From Human-Human Joint Action to Human-Robot Joint Action... and vice-versa ! Toulouse, April 4-5, 2016

Using institutions to model mixed societies of humans and robots

(a few initial steps)

Alessandro Saffiotti

AASS – Center for Applied Autonomous Sensor Systems Cognitive Robotic Systems Laboratory University of Örebro, Sweden

asaffio@aass.oru.se







DISCLAIMERS

- Very preliminary work in progress
- Not really my work!









[Stevan Tomic]





Roadmap







What is an Institution?

Roundabout



Trading



Queue







What is IN an Institution?





ÖREBRO UNIVERSITET

So, what is an Institution?

An abstract model

I = < *Roles*, *Actions*, *Artifacts*, *Norms* >

{driver} {yield, go, change lane} {patch} {if ... then ...; do not ...; }











ÖREBRO UNIVERSITET

Why do we need institutions?

Regulate direct / indirect collaboration

- should we say "regulate joint action" ?
- cf Elisabet's "pre-aligned representations"

Reduce uncertainty / cognitive load

- reduce number of possible moves of all actors
- hence simplify prediction of other actor's moves...
- ... and prune search space on my moves





So, can we use them in artificial systems?

• Yes! Tons of work related to Institutions in MAS

- about "organizations", "norms", "coalitions", ...
- e.g., MAS normative frameworks (MOISES, TEAMS, ...)
- But: typically "disembodied" agents no physical world, no physical action and perceptual capabilities

• Yes! Some recent work on "Institutional robotics"

- normative models for muti-robot (swarm) cooperation
- But: models are not explicit



[J.N. Pereira, P. Silva, P.U. Lima, A. Martinoli 2014]





REBRO UNIVERSITET

Our target

• A model of institutions that can be used by robots

- where the links with the physical world are part of the model
- and can be reasoned about





Roadmap







A model of Institutions

I = < *Roles*, *Actions*, *Artifacts*, *Norms* >

{driver} {yield, go, change lane} {patch} {if ... then ...; do not ...; }







A model of Institutions

I = < Roles, Action	ns, Artifacts, Norms >
Definition 1. An Obligation norm is an element $obl \in OBN$. The set of Obligation norms (OBN) is the relation between Roles and Acts:	
$OBN = \{obn_1, obn_2, \dots, obn_l\} \subseteq Roles \times \mathbb{R}$	Acts14. An Usability norm is an element $usn \in USN$.A set of Usability norms (USN) is a binary relation of Actsand Arts \cup Roles: $USN = \{usn_1, usn_2,, usn_u\} \subseteq Acts \times (Arts \cup Roles)$
Definition 3. A planning norm is an element $pln \in PL$ set of planning norms(<i>PLN</i>) is a n-ary relation on Act $PLN = \{pln_1, pln_2,, pln_p\} \subseteq Acts^n$	is:



Enter the physical world





 $D = \langle Agents, Behaviors, Objects, Capabilities, Affordances \rangle$



ÕREBRO UNIVERSITET



Grounding an Institution





ÖREBRO UNIVERSITET



Grounding an Institution







Grounding an Institution







Admissible grounding

Definition 11. Given a particular grounding \mathcal{G} , for $ag \in A$ and role \in Role, condition for well-formed role-agent grounding is defined as:

 $WellFormed(role, ag) \iff$

 $(\forall act \in Acts.(role, act) \in OBN.(Capable(ag, role, act) \land$

 $\forall art \in Arts.(act, art) \in USN. Affords(art, act) \land$

 $\forall urol \in Roles.(urol, act) \in USN.Affords(urol, act)))$

Demnuon 12. Given particular grounding G, and role \in Role, 'cardinality condition' is defined as:

 $Cardinality(role) \iff$

 $(min(Card(role)) \le |[\mathcal{G}_A]_{role}| \le max(Card(role)))$

Definition 13. The grounding $\mathcal{G} = \langle \mathcal{G}_A, \mathcal{G}_B, \mathcal{G}_O \rangle$, of institution is admissible, if the following condition holds:

 $\forall role \in Roles, \forall ag \in A : (Cardinality(role) \land ((role, ag) \in \mathcal{G}_A \implies (WellFormed(role, ag)))$



What it means to be part of an Institution?

- If an institution has been grounded in a domain
 - the agents, behaviors and objects involved must comply to the norms in the institution
- It constrains the behavior of each agent
 - and simplifies prediction of behavior of other agents

• For the technically curious

- implemented as constraints in a constraint-based planner
- more generally, as constraints in a meta-CSP solver...!







Roadmap







A children game

- A runner and a catcher run on a grid marked with letters •
- Runner goes to some spot, marked by a letter •
- Says a word that starts by that letter, then steps to a new spot •
- If catcher gest the runner before that, catcher wins •
- If runner visits all spots, runner wins •



[Ali Abdul Khalig]





The game modeled as institution





ÖREBRO UNIVERSITET

Grounding the institution



Grounding the institution





ÖREBRO UNIVERSITET

Grounding 1: play with dad





ÖREBRO UNIVERSITET



Grounding 1: play with dad (reverse roles)





ÖREBRO UNIVERSITET



Playing with the robots



Rob2 : reads RFID tags under the floor



ÖREBRO UNIVERSITET



Grounding 2: playing with Rob1





ÖREBRO UNIVERSITET



Grounding 2: playing with Rob1



 $D = \langle Agents, Behaviors, Objects, Capabilities, Affordances \rangle$



ÖREBRO UNIVERSITET



Grounding 2: playing with Rob2





ÖREBRO UNIVERSITET



Let's play!







Roadmap







What's next?

• Reasoning with institutions!

- how to instantiate, join or leave an institution
- how to monitor and repair an institution
- why to use an institution

• At the computational core of all of these

- find and maintain an admissible grounding
- And some tricky issues
 - membership to multiple institution
 - nested institutions



Swindon, UK





What's next?

Reasoning with institutions!

- how to instantiate, join or leave a
- how to monitor and repair an inst
- why to use an institution

At the computational core o

- find and maintain an admissible

• And some tricky issues

- membership to multiple institutio
- nested institutions

Thank you!

<u>Contact</u>: asaffio@aass.oru.se <u>Or</u>: stevan.tomic@aass.oru.se





