Girona-Eagles Rescue Team

Silvia Suárez, Beatriz López, Josep L. de La Rosa
Universitat de Girona
Av. Lluís Santaló s/n
17071 Girona, Spain
{sasuarez, blopez, peplluis}@eia.udg.es
http://eia.udg.es/arl/

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce two co-operation strategies for strengthening civil agents' lives in the RoboCup-Rescue simulator scenario: one for making communication efficient and the other for co-ordinating ambulance teams. For the latter, the co-ordination strategy, we use a Multiple Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) technique. This technique has been chosen due to the nature of the RoboCup-Rescue simulation environment, in which rescue decisions must be taken based on several alternatives with different constraints. In this dynamic and changeable environment, it is very important to have a good combination of all the possible variables found in order to reach the proposed goal – rescue alive victims. The co-operation strategies have been implemented in the Girona Eagles team, which has entered the next RoboCup-Rescue competition.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we present a new approach to providing agents with a robust decision-making procedure in the rescue scenario, based on Multiple Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) techniques that we have implemented in the Girona Eagles rescue team. Our aim is to develop a co-ordination strategy to help ambulance teams to rescue as many victims as possible. A combination of ambulance co-ordination and a good communication strategy has been proved to be vital in the Robocup Rescue competition [1,2].

This paper is organized as follows. Firstly, we present our multi-agent system approach to dealing with such a scenario, in which communication and co-ordination are highlighted in section 2. In sections 3 and 4, we describe our communication and co-ordination strategy respectively. Finally, we provide some conclusions and discussions regarding to the experiments performed with the Girona Eagles team.

2. The Girona Eagles Multi-Agent Rescue System

The Multi-Agent Rescue System developed by the Girona Eagles team emphasises the role of the ambulance station and, as a result, ambulance team activity. All moving rescue agents report information regarding victims' positions to their corresponding stations. This information is gathered by the ambulance station, which distributes its resources (ambulance teams).

3. The Girona Eagles communication strategy

The communication strategy of the Girona Eagles team emphasises information flow concerning disaster victims. The role of the moving agents is to gather information about victims (position), and the role of the fixed agents (Center Agents) is to pass on this information to the ambulance station. Figure 1 depicts the information flow.

Moreover, ambulance teams keep the ambulance station informed about their condition: hp, damage, position, buriedness, availability and goal. *Availability* means the current activity being carried out by the agent: "busy", if the ambulance team is trying to rescue a civilian; "free" if the ambulance team is looking for civilians; and "blocked" if the ambulance team cannot perform the task it has been assigned because of blocked roads. Finally, the *goal* descriptor indicates the current target of the ambulance team, i.e., the identification of the civilian that it is trying to rescue.



Fig. 1. Ambulance station communication flow

4. The Girona Eagles co-ordination strategy

The Girona Eagles co-ordination strategy emphasizes the role of the ambulance station in order to locate and then rescue as many victims as possible. The perception system of the ambulance station gathers the information sent by the ambulance teams and other moving agents that is stored as shown in tables 1 and 2.

Id	Availability	hp	Damage	Position	Buriedness	goal
2399	busy	10000	0	706	0	2345
2400	free	10000	0	901	0	
2401	busy	10000	0	690	0	2397
2402	free	9000	2	1850	0	
2403	busy	10000	0	76	0	2367

Table 1. Information sent from ambulance team

Id	Hp	Damage	Position	Buriedness	No. Victimas
2384	9200	17	23	25	1
2388	7900	21	98	60	1
2379	6000	20	1129	35	1
2338	9000	11	2098	15	2
2356	8500	16	2098	30	2
2367	7570	22	1980	16	1

Table 2. Information about injured and/or buried civilians

Information about ambulance teams (Table 1) is considered as resources, while information of injured or buried civilians (Table 2) are the activities to be performed by the ambulance teams and which the ambulance station should co-ordinate (see Figures 2 and 3). Which resource should be allocated to which activity is the decision that the ambulance station takes, based on a multiple criteria decision-making procedure.



Fig. 2. Information sent to stations



Fig. 3. Decision-making in the Ambulance station.

The multiple-criteria decision-making (MCDM) technique allows to know which of the ambulance teams should perform the rescue of a given civilian, in a specific situation. It takes into account the importance of each constraint involved (hp, buriedness, etc). The MCDM procedure is based on two main steps:

1- Rating of the different alternatives according to the different decision criteria

Alternatives	Criteria			
	C_1	C_2	...	C_m
A_1	V_{11}	V_{21}	...	V_{m1}
A_2	V_{12}	V_{22}	...	V_{m2}
A_3	V_{13}	V_{23}	...	V_{m3}
:				
:				
A_n	V_{1n}	V_{2n}	...	V_{mn}

2- Rating of the different alternatives according to the importance of each decision criteria. One possible way of rating the alternative is by using aggregation operators, such as the OWA (Order weighted Average [3].

Alternative	Value * weight	Value * weight	Value * weight	Value * weight	Aggregation
R_1	$V_{11} * W_1$	$V_{21} * W_2$	...	$V_{m1} * W_m$	$\sum_{i=1}^{m} v_{i1} w_i$
R_2	$V_{12} * W_1$	$V_{22} * W_2$	...	$V_{m2} * W_m$	$\sum_{i=1}^{m} v_{i2} w_i$
:					
R_n	$V_{1n} * W_1$	$V_{2n} * W_2$	...	$V_{mn} * W_m$	$\sum_{i=1}^{m} v_{in} w_i$

In the rescue problem, alternatives are the various pending activities (rows of Table 3). Regarding criteria, we have used the following ones:

(C_1): hp; (C_2): damage; (C_3): buriedness; (C_4): number of victims in the same place.

The importance of the different criteria has been established as follows: $C_2 > C_1 > C_4 > C_3$. The relative importance of each criterion is quantified in order to rank the different alternatives according to the following weights:

(C_2): $W_2 = 0.9$; (C_1): $W_1 = 0.7$; (C_4): $W_4 = 0.6$; (C_3): $W_3 = 0.5$

These weights are used at the rating stage of the MCDM procedure.

4.1 Example

To illustrate the MCDM process with an example, let us suppose that the current information about victims at the ambulance station is what is shown in Table 3. At the rating stage we thus obtain the following normalized values for each alternative:

Alternatives (Victims Id)	**Criteria**			
	hp	**Damage**	**Buriedness**	**No. victims**
2384	0,08	0,17	0,21	0,5
2388	0,21	0,21	0,5	0,5
2379	0,4	0,26	0,29	0,5
2338	0,1	0,11	0,13	1
2356	0,15	0,16	0,25	1
2367	0,24	0,22	0,13	0,5

Table 3. Current information about victims.

And the ordered results (ranking) are the following:

Alternatives (Victims Id)	**Value criteria * weight**				**Result**
	Hp * weight	**Damage * weight**	**Buriedness * weight**	**No. Victims * weight**	
2356	0,15 * 0,7	0,16 * 0,9	0,25 * 0,5	1 * 0,6	0,974
2379	0,4 * 0,7	0,26 * 0,9	0,29 * 0,5	0,5 * 0,6	0,959
2388	0,21 * 0,7	0,21 * 0,9	0,5 * 0,5	0,5 * 0,6	0,886
2338	0,1 * 0,7	0,11 * 0,9	0,13 * 0,5	1 * 0,6	0,834
2367	0,24 * 0,7	0,22 * 0,9	0,13 * 0,5	0,5 * 0,6	0,731
2384	0,08 * 0,7	0,17 * 0,9	0,21 * 0,5	0,5 * 0,6	0,614

The table shows an ordered list of civilians to be rescued. The best ranked victim is the one whose identification number (id) is 2356, so this will be rescued first.

These results are then combined with the information on Table 1 (resources available). In this table there are two free agents (see availability column). As a result, the ambulance station sends a message to ambulance teams 2402 and 2400 in order to rescue the victims who are in the most dangerous situation, 2356 and 2379 respectively.

5. Conclusions and discussion

In this paper we have presented a coordination and communication strategy for the Robocup Rescue simulator. The co-ordination strategy has been designed based on a multiple-criteria decision-making technique with the aim of improving the number of victims rescued in a disaster scenario. In addition, the strategy implemented supports the communication process which is very important in the rescue scenario.

Both the co-ordination and the communication strategy have been implemented by the Girona Eagles team, which has been entered for the next RoboCup Rescue competition (2003). In order to test our strategies, we performed three experiments:

- No communication: that is, there was no communication at all between agents. Results showed that ambulance teams get lost in the rescue scenario and cannot find victims that need to be rescued.
- Communication between homogeneous agents: that is, communication between agents of the same kind (between ambulance teams and the ambulance station, between fire brigades and the fire station, and between police forces and the police station). Results improve and two civilians are rescued. One ambulance close to a group of victims is able to receive help from another ambulance and rescue civilian agents.
- Communication between heterogeneous agents, according to the strategy presented on this paper. Results improve even more, since many more victim positions are known, and then can be rescued. Our score is 42 dead civilians, quite close to the YabAI 2001 RoboCup-Rescue champion [1].

This study shows the importance of ambulance team coordination, although the remarkable impact of the heterogeneous agents' co-operation is also made clear by the simulation process results.

As a future work, we are thinking of deploying the co-ordination strategy used in the ambulance station to the other central agents (police office and fire station), taking communication constraints into account. We are also planning to include some learning mechanisms in the decision process of the ambulance station in order to adapt the decision procedure to the reliability of the information received from the various rescue agents as we have already done in other domains (see for example [4]).

References

[1] Takeshi Morimoto, Kenji Kono, and Ikuo Takeuchi, YabAI. The first Rescue Simulation League Champion. Rococup 2001, pp. 49-59.

[2] Taku Sakushima, Tetsuya Esaki, Yoshiki Asai, Nobuhiro Ito, and Koichi Wada. A Design of Agents for the Disaster Simulator on RoboCup-Rescue. In: Springer-Verlag, LNAI 2377, 2001.

[3] R.R. Yager. On Ordered Weighed Averaging Aggregation Operators in Multi-criteria Decision Making. IEEE Transactions on SMC, volume 18, 1988.

[4] Acebo E, de la Rosa J.L. A Fuzzy System Based Approach to Social Modeling in Multi-Agent Systems. Proceedings of the First International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS'02), Palazzo Re Enzo (Italy), 2002.