DELIS

Dynamically Evolving, Large-scale Information Systems

Socially Inspired Approaches to Evolving Cooperation

David Hales

www.davidhales.com

Department of Computer Science
University of Bologna
Italy

Project funded by the Future and Emerging Technologies arm of the IST Programme

A note on typology in this presentation

- Because this area is actually vast, covering lots of disciplines and concepts, I have highlighted some key concepts in *red italic*
- This means that there are good overviews on wikipeadia: http://en.wikipedia.org
- You should look these terms up to fully grasp what is being presented here

DELIS
Dynamically Evolving, Large-scale Information Systems

Sociologically Inspired Computing

- Many key problems in the engineering of distributed computer systems bear close similarities to puzzles in human societies
- Historically these have been studied in areas such as Economics, Sociology and Political Science
- As computer scientists / engineers we can benefit from an awareness of some of these ideas

Sociologically Inspired Computing

- Recently an area called "*Computational Sociology*" has emerged
- Social scientists express their ideas using computer simulations (often agent-based)
- This is good news since we can get agent-level algorithmic descriptions of their ideas
- Some of those algorithms can be modified and applied for our purpose (nice self-* properties)

Sociologically Inspired Computing

- *CAUTION:* when dealing with social theories and talking about human societies it is important to note:
  - Within the social sciences there is no general agreement on basic principles, theories or subject matter
  - Social science tends to be broken into disconnected "factions" with competing assumptions, methods and goals
  - Furthermore ideas are often "political" and hence can cause people to get "excited"

Sociologically Inspired Computing

- *HOWEVER*: none of this need worry us because:
  - We are only interested in if the “theories” and “ideas” work in computer systems
  - We don’t care if they are true, false or silly
  - Hence we don’t need to get involved in sociological debates but just “steal” good ideas

Sociologically Inspired Computing

- There are many possible areas from which we could attempt to steal good ideas from social science (e.g.):
  - Formation of organisations and roles
  - The emergence of money / Economy
  - Trust and Reputation / Crime and Deviance
  - Power / Class
  - Cooperation, coordination, and altruism
- We will focus on Cooperation

Cooperation in Distributed Systems

- Many systems are composed of semi-autonomous units
  - E.g. Agent, P2P, animal and human societies
- It is often the case that individual interests conflict with collective interests
  - E.g. P2P file sharing system - downloading more than uploading
  - E.g. human society - over exploitation of a common resource

Cooperation in Distributed Systems

- Consider pollution and the environment:
  - It is in the *collective interest* keep the environment clean enough so we don’t all die
  - But it is in the *individual interest* of firms (corporations) to save money by not properly disposing of dangerous pollutants
  - This is particularly true if a small set of firms could pollute without this causing a problem but if *all* pollute then this kills us all (say)

Cooperation in Distributed Systems

- Consider a community fishing an area of sea:
  - It is in the *collective interest* of the community to avoid over-fishing such that there are not enough fish to reproduce
  - But it is in the *individual interests* of the fisherman to catch as much fish as possible

Cooperation in Distributed Systems

- These kinds of situations have been termed "commons dilemmas" or "collective resource dilemmas"
- G. Hardin (1968) summarized the issue in his famous paper: "The *Tragedy of the Commons*"
- These kinds of situations can occur in distributed systems also

Cooperation in Distributed Systems

- Consider an open file sharing P2P overlay network:
  - It is in the *collective interests* of the entire network community that each node shares high quality files
  - But it is in the *individual interest* of each node to download files without uploading them

Cooperation in Distributed Systems

- Consider routing of a message in an ad-hoc mobile network
  - It is in the collective interests of the network community that messages are routed correctly
  - But it is in the individual interests of the each node to save energy by receiving messages but not passing them on

Cooperation in Distributed Systems

- What kinds solutions have been proposed / identified for these kinds of problems?
- Central enforcement of correct behaviour
  - E.g. EU fishing quotas, “Kyoto carbon taxes”
    - Require centralised agencies and policing
- Decentralised methods
  - E.g. self-policing, emergence of cooperative social norms or behaviours
    - Do not require centralised coordination

Cooperation in Distributed Systems

- Much economic theory (including *Game Theory*) makes the following assumptions:
  - Individuals can assign a utility to themselves and others for all possible outcomes of behaviours
  - Individuals behave to maximise their utility
  - Individuals know that all others will behave in this way and have infinite computational resources to calculate the best next behaviour
- This is termed “ideally rational” or *Homo Economicus* model

Cooperation in Distributed Systems

- With classical assumptions - often possible to calculate *Nash Equilibria* - sets of behaviours (or strategies) such that no individual can improve their utility by changing strategy
- Under “ideally rational” assumptions individuals would behave selfishly in all our previous examples
- But studies show humans don’t behave in an ideally rational way - more cooperation, heuristics, learning (Herbert Simon - *Bounded Rationality*)

Cooperation in Distributed Systems

- More recently the “evolutionary approach” relaxes the classical assumptions:
  - Individuals follow simple learning rules based on how well they do relative to others
  - Copy the behaviours of better performing others
  - Modify their behaviour from time-to-time (innovate)
- Cultural evolution *not* biological evolution (although will often produce similar results)

The Prisoner's Dilemma

- This is a kind of minimal two-player form of a *Commons Tragedy*
- The "rational" game theoretic solution (the *Nash Equilibrium*) is the worst outcome for all
- Selfish adaptive / evolutionary units would also tend to Nash because this is also the *Evolutionary Stable Strategy* (ESS)
- It is desirable for societies to cooperation in such situations and many seem to. But how?

The Prisoner's Dilemma Game

Given: T > R > P > S and 2R > T + S

Player 1 / Player 2	C	D
C	(3) R R (3)	(5) T S (0)
D	(0) S T (5)	(1) P P (1)

The Prisoner’s Dilemma

Players =>	P1	P2	P1	P2	P1	P2	P1	P2
Moves =>	C	C	C	D	D	C	D	D
Payoffs =>	R	R	S	T	T	S	P	P
Values =>	(3)	(3)	(0)	(5)	(5)	(0)	(1)	(1)
Total =>	(6)		(5)		(5)		(2)	

A contradiction between collective and individual interests: *Nash Equilibrium* = DD

Ways to get Cooperation in the PD

- 3'rd party enforcement – requires trusted authority
- *Tit-for-Tat* – requires repeated interactions (IPD) with same agents (Axelrod 1984)
- Interaction & copying on lattice – not possible in many environments (Nowak & May 1992)
- Image Scoring - requires others to observe game interactions (Sigmund & Nowak 1998)
- Tags – scalable, single round, simple, applicable to P2P (Holland 1993, Riolo 2001, Hales 2004)

What are “tags”

- Tags are observable labels, markings, cues
- They are attached to agents
- Can be observed by other agents
- Agents interact preferentially with those sharing the same tag – no other function
- In cultural interpretation, tags = clothing styles (fashions) or other overt signals (make-up or mannerisms)

An Evolutionary PD Scenario

- Agents are selfish and greedy
- Copy behaviors and tags of more successful
- Randomly mutate strategies and tags
- No population structure but….
- *Agents preferentially interact with those sharing the <u>same tag</u>*
- When agents interact they play the PD

Agents - a Tag and a PD strategy

Tag = (say) Some Integer

Game interaction between those with same tag
(if possible)

How Tags Work



Visualising the Process



Visualising the Process



A P2P Scenario

Consider a P2P:

- Assume nodes maintain some max. degree
- Node neighbours can be thought of as a group
- Nodes may be good guys, share resources with neighbours, or free-ride, using neighbours resources but not sharing theirs (PD)
- Sharing / free-riding is a Strategy
- The neighbour links (as a whole) a kind of “tag” (if clustering high enough)

A P2P Scenario

- Represent the P2P as a undirected graph
- Assume nodes are selfish and periodically:
  - Play PD with randomly selected neighbour
  - Compare performance to some randomly selected other node
  - If other node is doing better copy its neighbourhood and strategy
  - Mutate strategies and neighbourhood.

Design Decisions

- Mutation of view => replace all with single randomly chosen node
- Mutation of strategy = flip the strategy
- Node j copying a more successful node i => replace i view with j's plus j itself
- When maximum degree of a node is exceeded throw away a randomly chosen link

Copying a more successful node

Before



$F_u > A_u$

Where A_u = average utility of node A

After



A copies F neighbours & strategy

In his case mutation has not changed anything

Random movement in the net

Before



Mutation applied to F's neighbourhood

After



F is wired to a randomly selected node (B)

Parameters

- Vary N between 4,000..120,000
- Maximum degree 20
- Initial topology random graph (not important)
- Initial strategies all defection (not random)
- Mutation rate m = 0.001 (small)
- PD payoffs: T=1.9, R=1, P=d, S=d
  (where d is a small value)

Results


Cycles to 99% Coop
400
300
200
100
0
4000
8000
12000
16000
20000
Nodes

A 100 node example – after 500 generations



General Conclusions
Socially Inspired Methods

- An awareness of sociological approaches can inspire novel approaches to self-* engineering
- However the process is not simple:
  - need to be aware of the assumptions being imported - make sense in new context?
  - much modification and testing is required
- The emerging area of computational sociology seems to be particularly relevant
- Evolutionary approaches appear more relevant than classical approaches in GT and Econ.

References

- *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation* (JASSS) http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/JASSS.html
- David Hales (2004) From Selfish Nodes to Cooperative Networks. *IEEE International Conference on Peer-to-Peer Computing* http://www.davidhales.com
- Riolo, R. L., Cohen, M. D. & Axelrod, R. (2001) Evolution of cooperation without reciprocity. *Nature* 414, 441-443
- Holland, J. (1993) The Effect of Lables (Tags) on Social Interactions. *Santa Fe Institute Working Paper 93-10-064*. Santa Fe, NM.
- Robert Axelrod (1984) *The Evolution of Cooperation*, Basic Books
- Nowak, M.A. and Sigmund, K. (1998) Evolution of indirect reciprocity by image scoring, *Nature* 393, 573.
- Nowak M A, May R M (1992) Evolutionary games and spatial chaos, *Nature*, 359, 826-829
- Garrett Hardin (1968) The Tragedy of the Commons *Science* 162, 1243-1248. http://www.sciencemag.org/sciext/sotp/commons.shtml