# $\overline{Abstract}$

This article proposes a system for generating possible *University Classes Schedules*. It uses multi-agent negotiation to find satisfactory solutions to the problem, while trying to consider *personal preferences* of the represented people and institutions.

# 1 Implementation

# 1.1 University Classes

A class is an en event, that brings together a group of students, and a professor in certain classroom in order to learn/teach the specified discipline. It happens periodically, usually weekly, at the established day of week and time.

For inner usage, the classes are divided into

- abstract without day and time;
- concrete with full time information.

```
class (Ord c, Show c, Typeable c) \Rightarrow
      AbstractClass\ c\ \mathbf{where}\ classDiscipline :: c \rightarrow Discipline
                                  classGroup
                                                    :: c \to GroupRef
                                  classProfessor :: c \rightarrow ProfessorRef
                                  classRoom
                                                    :: c \rightarrow ClassroomRef
                                  classNumber :: c \rightarrow Word
class(AbstractClass\ c, DiscreteTime\ time) \Rightarrow
   ConcreteClass\ c\ time\ |\ c \rightarrow time
     where classDay :: c \rightarrow Day
               classBegins :: c \rightarrow time
               classEnds :: c \rightarrow time
                     = \forall c \ time.ConcreteClass \ c \ time \Rightarrow Class \ c
data Class
data SomeClass = \forall c
                                 . AbstractClass\ c
                                                             \Rightarrow SomeClass c
   -- redefined 'System.Time.Day' - no 'Sunday'
\mathbf{data} \ Day = Monday \mid Tuesday \mid Wednesday
            | Thursday | Friday | Saturday
  deriving (Eq, Ord, Enum, Bounded, Ix, Read, Show)
```

The classes are negotiated by the interested parties: 1) students / groups, 2) professors, 3) classrooms. Each negotiation participant has a *timetable*, holding a schedule for one week, that repeats throughout the academic period. The *timetable* is actually a table: the columns represent days of week; the rows – discrete time intervals. Actual timetable structure may vary, as can be seen in figure 1.

```
class (Ord t, Bounded t, Show t, Typeable t) \Rightarrow DiscreteTime t where toMinutes :: t \rightarrow Int
```

	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
08:30 - 09:00						
09:00 - 09:30						
09:30 - 10:00						
10:00 - 10:30						
10:30 - 11:00						
11:00 - 11:30						
11:30 - 12:00						
: :						

(a) Timetable without recesses.

	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
08:30 - 09:10						
09:15 - 09:55						
10:05 - 10:45						
10:50 - 11:30						
11:40 - 12:20						
12:25 - 13:05						
13:15 - 13:55						
: :						

(b) Timetable with recesses.

Figure 1: Possible timetable structures.

```
\begin{array}{l} \textit{fromMinutes} :: \textit{Int} \rightarrow \textit{t} \\ \textbf{class} \left( \textit{DiscreteTime time} \right) \Rightarrow \textit{Timetable tt e time} \mid \textit{tt} \rightarrow \textit{time} \\ , \; \textit{tt} \rightarrow \textit{e} \\ , \; \textit{e} \rightarrow \textit{time} \\ \textbf{where } \textit{listEvents} :: \textit{tt} \rightarrow [\textit{e}] \\ eventsOn :: \textit{tt} \rightarrow \textit{Day} \rightarrow [\textit{e}] \\ eventsAt :: \textit{tt} \rightarrow \textit{time} \rightarrow [(\textit{Day}, \textit{e})] \\ eventAt :: \textit{tt} \rightarrow \textit{Day} \rightarrow \textit{time} \rightarrow \textit{Maybe e} \\ \end{array}
```

One should distinguish the resulting timetables, shown in figure 1 and the timetable, held an agent during the negotiation. The first one is immutable and is the result of agent's participation in the negotiation. The set of such timetables, produced by every the participant, is the **university schedule** for given academic period.

During the negotiation, an agent's inner timetable gets changed on the fly, in order to record agreements made. This means that we are dealing with *side* effects, that need to be explicitly denoted in Haskell. The following definition leaves it free to choose the monad abstraction for those effects.

class  $(DiscreteTime\ time, Monad\ m) \Rightarrow$ 

# 1.2 Negotiating Agents

As it was mentioned before, the schedule is formed in a negotiation between professors, groups and classrooms. To distinguish those three types of participants, agent's <u>role</u> is introduced. The role: 1) identifies the kind of person/entity, represented by the agent; 2) defines agent's reaction on the messages received; 3) defines agent's goal.

A representing agent is a computational entity, that represents a real person or object in it's virtual environment. In current case, it represents one's interests in a negotiation. Such an agent must

- (1) pursue the *common goal* it must consider the <u>common benefits</u>, while being egoistic enough to achieve it's own goal;
- (2) respond to the messages received in correspondence with (1);
- (3) initiate conversations (send messages, that are not responses), driven by (1);
- (4) become more susceptible (less egoistic) with passage of time.

```
\begin{aligned} \textbf{data} \ \textit{NegotiationRole} &= \textit{GroupRole} \\ &\mid \textit{FullTimeProfRole} \\ &\mid \textit{PartTimeProfRole} \\ &\mid \textit{ClassroomRole} \\ &\mid \textit{deriving} \ (\textit{Show}, \textit{Typeable}) \end{aligned}
```

### 1.2.1 Common Goal

Agent's own goal represents its egoistical interests. They may (and will) contradict another agent's interests, thus creating incoherence. The general rule is this case is to strive for solutions, benefiting the whole schedule. Because the schedule doesn't yet exist as a whole during the negotiation, an agent should consider instead the benefits, obtained by itself and the rest of the agents.

The *common goal* is incorporated in the *contexts* mechanism, and is discussed in section 1.3.7.

### 1.2.2 Messaging

### Is this section really needed?

### 1.3 Coherence

The coherence mechanism is based on [?]. It uses the *contexts* as means of separating (and further prioritizing) different *cognitive aspects*. The contexts used are based on *BDI* agent architecture.

The *combined coherence* is used as the a measure of goal achievement. It's combined of coherence values, calculated by agent's contexts.

#### 1.3.1 Information and Relations

The coherence is calculated over an *information graph*, that represents some aspect of agent's knowledge. The nodes of the graph are some *pieces of information* and the edges represent some *relations* between theese pieces.

```
newtype IGraph = IGraph (Set Information)

graphNodes :: IGraph \rightarrow [Information]

graphNodes (IGraph \ inf) = Set.toList inf

graphJoin :: IGraph \rightarrow [Information] \rightarrow IGraph

graphJoin \ (IGraph \ inf) \ new = IGraph \ (inf \ `union` \ Set.fromList \ new)

fromNodes :: [Information] \rightarrow IGraph

fromNodes = IGraph \circ Set.fromList

relationOn :: IRelation \ a \rightarrow IGraph \rightarrow RelValue \ a

relationOn \ rel \ (IGraph \ inf) = \bot - TODO
```

The proposed system makes use of the following information:

- 1. **Personal knowledge**, known only by one actor.
  - (a) Capabilites: information about what an agent can do, what kind of arrangments it can make.
  - (b) **Obligations**: information about *strong restrictions*, imposed over the agent.
  - (c) **Preferences**: information about weak restrictions.
- 2. Shared knowledge, obtained in the negotiation.
  - (a) Others' capabilities information about the counterpart agents, that are known to be (un-)capable of doing something.
  - (b) Classes proposals:
    - i. **Complete** references all three representing agents: a *group*, a *professor* and a *classroom*.
    - ii. Partial references less then three representing agents.
  - (c) Classes decisions:
    - i. Class acceptance a mark for accepted classes proposals. Only complete proposals can be accepted; all the three mentioned agents must accept it, or none.

```
ii. Class rejection – a mark for ignored classes proposals, a result
          of yield decision, discussed in section ??.
data InformationScope = Personal \mid Shared
  -- 'Ord' instance is mainly needed to create 'Set's.
class (Typeable i, Eq i, Ord i) \Rightarrow InformationPiece i
    where type IScope i :: InformationScope
class (InformationPiece i, Personal\simIScope i) \Rightarrow PersonalInformation i
class (InformationPiece i, Shared\simIScope i) \Rightarrow SharedInformation i
     where sharedBetween :: i \rightarrow Set AgentRef
instance Eq Some Class where
    (SomeClass\ a) \equiv (SomeClass\ b) = cast\ a \equiv Just\ b
          -- TODO
{\bf instance}\ Ord\ Some Class
instance\ Information Piece\ Some\ Class\ where
     type IScope\ SomeClass = Shared
{\bf instance}\ Shared Information\ Some Class
instance Eq Class
instance Ord Class
instance InformationPiece Class where type IScope Class = Shared
instance SharedInformation Class
data Information = \forall i.Information Piece i \Rightarrow Information i
collectInf :: (Typeable \ a) \Rightarrow Information \rightarrow Maybe \ a
collectInf (Information i) = cast i
instance Eq Information where
  (Information i1) \equiv (Information i2) =
    case cast i1 of Just x
                                    \rightarrow x \equiv i2
                                     \rightarrow False
instance Ord Information where
  (Information i1) 'compare' (Information i2) = \bot
newtype Needs = Needs (Set Discipline)
    deriving (Eq. Ord, Show, Typeable)
newtype CanTeach = CanTeach (Set Discipline)
    deriving (Eq, Ord, Show, Typeable)
instance InformationPiece Needs
instance InformationPiece CanTeach
```

5

The binary relations connect some information pieces, assigning to the edge

some value. The *whole graph relations*, on the other side, are applied to the graph as a whole and produce a single value.

The relations used, as well as the information in the graph, depend on the context.

```
data RelValBetween a = RelValBetween 
    relBetween
                    :: (Information, Information)
   , relValBetween :: a
type RelValsBetween \ a = Map \ (IRelation \ a) \ [RelValBetween \ a]
newtype RelValWhole \ a = RelValWhole \ a
unwrapRelValWhole (RelValWhole a) = a
type RelValsWhole a = Map (IRelation a) (RelValWhole a)
class InformationRelation r where relationName :: r \ a \rightarrow String
class InformationRelation r \Rightarrow
  BinaryRelation \ r \ \mathbf{where}
     binRelValue :: (Num\ a) \Rightarrow r\ a \rightarrow Information \rightarrow Information \rightarrow Maybe \ a
class InformationRelation r \Rightarrow
   Whole Relation \ r \ \mathbf{where}
     whole Rel Value :: r \ a \rightarrow I Graph \rightarrow a
data IRelation \ a = \forall r. BinaryRelation \ r \Rightarrow RelBin \ (r \ a)
                    \forall r. Whole Relation \ r \Rightarrow Rel Whole \ (r \ a)
relName (RelBin a)
                          = relationName\ a
relName (RelWhole a) = relationName a
instance Eq (IRelation a) where (\equiv) = (\equiv) 'on' relName
instance Ord (IRelation a) where compare compare on relName
type RelValue\ a = Either\ [RelValBetween\ a]\ (RelValWhole\ a)
```

#### 1.3.2 Contexts

In order to use contexts for information coherence assessment, the concepts of context-specific information graph and assessed information are introduced. The context-specific graph holds the information, already known/accepted by the agent, and is relevant for the context in question. The assessed one is assumed during the evaluation process.




Figure 2: Binary relations within an information graph. One can distinguish the relations between the assessed information pieces and the relations between assessed and the known ones.

To assess some information, it's propagated through the contexts, in the specified order, that stands for contexts priority. Each context xshould have a coherence threshold specified; after the assessed information's coherence has been estimated, it's compared against the threshold and either Success or Failure is returned, along with the evaluated coherence value. The information, that has successfully passed a context, is propagated further; otherwise the failure is returned.

```
class Context (c :: * \rightarrow *) a where
   contextName
                      :: c \ a \rightarrow String
   contextInformation :: c \ a \rightarrow IGraph
   contextRelations :: c \ a \rightarrow [IRelation \ a]
   contextThreshold :: c \ a \rightarrow IO \ a
   combine Bin Rels
                          :: c \ a \rightarrow RelValsBetween \ a
                                                                 \rightarrow Maybe (CBin a)
   combine Whole Rels :: c \ a \rightarrow Rel Vals Whole \ a
                                                                \rightarrow Maybe (CWhole a)
   combine Rels
                           :: c \ a \to CBin \ a \to CWhole \ a \to a
newtype \ CBin \ a = CBin \ a
newtype CWhole \ a = CWhole \ a
data AssessmentDetails a -- TODO
data SomeContext \ a = \forall c. Context \ c \ a \Rightarrow SomeContext \ (c \ a)
type AnyFunc1 \ res = \forall a.a \rightarrow res \ a
manEither :: AnuFunc1 \ r \rightarrow Either \ a \ b \rightarrow Either \ (r \ a) \ (r \ b)
```

```
mapEither\ f\ (Left\ a) = Left\ \$\ f\ a
      mapEither\ f\ (Right\ a) = Right\ \$\ f\ a
      assessWithin'::
                             (Context\ c\ a) \Rightarrow
                             [Information]
                             c a
                             (Maybe\ a, AssessmentDetails\ a)
         \rightarrow
      assessWithin' inf c = (assessed, \bot) -- TODO
         where assumed = contextInformation\ c 'qraphJoin' inf
                 (bins, whole)
                                  = partitionEithers
                                  \$ (\lambda r \rightarrow mapEither ((,) r) \$ r `relationOn` assumed)
                                  <$ > contextRelations c
                 assessed = \mathbf{do} \ rBin \leftarrow c \ `combineBinRels`
                                                                       Map.fromList bins
                                  rWhole \leftarrow c 'combine Whole Rels' Map.fromList whole
                                  return $ combineRels c rBin rWhole
      \mathbf{data} \ Assessed Candidate \ a = Assessed Candidate \ \{
             assessedAt
                                  :: SomeContext \ a
             assessed Val
                                  :: Maybe \ a
             assessed Delails \\
                                  :: AssessmentDetails \ a
      \mathbf{data}\ Candidate\ a = Success\ \{\ assessHistory:: [\ AssessedCandidate\ a\ ]
                                        , candidate
                                                        :: [Information]
                           | Failure \{ assessHistory :: [AssessedCandidate a] \} |
                                        , candidate
                                                      :: [Information]
      assessWithin :: (Context\ c\ a, Ord\ a) \Rightarrow
                        Candidate \ a \rightarrow c \ a \rightarrow IO \ (Candidate \ a)
      assessWithin f@Failure \{ \} \_ = return f
      assessWithin (Success hist c) cxt = do
         let (mbA, details) = c 'assess Within' cxt
             ac = AssessedCandidate (SomeContext cxt) mbA details
         threshold \leftarrow contextThreshold \ cxt
         return \$ if mbA > Just threshold
                  then
                             Success (ac:hist) c
                  else
                             Failure (ac: hist) c
Some contexts might also be capable of splitting information graphs into valid
candidates – the sub-graphs, that are valid at the context. The candidates can
be assessed by the rest of the contexts.
      class (Context\ c\ a) \Rightarrow SplittingContext\ c\ a where
```

 $splitGraph :: c \ a \rightarrow IGraph \rightarrow [Candidate \ a]$ 

# 1.3.3 Capabilities

The capabilities context handles question "Am I able to do it?". It's main purpose is to discard immediately any proposal that would never have been accepted.

- Group: "Am I interested in the discipline?"
- Professor: "Am I qualified to teach the disciple?"
- Classroom: "Do I suit the disciple?", "Do I have the capacity required?"

An agent should mark any other agent, that has declined some proposal for *capabilities* reasons, describing the reason. It should further avoid making same kind of proposals to the uncapable agent.

```
data family Capabilities (r :: NegotiationRole) :: * \rightarrow *
{\bf data\ instance}\ {\it Capabilities}\ {\it GroupRole}\ a={\it GroupCapabilities}\ \{
  needsDisciplines :: [Discipline]
data instance Capabilities Full Time Prof Role a = Full Time Prof Capabilities {
  canTeachFullTime :: [Discipline]
data CanTeachRel a = CanTeachRel
instance InformationRelation CanTeachRel where
  relationName \_ = "CanTeach"
instance BinaryRelation CanTeachRel where
  binRelValue \_a b =
     let v ds c = \mathbf{if} \ classDiscipline \ c 'member' ds then 1 else 0
     in case collectInf a of
       Just\ (CanTeach\ ds) \to \mathbf{let}
          r1 = \mathbf{case} \ collectInf \ b \ \mathbf{of} \ Just \ (SomeClass \ c) \rightarrow Just \ \ \ v \ ds \ c
          r2 = \mathbf{case} \ collectInf \ b \ \mathbf{of} \ Just \ (Class \ c)
                                                            \rightarrow Just \$ v ds c
          in r1 < | > r2
                              \rightarrow Nothing
data NeedsDisciplineRel a = NeedsDisciplineRel
instance InformationRelation NeedsDisciplineRel where
                                                                   -- TODO
                                                                    -- TODO
instance BinaryRelation NeedsDisciplineRel where
     -- Every capability must be coherent. 0*X = 0
combineBinRelsStrict \_bRels \mid null \ bRels = Nothing
combineBinRelsStrict \_bRels = Just \circ CBin \circ product
                                 ○ concatMap (map relValBetween)
```

```
$ Map.elems bRels
combine Whole Rels Strict \_ wRels \mid null \ wRels = Nothing
combine Whole Rels Strict \ \_wRels = Just \circ CWhole \circ product
                                   \circ map unwrapRelValWhole
                                   $ Map.elems wRels
combineRelsStrict \_ (CBin \ b) \ (CWhole \ w) = b * w
instance (Num\ a) \Rightarrow Context\ (Capabilities\ GroupRole)\ a\ where
                       = "Capabilities"
  contextName _
  contextInformation = fromNodes \circ (:[])
                       \circ Information \circ Needs
                       \circ Set.fromList \circ needsDisciplines
  contextRelations \_ = [RelBin NeedsDisciplineRel]
  contextThreshold \_ = return 0
  combine Whole Rels = combine Whole Rels Strict
  combine Bin Rels
                     = combine Bin Rels Strict
  combine Rels
                       = combineRelsStrict
instance (Num \ a) \Rightarrow Context (Capabilities FullTimeProfRole) \ a \ where
                       = "Capabilities"
  contextName _
  contextInformation = fromNodes \circ (:[])
                       \circ Information \circ Needs
                       \circ Set.fromList \circ can TeachFullTime
  contextRelations \_ = [RelBin \ CanTeachRel]
  contextThreshold \_ = return 0
  combine Whole Rels = combine Whole Rels Strict
  combine Bin Rels
                       = combine Bin Rels Strict
  combine Rels
                       = combineRelsStrict
```

#### 1.3.4 Beliefs

The beliefs is a *splitting* context, that uses as it's internal knowledge the state of the timetable at the moment.

Assessing yields one of three values

```
\begin{cases}
-1 & \text{if two proposals intersect in time} \\
0 & \text{if both proposals have the same } abstract \text{ part} \\
1 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
```

The assessment of concrete proposals (containing concrete classes) in the graph consists in finding time coherence for every possible pair of different proposals. If any of the coherence values  $\neq 1$ , then the graph is invalid and the assessment is -1. In case that all coherence values are (strongly) positive, the result is 1.

# 1.3.5 Obligations

Obligations determine the rest *strong restrictions* over the classes. Possible obligations might depend on agent's role and are usually determined by the institution. For example: maximum classes per day, lunch recess, lower/upper class time limit, two classes must/cannot follow etc.

#### 1.3.6 Preferences

Preferences determine *weak restrictions*, that are intended to be set by the represented person (the institution in case of the classroom).

The context should disminus its influence over time to avoid possible overrestrictions due to conflicting personal interests.

#### 1.3.7 External

External contexts take into account the *opinions* of the agents that are referenced by the solution candidate. It is responsible for *common goal* assessment. The assessment must be *objective* — it must give no preference to agent's own interests.

### 1.3.8 Decision

#### 1.4 Agent

Here follows *agents* implementation.