Summary Post

As I look back on my first post on Agent Communication Languages (ACLs), particularly KQML and FIPA-ACLs, I appreciate them more as tools that enable different autonomous systems to communicate with rich semantics. Originally, I was concerned with ACLs intent-based interaction, which is critical for dynamic systems such as supply chains and smart grids that involved continuous negotiation and delegation (Finin, Labrou and Mayfield, 1994; Wooldridge, 2009).

My peers' commentary on the post added notion to the concept and also highlighted some practical issues and solvable challenges. Mohamed Alzaabi remarked that middleware and more stringent standardisation would lower the parsing burden and enhance backward compatibility (Singh, 1998; Poslad, 2007). Abdulla Alshaibani went further in illustrating how FIPA has progressed in standardising and also provided various real-life instances like the smart grids by Siemens and autonomic computing by IBM, where the standardisation improves coordination and resilience by FIPA ACLs inspired communication (Sarvapali Ramchurn et al., 2011). While Rayyan Alnaqbi eloquently articulated more distributed strengths of ACLs, he also highlighted the persistent issue of performative parsing, which most directed programming calls completely ignore.

The information from Units 1–3 was also informative. Unit 1 described the reasons for agent-based computing the need for more interaction than simple procedure calls. Unit 2 discussed how intent, and performatives make possible negotiation. This also relates to my point about supply chains and energy grids. Unit 3 dealt with the constraints especially the difficulty of implementation and the need for more emphasis on standardisation and ontology design to decrease ambiguity.

In conclusion, ACLs remain essential for distributed, autonomous systems where flexibility and negotiation are required. However, their effective adoption depends on standardisation, middleware support, and domain-specific ontologies. The peer responses, combined with the unit content, have deepened my understanding of how ACLs are both powerful and challenging in real-world contexts.

References

Finin, T., Labrou, Y. and Mayfield, J. (1994) *KQML as an agent communication language*. Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management. ACM, pp. 456–463. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1145/191246.191322 (Accessed: 26 August 2025).

Poslad, S. (2007) 'Specifying protocols for multi-agent systems interaction', *ACM Transactions on Autonomous and Adaptive Systems (TAAS)*, 2(4), pp. 15–29.

Sarvapali Ramchurn, S., Vytelingum, P., Rogers, A. and Jennings, N. (2011) 'Agent-based control for decentralised demand side management in the smart grid', *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2011)*. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313363756_Agent-based_control_for_decentralised_demand_side_management_in_the_smart_grid

Singh, M.P. (1998) 'Agent communication languages: Rethinking the principles', *IEEE Computer*, 31(12), pp. 40–47.

Wooldridge, M. (2009) *An introduction to multiagent systems*. 2nd edn. Chichester: Wiley.