

International Scientific–Practical Conference  
on Programming (UkrPROG'2002)  
May, 22-23, 2002, Kiev, Ukraine

# Cooperation Layers in Agent-Enabled Business Process Management




Ermolayev, V. A., Plaksin, S. L.

Dept. of Mathematical Modelling and IT,  
Zaporozhye State University

[{eva, psl}@zsu.zp.ua](mailto:{eva, psl}@zsu.zp.ua)  (normal business hours)


# Business Lunch Delivery Service (B2B)

Clients: SME in a City district



# Business Lunch Delivery Service (B2B)

Clients: SME in a City district




# Business Lunch Delivery Service (B2B)

Clients: SME in a City district

Scenario is characterized by intrinsic distributedness, dynamic character and uncertainty:

- Not possible to plan the delivery statically (customer orders are not predictable, BLDS is an open organization - DU)
- No one is capable to perform and even to plan the whole delivery flow on its own (possibly a car repair or a speciality order will be required)
- Activities already allocated may result in failure (e.g., traffic, car is broken, the cooks are on strike, ... ) – corrective actions needed


**Why agents: autonomy, situatedness, reactivity, proactivity, adaptability**



# The Emphases of the Talk

- **Framework in a Nutshell:** A proposal of a Layered Approach to the design of agent-based architectures and distributed intelligent software systems for Business Process Management and Performance
- **Our contributions:** What have we done already to provide “plug-ins” to the Framework Slots at different layers
- **Widely accepted and standardized solutions:** What makes the framework open to heterogeneous solutions
- **Conclusions:** What are the results, the lessons learned?
- **Motivation:** Why the research in agent-enabled cooperative business process management and performance is important?  
– just few slides to justify the answer...


# Proposal: Conceptual Framework



# Cooperation Models Layer: Slots and Plug-ins

## Slots

## Plug-ins



### Task Performance

- Organization Model
- Functional System/Component Model
- Task Model


### Coordination

- Activity allocation and dynamic task coalition formation mechanism
- Mechanism for coordination of the flow of activities within a task


### Monitoring, learning from experience

- Fellow Capability Assessment Mechanism
- Fellow Credibility Assessment Mechanism
- Organizational Unit Performance Monitoring Mechanism



# Cooperation Models Layer: Organization



- On the higher level **Proxy** is viewed as a functional **component**. It expands to the **functional system** on the lower level of organization
- Proxies** “wrap” respective **organizational units** (MAS) and are the representative members in the **higher level units** (MAS)



# Cooperation Models Layer: **Functional System**




- Actors within organization/unit are considered to be functional (or reactive) components
- The same model is used for a functional system as far as an actor may expand into respective unit at the lower organizational level
- Capabilities are implemented as macro-model programs/methods one per activity
- A component may:
  - **Accept** incoming tasks/activities from the environment
- **Generate** new tasks/activities in response to environmental events
- **Reject** incoming tasks/activities
- **Delegate** activities to subordinates or peers (allocate via negotiation or by directive)
- **Perform** activities



# Cooperation Models Layer: Task

Task – partially ordered set of activities of varying granularity

Granularity:  $w^i$  for **A** – atomic, for **B** - non-atomic



$$T = \{w^1, w^2, \dots, w^i, \dots, w^k\}$$



**Cascade decomposition and execution**  
by autonomous components at run-time

## Task:

$w^i$  - **atomic**

$w^i$  - needs results of  $w^1, w^2$

$w^i$  - **Parameters**  $X^i$  **Results' Templates**  $Y^i$

comply to my understanding of  $w^i$

$w^i$  - not capable to perform myself


$w^i$  - believe that **B, C, D** are capable -  
need to allocate

$w^i$  - have the certain **Budget**, can  
delegate with the certain **Price**

$w^i$  - results needed before the **Deadline**

## Task:

$w^i$  - **non-atomic**, comprises




$w_1^i$  - can't perform now, need results  
of  $w_j^i, w_l^i$  before

$w_1^i$  - need to spend certain **Effort** to fit  
the **Deadline**



# Cooperation Models Layer: Task

Activity Results' **Desirability**

**Effort and Capacity**




$w = (\text{DeliverPizza}, X, Y)$



**Capacity** – how many pizzas can be delivered by A's delivery units to a certain location per unit time interval (eg.: 1 hour, 1 day...)

**Effort (Capacity Share)** – which part of A's delivery units will be busy to accomplish the activity within desired **Duration**

# Cooperation Models Layer: **Coordination**





## Coordination models (**plug-ins**):


- Activity allocation and dynamic task coalition formation
- Coordination of the flow of activities within a task

# Cooperation Models Layer: **Coordination**

Activity Allocation and Dynamic Task Coalition Formation



a. Coalition Formation



b. Proposition and Feedbacks

## Social laws:

- Relative cooperation commitment
- Activity arrangement convention
- Results delivery commitment

... authors are available at a coffee break for details...



Even more details may be found at:



<http://www.zsu.zp.ua/racing/list/e-pubs.htm>

# Coordination: Dynamic Task Coalition generates Workflow on the fly

Source: Our example from UkrPROG'2000 paper

Pre-planning: eg., WfMC PDL, Petri Net, ..

On-the-Fly: presented approach





# Coordination: Dynamic Task Coalition generates Workflow on the fly

Source: Our example from UkrPROG'2000 paper

Pre-planning: eg., WfMC PDL, Petri Net, ..

On-the-Fly: presented approach





# Coordination: Dynamic Task Coalition generates Workflow on the fly

Source: Our example from UkrPROG'2000 paper

Pre-planning: eg., WfMC PDL, Petri Net, ..

On-the-Fly: presented approach





# Coordination: Dynamic Task Coalition generates Workflow on the fly

Source: Our example from UkrPROG'2000 paper

Pre-planning: eg., WfMC PDL, Petri Net, ... vice

On-the-Fly: presented approach




- Workflow is pre-defined long before the process has started
- No means to consider the current executive's state, workload, capacity, capability, trustworthiness, rational interest
- Predefined workflow plans are far from being effective

- Workflow is developed step-by-step in the course of task execution by coalition of distributed autonomous rational actors
- Optimal workflow branch (activity performer) is chosen each time as the result of contracting negotiations



# Cooperation Models Layer: **Monitoring**



## Plug-ins:



-Adjusting Social Behavior: **Fellow Capability Assessment**

-Adjusting Social Behavior: **Fellow Credibility Assessment**


-**Organizational Unit Performance Monitoring:**  
further adaptability to typical tasks

# Cooperation Models Layer: **Monitoring**

Adjusting Social Behavior: **Fellow Capability Assessment**



$s_i, s_j \in S_A$   
 $s_i = \{r(X_A), q(F_A), t(F)\}$   
 $r(X_A)$  - parameter constraints  
 $q(F_A)$  - work constraints  
 $t(F)$  - transition function



→ Advertise  
→ Propose (Accept/Reject)  
→ Allocate

$$C = \begin{matrix} F_1 \\ \dots \\ F_n \\ S_1 \\ \dots \\ S_m \end{matrix} \begin{bmatrix} w^1 & \dots & w^j & \dots & w^k \\ c_1^1 & & c_1^j & & c_1^k \\ \dots & & \dots & & \dots \\ \dots & & c_i^j = (q_i^j, p_i^j) & & \dots \\ \dots & & \dots & & \dots \\ c_{n+m}^1 & & c_{n+m}^j & & c_{n+m}^k \end{bmatrix}$$

1.  $p_i^j \leftarrow p_i^j + \frac{r}{q_i^j}$ ,
2.  $q_i^j \leftarrow q_i^j + 1$

$r =$ 



- 0 if the fellow rejected the activity,
- 0.5 if the fellow replied that it can accept the activity
- 1 if the activity was finally delegated to the fellow

- Activities are advertised to the fellows possessing relevant capabilities
- Knowledge about changing fellows' capabilities is adjusted dynamically
- Agents benefit from cooperative work by adjusting their beliefs about the fellows



# Cooperation Models Layer: Monitoring


Adjusting Social Behaviour: Fellow Credibility Assessment



- Advertise
- Propose (Accept/Reject)
- Allocate

## Social laws:

- Relative cooperation commitment
- Activity arrangement convention
- Results delivery commitment



$$Cr_{i,j} := Cr_{i,j} \times \begin{cases} 1, t_r \leq t_a \\ p_{w^j}(t_a/t_r), t_a < t_r \leq d_{w^j} \\ 0, t_r > d_{w^j} \end{cases}$$






Fellows with higher credibility value w.r.t. the certain activity have better opportunities to get the next contract and, thus, to increase their own utility

# Cooperation Models Layer: Monitoring


Organizational Unit Performance Monitoring:

Source: Our example from UkrPROG'2000 paper



- Monitoring information (rejected activities, idle state durations) is collected by Coordination Agent
- It may be further used by human administrators to fine-tune the organization by adjusting agents' capabilities, capacities, organizational units' staff
- Organization thus becomes more optimized to the performance of the typical tasks

# Interoperability Layer:



## Operational:

- Interaction Protocols
- Conversation Patterns

## Semantic:

- Ontologies



# Interoperability Layer: Operational

## Interaction Protocols

-Any relevant widely accepted interaction protocol (e.g., FIPA) providing the common frame for inter-agent operation may be used to facilitate to agents cooperative task performance


-It is considered that a protocol versus a conversation pattern is a more complex and a more purpose-specific construct and may be assembled of conversation patterns and communicative patterns (performatives) of the Communication Layer

-Slightly modified FIPA Contract Net Protocol was used to arrange negotiations on activity allocation





# Interoperability Layer: Operational

## Conversation Patterns and Parametric Feedbacks




a. a directive

b. a parametric query with results analysis




### Parametric feedbacks –

expressed **capability** and **commitment** to perform requested activity (service) at a **certain state** with respect to the **self-interest of a service provider**




# Interoperability Layer: Semantic


Ontologies - shared common specification of a conceptualization



## Task Ontology



## Negotiation Ontology




OilEd 2.2a[1] and FACT[2] reasoner were used for ontologies design and expressiveness check. OIL, RDFS, DAML and SHIQ versions of Task and Negotiation Ontologies are available at [http://eva.zsu.zp.ua/eva\\_personal/ontologies/](http://eva.zsu.zp.ua/eva_personal/ontologies/)





[1] <http://img.cs.man.ac.uk/oil/>, [2] <http://www.cs.man.ac.uk/~horrocks/FaCT/>.

# Communication Layer:




KQML performatives **ask-one** and **tell** used for conversation patterns and (further on) for CNP protocol construction



$T = \{('DeliverPizza', X, Y)\}$

Ready for how much



## (ask-one

```

:sender "I3"
:receiver "M"
:in-reply-to Null
:reply-with DeliverPizza-TDF
:language (XML)
:ontology (Negotiation)
:contents (
<Desirability>
  <Activity> <Name>DeliverPizza</Name> </Activity>
  <Deadline> <Value>23.05.2002/20.00</Value>
    <Format>datetime</Format> </Deadline>
  <Time> <ZeroPoint> <Value>27.10.2001/08.00</Value>
    <Format>datetime</Format></ZeroPoint>
    <Granularity><Value>2</Value>
    <Format>hours</Format></Granularity>
</Time>
  <PointsNo>6</PointsNo>
  <TdfPoint> <TimeIncr>0</TimeIncr> <Incentive><Value>25</Value>
    <Format>Money</Format></Incentive> </TdfPoint>
  ...
  <TdfPoint> <TimeIncr>30</TimeIncr> <Incentive><Value>5</Value>
    <Format>Money</Format></Incentive> </TdfPoint>
</Desirability>
)
  
```

## (tell

```

:sender "M"
:receiver "I3"
:in-reply-to DeliverPizza-TDF
:reply-with Null
:language (XML)
:ontology (Negotiation)
:contents (
<TdfFeedback>
  <activity> <name>DeliverPizza</name> </activity>
  <PointsNo>2</PointsNo>
  <TdfPoint>
    <TimeIncr> </TimeIncr> <Incentive><value> </value>
    <format>Money</format></Incentive>
  </TdfPoint>
  <TdfPoint>
    <TimeIncr> </TimeIncr> <Incentive><value> </value>
    <format>Money</format></Incentive>
  </TdfPoint>
</TdfFeedback>
) )
  
```



# Transport Layer:


Transport Layer elements should be strictly standardized to ensure wide acceptance and usage in open systems with heterogeneous components

A general consensus on the transport environment is that it should provide the shell for agent **naming**, **location** and **message delivery** mechanisms.

According to **FIPA Transport Service Reference Model** Agents in an open organization are bound to **Agent Platforms (AP)** and exchange messages via the **Transport Services** of their AP-s.

The mechanism FIPA proposes as the standard to cope with various network protocols is the use of the **message Envelopes**.

For the moment FIPA has provided specifications for **IIOP** and **WAP** protocols



## Conclusions: Results and Lessons Learned

- Cooperation while performing business processes by autonomous, distributed actors possessing rational, uncertain and, sometimes, contradictory behaviors within an open organization is rather a complex utility
- There are still lots of open issues in the domain: e.g., the lack of widely accepted consensus on how all this stuff should be structured and organized
- The contribution of the presented research is the proposal of a four-layer formal cooperation framework for agent-enabled business process management
- The paper is not so ambitious as to claim the final solid word in the domain, but rather to analyze the trends, to try to put it to the reasonable places within a conceptual hierarchy
- Presented results to some extent prove that there is some sense in the proposed layering, especially in the domain of business process management and performance
- Review of related work (in the paper) provides no vital contradictions to the presented layering proposition



## Domain Keywords:

- Cooperation**
- Coalition**
- Rationality**
- B2B**
- Agent**
- Workflow**

**Google search with these keywords returns: ...**

# ...funny, but: The Domain is still **HOT** for Further Research

Пошук в Google: cooperation coalition rationality B2B agent workflow - Microsoft Internet Explorer

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help

Address <http://www.google.com/search?q=cooperation+coalition+rationality+B2B+agent+workflow>

Google [Розширений пошук](#) [Параметри](#) [Мовні інструменти](#) [Підказки для пошуку](#)

cooperation coalition rationality B2 Пошук в Google

Web [Зображення](#) [Групи](#) [Каталог](#)

Знайдено в Інтернеті для cooperation coalition rationality B2B agent workflow . Результати 1 - 2 від загаль

[\[PDF\] IBM Research Report](#)  
Формат файлу: PDF/Adobe Acrobat - [Показати у вигляді HTML](#)  
... BEP) such as **workflow**. Shown in the ... agents whose **rationality** is bounded by ... testing and **cooperation** in software ... **B2B** Integration with ... the travel **agent** and a ...  
[lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-stc/200012/pdf00000.pdf](http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-stc/200012/pdf00000.pdf) - [Подібні сторінки](#)

**staff**  
[OIL Ontologies for Collaborative task Performance](#)  
... in [6], "...**cooperation** and coordination ... monitoring and **workflow** of ... of **rationality**, self ... execution. **Coalition** formation ... prototype **agent-based** ... for **B2B** Investment ...  
[www.zsu.zp.ua/ecomo-2001/doklad.htm](http://www.zsu.zp.ua/ecomo-2001/doklad.htm) - 47k - [Збережено на сервері](#)

**Our paper at eCOMO'2001 (ER'2001)**

Лінки спонсорів

**Ultimus Workflow Suite**  
Slash doc management costs by 80%  
Learn how Ultimus users get results  
[www.ultimus.com](http://www.ultimus.com)  
Захоплення:

**BizFlow Software**  
Achieve a real process advantage with HandySoft's BizFlow software  
[www.handysoft.com](http://www.handysoft.com)  
Захоплення:

**Learn Workflow Basics**  
Problems with paper traffic? Get our free document management guide.  
[www.laserfiche.com](http://www.laserfiche.com)  
Захоплення:

Ваше повідомлення може бути тут...

# RACING: towards the next step ahead – <http://www.zsu.zp.ua/racing/>

**МІНІСТЕРСТВО  
ОСВІТИ ТА НАУКИ  
УКРАЇНИ  
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION  
AND SCIENCE  
OF UKRAINE**

**ЗАПОРІЗЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ  
УНІВЕРСИТЕТ  
Zaporozhye State University**

**RACING: Rational Agent Coalitions for  
INtelliGent Mediation of Information  
Retrieval on the Net**

**PROJECT TEAM**

**Prof. Vyachyslav A. Tolok**  
Professor, Doctor of Engineering, chair of Mathematical Modelling and IT Department of Zaporozhye State Univ., rector  
**Project Scientific Adviser**  
tel.: +380 61 264 45 46  
fax: +380 61 262 71 61  
e-mail: [tolok@zsu.zp.ua](mailto:tolok@zsu.zp.ua)  
e-mail: [sekr@zsu.zp.ua](mailto:sekr@zsu.zp.ua)

**Dr. Vadim A. Ermolayev**  
Assoc. Professor, PhD - Computer Science, deputy rector Zaporozhye State Univ. in charge of IT, Networking, Computing  
**Project Co-ordinator**  
tel.: +380 61 264 17 24  
fax: +380 61 264 45 46  
e-mail: [eva@zsu.zp.ua](mailto:eva@zsu.zp.ua)

**Search**

**SiteMap**

- English
  - Project Summary
  - Project Team
  - Project Workplan
    - Year 2002
    - Year 2003
    - Year 2004
  - Deliverables/Reports
  - Publications
    - RACING Workspace
  - Relevant Links
- Українська

Click to collapse

Internet

... Just filling in Google blank spaces

