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ABSTRACT
This paper aims to describe the relationship between propositional planning systems and the process of means-end reasoning used by BDI agents. To show such relationship, we define a mapping from BDI mental states to propositional planning problems and from propositional plans back to mental states. In order to test the viability of such mapping, we have implemented it in an extension of a BDI agent model through the use of Graphplan as the propositional planning algorithm. The implementation was applied to model a case study of an agent controlled production cell.

Categories and Subject Descriptors
I.2.11 [Artificial Intelligence]: Distributed Artificial Intelligence—Intelligent agents; I.2.8 [Artificial Intelligence]: Problem Solving, Control Methods, and Search—Plan execution, formation, and generation
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1. INTRODUCTION
The development of rational agents, i.e., agents capable of performing useful actions given its world perception and knowledge [29], has been a major concern since the beginning of Computer Science research [25]. Such development originated various important approaches to the implementation of computational reasoning, starting with the General Problem Solver (GPS) and generic problem solving algorithms, and evolving into Planning Systems. Although these planning systems are capable of defining how goals are to be achieved, they do not deal with the problem of which goals are to be pursued. In other words, they are capable of performing means-end reasoning but not to deal with the problem of practical reasoning [23].

Planning systems gave way to the reasoning model based on deliberative agents as a means to deal with practical reasoning. These agents used, initially, a series of decision making mechanisms which are theoretically defined, like decision theory, but have proven themselves inadequate to implementation, since they assumed agents that had unlimited time and computational resources [23]. In order to solve the issue of limited resources, a philosophical practical reasoning model was formalized and computationally implemented [5], that, in theory, allows an agent to limit the time spent in deliberation. Nevertheless, implementations of these agents tend to avoid facing the complexity of means-end reasoning through the usage of plan libraries, defined for the agent prior to its execution. Therefore, this approach solves the problem of an agent’s limited resources, but it delegates the responsibility of building plans to its developer.

Deliberation using a plan library is obviously more computationally efficient than performing plan formation at runtime. Nevertheless, the usage of a plan library ties the problem solving capability of an agent to the situations foreseen by its designer, while planning at runtime allows the agent to cope with a larger variety of situations. On the other hand, agent architectures that perform planning at runtime usually have tightly coupled planning methods that limit its improvement through the incorporation of novel planning strategies. Therefore, the purpose of our work is to show how to incorporate propositional planning in BDI agent models, providing agents with the ability of practical reasoning and means-end reasoning. Our approach is underpinned on a mapping among BDI mental states and propositional planning formalisms, thus allowing any algorithm based on a similar formalism to be used as a means-end reasoning process for a BDI agent. In order to demonstrate the viability of such approach we take a specific BDI agent model, namely the X-BDI model [19], and modify it to use propositional planning algorithms to perform means-end reasoning [20].

2. BASIC CONCEPTS
2.1 BDI Agents
As computer systems became more complex, abstraction mechanisms for these systems were developed. One abstraction mechanism that is becoming increasingly accepted is the notion of Computer Agents [23, 12, 9], so far as to be pro-
posed as an alternative to the Turing Machine as an abstraction for the notion of computation [12, 26]. Although there is a variety of definitions for Computer Agents, an informal definition, which adequately captures important properties of agency, is the following [12]: An agent is an encapsulated computer system that is situated in some environment and that is capable of flexible, autonomous action in that environment in order to meet its design objectives.

In the context of multi-agent systems research, one of the most widely known and studied models of deliberative agents uses Beliefs, Desires and Intentions as abstractions for the description of a system’s behaviour. This model is called BDI (for Beliefs, Desires and Intentions) and was originated by a philosophical model of human practical reasoning [4], later formalized [8] and improved towards a more complete computational theory [22, 29].

One of the most important processes of the BDI model is the selection of the course of action the agent will take in order to satisfy its intentions, i.e. given an environment and a set of objectives, determine whether the agent is capable of satisfying its objectives through some sequence of actions. This problem is characterized as the Agent Design Problem [28]. The most widely known BDI agent implementations have been bypassing this problem through the use of plan libraries where the courses of action for every possible objective an agent might have are stored [11, 10]. The theories commonly used to underpin systems capable of dealing with the agent design problem assume an agent with unlimited resources, thus making its actual implementation impossible [23, 22]. On the other hand, recent works seek to deal with this problem in various ways, for instance, by defining alternate proof systems [19, 21] or using model checking in order to validate the agent’s plan library [3]. An alternate approach to solve the problem is the use of planning algorithms to perform means-end reasoning at runtime [16], though the architecture we propose is suitable to such extensions.

2.2 Planning Algorithms

Means-end reasoning is a fundamental component of any rational agent [4] and is useful in the resolution of problems in a number of different areas, for instance scheduling [24]. Therefore, the development of planning algorithms has been one of the main goals of AI research [29]. A planning problem is generically defined by formal description of the [27]: i) start state; ii) intended goals; iii) actions that may be performed. The planning system will take these components and will generate a set of actions ordered by some relation, that, when applied to the world where the initial state description is true, will make the goals description true.

It is known that planning is undecidable [7] and that planning problems, in the general case, are PSPACE [6]. Despite the high complexity proven for the general case of planning problems, recent advances in planning research led to the creation of planning algorithms that perform significantly better than previous approaches to solve various problem classes [27, 20]. These algorithms belong mainly to two classes: i) Graphplan based algorithms [2]; ii) algorithms based in the compilation of the planning problem into a formula whose satisfiability is tested (SAT) [13].

In this work, we focus on STRIPS-like (STanford Research Institute Problem Solver) formalisms [20]. Our description of the formalism is based on the one found in [20], and is, according to the author, a SFL formalism, i.e. the basic STRIPS plus the possibility to use incomplete specifications and literals in the description of world states. It is important to point out that the formalisms defined by Nebel [20] are more general, but since we do not intend to provide a detailed study of planning formalisms, we use a simpler version of the referred formalism. In particular, we use a propositional logical language with variables only in the specification of operators. Also, operators are not allowed to have conditional effects. Considering the STRIPS formalism, one can notice that the referred planners deal only with atoms. Nevertheless, within this paper more expressivity is desirable, in particular, the possibility to use first order ground literals. It is possible to avoid these limitation through the use of syntactic transformations so that the planners described operate over first order ground literals.

2.3 Graphplan

Graphplan [2] is a planning algorithm based on the construction and search in a graph. It is considered one of the most efficient planning algorithms created recently [27, 20, 24]. The efficiency of this algorithm was empirically proved through the significant results obtained by instances of Graphplan in the planning competitions of the AIPS (International Conference on AI Planning and Scheduling) [14, 18]. Planning in Graphplan is based on the concept of a Planning Graph, which is a data structure in which information regarding the planning problem is stored in such a way that the search for a solution can be accelerated. The Planning Graph is not a space state graph in which a plan is a path through the graph. Instead, a plan in the Planning Graph is essentially a flow, in the sense of a network flow. Planning Graph construction is efficient. It has polynomial complexity in graph size and construction time with regard to problem size [2]. The graph is then used by the planner in the search for a solution to the planning problem using data stored in the graph to speed up the process. The basic Graphplan algorithm (i.e. without the optimizations proposed by other authors) is divided into two distinct phases: Graph Expansion and Solution Extraction.

The Planning Graph in Graphplan is directed and levelled. Considering that a plan is composed of temporally ordered actions, and, in between these actions there are world states, graph levels are divided into alternating proposition and action levels. Proposition levels are composed of proposition nodes labelled with propositions. These nodes are connected to the actions in the subsequent action level through pre-condition arcs. Action nodes are labelled with operators and are connected to the nodes in the subsequent proposition nodes by effect arcs. Every proposition level denotes literals that are possibly true at a given moment, thus the first proposition level represents the literals that are possibly true at time 1, the next proposition level represents the literals that are possibly true at time 2 and so forth. Action levels denote operators that can be executed at a given moment in time in such a way that the first action level represents the operators that may be executed at time 1 and so forth. The graph contains mutual exclusion relations (mutex) between nodes in the same graph level. Mutex relations have a fundamental role in algorithm efficiency. A mutual exclusion relation between two nodes means that they can-
not be simultaneously present in the same graph level for the
same solution. After graph expansion, the second phase of
Graphplan, called solution extraction, takes place. It uses a
backward chaining strategy to traverse the graph on a level
by level basis trying to find a flow starting from the goals
that leads to the initial conditions.

The algorithm chosen for implementation in the proto-
type is Graphplan. Its choice was due to the greater body
of available work related to its improvement, e.g. real-time
planning [24], additional inference of planning graph infor-
mation [17], among others, that might be incorporated into
an implementation.

3. PROPOSED SOLUTION

Considering that we will use propositional planners as a
mechanism for means-end reasoning within BDI agents, we
take the X-BDI agent model [19] and modify its operational
definition to accommodate the use of planning algorithms
external to its kernel.

3.1 Extending X-BDI with Graphplan

The X-BDI agent model was created in order to allow a
formal agent specification to be directly executed [19]. That
is possible because X-BDI’s language is defined in terms
of a formalism that has a reference implementation, which
is called Extended Logic Programming with explicit nega-
tion (ELP) using the Well-Founded Semantics extended for
the explicit Negation (WFSX), with a derivation procedure
called Selected Linear Derivation for extended programs
(SLX) [1]. X-BDI uses ELP’s ability to deal with contra-
diction to implement a variety of non-monotonic reasoning
processes, necessary for the BDI model. Moreover, a mod-
ified form of Event Calculus [15] is used in order to allow
X-BDI to deal with a dynamic world.

3.1.1 X-BDI Operation

An X-BDI agent has the traditional components of a BDI
agent, i.e. a set of Beliefs, Desires and Intentions. Besides,
given its extended logic definition, it has also a set of time
axioms defined through a variation of the Event Calculus
[19, 15]. The set of beliefs is simply a formalization of facts
in ELP, individualized for a specific agent. The belief revi-
sion process in X-BDI is the result of the program revision
process performed in ELP by the SLX procedure. From
the agent’s point of view, it is assumed that its beliefs are not
always consistent, because whenever an event that makes
the beliefs inconsistent, SLX will minimally revise the pro-
gram, and therefore, the beliefs. Every desire in an X-BDI
agent is conditioned to the body of a logic rule, which is a
conjunction of literals called Body. Thus, Body specifies the
pre-conditions that must be satisfied in order for an agent
to desire a property. When Body is an empty conjunction,
property P is unconditionally desired. Desires may be tem-
porally situated, i.e. can be desired in a specific moment,
or whenever its pre-conditions are valid. Besides, desires
have a priority value used in the formation of an order rel-
ation among desire sets. There are two possible types of
intentions: Primary Intentions, which refer to the intended
properties, and Relative Intentions, which refer to actions
able to bring about these properties. An agent may intend
something in the past or that is already true. Besides, in-
intentions may not be impossible, i.e. there must be at least
one plan available to the agent whose result is a world state
where the intended property is true. This definition repres-
ents the first change performed in X-BDI described in this
work. In the original X-BDI the possibility of a property
was verified through the abduction of an Event Calculus
theory that would make the property true. In this work, we
modified the planning process so that it is abstracted from
the operational definition of X-BDI, allowing that any plan-
ning process that satisfies the conditions of Section 2.2 to be
used by X-BDI. Thus, the notion of possibility of a desire is
associated with the existence of a plan to satisfy it.

The reasoning process performed by X-BDI initiates with
the selection of Eligible Desires, which represent the un-
satisfied desires whose pre-conditions were satisfied. The
elements of this set are not necessarily consistent among
themselves. Candidate Desires are then generated, which
represent a set of Eligible Desires that are both consistent
and possible and will be later adopted as Primary Inten-
tions. In order to satisfy the properties represented by Pri-
mary Intentions, the planning process generates a sequence
of temporally ordered actions that constitute the Relative
Intentions. Eligible desires have rationality constraints that
are similar to those imposed over the intentions in the sense
that an agent will not desire something in the past or some-
thing the agent believes will happen without his interfer-
ence. Agent beliefs must also support the pre-conditions
defined in the desire Body. Within the agent’s reasoning
process these desires will originate a set of mutually consis-
tent subsets ordered by a partial order relation. The process
of selecting Candidate Desires seeks to choose among the El-
igible Desires one subset that contains only desires that are
internally consistent and possible. A possible desire is one
that has a property P that can be satisfied through a se-
quence of actions. In order to choose among multiple sets
of Candidate Desires, X-BDI uses ELP constructs that allow
the definition of preferred revisions. Thus, X-BDI defines
a desire preference relation through a set of preferred revi-
sions generated using the priorities expressed in the desires.
Through this preference relation, a desire preference graph
that relates all subsets of Eligible Desires is generated.

Candidate Desires represent the most significant modi-
fication made in this paper regarding the original X-BDI
[19]. Originally, X-BDI verified the possibility of a desire
through the abduction of an Event Calculus Theory in which
the belief in the validity of a desired property P could be
true. Such abduction process is, actually, a form of plan-
ning. Since our main objective in this paper is to separate
the planning process previously hard-coded within X-BDI,
the notion of desire possibility had to be re-defined. There-
fore, we define that a set of Candidate Desires is the subset
of Eligible Desires with the greater preference value, and
whose properties can be satisfied. Satisfiability is verified
through the execution of a propositional planner that pro-
cesses a planning problem in which the initial state contains
the properties that the agent believes at the time of plan-
ning. The P properties present in the Candidate Desires are
used to generate the set primary intentions.

Primary Intentions can be seen as high-level plans, simi-
lar to the intentions in IRMA [5]. Hence, they represent the
agent’s commitment to a course of action, which will be per-
formed through a series of refinements up to the point where
an agent has a temporally ordered set of actions representing
a concrete plan towards the satisfaction of its goals. Rela-
tive Intentions correspond to the temporally ordered steps of
the concrete plans generated to satisfy the agent’s Primary Intentions. The notion of agent commitment results from the fact that Relative Intentions must be non-contradictory regarding Primary Intentions.

3.1.2 Intention Revision
The computational effort and the time required to reconsider the whole set of intentions of a resource-bounded agent is generally significant regarding the environment change ratio. Therefore, intention reconsideration should not occur constantly, but only when the world changes in such a way as to threaten the plans an agent is executing or when an opportunity to satisfy more important goals is detected. As a consequence, X-BDI uses a set of reconsideration “triggers” generated when intentions are selected, and causes the agent to reconsider its course of action when activated.

At this point, we verified that the modifications operated in X-BDI allow us to maintain the reconsideration conditions defined by Bratman [5]. In particular, if all of the agent’s Primary Intentions are satisfied before the time planned for them to be satisfied, the agent will restart the deliberative process, for he has achieved his goals. On the other hand, if one of the Primary Intentions has not been achieved at the time planned for it, the agent will have to reconsider its intentions because its plans have failed. Moreover, if a desire with a higher priority than the currently selected desires becomes possible, the agent will reconsider its desires in order to take advantage of the new opportunity. Reconsideration is completely based on integrity constraints over beliefs. Therefore, considering that beliefs are revised at every sensing cycle, it is possible that a reconsideration occurs due the “triggering” of a reconsideration restriction. The modifications implemented in X-BDI alter its operation so that it uses propositional planning algorithms as the underpinning of the means-end reasoning and as possibility verifiers in the practical reasoning process (Figure 1).

3.2 Solution Architecture
The prototype implemented for this work is essentially composed of three parts: the X-BDI kernel, implemented in Prolog, a planning system containing a C++ implementation of Graphplan, and a Java Graphical Interface used to ease the operation of X-BDI and to visualize its interaction with the environment. The Agent Viewer interface communicates with X-BDI through sockets by sending the input from the environment where the agent is embedded and receiving the result of the agent’s deliberation. Through Agent Viewer the user can also describe the agent through its desires, actions and initial beliefs. Once X-BDI receives the agent description, it communicates with the planning library through Operating System files and the Prolog/C++ interface. The planner is responsible for generating a set of intentions for the agent. The modification applied into X-BDI essentially consists of, when the agent deliberates, convert subsets of the agent’s desired properties into propositional planning problems and invoke the planning algorithm to solve these problems until either a plan that solve the highest priority desires is found, or the algorithm determines that it is not possible to solve any one of these problems.

4. A BDI PRODUCTION CELL
In this work we use a BDI agent in order to model a production cell as a case study, and as a means to verify the validity of the architecture described in Section 3. The proposed production cell is composed of seven devices, a Feed Belt, a Deposit Belt, four Processing Units and a Crane that can freely move components over all the devices in the cell. This Production Cell is illustrated in Figure 2.

Components enter the production cell for processing through the Feed Belt, and, once processed by all the appropriate Processing Units, they are removed from the cell through the Deposit Belt. Every Processing Unit is responsible for performing a different kind of operation in the component being processed, and can hold only one component at a given moment. Every component introduced in the cell can be processed by one or more Processing Units, which is determined by the type of component being processed. Different component types have different processing priorities. The control of this production cell is trusted to a BDI agent implemented using X-BDI, which should schedule the work of the production cell through its beliefs, desires and intentions, re-scheduling the work whenever some change occurs.

The first step in modelling any problem using a STRIPS-like formalism is the choice of the predicates used to represent the problem’s object-types and its states. Hence, we have the following predicates representing objects in the cell: i) bloc(B) denotes that B is a Component to be processed; ii) procUnit(P) denotes that P is a Processing Unit, Processing Units are also Devices; iii) device(D) denotes that D is a Device; iv) feedBelt represents the Feed Belt;
v) depositBelt represents the Deposit Belt. Similarly, we have the following predicates representing system states: i) over(B, D) denotes that Component B is over Device D; ii) empty(P) denotes that Processing Unit P is empty, i.e., has not Component over it; iii) processed(B, P) denotes that Component B has already been processed by Processing Unit P; iv) finished(B) denotes that Component B has already been removed from the Production Cell. Next, we define the actions the agent is capable of performing in the context of the proposed problem: i) Action process(B, P) having as pre-conditions procUnit(P), bloc(B) and over(B, P), and as effect processed(B, P), represents the processing that a Processing Unit P performs in a Component B over it; ii) Action consume(B) having as pre-conditions bloc(B) and over(B, depositBelt) and as effects over(B, depositBelt), empty(depositBelt) and finished(B), represents the removal of component B from the production cell through the Deposit Belt; iii) Action move(B, D1, D2) having as pre-conditions over(B, D1), empty(D2), bloc(B), device(D1) and device(D2) and as effects over(B, D2), ~over(B, D1), ~empty(D2) and empty(D1), represents the motion of Component B from Device D1 to Device D2.

The processing requirements of components and its priorities are modelled through the agent’s desires. Therefore, we can model agent pCell necessity to process Component bloc1 by Processing Units procUnit1, procUnit2 and procUnit3 as soon as this component is inserted into the production cell through the following desires:

des(pCell, finished(bloc1), Tf, [0.7])
if bel(pCell, bloc(bloc1)),
bel(pCell, processed(bloc1, procUnit1)),
bel(pCell, processed(bloc1, procUnit2)),
bel(pCell, processed(bloc1, procUnit3)),
bel(pCell, ~finished(bloc1)).

des(pCell, processed(bloc1, procUnit1), Tf, [0.6])
if bel(pCell, bloc(bloc1)),
bel(pCell, processed(bloc1, procUnit1)),
bel(pCell, ~processed(bloc1, procUnit2)),
bel(pCell, ~processed(bloc1, procUnit3)).

des(pCell, processed(bloc1, procUnit2), Tf, [0.6])
if bel(pCell, bloc(bloc1)),
bel(pCell, ~processed(bloc1, procUnit1)),
bel(pCell, processed(bloc1, procUnit3)).

Similarly, we can model the agent’s need to process Component bloc2 by Processing Unit procUnit3 and procUnit4 through the following desires:

des(pCell, finished(bloc2), Tf, [0.6])
if bel(pCell, bloc(bloc2)),
bel(pCell, processed(bloc2, procUnit3)),
bel(pCell, processed(bloc2, procUnit4)),
bel(pCell, ~finished(bloc2)).

des(pCell, processed(bloc2, procUnit3), Tf, [0.5])
if bel(pCell, bloc(bloc2)),
bel(pCell, ~processed(bloc2, procUnit2)),
bel(pCell, processed(bloc2, procUnit4)).

des(pCell, processed(bloc2, procUnit4), Tf, [0.5])
if bel(pCell, bloc(bloc2)),
bel(pCell, ~processed(bloc2, procUnit3)).

Finally, we model the agent’s static knowledge regarding the problem domain, in particular the object’s classes and the initial world-state with the following beliefs:

bel(pCell, procUnit(procUnit1)).
bel(pCell, procUnit(procUnit2)).
bel(pCell, procUnit(procUnit3)).
5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we described the relationship between propositional planning algorithms and means-end reasoning in BDI agents. To test the viability of such approach we describe a modification in the X-BDI agent model. Throughout this modification, new definitions of desires and intentions were created in order for the BDI model to maintain the theoretical properties present in its original version, especially regarding the definition of desires and intentions impossibility. Moreover, it was necessary to define a mapping between the structural components of a BDI agent and propositional planning problems. The result of implementing these definitions in a prototype can be seen in the case study of Section 4, which represents a problem that the means-end reasoning process of the original X-BDI could not solve. Considering that most implementations of BDI agents use a plan library in the means-end reasoning in order to bypass the inherent complexity of performing planning at runtime, X-BDI offers an innovative way of implementing more flexible agents. Its main drawback was the fact that the original planning mechanism is notably inefficient. For example, the case study described in Section 4 was not tractable by the original X-BDI planning process. Thus, the main contribution of our work consists in the definition of a mapping from BDI means-end reasoning to fast planning algorithms. Moreover, such approach enables the agent architecture to be extended with any propositional planning algorithm that uses a formalism compatible with the proposed mapping. Thus allowing an agent to use more powerful planners as they become available, or to use more suitable planning strategies for different problem classes.

Some ramifications of this work are foreseen as future work, in particular, the incorporation of the various Graphplan improvements, as well as the conduction of tests using other propositional planning algorithms, SAT being an example. Moreover, the determination of the class of problems for which some combination of BDI Agent and planning algorithm is capable of dealing with, represents an interesting theoretical contribution to our work.
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