Resource Logics with a Diminishing Resource

Extended Abstract

Natasha Alechina
University of Nottingham
Nottingham, UK
nza@cs.nott.ac.uk

Brian Logan
University of Nottingham
Nottingham, UK
bsl@cs.nott.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Model-checking resource logics with production and consumption of resources is a computationally hard and often undecidable problem. We show that it is more feasible under the assumption that there is at least one *diminishing resource*, that is, a resource which is consumed by every action.

KEYWORDS

Model-checking; resources

ACM Reference Format:
Natasha Alechina and Brian Logan. 2018. Resource Logics with a Diminishing Resource. In *Proc. of the 17th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2018), Stockholm, Sweden, July 10–15, 2018,* IFAAMAS, 3 pages.

1 INTRODUCTION

There has been a considerable amount of work on resource logics interpreted over structures where agents' actions produce and consume resources, for example [2, 3, 6–9, 12–14, 17–19]. There exists also a large body of related work on reachability and non-termination problems in energy games and games on vector addition systems with state [1, 11, 15, 16, 21]. The resource logics considered in this paper are extensions of the Alternating Time Temporal Logic (ATL), [10]. For ATL under imperfect information and with perfect recall uniform strategies, ATL_{iR}, the model-checking problem is undecidable for three or more agents [20]. It is however decidable in the case of bounded strategies [23].

In this paper we introduce a special kind of models for resource logics satisfying a restriction that one of the resources is always consumed by each action. This is a very natural setting that occurs in many verification problems. One obvious example of such a resource is time. Other examples include systems where agents have a non-rechargeable battery and where all actions consume energy, e.g., nodes in a wireless sensor network; and systems where agents have a store of propellant that cannot be replenished during the course of a mission and all actions of interest involve manoeuvring, e.g., a constellation of satellites. We call this special resource that is consumed by all actions a *diminishing resource*.

We study $\text{RB} \pm \text{ATL}^{\#}$ and $\text{RB} \pm \text{ATL}^{\#}_{iR}$, diminishing resource versions of Resource-Bounded Alternating Time Temporal Logic (RB±ATL) [5]. The model-checking problem for RB±ATL is known to be 2EXPTIME-complete [6], while $\text{RB} \pm \text{ATL}^{\#}$ model-checking is in PSPACE if resource bounds are written in unary. In the case of $\text{RB} \pm \text{ATL}^{\#}_{iR}$, the result of [23] does not apply immediately because the bound is not fixed in advance, but its model checking problem is decidable in EXPSPACE given encoding in unary. We also study $\text{RAL}^{\#}$, a diminishing resource version of Resource Agent Logic (RAL) [13]. Decidability of $\text{RAL}^{\#}$ follows from the result on the decidability of RAL on bounded models [13], but the PSPACE upper bound (for unary encoding) is new.

Proc. of the 17th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2018), M. Dastani, G. Sukthankar, E. André, S. Koenig (eds.), July 10–15, 2018, Stockholm, Sweden.

2 $\text{RB} \pm \text{ATL}^{\#}$

The syntax of $\text{RB} \pm \text{ATL}^{\#}$ is defined relative to the following sets: $Agt = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ is a set of n agents, $Res = \{res_1, \ldots, res_r\}$ is a set of r resource types, Π is a set of propositions, and $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{N}^{Res^{Agt}}$ is a set of resource bounds (resource allocations to agents). Elements of $\mathcal{B}$ are vectors of length n where each element is a vector of length r. We will denote by $\mathcal{B}_A$ (for $A \subseteq Agt$) the set of possible resource allocations to agents in A. Formulas of $\text{RB} \pm \text{ATL}^{\#}$ are defined by:

$$\phi, \psi ::= p \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi \vee \psi \mid \langle\!\langle A^b \rangle\!\rangle \bigcirc \phi \mid \langle\!\langle A^b \rangle\!\rangle \phi \,\mathcal{U}\, \psi \mid \langle\!\langle A^b \rangle\!\rangle \phi \,\mathcal{R}\, \psi$$

where $p \in \Pi$, $A \subseteq Agt$, and $b \in \mathcal{B}_A$. $\langle\!\langle A^b \rangle\!\rangle \bigcirc \phi$ means that a coalition A can ensure that the next state satisfies ϕ under resource bound b. $\langle\!\langle A^b \rangle\!\rangle \phi \,\mathcal{U}\, \psi$ means that A has a strategy to enforce ψ while maintaining the truth of ϕ, and the cost of this strategy is at most b. $\langle\!\langle A^b \rangle\!\rangle \phi \,\mathcal{R}\, \psi$ means that A has a strategy to maintain ψ until and including the time when ϕ becomes true, or to maintain ψ forever if ϕ never becomes true, and the cost of this strategy is at most b. The language is interpreted on the following structures:

Definition 2.1. A resource-bounded concurrent game structure with diminishing resource ($\text{RB-CGS}^{\#}$) is a tuple $M = (Agt, Res, S, \Pi, \pi, Act, d, c, \delta)$ where:

- Agt, Res and Π are as above; the first resource type in Res is the distinguished diminishing resource;
- S is a non-empty finite set of states;
- $\pi : \Pi \to \wp(S)$ is a truth assignment that associates each $p \in \Pi$ with a subset of states where it is true;
- Act is a non-empty set of actions;
- $d : S \times Agt \to \wp(Act) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ is a function that assigns to each $s \in S$ a non-empty set of actions available to each agent $a \in Agt$.
- $c : S \times Act \to \mathbb{Z}^r$ is a partial function that maps a state s and an action σ to a vector of integers, where a positive (negative) integer in position i indicates consumption (production) of resource r_i by the action. The first position in the vector is always at most -1.
- $\delta : S \times Act^{|Agt|} \to S$ is a partial function that maps every $s \in S$ and $\sigma \in d(s, a_1) \times \cdots \times d(s, a_n)$ to a state resulting from executing σ in s.

In what follows, we use the usual point-wise notation for vector comparison and addition, and, given a function f returning a vector, we denote by f_i the function that returns the i-th component of the vector returned by f. Given an RB-CGS# M and a state $s \in S$, a *joint action by a coalition* $A \subseteq Agt$ is a tuple $\sigma = (\sigma_a)_{a \in A}$ such that $\sigma_a \in d(s, a)$. The set of all joint actions for A at state s is denoted by $D_A(s)$. Given a joint action by Agt, $\sigma \in D_{Agt}(s)$, σ_A denotes the joint action executed by A as part of σ: $\sigma_A = (\sigma_a)_{a \in A}$. The set of all possible outcomes of a joint action $\sigma \in D_A(s)$ at state s is: $out(s, \sigma) = \{s' \in S \mid \exists \sigma' \in D_{Agt}(s) : \sigma = \sigma'_A \wedge s' = \delta(s, \sigma')\}$. A *strategy for a coalition* $A \subseteq Agt$ in an RB-CGS# M is a mapping $F_A : S^+ \to Act^{|A|}$ such that, for every $\lambda \in S^+$, $F_A(\lambda) \in D_A(\lambda[|\lambda|])$. A computation λ is consistent with a strategy F_A iff, for all i, $1 \leq i < |\lambda|$, $\lambda[i+1] \in out(\lambda[i], F_A(\lambda[1, i]))$. We denote by $out(s, F_A)$ the set of all computations λ starting from s that are consistent with F_A. Given a bound $b \in \mathcal{B}$, a computation $\lambda \in out(s, F_A)$ is b-consistent with F_A iff, for every $i \geq 0$, for every $a \in A$, $b_a - \sum_{j=0}^{j=i-1} c(F_a(\lambda[0, j])) \geq c(F_a(\lambda[0, i]))$.

A computation λ is b-maximal for a strategy F_A if it cannot be extended further while remaining b-consistent. The set of all maximal computations starting from state s that are b-consistent with F_A is denoted by $out(s, F_A, b)$.

Given an RB-CGS# M and a state s of M, the truth of an RB±ATL# formula ϕ with respect to M and s is defined as follows (omitting the cases for propositions, $\neg$ and $\wedge$):

- $M, s \models \langle\langle A^b \rangle\rangle \bigcirc \phi$ iff $\exists$ strategy F_A such that for all b-maximal $\lambda \in out(s, F_A, b)$: $|\lambda| \geq 2$ and $M, \lambda[2] \models \phi$;
- $M, s \models \langle\langle A^b \rangle\rangle \phi \,\mathcal{U}\, \psi$ iff $\exists$ strategy F_A such that for all b-maximal $\lambda \in out(s, F_A, b)$, $\exists i$ such that $1 \leq i \leq |\lambda|$: $M, \lambda[i] \models \psi$ and $M, \lambda[j] \models \phi$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, i-1\}$.
- $M, s \models \langle\langle A^b \rangle\rangle \phi \,\mathcal{R}\, \psi$ iff $\exists$ strategy F_A such that for all b-maximal $\lambda \in out(s, F_A, b)$, either $\exists i$ such that $1 \leq i \leq |\lambda|$: $M, \lambda[i] \models \phi$ and $M, \lambda[j] \models \psi$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, i\}$; or, $M, \lambda[j] \models \psi$ for all j such that $1 \leq j \leq |\lambda|$.

The following theorem is proved by demonstrating a model-checking algorithm for RB ± ATL#, see [4]:

Theorem 2.2. *The model-checking problem for RB ± ATL# is decidable in PSPACE (under unary encoding).*

3 RB ± $\text{ATL}^\#_{iR}$

In this section, we study RB ± $\text{ATL}^\#_{iR}$, RB ± ATL# with imperfect information and perfect recall. To model imperfect information, RB-CGS# are extended with an indistinguishability relation $\sim_a$ on states, for every agent a. This relation can be lifted to finite sequences of states. Strategies under imperfect information should be *uniform*: if agent a is uncertain whether the history so far is λ or λ' ($\lambda \sim_a \lambda'$), then the strategy for a should return the same action for both λ and λ': $F_a(\lambda) = F_a(\lambda')$. A strategy F_A for a group of agents A is uniform if it is uniform for every agent in A. In what follows, we consider *strongly uniform* strategies [22], that require the existence of a uniform strategy from all indistinguishable states:

- $M, s \models \langle\langle A^b \rangle\rangle \bigcirc \phi$ under strong uniformity iff there exists a uniform strategy, F_A, such that, for all $s' \sim_a s$ where $a \in A$, for all $\lambda \in out(s', F_A, b)$, $|\lambda| > 1$ and $M, \lambda[2] \models \phi$.

The truth definitions for $\langle\langle A^b \rangle\rangle \phi \,\mathcal{U}\, \psi$ and $\langle\langle A^b \rangle\rangle \phi \,\mathcal{R}\, \psi$ are also modified to require the existence of a *uniform* strategy from all states s' indistinguishable from s by any $a \in A$.

Theorem 3.1. *The model-checking problem for RB ± $\text{ATL}^\#_{iR}$ is decidable in EXPSPACE (under unary encoding).*

4 RAL#

RAL# is obtained by modifying the definition of RAL [13] for the diminishing resource setting. The sets Agt, Res, and Π are as before. An *endowment (function)* $\eta : Agt \times Res \to \mathbb{N}$ assigns resources to agents: $\eta_a(r) = \eta(a, r)$ is the amount of resource agent a has of resource type r. En denotes the set of all possible endowments. Formulas of RAL# are defined by:

$$\phi, \psi ::= p \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi \wedge \phi \mid \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\downarrow}_{B} \bigcirc \phi \mid \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\eta}_{B} \bigcirc \phi \mid \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\downarrow}_{B} \phi \,\mathcal{U} \psi \mid \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\eta}_{B} \phi \,\mathcal{U} \psi \mid \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\downarrow}_{B} \phi \mathcal{R} \psi \mid \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\eta}_{B} \phi \mathcal{R} \psi$$

where $p \in \Pi$, $A, B \subseteq Agt$, and $\eta \in$ En. Unlike in RB ± ATL#, in RAL# there are two types of cooperation modalities, $\langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\downarrow}_{B}$ and $\langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\eta}_{B}$. In both cases, the actions performed by agents in $A \cup B$ consume and produce resources (actions by agents in $Agt \setminus (A \cup B)$ do not change their resource endowment). The meaning of $\langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\eta}_{B} \varphi$ is otherwise the same as in RB ± ATL#. The formula $\langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\downarrow}_{B} \varphi$ requires that the strategy uses the resources *currently* available to the agents.

The models of RAL# are RB-CGS#. Strategies are also defined as for RB ± ATL#. However, to evaluate formulas with a down arrow, such as $\langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\downarrow}_{B} \bigcirc \varphi$, we need the notion of *resource-extended computations.* A *resource-extended* computation $\lambda \in (S \times \text{En})^+$ is a sequence over $S \times$ En such that the restriction to states (the first component), denoted by $\lambda|_S$, is a path in the underlying model. The projection of λ to the second component is denoted by $\lambda|_{\text{En}}$. A (η, s_A, B)*-computation*, λ, is a resource-extended computation iff for all $i = 1, \ldots$ with $\lambda[i] := (s_i, \eta^i)$ there is an action profile $\sigma \in d(\lambda|_S[i])$ such that:

- $\eta^0 = \eta$ (η describes the initial resource distribution);
- $F_A(\lambda|_S[1, i]) = \sigma_A$ (A follow their strategy);
- $\lambda|_S[i+1] = \delta(\lambda|_S[i], \sigma)$ (transition according to σ);
- for all $a \in A \cup B$: $\eta^i_a \geq c(\lambda|_S[i], \sigma_a)$ (each agent has enough resources to perform its action);
- for all $a \in A \cup B$: $\eta^{i+1}_a = \eta^i_a - c(\lambda|_S[i], \sigma_a)$ (resources are updated);
- for all $a \in Agt \setminus (A \cup B)$ and $r \in Res$: $\eta^{i+1}_a(r) = \eta^i_a(r)$ (the resources of agents not in $A \cup B$ do not change).

$out(s, \eta, F_A, B)$ is the set of all (η, F_A, B)-computations starting in s. The truth definition is given with respect to a model, a state, and an endowment η:

- $M, s, \eta \models \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\downarrow}_{B} \bigcirc \varphi$ iff there is a strategy F_A for A such that for all $\lambda \in out(s, \eta, F_A, B)$, $|\lambda| > 1$ and $M, \lambda|_S[2], \lambda|_{\text{En}}[2] \models \varphi$

and similarly for $\langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\downarrow}_{B} \varphi \,\mathcal{U} \psi$ and $\langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\downarrow}_{B} \varphi \mathcal{R} \psi$. The cases for $\langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\zeta}_{B} \bigcirc \varphi$, $\langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\zeta}_{B} \varphi \,\mathcal{U} \psi$, $\langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\zeta}_{B} \varphi \mathcal{R} \psi$ quantify over $\lambda \in out(s, \zeta, F_A, B)$.

Theorem 4.1. *The model-checking problem for RAL# is decidable in PSPACE (under unary encoding).*

REFERENCES

[1] Parosh Aziz Abdulla, Richard Mayr, Arnaud Sangnier, and Jeremy Sproston. 2013. Solving Parity Games on Integer Vectors. In *CONCUR'13*, Vol. 8052. Springer, 106–120.

[2] Natasha Alechina, Nils Bulling, Stéphane Demri, and Brian Logan. 2016. On the Complexity of Resource-Bounded Logics. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Reachability Problems (RP 2016) (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Kim Guldstrand Larsen, Igor Potapov, and Jirí Srba (Eds.), Vol. 9899. Springer, 36–50.

[3] Natasha Alechina, Nils Bulling, Brian Logan, and Hoang Nga Nguyen. 2017. The virtues of idleness: A decidable fragment of resource agent logic. *Artificial Intelligence* 245 (2017), 56–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2016.12.005

[4] Natasha Alechina and Brian Logan. 2018. Resource Logics with a Diminishing Resource. *CoRR* (2018). To appear.

[5] Natasha Alechina, Brian Logan, Hoang Nga Nguyen, and Franco Raimondi. 2014. Decidable Model-Checking for a Resource Logic with Production of Resources. In *Proceedings of the 21st European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI-2014)*, Torsten Schaub, Gerhard Friedrich, and Barry O'Sullivan (Eds.). IOS Press, 9–14.

[6] Natasha Alechina, Brian Logan, Hoang Nga Nguyen, and Franco Raimondi. 2017. Model-checking for Resource-Bounded ATL with production and consumption of resources. *J. Comput. System Sci.* 88 (September 2017), 126–144. https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2017.03.008

[7] Natasha Alechina, Brian Logan, Hoang Nga Nguyen, and Abdur Rakib. 2009. A Logic for Coalitions with Bounded Resources. In *Proceedings of the Twenty First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI 2009)*, Craig Boutilier (Ed.), Vol. 2. AAAI Press, 659–664.

[8] Natasha Alechina, Brian Logan, Hoang Nga Nguyen, and Abdur Rakib. 2010. Resource-bounded alternating-time temporal logic. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2010)*, Wiebe van der Hoek, Gal Kaminka, Yves Lespérance, Michael Luck, and Sandip Sen (Eds.). IFAAMAS, 481–488.

[9] Natasha Alechina, Brian Logan, Hoang Nga Nguyen, and Abdur Rakib. 2011. Logic for coalitions with bounded resources. *Journal of Logic and Computation* 21, 6 (2011), 907–937.

[10] Rajeev Alur, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Orna Kupferman. 2002. Alternating-Time Temporal Logic. *Journal of the ACM* 49, 5 (2002), 672–713.

[11] Tomas Brázdil, Petr Jancar, and Antonin Kucera. 2010. Reachability Games on Extended Vector Addition Systems with States. In *ICALP'10*, Vol. 6199. Springer, 478–489.

[12] Nils Bulling and Berndt Farwer. 2010. Expressing Properties of Resource-Bounded Systems: The Logics RBTL and RBTL*. In *Computational Logic in Multi-Agent Systems - 10th International Workshop, CLIMA X, Revised Selected and Invited Papers (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Vol. 6214. 22–45.

[13] Nils Bulling and Berndt Farwer. 2010. On the (Un-)Decidability of Model Checking Resource-Bounded Agents. In *Proceedings of the 19th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI 2010)*, Helder Coelho, Rudi Studer, and Michael Wooldridge (Eds.). IOS Press, 567–572.

[14] Nils Bulling and Valentin Goranko. 2013. How to Be Both Rich and Happy: Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Strategic Reasoning about Multi-Player Games (Extended Abstract). In *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Strategic Reasoning (SR 2013) (Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science)*, Fabio Mogavero, Aniello Murano, and Moshe Y. Vardi (Eds.), Vol. 112. 33–41.

[15] Jean-Baptiste Courtois and Sylvain Schmitz. 2014. Alternating Vector Addition Systems with States. In *MFCS'14*, Vol. 8634. Springer, 220–231.

[16] Aldric Degorre, Laurent Doyen, Raffaella Gentilini, Jean-François Raskin, and Szymon Toruńczyk. 2010. Energy and Mean-Payoff Games with Imperfect Information. In *Computer Science Logic, 24th International Workshop, CSL 2010, 19th Annual Conference of the EACSL, Brno, Czech Republic, August 23-27, 2010. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Anuj Dawar and Helmut Veith (Eds.), Vol. 6247. Springer, 260–274. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15205-4

[17] Dario Della Monica and Giacomo Lenzi. 2012. On a Priced Resource-bounded Alternating μ-Calculus. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence (ICAART 2012)*, Joaquim Filipe and Ana L. N. Fred (Eds.). SciTePress, 222–227.

[18] Dario Della Monica, Margherita Napoli, and Mimmo Parente. 2011. On a Logic for Coalitional Games with Priced-Resource Agents. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 278 (2011), 215–228.

[19] Dario Della Monica, Margherita Napoli, and Mimmo Parente. 2013. Model checking coalitional games in shortage resource scenarios. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Games, Automata, Logics and Formal Verification (GandALF 2013) (Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science)*, Gabriele Puppis and Tiziano Villa (Eds.), Vol. 119. 240–255.

[20] Catalin Dima and Ferucio Laurentiu Tiplea. 2011. Model-checking ATL under Imperfect Information and Perfect Recall Semantics is Undecidable. *CoRR* abs/1102.4225 (2011). http://arxiv.org/abs/1102.4225

[21] Marcin Jurdzinski, Ranko Lazić, and Sylvain Schmitz. 2015. Fixed-Dimensional Energy Games are in Pseudo-Polynomial Time. In *ICALP'15*, Vol. 9135. Springer, 260–272.

[22] Bastien Maubert and Sophie Pinchinat. 2014. A General Notion of Uniform Strategies. *IGTR* 16, 1 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219198914400040

[23] Steen Vester. 2013. Alternating-time temporal logic with finite-memory strategies. In *Proceedings Fourth International Symposium on Games, Automata, Logics and Formal Verification, GandALF 2013, Borca di Cadore, Dolomites, Italy, 29-31th August 2013 (EPTCS)*, Gabriele Puppis and Tiziano Villa (Eds.), Vol. 119. 194–207. https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.119