Summary Post

The discussion about Agent Communication Languages (ACLs) highlights their enduring significance in the evolution of multi-agent systems. In my original post, I explained that ACLs, grounded in speech-act theory, allow agents to communicate not only data but also intentions, goals, and commitments (Finin et al., 1994). This approach supports autonomy and flexibility in distributed, heterogeneous environments, in contrast to traditional method invocation, which is fast but rigid. I also discussed how newer interoperability protocols such as ACP and A2A build on these principles to enhance communication in modern distributed systems (Ehtesham et al., 2025). Meanwhile, current research in deep reinforcement learning and large language model agents explores how communication can emerge dynamically, raising questions about when formal ACLs are still necessary (Zhu et al., 2024; Yan et al., 2025).

Pavlos provided a valuable philosophical perspective, noting that ACLs embody the idea of agents as intentional entities capable of reasoning, drawing on Dennett's (1989) concept of the intentional stance. He also observed that modern service-oriented and API-based architectures increasingly incorporate semantic layers, making them more conversational and bridging the gap between formal ACLs and procedural methods (Papazoglou et al., 2007).

Saeed's contribution built on this by proposing a hybrid model that combines a structured ACL framework with the flexibility of natural language or learned communication. This balance between auditability and creativity reflects a practical

middle ground where both symbolic reasoning and adaptive interaction can coexist effectively.

Ahmed emphasized the ongoing relevance of ACLs in contemporary systems and appreciated how they continue to connect symbolic and statistical forms of communication. His point that large language model agents blur the boundary between formal and natural exchanges aligns closely with this theme.

Overall, the discussion shows that the future of agent communication depends on integrating structured ACL principles with newer, adaptive communication paradigms to achieve both reliability and intelligence.

References:

Dennett, D.C. (1989) *The Intentional Stance.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Available at: https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262540537/the-intentional-stance/ (Accessed: 20 October 2025).

Ehtesham, A., Singh, A., Gupta, G.K. and Kumar, S. (2025) *A survey of agent interoperability protocols: Model Context Protocol (MCP), Agent Communication Protocol (ACP), Agent-to-Agent Protocol (A2A), and Agent Network Protocol (ANP).* arXiv preprint. Available at: https://arxiv.org/html/2505.02279v1 (Accessed: 20 October 2025).

Finin, T., Fritzson, R., McKay, D. and McEntire, R. (1994) *KQML as an agent communication language.* Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management. ACM. Available at: https://cdn.aaai.org/Workshops/1994/WS-94-02/WS94-02-007.pdf (Accessed: 20 October 2025).

Papazoglou, M.P., Traverso, P., Dustdar, S. and Leymann, F. (2007) *Service-oriented computing: State of the art and research challenges. Computer,* 40(11), pp. 38–45. Available at: https://www.infosys.tuwien.ac.at/Staff/sd/papers/Service-Oriented%20Computing_IEEEComputer.pdf (Accessed: 20 October 2025).

Yan, B., Zhou, Z., Zhang, L., Zhang, L., Zhou, Z., Miao, D., Li, Z., Li, C. and Zhang, X. (2025) *Beyond self-talk: A communication-centric survey of LLM-based multi-agent systems.* arXiv preprint. Available at: https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.14321 (Accessed: 20 October 2025).

Zhu, C., Dastani, M. and Wang, S. (2024) *A survey of multi-agent deep reinforcement learning with communication. Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems,* 38(4), Article 4. Available at: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10458-023-09633-6 (Accessed: 20 October 2025).