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agent programming constructs have influenced a significant number of mainstream software components

our new Java-based LeanProlog implementation is centered around “agent-like” first class logic engine constructs

agent-oriented language design ideas can be used for a refactoring of Prolog’s interoperation with the external world, including interaction with other instances of the Prolog processor

to ensure scalability and readiness for integration in cloud-computing services we need resource-aware distributed agent programming constructs that are as oblivious as possible to the actual location of an agent
local inheritance mechanisms and interactions between agents
“remote logic invocation” (RLI) mechanism
agent spaces: a protocol for multi-agent coordination
distributed programming constructs ensuring agent mobility
typical use cases of the framework
conclusion
agents are implemented as named Prolog dynamic databases

each agent has a process where its home is located - called an agent space

they share code using a simple “Twitter-style” mechanism that allows their followers to access their predicates

agents can visit other spaces located on local or remote machines - where other agents might decide to follow their replicated “avatars”

the state of its avatar is dynamically updated when a state change occurs in the agent’s code space

communication between agents, including avatar updates, is supported by a remote predicate call mechanism between agent spaces, designed in a way that each call is atomic and guaranteed to terminate
First Class Logic Engines

- a logic engine is a Prolog language processor reflected through an API that allows its computations to be controlled interactively from another engine.
- very much the same thing as a programmer controlling Prolog’s interactive toplevel loop:
  - launch a new goal
  - ask for a new answer
  - interpret it
  - react to it
- logic engines can create other logic engines as well as external objects
- logic engines can be controlled cooperatively or preemptively
Lean Prolog provides dynamic database operations acting on multiple named databases.

The API is a set of predicates like:
- `db_assert(Database, Clause)`
- `db_retract(Database, ClauseHead)` etc.

The default database (named `$`) is used for operations without an explicit database argument.

The default database is shared i.e., when no definition exists in a named database, calls are redirected to predicate definitions in the default database.

The state of an agent (seen as a set of dynamic Prolog clauses) is contained entirely in a database with a name derived from the name of the agent.
A “Twitter-style” agent inheritance mechanism

- agents share compiled code
- agents inherit code automatically from the default dynamic database
- an agent can decide to “follow” a set of other agents
- the set of agents followed by a given agent can be updated dynamically at any time
Example

Running the goal

?-cindy@[alice, bob].

ensures that agent \textit{cindy} follows agents \textit{alice} and \textit{bob} but later \textit{cindy} can change her mind and issue

?-cindy@[alice, dylan].

from which point in time \textit{cindy follows alice and dylan}

- we have a fully dynamic “one-level” inheritance mechanism
- inheritance is “weak” i.e. non-transitive
- “all-or-nothing”: an agent inherits a \textit{complete predicate definition} from the first of the followed agents that provides it
Example of Local Agent Interactions

local_agent_test:-
    assert(friends(cool_people)),
    alice@[bob,cindy], % alice follows bob and cindy
    alice@assert(like(macs)),
    alice@assert(like(popcorn)),
    alice@assert(hate(candy)),
    alice@((hate(pcs):-true)), % shorthand for assert
    cindy@[alice,bob], % cindy starts following alice
    bob@((like(X):-alice@hate(X))), % bob likes what alice hates
    foreach(cindy@friends(X),println(friends:X)),
    foreach(bob@like(X),println(bob:likes(X))),
    foreach(alice@like(X),println(alice:likes(X))),
    foreach(cindy@hate(X),println(cindy:hates(X))).
When running the predicate one can observe the fairly natural semantics of “following” another agent, e.g. that \texttt{bob} likes candy because \texttt{cindy} hates it.

?- local_agent_test.
friends : cool_people
bob : likes(candy)
bob : likes(pcs)
alice : likes(macs)
alice : likes(popcorn)
cindy : hates(candy)
cindy : hates(pcs).
Calling Remote Predicates

- as high level as possible remote execution mechanism - we call it Remote Logic Invocation (RLI)
- ⇒ based on Java’s *Remote Method Invocation* (RMI) communication layer
- communication is a good thing, if used with moderation :-)
- ⇒ usually only one RMI port for each Prolog process is enough
- the port is shared among the agents
package rli;

import java.rmi.Remote;
import java.rmi.RemoteException;

public interface ServerStub extends Remote {
    public Object rli_in() throws RemoteException;

    public void rli_out(Object T) throws RemoteException;

    public int rli_ping() throws RemoteException;

    public int rli_stop_server() throws RemoteException;

    public Object rli_call(Object T) throws RemoteException;
}
Agent Spaces

- an *agent space* is seen as a container for a group of agents usually associated with a Prolog process and an RLI server
- we assume that the name of the space is nothing but the name of the RLI port
- we make sure that on each host, a “broker”, keeping track of various agents and their homes, is started, when needed
- `start_space(BrokerHost, ThisHost, Port)` starts, if needed, the unique RLI service associated to a space and registers it with the broker (that it starts as well, if needed!)
- communication with agents inhabiting an agent space happens through this unique port - typically one per process
- ⇒ all RLI calls to a given port are atomic and terminating
our concept of agent mobility is derived directly from the unique nature of a Prolog program - that can be seen as a set of predicate definitions built each from an ordered set of clauses

⇒ changes of an agent’s state can be safely propagated from an agent space to another without the need to spawn a thread for each otherwise possibly non-terminating remote procedure call

we will now show that it is possible to keep such calls always local using code replication
Visiting an Agent Space

- an agent can *visit* one or more agent spaces at a given time
- when calling the predicate `visit(Agent, Host, Port)` an agent broadcasts its database and promises to broadcast its future updates
- “avatar”: an agent is represented at a remote space by a replica of its set of clauses
- the predicate `take_my_clauses(Agent, Host, Port)` remotely asserts the agent’s clauses to the database of the agent’s “avatar”
- only the agent’s *own code* goes and not the code that the agent inherits locally
Propagation of Updates

- as the agent keeps track of all the locations where it has dispatched avatars, it will be able to propagate updates to its database using atomic, guaranteed to terminate RLI calls

- an agent is also able to unvisit a given space - in which case the code of the avatar is completely removed and broadcasts of updates to the unvisited space are disabled
Remote Followers

- an agent can have followers in various spaces that it visits
- followers inherit the code of the avatar - and therefore all their calls stay local
- why this makes sense:
  - for instance, an agent asked to find neighboring gas stations should do it based on the GPS location of the agent space it is visiting
  - execution is local - possible non-termination or lengthy execution does no block communication ports
“Free Will” ⇒ Flexibility

- it is an agent’s autonomous decision to visit a given agent space
- it is an agent’s autonomous decision to become a follower locally or mediated through an avatar
- “free will” on both sides provides flexibility and enables implementation of “anthropomorphic" mechanisms for negotiation, reputation building and trust between agents in a given application
french_space: initializes an agent space where salutations occur in French, inhabited by agent alice

french_space:-
    start_space(french_space),
    assert(when_arriving_say(bonjour)),
    assert(when_leaving_say(aurevoir)),
    rli_wait(english_space), % synchronizing spaces
    sleep(3), % assuming bob has arrived by now
    alice@[bob], % alice adopts good manners from bob
    alice@salutations, % and applies them
    alice@visit(english_space). % then she visits bob's home
english_space: salutations occur in English, inhabited by bob

english_space :-
    start_space(english_space),
    assert(when_arriving_say(hello)),
    assert(when_leaving_say(goodbye)),
    bob@[], bob@visit(french_space),
    bob@(salutations:- % bob brings some politeness
        when_arriving_say(A),
        println(A),
        sleep(5), % we can do something more interesting here
        when_leaving_say(B),
        println(B))),
    sleep(3), bob@unvisit(french_space), % bob leaves
% assuming that alice is visiting later
alice@[bob], % good manners are borrowed from bob
alice@salutations. % and exercised right away
Alice greeting Bob, who visits French_space
?- French_space.
Bonjour
Aurevoir

Alice greeting Bob when she visits English_space
?- English_space.
Hello
Goodbye

- When Bob visits, he promises that future code updates will follow him - resulting in the predicate salutations being brought to French_space
- Since Alice follows him this predicate becomes available to her
- The salutation messages executed by Alice depend on local facts and come out in the local language
Limitations

- the predicates described so far are just basic building blocks
- initial synchronization is needed to ensure all spaces are up and running
- complex multi-agent interactions require “discovery of services”
- other interaction patterns are needed for more complex agent coordination, e.g. publish/subscribe or Linda blackboards (see COORD’2011 paper)
- parallelism for performance is available independently using higher-order predicates like multi-fold, multi-all (see DAMP’2011 paper)
Conclusion

- we have described a distributed multi-agent architecture that, despite its simplicity exhibits some novelty in terms of the way agents inherit dynamic code and the way they engage in communication with other agents.
- our concept of agent mobility is based on a simple remote logic invocation mechanism.
- while quite straightforward – by limiting calls to database updates – it provides remote code sharing without requiring potentially non-terminating remote predicate calls.
- our framework supports a dynamic a “free will" mechanism that agents can exercise when using other agents’ knowledge bases.
- not covered: various reasoning mechanisms that agents can implement - these are seen as independent of the infrastructure itself.
- We thank for support from NSF (research grant 1018172) and Viviomind Research LLC.
A few related papers are at:

- http://logic.cse.unt.edu/tarau/research/LeanProlog