligence” that actually characterises the systemic/synergistic (as opposed to compositional) vision of MAS, but also to observe, control, and possibly change MAS social behaviour [Ciancarini et al., 2000]
## Aspects of agent-artifact relationship

**use**  An agent can use an artifact, according to its use goal, associating it with a destination

- **aware use**  because the agent is aware of the artifact’s function
- **unaware use**  because the artifact’s use is encoded in the agent by the programmer / designer

**selection**  An agent can select an artifact for future use, according to its use-value goal, reasoning about its possible future destinations and use goals

**construction / manipulation**  An agent can modify an artifact to adapt its function to some required use-value goals and to its possible future destinations

- or, an agent can create *ex-novo* a new artifact with an agent-designed function according to some required use-value goals and to its possible future destinations
Cognitional Artifacts

Definition (A&A Cognitional Artifact)

An A&A cognitional artifact is an artifact aimed at the cognitive use by agents.

- **genus** cognitional artifacts are artifacts
- **differentia** cognitional artifacts are aimed to be used in a cognitive way by agents

Rational exploitation of (cognitional) artifacts by cognitive agents

- In order to allow for its rational exploitation by intelligent agents, an A&A artifact possibly exposes
  - a *usage interface*
  - *operating instructions*
  - a *function description*
Cognitional Artifacts: Usage Interface

Agents, artifacts & operations

- One of the core differences between artifacts and agents is the concept of *operation*.
- An operation is the means by which an artifact provides agents with a service or function.
- An agent executes an action over an artifact by invoking an artifact operation.
- Execution possibly terminates with an *operation completion*, typically representing the outcome of the invocation, which the agent comes to be aware of in terms of *perception*.

**usage interface** The set of operations provided by an artifact defines what is called its *usage interface*.

- which (intentionally) resembles interfaces of services, components or objects—in the object-oriented acceptation of the term.
Artifact’s manuals for intelligent agents

- Operations cannot be invoked in any order
- Artifact’s state & behaviour, along with the effects of agent’s actions on the environment via the artifact, depend on the execution order of operations

**Operating instructions**  
*Operating instructions* are a description of the procedure an agent has to follow to meaningfully interact with an artifact over time

- which should of course be coupled with usage interface
Cognitional Artifacts: Operating Instructions II

Operating Instructions

- Operating instructions are a description of the possible usage protocols, i.e. sequences of operations that can be invoked on the artifact, in order to exploit its function.
- Besides a syntactic information, they can also embed some sort of semantic information for rational agents.
  - Rational agents can use such information for their practical reasoning.
- Artifacts are conceptually similar to devices used by humans.
  - Operation instructions play for agents a role similar to a manual for a human—which a human reads to know how to use the device on a step-by-step basis, and depending on the expected outcomes he/she needs to achieve.
Agents, artifacts & function

- Agents should be provided with a description of the functionality provided by the artifact
  - which agents essentially use for artifact selection

**Function description** Artifacts could then be equipped with a *function description* (or, a *service description*), (formally) describing the function / service that the artifact is designed to provide agents with
  - differently from operating instructions, which describes *how* to exploit an artifact, function description describes *what* to obtain from an artifact
An example

When modelling a sensor wrapper as an artifact, we may easily think of the operations for sensor activation and inspection as described via usage interface and operations instructions, while the information about the sensory function itself being conveyed through function description of the sensor wrapper.
Definition (A&A MAS)

An A&A MAS is a *computational systems* made of agents and artifacts

**genus**  MAS is computational system

**differentia** its basic components are agents and artifacts

A constructive definition

- Based on the previous definitions
- Also based on on the (primitive) notion of system as well
A&A MAS are Situated

**MAS & situatedness**
- MAS are made of agents & artifacts
- Both agents & artifacts are situated computational entities
- As an obvious consequence, MAS are *situated computational systems*

**MAS & environment**
- A MAS is always immersed within an environment
- A MAS cannot be conceived / modelled / designed in a separate way with respect to its environment
A&A MAS have a Behaviour

MAS & activity

- MAS are made of agents & artifacts
- Agents are pro-active, artifacts are reactive
- Agents are autonomous entities, artifacts have functions

→ In the overall, a MAS has a behaviour that results from the interaction of autonomous, self-governing entities (agents) and reactive, functional entities (artifacts)
Admissible interactions \textit{within} a MAS

- MAS are made of agents & artifacts
- Two fundamental entities give rise to four different sorts of admissible interactions
  - \textit{communication} agents \textit{speak} with agents
  - \textit{operation} agents \textit{use} artifacts
  - \textit{composition} artifacts \textit{link} with artifacts
  - \textit{presentation} artifacts \textit{manifest} to agents
MAS interactions with the environment

- Defining a system is to define a boundary—the same holds for a MAS, of course
- Interactions occur within and without the boundaries
  - MAS interaction with the environment
- Depending on the desired level of abstraction, we may attribute environment interactions to either individual agents & artifacts, or to the MAS as a whole
Delimiting a MAS

MAS boundaries
- Our definition allows us to understand whether a computational system is a MAS
- It mostly define the class of the MAS in the A&A meta-model

What is an open system?
- How can we determine / recognise the boundaries of an open MAS?
- On the engineering side, how can we design an open MAS?
  - what should we actually design when designing a MAS?
  - what should anyway account for / account not?
To define one single MAS, we need a characterising criterion. The very notion of system means there is a coherent way to interpret the overall set of components as a whole, and to determine whether a given component belongs to a given MAS. Characterising a single MAS then means firstly to define a criterion according to which an agent / an artifact could be said either to belong or not to a given MAS. Hopefully in a univocal way, possibly dynamically depending on a number of parameters, like time, state of components, state of MAS, state of the environment, ...
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