Exercise 2.23 This exercise goes with the article "Collective intentions" by Dunin-Kęplicz en Verbrugge. Consider the following potential definitions for "collective intention within a group to achieve φ together". Keep in mind that for a collective intention to exist there should be true teamwork, full cooperation.

- 1. E-INT_G(φ)
- 2. E-INT_G(φ) \wedge C-BEL_G(E-INT_G(φ))
- 3. E-INT_G(E-INT_G(φ))
- 4. M-INT_G(φ)
- 5. C-INT_G(φ) (d.w.z. M-INT_G(φ) \wedge C-BEL_G(M-INT_G(φ)))

Compare these definitions by answering the following questions:

- **a** Devise a concrete situation with a group of people and a goal formula φ , where 1 holds, but 2 does not. Why is 1 not sufficient for a collective intention?
- **b** Devise a concrete situation with a group of people and a goal formula φ , where 2 holds, but 3 does not. Why is 2 not sufficient for a collective intention?
- **c** Devise a concrete situation with a group of people and a goal formula φ , where 3 holds, but 4 does not. Why is 3 not sufficient for a collective intention?
- **d** Devise a concrete situation with a group of people and a goal formula φ , where 4 holds, but 5 does not. Why is 4 not sufficient for a collective intention?

Exercise 2.24 Make the task "agentlogica: Rao en Georgeff" from the domain "Multi agent systemen en cognitieve robotica" at the LOKweb. There is a direct link from the MAS website. Use the article by Rao and Georgeff, and possibly also the other sources downloadable from the task website.

Here follow translations for the non-formula parts of the exercise:

- 2 Translate the three formulas under 2 a, b, c into natural language (English without variables); then for each formula, construct a model in which it is satisfied and explain why the model does so.
- **3** Prove or refute the three general properties 3 a, b, c. This may be done semantically. Note that it may make a difference whether you assume that all trees are finite or infinite.