Multi Agent Model to Control Production System: a Reactive and Emergent Approach by Cooperation and Competition Between Agents

Mahmoud Tchikou, Eric Gouardères

Laboratoire d'Informatique Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour(LIUPPA)
U.F.R. Sciences et Techniques, Département Informatique
Avenue de l'Université – BP 1155 – 64013 Pau Cedex
tchikou@univ-pau.fr ,eric.gouarderes@univ-pau.fr

ABSTRACT. In view of strong competitive markets, current companies tend to new methods of production, from a logic of «planning» type of production to a logical of «Just in time » type. In this context, the system that allows controlling the production has to be a modular, flexible and reactive system. The hierarchized and classical approaches don't permit any more to take into account the complexity linked to such system. That's why, we propose an approach, which has reactive, distributive, and emergent properties to control the system of production, based on multi-agent system principles. After having introduced the context and reasoning work, we describe the different parts of our multi-agent model. Lastly, we illustrate this approach on a practical example of cell production.

KEYWORDS: multi-agents system, production system, negotiation, cooperation

1 Introduction

Flexibility, reactivity, and agility have become unavoidable qualities for many companies, which are confronted with ever more demanding constraints of quality and real time that are both varied and fluctuating. Indeed, the new methods of manufacture, in particular the production constrained by the demand (PULL), implies that at the level of production control, companies switch directly from a logic of «projected planning» to a logic of «just in time», directly led by the customer and the product in a process of development. It results from this a new challenge for these companies, which must install modular and flexible production equipments with a system of control able to manage them. The latter must, on the one hand, be able to adapt to the heterogeneity of available equipment (API, Computers, machines with numerical command, robots, etc.), equipment, which can be substituted, deleted, or reconfigured, according to needs. On the other hand, it must be sturdy when confronted with different malfunctions and dangers, which can affect it. The control

of the system is equally inseparable from human beings, whose decisions and global vision lead to a well run system [FOX 92] [NOR 94], and from the company that placed the order, who nowadays is strongly and directly involved in the logistical chain [MAS 99].
The problem of production systems control can be set out in the following way: how can we ensure that a group of elements from different origins are able to follow their aims, in agreement with the aims of the company? The main difficulty is to find a compromise between, on the one hand, maintaining the relevance outside the company through to the determination of clear performance targets and on the other hand, to deal continually with the internal coherence of the collective action.
The development of theses system of control remain very complex because of the great amount of data to process and the decisions to take, without forgetting constraints of real time and the need to communicate with equipments in the field and other functions within the company. Therefore, in order to answer simultaneous needs of reactivity, flexibility and robustness, many pieces of research have neglected the prearranged, centralized and hierarchized structures to try to implement distributed structures, that control system is distributed between several decision-making centres, all of which have a degree of autonomy and cooperation and which communicate with each other in order to see the planned production through. In this context, the approaches permitting the auto-configuration or the configuration of a system are regarded nowadays as a major improvement. A recent study [KOU 02] shows that the multi-agent systems and the underlying emergent approach constitute actually one of the important types of research in the domain. We will begin by introducing our approach with the main principle of reactivity, distribution and emergence for the control of production systems, and then we will present models and principals that we have kept for the modelling of multi agent systems. Finally, we will illustrate our approach by a concrete example in order to explain better the different mechanisms that were used at the time of the controlling production cell.

2. Presentation of the Approach

2.1 Principles: Reactivity, Distribution and Emergence

The control of the production systems is synonymous with the action to run, to guide and to assure the pertinence and coherence of a system in a given environment. The controlling can be considered as the art to adapt permanently the objectives of a company at the evolution of the environment through to the analysis of constraints and opportunities. This activity is made delicate at the same time by the combinatory aspect related to the organization of production, the multi-criterion aspect of decisions taken and finally, the management of uncertain data, inside as well as outside the production system. In order to better determine these problems we propose to use a reactive operational approach, distributed and emergent. The reactive proprieties are to be used for adapting the command to the different variations and disruptions of the system and its environment. The approach is distributive since it is made up of

autonomous entities in order to give more flexibility. The approach is emergent in that the performance of the system is not globally planned, but the global plan will emerge from the dynamics of the interactions in real time between the entities (dynamic planning), using multi-agents technologies. In this way, it is not necessary for the system to alternate between a planning phase and one of execution, but its behaviour is elaborated from competitive decisions of the entities, which make it up.

2.2 General Approach

Production system is a system (set of material or abstract elements in interaction [DEL 71]) realizing production activity, which means transforming raw materials or components to finished product. In order to conclude this operation of transformation, the production system uses a set of resources such as machines, operators, stocking area, industrial tools. From this definition, a distributed, reactive, and emergent model to control the production system will be proposed. This model based on multi agent approach. This approach was chosen because a lot of works and applications were done in the domain of distributed control. The reader can find a study and review of this work in [KOU 02][PAR 98][SHE 99][BUS 01].

Within this approach, a control process is associated with each resource and for each product present in the production system. Each process will be modeled by an entity. Each entity of the production system is represented by an autonomous agent which has individual behavior and the capacity to make it's own local decisions. Each entity is composed of two parts, an operative part and its controller. This architecture insures decoupling of the operative and control parts which allows us to avoid a global controller of the cell, facilitating the reuse of the component in new configurations. These agents gather the functions of action, decision and communication, as well as a local base of knowledge. Each product is able to communicate and negotiate with the other agents to organize, plan and control the system of production. The agents produced require services of the agents resource, which can accept or refuse these services. A population of resource agents and a population of product agents will be obtained.

Human operator is present in the loop of control of the production by the means of interface agent, which enables him to communicate with the other agents of the system.

The system consists of three types of agents product agents, resources agents and operators agents. In this approach the decision is distributed between all the agents, it is a team of agents in which there is no order relation. Only the links of cooperation exist. Each agent takes his decision cooperating with his neighbours in order to conserve the global coherence of the decisions and to respect the objectives fixed to the system. The advantage of this approach is its simplicity, flexibility, reactivity, its tolerance of faults, its efficiency, and its robustness. This system is able to adapt quickly to disruptions no matter if their origins are internal or external to the system.

3 Multi agent model

A multi-agents system is commonly characterized by: agents, an environment, an organization and interaction model. We took the Parunak model [PAR 97] to specify environment, the agents and the coupling between them. But this model does not describe organizational aspect and agent behavioural. On this subject, much of works use the concept of role, abstraction of a function, a service or a behaviour. The model of interaction being based then on the relations between these roles [CAS 00]. Among those, we have chooses AALAADIN model (Agent groups role) [GUT 99]. In this last, the agent is a communicating autonomous entity, which plays roles within different groups. An agent can have several distinct roles within several groups and the same role can be hold by several agents, which makes possible the heterogeneity of the situations of interaction [GUT 00]. There is no constraint or pre required on internal agent architecture and does not define a particular model to describe the agent behaviour. The agent behaviour can be produced by multiple ways: tasks made up of primitives then started by stimuli, sorters system, Petri nets [FER 95], but to create agents which can adapt, will consist first and above all to make evolve their behaviours, in all their complexity. To tackle this problem, we should use an approach that allows the evolution of agent behaviour. Work of Picault and Landau [LAN 01] encouraged us to produce agent behaviour, by using a structure of oriented and stamped graph named ATN (Augmented Transition Network).

3.1 Basic Model of MAS

A multi-agents system according to Parunak can be defined like a triplet: a set of agent, an Environment, and a coupling, which defines the bond between them [PAR 97].

$$MAS = \langle Agents, Environment, coupling \rangle$$

3.1.1 Agents

$$Agents = \{Agent_1, ..., Agent_n\}$$

Each agent is quadruplet (four-tuple):

$$Agent_i = \langle State, Input_i, Output_i, Process_i \rangle$$

$State_i$: set of values that completely define the agent.
$Input_i$ and $Output_i$: subsets of state of an agent's sensors and effectors
$Process_i$: an autonomously executed mapping that changes the agent's state. These agents have complex behaviours, which will be defined afterwards with graphs ATN.

3.1.2 Environment

The environment is a duplet (two-tuple) that is syntactically a subset of an agent:

$$Environment_i = \langle State, Process_i \rangle$$

The environment has its own process that can change its state, independent of the actions of its embedded agents. Meaning that the environment itself is active.

3.1.3 Coupling

This system is Homodynamic Systems, meaning that both agents and environment are modelled the same way, (in our case discrete-event). The coupling of $Input_i$ and $Output_i$ to $state_i$ is simply a mapping of registers from environment to agent or vice-versa.

3.2 Method and Organisational Model

The dynamic aspect is very important in this approach because it ensures the emergence of the overall plan. The team was interested in specifying the system using a methodology and modelling based on organisational notions dedicated to the multi agents system stemmed from the Aalaadin [GUT 99]. This model is based on the notion of agent-group-role. A group is seen like a usual MAS and in our case we identified four groups:

- Products agents group,
- Resources agents group,
- Operators agents group,
- A group allowing to associate a product agent with the resources agents necessary to its transformation.

3.2.1 Products agents

Each product agent has its own procedure (range), these agents are created from their enter in the production system and destructed at the end. Several product agents can be find in the production system at the same time. The role of the product agents is to plan and to control the product in the production system in order to effectuate all the treatments dictated by the procedure, respecting the time price and quality constraints

3.2.2 Resources agents

These agents control the resources of the production system, (for example: machines, robots, conveyor) in the production system resources agents can be find from the same type which has to cooperate each other in order to avoid conflicts. The role of the resource agents is to effectuate the treatment and task over part respecting the time constraints.

3.2.3 Operators agents

The interface agent is designed to interpret the human operator's messages in order to configure the system and send back the interactions between the resource and product agents to the operator. The role of this agent is:

- The operator agent can introduce new constraints on the resources or on the product.
- Favour the production of a product compared to another product.
- New data and external information can be added.
- The operator is responsible to release (the start and the stop of the system).
- We can use this agent with an aim of simulation to introduce breakdowns on the resources, and to follow the behaviour of the system




Fig. 1. : Organisational structure of the multi-agent system to control the production system.

3.3 Interaction model

The aim of the interaction model is to show and explain in what way the multi agent system will resolve problems of conflict, how these entities are obliged, to cooperate in order to reach their objective and the tool with which the agents exchange knowledge. In this part of article, model of communication and negotiation used will be defined.

3.3.1 Communication system

The communication is a fundamental point of the multi-agent system. It is not reduced at data exchanged systems, but it's matter of an intentional act, which finds an expression in a modification of the agent knowledge. FIPA (Agent Communication Language) has been used; it is a high level of communication language and protocol, oriented message, independent of the syntax and semantic of the content (ontology). It is even independent of message transport mechanisms (ex: TCP/IP, SMTP, IIOP, HTTP…) and high-level protocol of negotiation (ex: Contract-Net). ACL is based on primitive of communication that is called "act of communication".

3.3.2 Negotiation system

The aim of a negotiation process is the modification of the agents local plans to reach a consensus upon execution of the tasks in the system. The negotiation is essential for this particular system. The contract-net protocol (CNP) was chosen as model of negotiation. CNP is model of negotiation based on the notion of call of offer used in public markets. The relations between the managers and bidders are created thanks to offer call mechanisms and the responses of the call after an analyse of sent propositions by the managers [SMI 81][SMI 80]. This model being known and already largely used, we will not detail it more here.

3.4 Process Model (Behavioural Model)

To describe the behaviour of the agents it has been decided that an oriented and stamped graph structure named ATN (Augmented Transition Network) will be used. At the beginning these graphs were used within the context of automatic treatment of the language [WOO 70] [WIN 83], and at a later stage, they were used to describe the process of the agents [BOU 93][GUE 96]. The ATN are constituted of linked nodes by arcs, which can be stamped by a whole set of conditions and list of actions. The choice of ATN is not by hazard but to produce the behavioural graph automatically using genetic algorithms [LAN 01]. In this article the ATN graph is generated manually. After the presentation of the approach and the specification of agents. The approach is going to be applied through an example.

4 Illustration by an example

To test the approach, simulator of the cell production was chosen. The main objective is to control this cell in real time. In addition to reactivity, robustness, and efficiency, we test the coherence of the overall plan, which emerge from local agent plan. Even the feasibility of the approach will be test.




Fig. 2. System of production with all actors

4.1 Presentation of Example

4.1.1 Description of the Production Cell [LOT 96]

The production cell is equipped with two conveyors belts, four processing units and two portals with a traveling crane. The conveyor belts carries the blanks in only one direction, from left to right. At the end of the feed belt, there is a light barrier and a code reader. The deposit belt contains a light barrier at it's beginning. The processing units are equipped with two sensors, one sensor which reports whether the unit is occupied or not and the second sensor which indicates whether the unit is working or not. There is two type of processing unit type 1 (drill or press) or type 2 (oven). Both traveling cranes can reach all four processing units and can be moved in three directions.

Blanks are introduced to the system via the feed belt, whenever a sensor reports a blank the belt must be stopped. Then, the blank is positioned directly in front of the bar code reader. Blanks have a bar code which contains information about the procedure for there processing. It tells which type of processing unit must be used and determines whether the processing order is correct or not. Additionally, there may be time constraints, which limit the time that can be used for processing the blanks. An additional time constraint gives a maximum limit on the total time a blank may spend in the whole system. The code reader transmits the information after having read it from each blank. The type of return value of the bar codes is tuptel $\left\langle n, \left\langle \min_i, \max_i \right\rangle_{i=1}^{n}, r, t_G \right\rangle$ which tells how the blank must go through the system and gives time constraints listed in table 1.

Table 1. The bar Code

Component	Type	Information
n	Integer	Number of type of processing units, which must be used (type 1 or type 2 or both).
$\min_i$	Integer	Minimum processing time in seconds, which is necessary for type i
$\max_i$	Integer	Maximum processing time in seconds, which is necessary for type i
r	Boolean	Indicates whether certain type of processing units must be used in an exact order during processing
t_G	Integer	Maximum time in secs, which may be spent in the whole system (measured between gripping from the feed belt and arrival on the deposit belt reported by the sensor

4.1.2 Treated Problem

Our MAS must control the cell of production, solve the problem of conflict between the resources and avoid the collision between the two gantries (cranes). The agents must respect the procedure of treatment delivered by the code bar (order, and

maximum duration that the blank should not exceed in the system, and each type of machine).




Fig. 3. The simulator with the resources agents, blanks agents and interface agent

4.2 Functioning and Application of the Approach

Agents model the blanks and the machines of the system. As soon as the blank arrives in the entry conveyor, the blank agent is created through an event caused by a light barrier sensor. The reader of bar code agent sends the procedure (range) to the blank agent, from this location the blank agent negotiates using the Contract-Net [FIPA 00037].

4.2.1 The Negotiation Between Blank and Resources

Firstly the blank agent makes a bid to the machines agents in order to fulfil the procedure. Each machine agents propose according its capability on bid, which specifies a starting date for the task and a list of tasks already scheduled on the machine. The blank agent compares bids and chooses the machines, which propose the weakest date (the smallest date). All that is done, before the blank quits the entry conveyor and before that the blank suffers the treatment. As soon as the success of the negotiation we pass to the execution of the task planed, at the end of the execution, the blank agent is destroyed by the exit conveyor agent. The global plan for the treatment in cell emerges from an organised plan by each blank agent.

In the case of the breakdown or perturbation, the blank agent cancels the contract and tries another new proposition with new bid in order to follow the treatment.

4.2.2 The Coordination Between Resource Agents:

The resource agents can coordinate their plan before giving the proposition to the blank agent in order to respect the constraints, for example collision between cranes.

4.2.3 The Coordination Between Blank Agents:

To respect the production delays of some products, the system has to adapt and favour certain products; in that case, the blank agents must coordinate their plans and exchange them. The priority blank agent sends messages to the other blank agents, which are in the system, and negotiate, if possible, respecting the range constraints, of passing into resources before the others. In that case, the agents already in the system cancel contracts with some resources to leave a place for the priority blank agent.

4.2.4 Behavioural Model of the Agents

As we have indicated previously, the behaviour of the agents are described by graphs ATN. The behaviour graph of an agent has a direct node of departure (called start), and a final node (end). The other nodes are linked by arcs, which can be associated by a whole range of conditions and by a sequence of actions. Our agents are initialised at the beginning. Also the agent activity consists for each node:

To select between the arcs from the current node, the ones which are crossed, that is to say either without conditions or whose conditions are checked simultaneously. To chose one of its arcs randomly. To cross it (to take up on a node where it ends up) after having possibly realized actions linked at the arc in the order. The agent searches continuously to get from one node to another, if no arc is surmountable, it stays in the first state, and will try again to the next step. It changes in a waking state when it is situated on the node called end and stops acting.

It can be noticed that two agents, which have a common ATN, can adopt very different behaviours (from the same abilities of reception and actions), in the situation when they can use different arcs if they are situated in the same conditions.




Fig. 4. ATN of the Blank agents

Table 2. The actions and the conditions of blank agent

Action !	Condition ?
Ask a call for proposals !	Recept msg ?
Chose proposal !	Msg pane ?
Send confirm msg !	Blank pass all resource ?
Send refuse msg !	Time out ?
Update list of resources !	




Fig. 5. ATN of the resource agents.

Table 3. The actions and the conditions of resource agent.

Action !	Condition ?
To Plan !	*Recept msg ?*
Send msg!	*Recept msg refuse ?*
Delay!	*Recept msg confirmation ?*
To execute!	*Plan Ready ?*
Follow up!	*No plan ?*

Send msg to cancel contracts!	*Resource Fixed ?* *End of Execution ?* *Resource failure ?*

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented the modeling of multi-agent systems for controlling production systems. This approach is motivated by the evolution of production methods and increasing of complexity of products, which have in consequence raised complexity of the controller systems. The evolution towards to the notion of (virtual company) does become worth this trend multiplying the number of parameters and the number of components, which are in interaction in the system. That leads the traditional methods of optimization to the combinatory explosion of counts, the number of interactions in-group of elements growing faster than the number of elements in this same group. Associating an entity at every element in interaction, the multi agent approach permits us to substitute the explicit coding of the whole of interaction by its generation at the time of execution. The combinatory aspect of behaviours is no longer planned at the moment of conception. That reduces drastically the quantity of coding at the production stage and so, the cost of developing the system. That is why this approach nowadays constitutes one of the most important types of research in the domain.

Considering the previous remarks, we have above all put the accent on complex activities as part of the aspect of interactions between agents instead of on the agent-thinking modes. Our main objective is to analyze; to realize a multi-agent system composed of autonomous agent, which are in interaction according to modes of cooperation more or less complex, conflict, challenge, etc, To lead to the achievement of global objective. This approach highlights the degrees of freedom available to the agents and makes it possible to manage the autonomy of decision of each agent while guaranteeing a total coherence of the system.

To reach this objective, the originality of our approach is to try to integrate different existing models in order to provide a complete model adapted to our problem. This allows us to describe all the aspects of a multi agent system: the agents, their behaviour, their organization, the environment in which they evolve, and the way in which they communicate to realize collective actions.

To establish these agents, we use the last version of JADE (Java Agent DEvelopment framework).

The realized work opens the way to several perspectives about:

- The evolution of models of behaviour: utilization of ATN allows us to plan the automatic generation and adaptation using the Picault Landau ‘s works based on an evolutionary approach,
- The resolution of the problem of the follow-up and possibly of recovery while a degraded functioning of the production system.
- The resolution of the agent autonomy problems compared to the global coherence of the system.

In this article, we have tried to give global vision of the problems and the solution that we propose. However, as a work in process, we are conscious that a lot of work still lies ahead before we reach to the objectives that we wish to.

6. References

[BOU 93] Bouron T. : Structures de communication et d'organisation pour la communication dans un univers multi-agent. Thèse de doctorat. Univer-sité Paris VI. 1993.

[BUS 01] Bussmann S., Schild K.: An Agent-based Approach to the Control of Flexible Production Systems, in: Proc. of the 8th IEEE Int. Conf. on Emergent Technologies and Factory Automation (ETFA 2001), pp.481-488 (Vol.2).

[CAS 00] Casteran J.C., Gleize M.P., Glize P. : Des méthodologies orientées multi-agent, *Actes de JFIADSMA'00*, Hermes, 2000. p.191-207.

[DEL 71] Delattre P.: Système, structure, fonction, évolution. Essai d'analyse épistémologique, Thèse de doctorat, Paris Maloine-Dion, 1971.

[FER 95] Ferber J.: Les systèmes multi-agents, vers une intelligence collective, Paris, InterEditions, 1995.

[FIPA00037] FIPA Communicative Act Library Specification, 2000, Foundation for Intelligent Physical Agents, http://www.Fipa.org/specs/fipa00037/

[FOX 92] Fox M.S.: The tove project : Towards a common sense model of the enterprise, Enterprise Integration', C Petrie (Ed.) AAAI Press, 1992, p. 291-316.

[GUE 96] Guessoum, Z. : Un environnement opérationnel de conception et de réalisation de systèmes multi-agents. Thèse de doctorat, Université Paris VI, 1996.

[GUT 99] Gutknecht O., Ferber J.: Vers une méthodologie organisationnelle de conception de système multi-agents, Thèse de doctorat, LIRMM, 1999.

[GUT 00] Gutknecht 0. , Ferber J.: *MADKIT :* une expérience d'architecture de plateforme multi-agent générique. JFIADSMA'00 , Hermès Science Publications, ISBN 2-7462-0176-3, 2000, p. 223-236.

[KOU 02] Kouiss K., Gouardères E. , Massote P.: Organisations distribuées des systèmes de pilotage de la production, Collection IC2, Hermès, 2002.

[LAN 01] Landau S., Picault S.,: Modeling Adaptive Multi-Agent Systems Inspired by Developmental Biology. Springer, Actes de AEMAS 2001, p. 238-246,.

[LOT 96] Lotzbeyer A, Muhlfeld Dr. R.: Task Description of Flexible Production Cell With Real Time Properties, 1996.

[MAS 99] Massotte P.: Auto-organisation dans les structures et les systèmes, Actes de la deuxième conférence francophone de modelisation et SIMulation, MOSIM, 1999, p21-29.

[NOR 94] Norrie M., Wunerli M., Montau R., Leonhardt U., Shaad W. et Schek H.J.: Coordination Approach for CIM, Proceedings of the European Workshop on Integrated Manufacturing Systems Engineering, IMSE, 1994, p.223-232.

[PAR97] Parunak H. D. V.: Go to the Ant : Engineering Principles from Natural Multi-Agent Systems, Annals of Operations Research 75, 1997, p. 69-101.

[PAR 98] Parunak H.V.D.: Practical and Industrial Applications of Agent-Based Systems, Environmental Research Institute of Michigan (ERIM), 1998.

[SHE 99] Shen W., Norrie D.H.: Agent-based Systems for Intelligent Manufacturing : A State-of-the-Art Survey, Knowledge and Information Systems, an International Journal, Vol.1, No.2, 1999, p. 129-156.

[SMI 81] Smith R.G., Davis R.: Framework for cooperation in distributed problem solving. IEEE Transactions on system, Man and Cybernetics,SMC,11(1), 1981, p. 61-70.

[SMI 80] Smith R.G.: A Framework for distributed problem solving. UNI Research Press, 1980.

[WIN 83] Winograd T.: Language as a Cognitive Process. Addison-Wesley,1983.

[WOO 70] Woods W.A.: Transition networks grammars for natural language analysis. Communications of the Association for the Computational Ma-chinery,1970.