

An evaluation framework for agent-oriented methodologies

Agentlink III AOSE TFG Ljubljana, 28 feb.-1 mar. 2005



Juan Pavón Univ. Complutense Madrid jpavon@sip.ucm.es

An evaluation framework for AOSEM

Context

- Diverse scope of application of methodologies
 - Several aspects: analysis, design, implementation, deployment, validation, verification, etc.
 - Several application domains: from closed systems to open systems, web support, etc.
- Tool support
 - Tools for modelling and code generation
 - Some methodologies have no tool support at all
- Development process not always defined
- Different notations
- Different agent concepts
- Standardization efforts
- Several approaches for integration:
 - A common standard notation: which one?
 - Fragments

An evaluation framework for AOSEM

- Evaluation of AOSEM can help towards the success of AOSE
 - Clarification of concepts => towards a standard notation
 - Integration of fragments
 - Definition of AOSE processes: heavy to light approaches
 - Promotion of tools

3

Inputs for AOSEM evaluation

- A. Sturm, O. Shehory, D. Dori (2004). Evaluation of Agent-Oriented Methodologies. In AL3 TF1-AOSE TFG
- Q.N. Tran, G. Low (2005). Comparison of ten agent-oriented methodologies. To appear.
- C. Bernon, et al. (2004). A Study of some Multi-Agent Meta-Models. Proc. AOSE 2004.
- L. Cernuzzi, G. Rossi (2004). On the evaluation of agent oriented methodologies.
- L. Cernuzzi, M. Cossentino, F. Zambonelli (2005). Process Models for Agent-Based Development. International Journal on Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence (EAAI). Elsevier. (in edition?)

Criteria for AOSEM evaluation

Process

- Process definition: agile vs. heavy
- Scope of activities: whole or partial life-cycle, from requirements to implementation, validation, verification, testing, etc.
- Documentation and guidelines. Examples
- Tool support
- Metrics, quality assurance
- Teamwork/enterprise support
- Concepts/Modeling elements
 - Individual aspects: agent modelling, behaviour, mental notions
 - Social aspects: organization, communication, coordination, user interface
 - Environment: perception and actuation, mobility, application domain, interworking with legacy sytems

Criteria for AOSEM evaluation

- Features
- Complexity
- Application domain
- Pragmatics
- Others ???

Criteria for AOSEM evaluation

	Concepts	Process	
Features	Agent, Goal, Interaction	Deliverables Activities	
Complexity	Abstraction Modularity	Team work	
Domain	Domain specific concepts	Domain specific methods	
Pragmatics	Knowledge skills Scalability	Tools	

Towards an AOSEM evaluation framework

- The evaluation framework should allow:
 - Criteria refinement and extensions
 - Criteria metrics depending on the domain
 - E.g. agents in a web service or in robotics
 - Definition of standard case studies for evaluation
 - Evaluation of documentation is not enough
 - **...**

Towards an AOSEM evaluation framework

- The framework can be based on the definition and use of evaluation models
 - Case studies for putting the methodologies to work
 - Organized by criteria
 - For each criteria, define metrics
 - Criteria can be refined to get more insight or being more specific
 - For instance, agent behaviour, depending on whether BDI, neural network, CBR, reactive, or whatever model is used
 - New criteria can be added
 - Some criteria may be considered non applicable
 - Associate criteria to case studies

Proposed activities

- What to do from now on
 - Collaborative work area: phpCollab (UCM)
 - Send email to <u>jpavon@sip.ucm.es</u> for being included
 - Contribute to forum by discussing on
 - Criteria structure
 - Cirteria identification definition
 - Case studies
 - What else?
 - Contribute by adding material
 - References
 - Proposals
- Next AOSE TFG meeting
 - Confirm structure of evaluation framework
- And finally
 - Establish an open web site for including case studies developed with methodologies and evaluations derived from these