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- Julian Bishop, PhD Proposal, Friday 11 AM (ENS 31NM)
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How agents *form and disband* teams
Joint Intentions – Setting

How agents form and disband teams

- Agents in dynamic multiagent world
- Neither complete nor correct beliefs
  - Positive introspection: know own beliefs
- Changeable goals, fallible actions
- Don’t know others’ beliefs/goals
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**Intention:** persistent goal, belief throughout that it’s being done

- What’s the role of $q$?
- What’s the difference between goal, intention?
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Why too weak and too strong?
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Weak achievement goal (WAG): relative to $q$ with respect to a team to achieve $p$

- Individually wants $p$
  OR
- Believes $p$ true, impossible, or irrelevant, AND has a goal of team knowing it.

4 cases
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- Overhead: automatic goal to communicate status
Establishing JPGs

- Communication (basis for KQML)
- Observation (requires co-presence)
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- Any other way?
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Example: “Please close the window.”
“Capabilities for teamwork cannot be patched on, but must be designed in from the start.” (Grosz, 1996)
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- Agree or disagree?
STEAM
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• An implementation/extension of joint intentions

• Goals
  – Anticipate teamwork failures
  – Flexibility and re-use

• Joint intentions doesn’t do it all, though
  – Coherence: all use same plan, commitment protocols
  – Communication cost — decision theoretic
  – Replanning — role dependencies
Domains

- **Attack:**
  - Fly to holding point
  - Send out scouts
  - Shoot at enemy

- **Transport:**
  - Escorts protect transports

- **RoboCup**
Observed Problems
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- Commander returns to home alone after failing, others stayed
- Scout never returned, others got into infinite loop
- One got orders first and went ahead alone
- All out of ammunition, but failed to realize unachievable

Solved generally with STEAM
Evaluation
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- Flexibility: solves initial problems, can deal with small changes to environment
- Communication efficiency
- Encoding and modification effort
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• Attempt to program common sense

• > 1 million rules
  – “Trees are usually outdoors.”
  – “Once people die they stop buying things.”
  – “Glasses of liquid should be carried rightsideways.”

• Ongoing effort since 1984

• Potential applications?
  – Some listed on their web site
  – Question answering, retrieval of captioned information, machine translation, speech recognition, semantic data mining, . . .