

Goals are Enough: Inducing AdHoc cooperation among unseen Multi-Agent systems in IMFs

Kaushik Dey and Satheesh K. Perepu
Ericsson Research (Artificial Intelligence)

India

{deykaushik,perepu.satheesh.kumar}@ericsson.com

Abir Das

Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur

India

abir@cse.iitkgp.ac.in

Abstract—Intent-based management will play a critical role in achieving customers’ expectations in the next-generation mobile networks. Traditional methods cannot perform efficient resource management since they tend to handle each expectation independently. Existing approaches, *e.g.*, based on multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL) allocate resources in an efficient fashion when there are conflicting expectations on the network slice. However, in reality, systems are often far more complex to be addressed by a standalone MARL formulation. Often there exists a hierarchical structure of intent fulfillment where multiple pre-trained, self-interested agents may need to be further orchestrated by a supervisor or controller agent. Such agents may arrive in the system adhoc, which then needs to be orchestrated along with other available agents. This is especially true for networks evolving with time as components can get added incrementally. Retraining the whole system every time is often infeasible given the associated time and cost. Given the challenges, such adhoc coordination of pre-trained systems could be achieved through an intelligent supervisor agent which incentivizes pre-trained RL/MARL agents through sets of dynamic contracts (goals or bonuses) and encourages them to act as a cohesive unit towards fulfilling a global expectation. Some approaches use a rule-based supervisor agent and deploy the hierarchical constituent agents sequentially, based on human-coded rules.

In the current work, we propose a framework whereby pre-trained agents can be orchestrated in parallel leveraging an AI-based supervisor agent. For this, we propose to use Adhoc-Teaming approaches which assign optimal goals to the MARL agents and incentivize them to exhibit certain desired behaviours. Results on the network emulator show that the proposed approach results in faster and improved fulfilment of expectations when compared to rule-based approaches and even generalizes to changes in environments.

Index Terms—multi-agent reinforcement learning, adhoc-teaming approach, goal assignment

I. INTRODUCTION

Intent Management frameworks (IMF) form a key component in networks of the future to meet the ever-changing demands of customers [19], [31]. An intent can contain single/multiple expectations which are defined in the form of targets on a single/multiple KPI/s. For example, an intent could specify “70% of users using conversational video service should get Quality of experience ≥ 4 ”. [19], [30]. In networks of the future, there could be multiple intents, in a single resource slice, each containing different expectations on multiple KPIs [2]. Constraints on available radio resources combined with varying demands from customers can lead to

conflicting intents *e.g.*, actions fulfilling certain expectations may affect the fulfilment of other intents on the slice.

In general, an intent-based framework may have multiple agents, each controlling one or more KPIs. It is necessary for such agents to coordinate in order to handle conflicts [1]. Existing approaches based on machine reasoning [14], machine learning [24], and reinforcement learning [21] try to address such conflicting intents. These agents being pre-trained may only work for specific scenarios. In the real world, the scenarios often change dynamically and hence may necessitate generalization of such pre-trained agents [13].

Using methods based on Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning (MARL), we can train a predefined set of agents to collaborate towards a common goal. Specifically, [21] considered the case where a MARL system (consisting of more than one RL agent) trained to control packet priority, coordinates with another set of MARL systems that modulates the Maximum Bit Rate (MBR). The coordination across both MARL systems is enforced by a rule-based controller which forces each MARL system to act sequentially for a predefined number of time steps. However, creating such human-driven rules can be a challenge as the number of intents increases. Additionally for collaborative intent management frameworks in 6G, such MARL systems may arrive pre-trained without any information about each other. Given the pre-training, each MARL system would be self-interested and the supervisor agent will not have any control over their actions. In such a situation, traditional MARL or hierarchical algorithms may often prove infeasible as it might be impractical or costly to either retrain the entire system from scratch or manually enforce expert-driven rules. Hence in this paper, we look at a problem where sets of pre-trained, self-interested MARL agents need to collaborate together to achieve a cooperative behaviour aided by an AI-enabled controller, known as the *supervisor agent*.

Also, in [21] while the authors considered sequential execution of MARL agents which can increase the time taken for episode convergence, we propose a framework for simultaneous execution of MARL systems. To implement the same, we propose a method where modified AdHoc Teaming (AHT) techniques for Goal Engineering are integrated with MARL agents. The results presented in this work demonstrate, orchestrating the individual *Goals are Enough* for the supervisor to incentivize the pre-trained MARL agents to act

in a cohesive manner towards a global intent. Our proposed method integrating the modified AHT and MARL in a single framework is henceforth referred to as AT-MARL.

AHT is a method of inducing cooperation between unseen agents on the fly [18], [26]. Here self-interested agents arrive in the system without prior knowledge about other agents. The AHT **framework** involves training an agent, referred to as the learner/supervisor, to collaborate with an unfamiliar group of teammates without prior coordination. The teammates possess relevant skills for the teamwork task, and the objective is to find a policy for the supervisor agent that will enable it to create dynamic sets of goals for the teammates. Such goals induce all the available agents/systems to perform a specific sequence of actions and thereby can create cooperative behaviour across the lower-level agents even though the supervisor cannot control the intrinsic actions of the agents directly.

The problem's inputs include the global task (list of intents with their KPI expectations), the dimension of action space for each agent, and the list of teammates. The output is represented by a policy that determines the supervisor's actions in any domain state, potentially including creating sub-goals that act as a short-term contract with trained agents. Three key assumptions characterize the AHT problem:

- 1) *No prior coordination*: The supervisor must coordinate with teammates without prior establishment of coordination mechanisms. It may have partial knowledge of teammates' attributes acquired from an expert.
- 2) *No control over teammates*: The supervisor cannot change the environment or teammates' policies; it must adapt to the given conditions.
- 3) *Collaborative*: All agents share a common objective, but individual teammates may have additional objectives that do not conflict with the team's common task.

In summary, the AHT problem involves training an agent to collaborate with unfamiliar teammates without prior coordination, while pursuing a common objective.

II. BACKGROUND

In this work, we consider the IMF as defined in [21]. In this framework three types of services are considered, namely Conversational Video (CV), Ultra Reliable Low Latency Communication (URLLC), and Massive IoT (mIoT) services each of which has distinct network traffic characteristics [29]. Especially, we are interested in controlling the KPIs, Quality of Experience (QoE) of CV service, and Packet Loss (PL) of both URLLC and mIoT services. To ensure tractability, we have selected Packet Priority and Maximum Bit Rate (MBR) as the two control parameters. Now, in a scenario where resources in the slice are limited, enhancing packet priority can enhance the Quality of Experience (QoE) for CV, but it might negatively impact packet loss for URLLC. Similarly, augmenting MBR for URLLC can improve packet loss and reduce latency for URLLC, but it may have adverse effects on the mIoT and CV service. In essence, the challenge lies in optimizing the

fulfillment of various conflicting intents within the resource constraints of the network slice.

Authors in [21] used MARL-based methods to address the conflicting intents problem. In this approach, they have two MARL agents as in Figure 1a, one for controlling priority (we refer to it as Priority MARL system) and another for controlling MBR (a.k.a MBR MARL system). Each system can influence both KPIs, PL (URLLC & mIoT) and QoE. To switch between these multiple MARL agents the authors proposed a rule-based supervisor that can switch between the respective MARL systems after a predefined interval of 5 time-steps.

However, there are a few drawbacks to this approach:

- 1) *Rule-Based Control switching*: The supervisor agent works on the basis of heuristics and rules which are designed by a human expert. The expert needs to devise complex rules with the addition of new agents/new control parameters as shown in dotted grey/green boxes in Figure 1a. Also, the rules may depend on various factors e.g. radio environment, which is humanely difficult to comprehend with an increase in scale and complexity.
- 2) *Execution for fixed timesteps*: Since the rules are pre-configured, the execution for each system (5 time-steps in [21]) has to occur for a pre-determined time period and is not conditioned on the state of the environment. Ideally, this approach is not optimal as the optimal actions of MARL agents depend on the state of the environment prevailing at that point in time.
- 3) *Sequential execution*: Sequential execution of each task, (either priority or MBR actions), increases the total time window for intent fulfilment. Parallel execution is not feasible in [21] since the supervisor cannot deal with the non-stationarity of simultaneous actions.

In order to address the drawbacks, we introduce **AT-MARL** which proposes and changes goals dynamically for each system of agents, and through a seamless interaction with multiple MARL systems, is able to orchestrate all the MARL systems to an optimal convergence with improved accuracy and precision. Our main contributions in the paper are

- 1) *AI-based Orchestration*: An Autonomous Orchestration of independently trained systems (MARL systems here), which makes it scalable and doesn't need formulation of rules created by human experts.
- 2) *Event-based execution*: The length of execution of episodes for each system can vary according to the global state making each sub-stage of the process more efficient
- 3) *Concurrent execution wherever needed*: The execution process for every system is decided dynamically by the supervisor agent enabled by AHT. Hence two systems often execute in parallel reducing the overall convergence time for the realization of intents. The experiments shown below, demonstrate that our process is able to improve the end-to-end execution window by 30% and more importantly achieve a much more stable conver-




Fig. 1: Orchestrating multiple MARL systems through supervisor (Left Side) and corresponding results (Right Side) by using [21] framework which uses a rule-based supervisor. The white boxes show the existing solution. The grey and green boxes show additional intents and evolving controls and thereby the scalability need which necessitates the creation of complex and ever-changing rules. This motivates us to propose an AI-based supervisor agent that can scale without human-coded rules

gence eliminating oscillations in most cases. Eliminating oscillations around the desired KPI is important for mission-critical URLLC applications.

- 4) *Generalization with change in radio Environments*: The rule-based supervisor is not able to adapt as the radio environment changes. Mobility patterns, weather, or the nature of data transmissions change the prevailing radio environment often. Our proposed method is able to generalize on changes in radio environments due to mobility and hence doesn't need any further retraining.

A. Related Work

Recently, there has been tremendous interest among researchers in training agents to perform complex tasks. Since it is hard for a single agent to perform in a complex scenario, it is broken down into different sub-tasks and each agent is trained to perform one sub-task. Also, each of these sub-tasks requires different skills, and only one/more types of agents are trained to perform these sub-tasks. Hence to successfully complete the complex task, the participating agents should coordinate among themselves [9], [25], [27]. AHT is one of the efficient ways by which coordination can be learned among pre-trained agents where the agents are oblivious to each other's capabilities and actions till this point.

Research in AHT has been prevalent for a while and collaboration without pre-coordination has become more relevant as trained robots make their way into 5G-enabled Industry 4.0 scenarios. AHT scenarios have been simulated in various environments and a variety of techniques have been explored to induce adhoc collaboration. In Matrix Games, authors in [3] empirically evaluate different multi-agent learning algorithms in adhoc mixed teams while [11] introduce an optimal algorithm for cooperation with a Markovian teammate. In the Predator-Prey environment, authors in [8] utilize Monte Carlo Tree Search with type-based reasoning using handcrafted types, while [23] extends AHT methods to work with teammates that can dynamically change their respective behaviours.

Authors in [20] assume only local observations are available for building the adhoc teamwork. In the context of Large-scale Battlefields, the work in [4] develops type-based game theoretic reasoning. [22] utilizes graph-based learning to handle a dynamic number of agents. In the Robot-soccer environment, [9] proposes an approach for developing coordination with adhoc teams created impromptu, and [7] introduces a method for reusing policies learned from previous teammates. Authors in [6] present algorithms for AHT based on previously met teammates, utilizing either policies or models. [10] create a meta-strategy for solving adhoc teamwork in Hanabi using a diverse set of possible teammates. In addition, [17] created an optimized metric for determining policy diversity in Hanabi self-play.

However, none of these scenarios deals with *Adhoc teaming for multi-agent systems* where two levels of decision-making may be present, one about coordinating individual actions between agents within each multi-agent system and another to decide synchronization of actions between multi-agent systems (proposed herein through AHT). The interaction of AHT and MARL-based frameworks is unique to our work and the proposed method (AT-MARL) may be leveraged to create a novel implementation for IMFs in 6G or future networks.

Let us also discuss on complexities of AI-based coordination among pre-trained MARL systems. Each MARL system, like the **Priority MARL system** or the **MBR MARL system**, arrives as a trained entity and has its own policy. Each system is trained to coordinate the actions within the system but is not trained to condition its actions based on the other system. Also, it may not be able to adjust to non-stationarity generated by another MARL system, which it may just discard as a noise in the environment. Notably, each MARL system does not have visibility about the actions of another system but can only see the global effect. In such a situation our challenge is to enable an intelligent coordinator/supervisor which can orchestrate the MARL systems autonomously. The supervisor should enable both Priority and MBR systems to act in parallel,




Fig. 2: AT-MARL method for generating sub-goals for each agent. The agents’ capabilities are introduced in the form of Γ_t^i and merged with the current performance of the agents (s_t^i, a_t^i, g_t^i) to obtain the embeddings m_t^i . The embeddings calculated for each agent are fused with global goals (given by the customers) to create future context c_{t+1} , which is used to train the goal policy π_g to obtain the sub-goals for each agent in the next time-step.

thereby reducing the episode length in execution. Finally, the supervisor should ideally be able to adjust to changes in the radio environment and thereby be able to steer both systems to generalize their actions accordingly. Implementing such a method for orchestrating multiple MARL systems, which are pre-trained and thus have a mind of their own, is non-trivial. Additionally, the solution should be scalable, an aspect that has been a challenge with preset rule-based supervisor systems.

III. METHODOLOGY

As discussed in the earlier sections, the idea is to train the supervisor agent using AHT approaches. For this, we imbibe concepts mentioned across AHT in [5], [16], [26] and propose AT-MARL that binds the AHT to the pre-trained MARL framework of Priority and MBR systems discussed earlier. The approach consists of training a goal policy (within the supervisor agent) that generates the sub-goals. To train the policy, two inputs are required (i) Individual agent’s capabilities and (ii) Individual agent’s current performance.

At first, we input the individual agent’s capabilities in the form of a vector at every time instant t [26]. The capability vector Γ_t^i for agent i at time t represents the probability of agent i achieving goal g_p . Specifically,

$$\Gamma_t^i = \begin{bmatrix} g_1 & g_2 & \cdots & g_P \\ \rho_{t,1}^i & \rho_{t,2}^i & \cdots & \rho_{t,P}^i \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where g_p , $p = 1, \dots, P$ is set of goals for the agent i and $0 \leq \rho_{t,p}^i \leq 1$ represents the probabilities for the agent i achieving specific goal p within time instant t . The capability vector Γ_t^i is encoded using an encoder (fully connected network in our case) to project into low-dimensional space.

As mentioned earlier we also input the agent’s current performance for better sub-goal assignment. For this, we create a state-action-goal tuple of the agent (s_t^i, a_t^i, g_t^i) , where s_t^i is the state of the agent i at time step t , a_t^i is the action taken by the agent i at time step t and g_t^i is the goal assigned for agent i at time step t . We merge this tuple with the encoder output obtained earlier to create an embedding m_t^i .

For every agent, we use a separate encoder and merger and use it to create N embeddings m_t^i , $i = 1, \dots, N$. Finally, we compute the embedding for all the agents and fuse them using the fusion layer. Also, we input the global goals (derived from intents) to the fusion layer since we would like the sub-goals generated to be conditional on the global goals.

The output of the fusion layer obtained by fusing the N embeddings $m_{i,t}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ at time instant t and global goals gives us the context representation for the future time step denoted as c_{t+1} , which can be used to train the goal policy π_g to generate the sub-goals g_{t+1}^i , $i = 1, \dots, N$ for next time step. In this work, we use the RL-based actor-critic approach model to train the goal policy [28]. The block diagram of the proposed approach for sub-goal creation is shown in Figure 2.

The actor is chosen to be a 2-layer gated recurrent unit (GRU) network [12] and critic a 2-layer fully connected network. Here we use fully connected layers to represent the encoder(2-layer), merger(1-layer), and fusion layers(3-layers).

Now before using the proposed method let us look at some baselines for comparison. This also helps to establish a lower bound and adds to the motivation for the AT-MARL.

The existing literature [21] for coordinating pre-trained MARL/RL systems uses a rule-based approach for orchestrating the Priority and MBR MARL systems.

Here we test situations where both MARL systems are executed simultaneously: In the first step, we introduce a simple supervisor agent which naively passes the same goals as is received from the intents. Both the MARL systems execute simultaneously and are driven by the same goal. This results in sub-optimal performance and non-convergence which can be attributed to non-stationarity induced due to concurrent actions of both agents as shown in Figure 3a.

Now in the proposed AT-MARL, we investigate three types of approaches (1) & (2): Sub-Goals generated at the service level and (3) Sub-Goals generated at the agent level

- 1) **Goal generated at service level:** Here we generate the goals at the service level i.e. at the KPI level using vanilla AHT framework. Since we plan to perform




Fig. 3: Parallel execution of the MARL agents with/without intermediate goals. These results are shown to demonstrate the problem which occurs without goal refinement when the MARL agents are executed in parallel.

simultaneous execution of all the MARL systems, the same goal is passed to the respective agents in both MARL systems. At the start of the episode, we do not pass the final goal to the MARL systems but rather create intermediate sub-goals. These intermediate goals are expected to drive the trajectory in the right direction similar to the concept of auxiliary goals [15] in RL. However, given the same intermediate goals are passed to both MARL systems for each KPI, it results in significant oscillations around the target without any signs of convergence (Figure 3b). While this may look like a naive approach, this helps to analyze the challenges with respect to asynchronous and simultaneous execution.

- 2) **Intuitive division of Goals:** In the next step instead of sending the same generated sub-goals to both systems, we divide them in half and send them to respective agents. So if the AHT framework proposes an intermediate goal of 3 for QoE we divide it into equal parts and send it to respective Priority and MBR agents residing in two different MARL systems. The halving is a starting point based on our intuitive human logic of distributing a task equally among two participating cooperative systems. Although this is not optimal, however, we use this approach for a second baseline comparison.
- 3) **Goals generated at agent level:** In this approach we improve on (2) whereby we generate unique intermediate goals at the agent level i.e. two different goals for each of the KPI, one in each of the MARL systems. This goal is conditioned on the global state of the system and the performance of the agents till that point. Hence in the proposed approach, we generate 6 unique goals for three different KPIs given there are two MARL systems in this experiment. We then explore the scalability of this approach by adding two additional intents to the system. In such a case we generate 10 goals, two for respective agents in both MARL agents. We refer to this version as the baseline AT-MARL method.




Fig. 4: Distribution of UE's across gNodeB's considered in the experiments for generalization.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Experiments are performed on a network emulator to demonstrate the efficacy of the proposed AHT-based approach. For effective comparison, the same network emulator is used as in [21]. The network emulator has the capability to generate different traffic scenarios from/to application layer to/from UE's through user-plane function (UPF) and gNodeB's. For every such link, we can configure the bandwidth to create different scenarios like enough resources or scarce resources for the UEs to achieve all the goals. However, since the main objective of the work is to demonstrate the usage of AHT approaches to train the supervisor agent we demonstrate only the enough resources scenario by configuring the airlink bandwidth to 10 MBPS.

In the network emulator, three types of services are simulated (i) CV, (ii) URLLC, and (iii) mIoT. The emulator has the capability of deploying multiple instances of URLLC and mIoT services. For our experiments, UE's are distributed uniformly across four gNodeB's as shown in Figure 4.

We follow the procedure in [21] to train the priority and MBR MARL agents. For all three cases discussed in Section III, we use these same pre-trained MARL agents.

Having established a baseline in Case 1 and 2 of Section III, we used the AT-MARL method conditioned on Global and local observations for (3), i.e. **Goals generated at agent level**. This method generates individual sub-goals for each agent in the Priority and MBR MARL system. For example, we generate two unique QoE sub-goals, one for the RL agent modulating Priority for QoE (which is part of the Priority MARL system) and another for the RL agent modulating MBR for QoE intent(part of MBR MARL system). The sub-goals may again be revised after a few time steps by the supervisor based on the progress of the constituent agents. To the best of our knowledge, such an autonomous orchestration involving multiple pre-trained MARL systems and an AHT-based Supervisor agent has not been attempted before.

To quantify the performance we use a metric known as the integral absolute relative error (IAE) which is widely used in closed-loop control. Since IAE is subject to noise, we estimate it from the point the KPI first reaches within 10% deviation




Fig. 5: Comparison of approaches with uniformly distributed UEs measured by KPIs (a)QoE(CV), (b)PL(URLLC), (c)PL(mIoT).

from the target. The IAE is defined as

$$IAE = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{|KPI[i] - T|}{T} \text{ from the instant } KPI[i] \geq 0.9T \quad (2)$$

where $KPI[k]$ is the value of KPI measured at time instant k , T is the target for the KPI and N is the number of samples (counted from the instance the KPI value reaches $0.9T$ for the first time). The better the performance of the closed-loop control, the lower the IAE value.

The results are evaluated across three aspects:

- 1) Convergence accuracy - measured by **IAE** and figures shown herein
- 2) Scalability - Evaluated by increasing the number of intents to 5
- 3) Generalization - Measured by training the AHT on a Uniform distribution of UEs and then testing on a Gaussian distribution. This simulates a change in the Radio environment due to changes in mobility patterns.

A. Uniform Distribution

The KPI level execution plot for the QoE, PL (URLLC), and PL (mIoT) are shown separately in Figures 5a, 5b and 5c respectively. From the plots, it is evident that the AT-MARL method resulted in significantly improved performance than the rule-based approach. The oscillations around the expected value are reduced and the convergence is faster. The IAE values obtained for different approaches for all KPIs are given in Table I. From these values also, it is clear that the AT-MARL results in improved IAE values for every KPI, when compared to the rule-based approach by demonstrating accurate control and faster convergence. In terms of convergence time, we see that AT-MARL achieves convergence at an average of 14-time steps instead of 20-time steps in the rule-based approach (Fig 1b). Hence the proposed approach improves the convergence time by about 30%. Also, AT-MARL outperforms the goal-halving method by 21% as seen in IAE values.




Fig. 6: Performance of the AT-MARL approach on multiple instances of 5 services to demonstrate the scalability

TABLE I: IAE calculated on KPIs across approaches when UE's are distributed uniformly across gNodeB's

Approach \ KPI	QoE (CV)	PL (URLLC)	PL (mIoT)
Rule-based	0.51	0.88	1.87
Goal-Halving	0.42	0.54	0.98
AT-MARL	0.364	0.417	0.575

To demonstrate the **scalability** of the proposed approach we tested the proposed approach with five intents, QoE for CV, PL for two instances of URLLC service, and PL for two instances of mIoT service. The execution performance across KPIs using AT-MARL is shown in Figure 6. From the plot, it can be seen that the proposed approach results in accurate closed-loop control and thus is easily scalable. Hence as intents increase and correspondingly the complexity, the need for human-driven rules can be eliminated using AT-MARL. Although we limited experiments to 5 intents, the proposed approach can be easily scalable to many more number of intents.

B. Gaussian Distribution

To demonstrate the generalization capabilities of AT-MARL, we tested the approach on the network emulator when the UE's are distributed as in Figure 4 (Gaussian distribution).




Fig. 7: Comparison of approaches with Gaussian distributed UE's across KPI's (a) QoE (CV), (b) PL (URLLC), (c) PL (mIoT).




Fig. 8: Performance of updated AT-MARL with supervisor agent retained on Gaussian distribution (Oracle*)




Fig. 9: Performance of the agents with AT-MARL approach under continuous distribution change.

Here the same agents from Sec IV-A are employed without further retraining i.e. the same Priority MARL, MBR MARL agent systems, and even the same M3RL agent. The KPI plot for the QoE, PL (URLLC), and PL (mIoT) are shown in Figures 7a, 7b and 7c respectively. From the plots, it is evident that the AT-MARL achieves far better generalization when compared with the rule-based approach. Also, IAE values obtained for this case across different KPIs are given in Table II. Hence, it can be concluded that the performance of AT-MARL demonstrates adequate generalization capabilities in the face of a changing radio environment.

For purposes of benchmarking the generalization ability of AT-MARL with an upper bound, where we *re-trained* the

TABLE II: IAE calculated on KPIs compared across approaches when UE's spread in Gaussian distribution across gNodeBs. The first three options are test-time metrics for generalization

Approach \ KPI	QoE (CV)	PL (URLLC)	PL (mIoT)
Rule-based	0.64	2.31	4.74
Goal-Halving	0.62	0.66	1.02
AT-MARL	0.421	0.397	0.614
AT-MARL (with updated supervisor) ORACLE*	0.341	0.287	0.511

supervisor agent on Gaussian distribution by keeping priority and MBR MARL agents fixed. The execution performance of this approach is shown in Figure 8 and the IAE values obtained are shown in Table II. Here it could be seen that AT-MARL's performance is closer to the best possible upper-bound case. Hence it can be concluded that the proposed method, AT-MARL, can generalize across radio environments without the need for retraining supervisor or lower-level MARL agents.

C. Real-time execution of the proposed approach

In the above two sub-sections, we have presented the results when the distribution of UE's across gNodeBs is either uniform or Gaussian. However, in a real-time scenario, the distribution change is continuous i.e. during the middle of one execution the distribution changes. To emulate the same, we performed the following experiment.

We initially trained the agents on uniform distribution. The KPI-level execution plot for this case is shown in Figure 9. In the middle of the execution, at 20th time step, we changed the distribution to Gaussian (Figure 4). Now, because of this, we can see a small dip in KPIs. However, the supervisor agent redefined sub-goals such that performance is quickly restored. Further at the 30th time step, we change the distribution to Gamma (Figure 4). Here also it is evident that there is a very small dip in performance but the KPIs are promptly brought back to their respective targets as the supervisor agent realizes the same and reassigns the goals.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we introduce a method AT-MARL whereby multiple intents in a network can be fulfilled by autonomous orchestration of an AI-based Controller. The controller or supervisor learns to control more than one pre-trained group of RL agents that have not seen each other before and neither is allowed to communicate directly between groups. Results demonstrate that creating dynamic **“Goals are Enough”** to achieve such a complex control as it incentivizes sets of pre-trained MARL agents to act in cohesion. The proposed method leverages AHT techniques on top of MARL framework. The synergy induced by our method across both the AHT and MARL agents is unique to our work. The results demonstrate significantly improved convergence and also the scalability of the approach when compared with existing approaches. Most importantly the findings demonstrate the capability of the proposed approach to generalize to changes in the radio environment. Hence such a framework can be adequately leveraged for constructing a self-contained hierarchical IMF, which in turn will autonomously orchestrate multiple intents in the network.

Future work may look into the explainability of the AI controller such that the system becomes interpretable to a human expert and thereby more trustworthy for live deployments.

REFERENCES

- [1] Khizar Abbas, Talha Ahmed Khan, Muhammad Afaq, and Wang-Cheol Song. Network slice lifecycle management for 5g mobile networks: An intent-based networking approach. *IEEE Access*, 9:80128–80146, 2021.
- [2] Fred Aklamanu, Sabine Randriamasy, Eric Renault, Imran Latif, and Abdelkrim Hebbar. Intent-based real-time 5g cloud service provisioning. In *2018 IEEE Globecom Workshops (GC Wkshps)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2018.
- [3] Stefano V. Albrecht and Subramanian Ramamoorthy. Comparative evaluation of mal algorithms in a diverse set of ad hoc team problems. In *AAMAS '12*, 2012.
- [4] Stefano V. Albrecht and Subramanian Ramamoorthy. A game-theoretic model and best-response learning method for ad hoc coordination in multiagent systems. In *Proceedings of the 2013 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems, AAMAS '13*, pages 1155–1156. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2013.
- [5] Chris Baker, Rebecca Saxe, and Joshua Tenenbaum. Action understanding as inverse planning. *Cognition*, 113:329–349, 12 2009.
- [6] Samuel Barrett, Avi Rosenfeld, Sarit Kraus, and Peter Stone. Making friends on the fly: Cooperating with new teammates. *Artificial Intelligence*, 242:132–171, 2017.
- [7] Samuel Barrett and Peter Stone. Cooperating with unknown teammates in robot soccer. In *AAAI Workshop on Multiagent Interaction without Prior Coordination*, page 6, 2014.
- [8] Samuel Barrett, Peter Stone, and Sarit Kraus. Empirical evaluation of ad hoc teamwork in the pursuit domain. In *AAMAS '11*, volume 2, pages 567–574, 2011.
- [9] Michael Bowling and Peter Mccracken. Coordination and adaptation in impromptu teams. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2005.
- [10] Rodrigo Canaan, Xianbo Gao, Julian Togelius, Andy Nealen, and Stefan Menzel. Generating and adapting to diverse ad-hoc cooperation agents in hanabi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.13710*, 2020.
- [11] Subhro Chakraborty and Peter Stone. Cooperating with a markovian ad hoc teammate. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, volume 1 of *AAMAS '13*, pages 1085–1092. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2013.
- [12] Kyunghyun Cho, Bart Van Merriënboer, Dzmitry Bahdanau, and Yoshua Bengio. On the properties of neural machine translation: Encoder-decoder approaches. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1259*, 2014.
- [13] Kaushik Dey, Satheesh K. Perepu, Pallab Dasgupta, and Abir Das. Domain adaptation of reinforcement learning agents based on network service proximity. In *2023 IEEE 9th International Conference on Network Softwarization (NetSoft)*, pages 152–160, 2023.
- [14] ETSI GS ZSM 009-1. Zero-touch network and service management (zsm): Closed-loop automation; enablers group specification.
- [15] Max Jaderberg, Volodymyr Mnih, Wojciech Marian Czarnecki, Tom Schaul, Joel Z Leibo, David Silver, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. Reinforcement learning with unsupervised auxiliary tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.05397*, 2016.
- [16] Tejas D Kulkarni, Ardavan Saeedi, Simanta Gautam, and Samuel J Gershman. Deep successor reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.02396*, 2016.
- [17] Andrei Lupu, Brandon Cui, Hengyuan Hu, and Jakob Foerster. Trajectory diversity for zero-shot coordination. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7204–7213, 2021.
- [18] Jean P. Martins, Igor Almeida, Ricardo Souza, and Silvia Lins. Policy distillation for real-time inference in fronthaul congestion control. *IEEE Access*, 9:154471–154483, 2021.
- [19] Jorg Niemoller, Leo Mokrushin, Swarup Mohalik, Vlachou Konchylaki, and Sarmonikas. Cognitive processes for adaptive intent-based networking. Technical report, Ericsson Technology Review, Kista, Sweden, 2020.
- [20] Georgios Papoudakis, Filippos Christianos, and Stefano V. Albrecht. Local information agent modelling in partially-observable environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09447*, 2021.
- [21] Satheesh K. Perepu, Jean P. Martins, Ricardo Souza S, and Kaushik Dey. Intent-based multi-agent reinforcement learning for service assurance in cellular networks. In *GLOBECOM 2022 - 2022 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, pages 2879–2884, 2022.
- [22] Arrasy Rahman, Niklas H’opner, Filippos Christianos, and Stefano V. Albrecht. Towards open ad hoc teamwork using graph-based policy learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139. PMLR, 2021.
- [23] Manish Ravula, Shani Alkoby, and Peter Stone. Ad hoc teamwork with behavior switching agents. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 550–556, 2019.
- [24] Diego Fernando Preciado Rojas and Andreas Mitschele-Thiel. Machine learning-based son function conflict resolution. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC)*, pages 1–6, 2019.
- [25] Michael Rovatsos and Marco Wolf. Towards social complexity reduction in multiagent learning: the adhoc approach. In *Collaborative Learning Agents. Papers from 2002 AAI Spring Symposium on*, number SS-02-02 in *AAAI Technical Report*, pages 90–97. AAAI Press, 2002.
- [26] Tianmin Shu and Yuandong Tian. M³rl: Mind-aware multi-agent management reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [27] Peter Stone, Gal A. Kaminka, Sarit Kraus, and Jeffrey S. Rosenschein. Ad hoc autonomous agent teams: Collaboration without pre-coordination. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI'10*, page 1504–1509. AAAI Press, 2010.
- [28] Richard S Sutton, David McAllester, Satinder Singh, and Yishay Mansour. Policy gradient methods for reinforcement learning with function approximation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 12, 1999.
- [29] Tarik Taleb, Konstantinos Samdanis, Badr Mada, Hannu Flinck, Sunny Dutta, and Dario Sabella. On multi-access edge computing: A survey of the emerging 5g network edge cloud architecture and orchestration. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 19(3):1657–1681, 2017.
- [30] Luis Velasco, Marco Signorelli, Oscar González De Dios, Chrysa Papagianni, Roberto Bifulco, Juan Jose Vegas Olmos, Simon Pryor, Gino Carrozzo, Julius Schulz-Zander, Mehdi Bennis, et al. End-to-end intent-based networking. *IEEE communications Magazine*, 59(10):106–112, 2021.
- [31] Engin Zeydan and Yekta Turk. Recent advances in intent-based networking: A survey. In *2020 IEEE 91st Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2020-Spring)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2020.