

)

Introduction

Research and technology trends promote a vision of artificial systems that are able to resiliently manage themselves

Indeed, beyond the results that individual autonomous agents can carry out, a further opportunity lies in the *collaborative*

we provide a review of literature about autonomy and especially collective autonomy in MASs; we analyse the aggregate computing framework by the perspective of autonomy, by covering its positioning with respect to the state of the art; we exemplify the discussion through a simulated case study, investigating (i) the relationship between individual goals/autonomy and collective goals/autonomy; (ii) the relationship between individual goals/autonomy and collective goals/autonomy; we discuss gaps in literature on programming reliable collective autonomy and delineate a research roadmap

Experiment setup

The collective goal is to find animals in danger and rescue them. The environment consists of a continuous two-dimensional space. *Animal*: an agent that needs to be rescued if it is in danger. The danger status changes are domain-specific dynamic. *Mobile node*: an agent that moves around the world and could have the capability to heal an animal. *Station*: a fixed node that works as a gateway for mobile nodes. In this experiment, *Mobile nodes* can perform *tasks*, namely problems to be solved. Our characterisation of this context includes the following *tasks*: *ExploreAreaTask*: leads agents to explore an established portion of the space. *HealTask*: for which a set of agents must rescue a defined animal (and must correspondingly have “rescue capabilities”). At runtime, the program identifies agent roles (*healer*, *explorer*, *stationary*) according to the local behaviour sensed. The leader election is made in the stationary nodes (via —S—); mobile nodes sense animals in danger and send the local information to the leader (via —C—); the leader chooses what is the animal that needs to be rescued; the leader shares its choice (via —broadcast—); the slaves act according to the leader choice. To be more specific, the program first tries to detect nodes’ role checking how much each node has moved in a defined time interval.

[b] val leader = branch(isStationary) S(grain) false //(1.) leader election //.. (2.) sense animals in danger .. val noAnimal moves around the environment; executes tasks. Each behaviour has an endogenous and exogenous aspect: with this program, we can specify how agent behaviour evolves in a multileader election, animal dangers sensing, and task selection to reduce the animal in danger in zones. With ScaFi the overall behaviour is intentionally described as:

What we want to enforce in this experiment is that individual autonomy influence collective autonomy. For example, in simulation evaluation, we consider whether functional and non-functional aspects. The main functional metric is the number of animals rescued.

What we expect from these simulations is that selfish settings bring worse performance. Indeed, here we need a collective choice. p : is the probability to follow the collective choice, $1 - p$ is the probability to act selfishly; the bigger is p the lesser the *healer count*: the nodes needed to rescue an animal. A higher value of *healer count* needs greater control on local agent behaviour. Results and discussion

Wildlife monitoring simulation screenshot. The “wi-fi” like symbol represents a *Station* node. Each *Station* has an influence on the environment. We now present the key results produced by the different simulation runs we conducted. In fig:wildlife-monitoring-gif. In general, the results confirm our thesis: the more agents act autonomously, the worse the system behaves. However, the results also show that the system is robust to individual autonomy.

[b]0.32 [width=]imgs/healed-4.pdf

[b]0.32 [width=]imgs/healed-6.pdf

[b]0.32 [width=]imgs/healed-8.pdf

Experiment results. In each plot, the colour identifies the p parameter. The first column shows how many animals are rescued. [ht!] [width=]imgs/box-plot.pdf Average error (RMSE) for each combination of p and *healer count*. Horizontal lines represent the final remarks. In this experiment, we deliberately did not consider the following aspects (even if they could affect the results). In the following, we identify a roadmap of two research directions to unveil the full potential of aggregate programming. Expressing collective autonomous behaviour Addressing problems at a suitable level of abstraction is key in modelling and programming. In this section, we cover cognitive collectives. Notions like distributed cognition and group minds are often leveraged in sociology and cognitive science. Collective autonomy and structural organisation One of the first works analysing the relationship between organisational structure and autonomy is by Schillo [?]. Safe collective autonomy For instance, approaches to MAS programming based on the notion of a *team* (i.e., a sub-collective) have been proposed. Reliable collective autonomy Related to the ability of expressing collective autonomous behaviour is the extent to which specifications lead to predictable behaviour. Safety and guarantees Currently, few results are available on programming of reliable collective adaptive behaviours. In the context of aggregate programming, Norms and trust Among the notions studied in literature to promote good cooperation between agents there are *norms* and *trust*. Trust can also be used as a way to reduce cooperation inefficiency and issues. An excess of individual autonomy may lead to inefficiency. Applications Multi-agent systems and technologies span various application domains [?] including e-commerce [?], health care [?], and many others. traditional paradigms, promoting the vision of system development through integration of multiple perspectives and viewpoints. Conclusion In this paper, we consider the problem of programming the collective autonomous behaviour of multi-agent systems. The various goals described in the introduction have been addressed as follows. The literature review in section 2. We argue that it is important to *directly* address the collective dimension of MASs, rather than programming individual agents. References yes