

TESS: A Multi-intent Parser for Conversational Multi-Agent Systems with Decentralized Natural Language Understanding Models

Burak Aksar^{1*}, Yara Rizk², Tathagata Chakraborti²

¹Boston University, ²IBM Research

¹Contact: baksar@bu.edu

Abstract

Chatbots have become one of the main pathways for the delivery of business automation tools. Multi-agent systems offer a framework for designing chatbots at scale, making it easier to support complex conversations that span across multiple domains as well as enabling developers to maintain and expand their capabilities incrementally over time. However, multi-agent systems complicate the natural language understanding (NLU) of user intents, especially when they rely on decentralized NLU models: some utterances (termed single intent) may invoke a single agent while others (termed multi-intent) may explicitly invoke multiple agents. Without correctly parsing multi-intent inputs, decentralized NLU approaches will not achieve high prediction accuracy. In this paper, we propose an efficient parsing and orchestration pipeline algorithm to service multi-intent utterances from the user in the context of a multi-agent system. Our proposed approach achieved comparable performance to competitive deep learning models on three different datasets while being up to 48 times faster.

1 Introduction

The backbone of any commercial venture or organization is its business process portfolio (Weske et al., 2004). A business process is a set of operations or activities that must be completed in a specific order to achieve a task (Dumas et al., 2013). Robotic process automation (RPA) is a low-cost technique for injecting automation into business operations in the age of digital transformation; RPA bots are ideal for tasks that are mundane, repetitive, and error-prone (Ivančić et al., 2019).

However, most business users who would benefit from RPAs are not technically savvy enough to fully leverage their potential (Jakob and Krcmar,

2018). This lack of accessibility limits a business user’s capacity to monitor and adapt such solutions (Gao et al., 2019). Another limiting factor is that highly-regulated industries still require human-in-the-loop automation due to security and liability issues. As a result, RPA vendors have provided conversational interfaces to their bots to make them more accessible to business users.

A digital assistant can be made up of several conversational software bots that automate specific tasks for a business process. It enables business users and domain experts who lack programming or software development abilities to design and communicate with their business process automation solutions using natural language. Digital assistants provide a natural language interface to invoke and interact with RPA bots (Anagnoste et al., 2021) to lower the barrier to entry for process automation. RPA bots have been integrated with chatbot authoring tools like Dialogflow (Gajra et al., 2020) and in multi-agent conversational systems like Rizk et al. (2020). As noted in the latter, in addition to accessibility, a multi-agent framework makes the system easily extensible for developers.

However, the complexity of semantic parsing and intent detection increases in chatbots implemented as multi-agent systems featuring decentralized natural language understanding (NLU) models. Natural language utterances may range from simple single-intent phrases that map to a single to more complex phrases that map to multiple agents. State-of-the-art semantic parsers, capable of understanding a wide range of complex phrases, generally rely on deep language models that are computationally demanding and not easily customizable to specialized domains (Xuan, 2020; Einolghozati et al., 2018). Businesses that leverage RPAs often do not have the compute power (GPU clusters, etc.) to fine-tune or run deep learning models (Bauer et al., 2020; Schlögl et al., 2019). Furthermore, their specific domains may not have enough train-

* This work was done during Burak’s internship at IBM Research during the summers of 2021 and 2022. The results, the choice of baselines, and the conclusions drawn are representative of that timeline.




Figure 1: Scaling up conversational assistants using a distributed architecture. The user is talking to a singular assistant across multiple domains, and the conversation is handled internally by respective agents.

ing data to fine-tune these models (Al-Shabandar et al., 2019; Rongali et al., 2022).

In this study, we introduce a computationally efficient decentralized semantic parser tailored for multi-intent phrases within multi-agent conversational systems. This parser utilizes a posterior orchestration algorithm coupled with decentralized natural language evaluators to ascertain the most probable parsing. Empirical evidence indicates that our method attains accuracy on par with deep learning algorithms yet requires substantially less computational power.

2 Conversational Systems at Scale

While monolithic dialogue agents can be constructed using a combination of intents and entities, such as in Watson Assistant¹, Dialogflow², and Rasa³, such approaches do not scale (Calhoun, 2018; Lambert, 2018; Messinger, 2019) to conversations of sufficient complexity due to the developer needing to manually specify a complex dialogue tree as an (exponential) combination of those intents and entities. As a monolith, this approach is not only difficult in terms of coverage of all the cases to be covered by the assistant but also almost impossible to maintain and refactor over time once new improvements or additions are needed (McGregor, 2020). As a result, there has been an increasing movement towards more dynamic approaches to the design of conversational agents using task-oriented declarative elements (McGregor, 2020; Xie et al., 2022; Muise et al., 2020).

¹<https://www.ibm.com/products/watson-assistant>

²<https://cloud.google.com/dialogflow/docs/>

³<https://rasa.com/>

2.1 Scaling with an Aggregated Architecture

The power of using dynamic composition solely depends on how reusable the individual elements in the system are. Of late, an architecture that has become increasingly powerful in this context is that of an assistant realized as an aggregate of elements called agents (or skills) (Rizk et al., 2020). These form the units of automation, and the capabilities of the assistant are realized as an aggregate of these individual units. While agents may or may not be conversational, in this paper, we will consider only those directly invoked by natural language utterances (as it relates to the multi-intent parsing task addressed in this work).

Examples of such agents include chit-chat and Q&A, information retrieval, data analytics, and so on. Prime examples of this include the skill catalog of Amazon Alexa⁴ in the space of commercial assistants and similar catalogs for assistants for enterprise applications from Automation Anywhere⁵, UiPath⁶, etc. Such an assistant is conceptualized in Figure 1, where the user is having a multi-domain conversation with the same assistant (internally handled by respective agents).

Using a distributed architecture, it is possible to achieve an exponential scale-up from the complexity of specification to the sophistication of conversational paths supported by the assistant (or, conversely, an exponential reduction of the size of specification for the same complexity of the assistant). Past works have demonstrated this by using automated composition techniques (Sreedharan et al., 2020; Chakraborti et al., 2020a).

Formally, we can describe such an assistant \mathbb{A} as a functional mapping from an event \mathcal{E} (e.g., natural language utterance) and a set of agents Φ to a new event (e.g., a function call or a natural language response to the user). The nature of this mapping describes the properties of the assistant.

$$\mathbb{A} : \mathcal{E} \times \Phi \mapsto \mathcal{E} \quad (1)$$

2.2 The Curse of Scaling

This decentralized approach allows developers to build and maintain their individual agents without having to worry about the rest of the capabilities of the assistant that is going to house them. However, the immediate impact of this setup is that the

⁴<https://developer.amazon.com/alexa/alexa-skills-kit>

⁵<https://botstore.automationanywhere.com>

⁶<https://marketplace.uipath.com/listings>

assistant has lost control and influence over the capabilities of its constituent elements or agents.

2.2.1 Decentralized Knowledge

Since these agents are developed and maintained independently, the assistant by itself can no longer determine which agents can handle a user query. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that it is impossible to predict the correct way to parse a user utterance without knowledge of what each individual agent does. Consider, for example, the following utterance:

S_1 : “Book me a hotel and flight from Boston to New York for this weekend.”

This could be a single-intent utterance if there is an agent in the orchestration that can book both flights and hotels but is a multi-intent utterance if there are agents that deal with flights and hotels separately, in which case, both agents must be executed in response to this request. As a first step, we can delegate that determination to the agents themselves, for them to self-report their relevance to the user query, thereby allowing the assistant to orchestrate among interested agents. Following on from Equation 1, we define an evaluation function \mathbb{E} that provides a probability estimate that an agent is going to be able to handle a given event \mathcal{E} .

$$\mathbb{E} : \mathcal{E} \times \Phi \mapsto [0, 1] \quad (2)$$

Ostensibly, this can be used directly as a signal of whether to invoke an agent or not. For example, an orchestration rule to execute agents that evaluate to a probability above a predefined threshold δ , per turn of user conversation leads to the simplest of aggregated assistants, as described in (Rizk et al., 2020). However, we emphasize once again that agents are sourced and maintained independently, built focusing on their individual tasks. As such, a complex utterance may lower the probability of selection merely due to the fact it is built to receive more focused sentences. That is to say:

$$\mathcal{E}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{E}_2 \not\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}_1, \phi) \leq \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}_2, \phi) \quad (3)$$

In the previous example, let’s say that there are two separate agents ϕ_f and ϕ_h for booking flights and hotels, respectively. Then, it is very much possible that evaluating an agent with the entire sentence is less accurate than evaluating a parsed sub-string tailored to those agents:

S_2 : “Book me a hotel in New York for this weekend.”

S_3 : “Book me a flight from Boston to New York for this weekend.”

such that $\mathbb{E}(S_2, \phi_h) \approx \mathbb{E}(S_3, \phi_f) > \mathbb{E}(S_1, \phi_f) \approx \mathbb{E}(S_1, \phi_h)$. This leads us to an intriguing parsing problem: *how do we split up the user utterance to facilitate the best expectation calculation for agents in an aggregate?*

In recent work (Clarke et al., 2022), researchers have attempted to tackle this issue by computing an utterance-to-agent mapping step upfront and an utterance-to-response mapping after all the agents in an aggregate have responded. While their approach and ours operate within an almost identical set of circumstances, we recognize two critical difficulties in building a one-to-one utterance to response classifier: 1) many agents in the aggregate change the state of the world, and hence we cannot depend on the final response to make a routing decision and 2) as described in (Sreedharan et al., 2020), multiple agents might be combining to service the same utterance, and as discussed in Table 1 this combination can vary based on the constituents of an aggregate for the same exact utterance. Thus, while an utterance-to-agent match can help in guiding our parse as well (in exchange for an explicit broadcast and evaluation step), our primary aim continues to be to find the optimal parse of an utterance with multiple actors in mind.

2.2.2 Decentralized Parsing

While this seems like a straightforward parts-of-speech-based parsing problem, a closer inspection reveals a lurking complication. Let us consider a simple syntactic parser based on a context-free grammar to achieve this parse:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} &\rightarrow \epsilon \\ \mathcal{E} &\rightarrow A \\ A &\rightarrow ABA \\ A &\rightarrow CACS \\ B &\rightarrow \text{then} \mid \text{and} \mid \text{before} \mid \text{after} \\ C &\rightarrow \text{if} \mid \text{when} \mid \epsilon \\ A &\rightarrow \phi \in \Phi \end{aligned}$$

Interestingly, while this grammar can produce the required splits, it cannot make the final production. Due to the decentralized nature of the knowledge of the system, the correct production can only be determined once $\mathbb{E}(A, \phi)$ has been evaluated $\forall A$. Thus, in order to maximize the effectiveness of




Figure 2: The natural language processing pipeline shows the proposed decentralized parsing algorithm.

the distributed architecture to service a wide variety and complexity of user utterances while preserving agent autonomy, we need a parser that (1) can split up the utterance to maximize multi-intent capture and (2) is able to implement a parsing technique where the evaluation of the goodness of possible splits is done external to the parser.

This is the specification of a parser that can service complex utterances in the aggregated assistant setting. Before we describe how we go about implementing this, it is interesting to note that since the optimal parse itself is dependent on the constituents of an aggregate, the classical notion of multi-intent classification in natural language processing is somewhat muddled here with whether one or more agents are involved in servicing it.

	Single-intent	Multi-intent
Single-agent	S_5 : NLQ	–
Multi-agent	S_4 : NLQ \rightarrow Viz	S_6 : NLQ, Viz

Table 1: Types of multi-intent utterances in the context of a multi-agent conversational system.

Multi-Intent Taxonomy The simplest case – single-agent single-intent – is when an utterance invokes a single agent (Table 1). Multi-agent single-intent utterances include one intent grammatically, but under the hood, they execute multiple agents due to the way the agents in the aggregate are constructed. Consider the following user utterance:

S_4 : “Plot the borrowers’ data.”

The visualization agent (VIZ) first needs to fetch the data to plot, so it has to invoke the information retrieval agent (NLQ) in the background. On the other hand, if the query was simply:

S_5 : “List all borrower data.”

then the execution of the NLQ agent suffices by itself. This shows that even with a traditional single-intent sentence (grammatically), in a distributed parsing problem, we end up with multi-agent splits purely based on the members of the

aggregate. In the scope of this work, we focus on multi-agent multi-intent utterances (including the execution of the same agent multiple times), where there are more than two intents explicitly stated in the user utterance – servicing the single-intent multi-agent cases require higher-order reasoning as demonstrated in (Sreedharan et al., 2020) and is not exclusively a parsing task.

A multi-intent multi-agent setup covers a wide class of utterances where multiple agents are explicitly invoked with possible orderings and relations among them. One famous class of such utterances are IFTTT (if-this-then-that) instructions⁷, where each parameter of the instruction is to be routed to a separate agent, e.g., “Send me a message when I get an email” (considering that there are separate messaging and email clients in the assistant). In the running example, this takes the form:

S_6 : “List all borrower data and plot it.”

The response from the assistant here should be to execute both NLQ and VIZ agents, but note how with a naive splitting mechanism, such as the one using the syntactic parser in Section 2.2.2, the system will end up with “plot it” as a sub-string that is no good to any agent.

3 Proposed Framework

This section describes an implementation of an aggregate assistant architecture that can service complex user utterances based on the specification outlined in Section 2.2.2. As stated in section 2.2.1, an evaluation function that calculates an agent’s ability to handle the user’s request is used to solve the distributed knowledge problem. This forms the basis of an evaluate-and-execute pipeline inside our aggregate agent (Figure 2) with a decentralized parser TESS at the heart of it. The flow of control is conceptualized in Algorithm 1.

⁷<https://ifttt.com>




Figure 3: We show here the TESS tree for a simple utterance with one conjunction. Evaluate and parse operations are shown in blue and red, respectively. After the values of the nodes are backed up recursively per Equation 6, the sequence of split-evaluate operations producing the most utility indicates the optimal parse.

3.1 The TESS Parser

The decentralized parser unfolds across three stages in the pipeline. Together, they realize a parse tree, except that the evaluation of the final production rules is done externally.

3.1.1 Generating the Parse Tree

The first step is to generate the TESS tree with all possible parse combinations for the given utterance using specific single-token conjunctions (and, then, after, etc.), double-word conjunctions (first-second, first-after, etc.), punctuation marks (comma, full stop, question mark, exclamation point, etc.), and token-level dependencies (refer to Table 2 for examples of correct multi-intent parses).

Each node $\mathcal{N} = \{\mathcal{E}_i\}$ in the parse tree represents the state of the multi-intent parse and is composed of one or more candidate utterances derived from the user utterance. The root is the user utterance itself. The full parse tree is constructed recursively using the following three operations on a node.

The first one is an *evaluate operation* – the candidate utterances are broadcast to the agents to evaluate their likelihood. The score of each utterance in a node is the highest evaluation score of any agent on that utterance, and the evaluation of that node is the average of those individual evaluations.

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{N}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}|} \sum_{\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{\phi \in \Phi} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}, \phi) \quad (4)$$

Algorithm 1: Flow of control

```

while  $\mathcal{E}$  do
   $\{\mathcal{E}\} \leftarrow \text{Parse}(\mathcal{E})$ 
  Find:  $\mathbb{E} \subseteq \{\mathcal{E}\}$  such that:
  foreach  $\Phi \in \{\Phi\}_i$  do
    if  $\exists \Phi.\text{preview}$  then
       $P(\Phi) \leftarrow \Phi.\text{preview}(\mathcal{E})$ 
      // confidence
       $S(\Phi) \leftarrow \text{Scorer}(P(\Phi))$ 
    else
       $S(\Phi) \leftarrow 0$ 
    end
  end
end

 $\Phi \leftarrow \text{Selector}(\Phi)$ 
 $\langle \Phi \rangle \leftarrow \text{Sequencer}(\Phi)$ 
foreach  $\phi \in \langle \Phi \rangle$  do
  return  $\phi(\mathcal{E})$ 
end
end

Function Scorer( $P(\Phi)$ ):
  return  $P(\Phi)$  // default
return

Function Selector( $\Phi$ ):
  return  $\Phi$  // default
return

Function Sequencer( $\Phi$ ):
  return List( $\Phi$ ) // default
return

```

The second one is the *parse* or *split* operation, which implies that we can continue splitting.

$$\mathbb{P}\mathcal{N} : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}' \quad (5)$$

The last is the *end operation*, which indicates an end to splitting. The score of an end node is 0.

3.1.2 Evaluation Requests

After the parse tree is created, the next stage traverses the tree and sets *broadcast scores* for each node. For example, if a node has two candidate utterances derived from the original utterance (“list available flights” and “show me meal options for my next flight”), then each of them will be sent to an agent for evaluation; and for each utterance, we store the agent with the highest confidence along with its confidence score. We show broadcast scores for each evaluate node in Figure 3.

Parse Type	Utterance	Correct Parse
Single-token conjunctions	Book me a hotel and show me flights to NYC	Book me a hotel + show me flights
Double-word conjunctions	First send an email and then a Slack message.	Send an email + Send a Slack message
Punctuation marks	Book me a flight, find a cab to the airport	book me a flight + find a cab to the airport
Token-level dependencies	Book a hotel and flight to NYC.	Book a hotel to NYC + Book a flight to NYC

Table 2: Illustration of different forms of tokens used for multi-intent parsing.

3.1.3 Min-Max Style Backups

TESS then computes the score of each *evaluate* node as per Equation 4. The average corresponds to an average probability mass, but this scoring mechanism can accommodate other schemes like joint or maximum probability. For example, consider the final evaluate operation in Figure 3: [“list available flights”, “show me meal options for my next flight”]: flight-agent: 0.97; meal-agent: 0.92 ; the average probability mass function gives us a selection score of 0.945, whereas the joint probability function gives us a score of 0.892 (probabilities, i.e., utterance evaluations \mathbb{E} are independent).

At this point, we have a parse tree where each node has a corresponding score. We determine the optimal parsing choice from the root down to the leaves based on a min-max style (Aumann and Maschler, 1972) backup computation to compute the score recursively \mathbb{S} of each node.

$$\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{N}) = \max \mathbb{E} \mathbb{N}(\mathcal{N}), \mathbb{S} \cdot \mathbb{P} \mathbb{N}(\mathcal{N}) \quad (6)$$

3.2 Selection to Execution

As described in Algorithm 1, once the backups are done, we have an optimal parse of the utterance indicating which agents are involved in acting upon which parts of the user input. This induces a selection of agents to sequence and execute. The order of execution is determined by the sequencer stage and can involve additional reasoning, such as using an AI planner in (Sreedharan et al., 2020). Since this paper focuses on the parser, we leave the final stages of the pipeline as default, in Algorithm 1, as per (Rizk et al., 2020).

4 Methodology and Evaluation

The first section details the datasets we use to test our framework and baselines. Following that, we discuss the details of NLU model training (i.e., agents). Then, we explain the implementation details of our framework and baselines. We conclude by presenting classification performance and comparison of TESS with baselines.

4.1 Datasets

To test our approach, we refer to popular public datasets for intent classification, namely:

- Single-intent Airline Travel Information System (ATIS) (Tur et al., 2010) with 5,871 instances;
- Multi-Domain Wizard-of-Oz (MultiWOZ) (Budzianowski et al., 2018; Eric et al., 2019; Zang et al., 2020) with 10,000 instances;
- Multi-intent phrases (MixATIS) (Qin et al., 2020) with 20,000 instances.

Survey Dataset We also collected an internal dataset where we specifically collected multi-intent multi-agent utterances (according to our taxonomy in Table 1) using utterances from ATIS and multiWOZ datasets as references. We asked users to create multi-intent multi-agent utterances considering the given list of agents determined by ATIS and multiWOZ. We collected 60 multi-agent multi-intent utterances for each dataset (for a total of 120 instances) from 6 respondents, each providing between 10 and 20 utterances. Two examples are included below, including the multi-intent phrase and the parsed phrase with the intent:

List all the airports in New York. Also, how long will it take me to fly from Arizona to Albuquerque?

- List all the airports in New York **airport-info**
- Also, how long will it take me to fly from Arizona to Albuquerque? **distance-info**

List the cheapest rental cars in Utah and show me the type of aircrafts that are used by Turkish airlines.

- List the cheapest rental cars in Utah **ground-fare-info**
- Show me the type of aircrafts that are used by Turkish airlines **aircraft-info**

4.2 Simulating a Multi-Agent Assistant

TESS is built for a decentralized architecture, where each agent is specialized to one specific intent and trained using single-intent sentences. We train a set of NLU models to simulate this setup using the open-source RASA framework (Bocklisch et al., 2017). We use pre-trained word embeddings and




Figure 4: An alternative parse tree using AMR for the utterance: *List available flights and show meal options on next flight*. We assume each sub-tree (under the red arrows) contains a meaningful parse and re-construct parses via traversing the nodes.

Dual Intent and Entity Transformer (DIET) classifier (Bunk et al., 2020) to train agents. DIET is a multi-task transformer architecture that simultaneously performs intent classification and entity recognition. It allows plugging pre-trained embeddings such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2018), ConveRT, or GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014). More details about this process are available in Appendix D.

4.3 Baselines

AGIF The first baseline is AGIF, a recent multi-intent detection model that also performs slot filling Qin et al. (2020) – given our multi-intent multi-agent domain, and the outsized importance of slot-filling in conversational agents (Louvan and Magnini, 2020), this makes for an ideal baseline. We use the open-source implementation⁸ of AGIF (with default parameters).

AMR The second baseline is a parser based on Abstract Meaning Representation (AMR) (Banarescu et al., 2013). As a state-of-the-art semantic parser, the AMR baseline gives us an alternative view into the appropriateness or effectiveness of the syntactic parser in TESS for capturing multiple intents in a sentence, which is a common representation in the domain, and it can be used to generate meaningful parses using the semantic in-

formation. AMR converts a natural sentence into a rooted directed acyclic graph to capture semantic meaning; concepts and their relationships are captured by nodes and edges respectively (Banarescu et al., 2013). We use current state-of-the-art AMR implementation⁹ (Zhou et al., 2021) to obtain a parse for each utterance, which is then used to generate the candidate utterances to evaluate.

Figure 4 illustrates the AMR parse tree and tokens we obtain for a specific utterance. After we generate the AMR parse tree, we traverse the tree from the root node in each available direction until each sub-tree (under the red arrows) is completed. Our heuristic approach relies on the idea that each sub-tree represents a meaningful parse. We match tokens with the actual words from the original utterance and re-construct the parsed sentence. For the given example, the generated parses are *list available flights*; *show meal options on next flight*. In some utterances, the heuristic approach struggles to find one-to-one mappings with all the available tokens leading to incomplete parses (e.g., *available flights* instead of *list available flights*).

4.4 Evaluation Metrics

To evaluate the classification performance across single-intent sentences, we report the accuracy as the number of correctly identified intents divided by the total number of sentences. For multi-intent sentences, we evaluate the correctness of the selected *parse* as well as the *intent*. In the rest of the paper, we assume that each agent is responsible for a single intent. In other words, the terms “agent” and “intent” are used interchangeably. We divide this evaluation into four different categories:

1. Correct parse and correct agent (CPCA): the selected parse and agent are correct;
2. Correct parse and wrong agent (CPWA): the selected parse is correct, but the selected agent is wrong due to the NLU model;
3. Wrong parse and correct agent (WPCA): the selected parse is partially correct or incorrect, but the selected agent is correct;
4. Wrong parse and wrong agent (WPWA): the selected parse and agent are incorrect.

In this example: “Give me a list of all airports in Beijing and list the available meals for my next flight”, there are two ground truth parses: (1) “give

⁸<https://github.com/LooperXX/AGIF>

⁹<https://github.com/IBM/transition-amr-parser>

Category	Multi-intent ATIS			Multi-intent MultiWOZ		
	TESS (Average)	TESS (Joint)	AMR Parser	TESS (Average)	TESS (Joint)	AMR Parser
CPCA	0.34	0.33	0.02	0.24	0.23	0.06
CPWA	0.10	0.10	0.01	0.20	0.18	0.03
WPCA	0.26	0.27	0.48	0.18	0.20	0.33
WPWA	0.30	0.30	0.49	0.38	0.39	0.58

Table 3: Multi-intent parsing and intent classification accuracy for the survey dataset. Based on correct agent selection accuracy (CPCA + WPCA), TESS (Average or Joint) reaches 60%, whereas the AMR parser reaches 0.50%. For the MultiWOZ dataset, TESS (Joint) achieves 43% whereas the AMR parser achieves 39%.

me a list of all airports in Beijing”, and (2) “list the available meals for my next flight”. For the first parse, we expect the label to be the *airport* intent; if our pipeline selects the same intent, it is labeled as the correct agent. To compare parses, we remove punctuation marks and perform (case-independent) character-by-character comparisons.

4.5 Multi-intent Classification Performance

The performance of TESS on multi-intent utterances is presented in Table 4. We observe that TESS slightly edges out AGIF in the MixATIS dataset. This could be attributed to mixATIS, including phrases that fit well the heuristic rules adopted in TESS. The accuracy is also influenced by the decentralized intent recognition pipeline from (Rizk et al., 2020) that is not present in AGIF’s pipeline.

To further understand TESS’ performance, we deconstruct its parsing and prediction accuracy into four categories (as described in Section 4.4). Table 3 shows that TESS outperforms AMR on every dimension except WPCA. Essentially, even though the AMR parser is generating incorrect parses, the intent recognition component can still correctly identify the users’ intents and select the correct agents. We suspect that this has to do with the parsing algorithm creating both fragments of sentences that do not contain enough information to affect intent prediction and those that do contain enough information despite being incomplete parses. However, ultimately, we care about selecting the right agents irrespective of whether the intermediary representation is accurate (i.e., the parses). Hence, looking at CPCA and WPCA, TESS still outperforms AMR (60% vs. 50% on ATIS and 43% vs. 39% on MultiWoz).

Models	MixATIS
TESS- Joint	0.75
TESS- Average	0.76
AGIF	0.74

Table 4: Multi-intent accuracy for MixATIS.

Interestingly, the performance of parsing based on joint versus average probability is fairly consistent. This can be used as an indicator of how stable the confidences (determined independently by agents) are – i.e., if there are over-eager agents in an uncalibrated multi-agent system – by virtue of how geometric and arithmetic means respond differently to outliers (McChesney, 2016).

Finally, let’s consider the computational overhead of adding a parser to the NLU pipeline of chatbots. This is particularly important in applications where computational resources are scarce and conversational systems are not deployed on powerful GPUs for cost reasons. Since TESS does not rely on deep learning approaches (unlike AMR), its parse time is approximately one-tenth of a second, almost 400 times faster than AMR when running on a CPU¹⁰, as shown in Table 6. It achieves this without sacrificing prediction accuracy.

Models	MultiWoz	ATIS
TESS- Joint	0.87	0.99
TESS- Average	0.87	0.99
AGIF	N/A	0.97
AMR Parser	0.76	0.91

Table 5: Single intent classification accuracy of TESS and baselines

Table 5 shows that TESS also outperforms the remaining parsers on single-intent phrases. ATIS contained simpler phrases that didn’t confuse the parsers (resulting in a high accuracy). In contrast, MultiWoz contained more complex phrases like the example above that resulted in a lower accuracy for TESS compared to the ATIS dataset. Furthermore, errors in the parsing logic of AMR and AGIF caused them to parse some of the single-intent phrases incorrectly, which affected the performance of the downstream task of intent recognition.

Finally, based on Table 3, TESS does not signifi-

¹⁰We use 2.3 GHz 8-Core Intel Core i9 CPU with 64 GB 2667 MHz DDR4 memory in all experiments.

Model	ATIS		MultiWOZ	
	Single-intent	Multi-intent	Single-intent	Multi-intent
TESS	0.06	0.12	0.07	0.1
AMR Parser	2.86	4.34	2.80	4.81

Table 6: Average parse time (second) for single-intent and multi-intent sentences in ATIS and MultiWoz datasets.

cantly slow down the response time of the pipeline compared to AMR (especially when GPUs are not available), which is an important consideration for chatbots where responsiveness is crucial.

4.6 Single-intent Classification Performance

Since conversational systems will encounter both multi-intent and single-intent inputs, we evaluate the performance of TESS and the other parsers on single-intent phrases. The diversity of natural language phrases may cause parsers to mistake single-intent phrases for multi-intent and parse them accordingly. For example, “list all borrowers by zip code and yearly income” is a single-intent phrase despite including the conjunction “and”. Since these parsers may err, we want to ensure that adding parsers to the NLU pipeline does not deteriorate single-intent recognition performance.

5 Related Work

Conversational systems require two main functions to operate: NLU and dialog management. The NLU component understands the user’s objective described in natural language by parsing the input (semantically and syntactically), detecting its intent, and identifying entities. This component and its sub-tasks of parsing and intent/entity recognition have seen various approaches over the past few decades, ranging in complexity and efficacy.

Single-intent classification models have included support vector machines (Haffner et al., 2003), recurrent neural networks (Sarikaya et al., 2011), and a capsule-based neural network with self-attention (Xia et al., 2018). Some models have been jointly trained on the parsing and intent/entity recognition tasks to leverage the correlation between slots and intents (Goo et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2019; Qin, Libo and Che, Wanxiang and Li, Yangming and Wen, Haoyang and Liu, Ting, 2019). However, even these models mainly focus on single-intent phrases.

Multi-intent detection has also been investigated. Perhaps the closest to our work is Kim et al. (2017), where they proposed a two-stage framework based on a heuristic parser and a classifier. The first

stage uses pre-defined conjunctions to parse the sentences and decides whether the sentence is multi-intent based on a heuristic selection algorithm. The second stage was composed of a linear-chain conditional random field trained on multi-intent sentences generated from single-intent sentences. This stage is executed if the first stage cannot detect multiple intents. However, this framework assumed a centralized NLU engine, and their heuristic selection algorithm was unsuitable for our setting with multiple independent agents in the ecosystem.

Other existing works mainly leveraged an end-to-end deep learning model; Xu and Sarikaya (2013) proposed adding features shared by a set of intent combinations and segmenting sentences into word sequences that belong to each single intent. They used log-linear models to perform single-intent and multi-intent detection with their proposed approaches. Gangadharaiyah and Narayanaswamy (2019) proposed a model composed of LSTMs and performed joint multi-intent classification at sentence-level and token-level. To the best of our knowledge, the state-of-the-art was called Adaptive Graph Interactive Framework (AGIF) with an adaptive intent-slot graph interaction layer (Qin et al., 2020). This layer was composed of each token’s hidden state generated by a slot-filling decoder and embeddings of predicted multi-intent phrases. Even though end-to-end deep learning frameworks show highly promising results, they are not suitable for decentralized environments, such as in this work, which consists of multiple agents with their own NLU models. Additionally, they consume significantly more computational resources than the token-based syntactic parser proposed here.

6 Conclusion

Our new parsing algorithm for scalable, decentralized NLU-based conversational systems matches the performance of deep learning parsers on multi-intent phrases but uses far fewer resources. It shows the potential for efficient non-deep learning solutions without losing accuracy. Future efforts will aim to extend the parser’s capabilities to a wider range of multi-intent phrases.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to acknowledge the influence of multiple collaborators throughout the various phases of this project that culminated in this paper. Specifically, authors thank Kartik Talamadupula for reviewing the manuscript, Yasaman Khazaeni for her help in developing the problem statement, and the IBM Watson Orchestrate teams who helped mature some of the thoughts around the problem statement through discussions and interactions.

References

- Raghad Al-Shabandar, Gaye Lightbody, Fiona Browne, Jun Liu, Haiying Wang, and Huiru Zheng. 2019. The Application of Artificial Intelligence in Financial Compliance Management. In *Artificial Intelligence and Advanced Manufacturing*.
- Sorin Anagnoste, Isabelle Biclesanu, Fabrizio D'Ascenzo, and Marco Savastano. 2021. The Role of Chatbots in End-To-End Intelligent Automation and Future Employment Dynamics. *Business Revolution in a Digital Era*.
- Robert J Aumann and Michael Maschler. 1972. Some thoughts on the minimax principle. *Management Science*.
- Laura Banarescu, Claire Bonial, Shu Cai, Madalina Georgescu, Kira Griffitt, Ulf Hermjakob, Kevin Knight, Philipp Koehn, Martha Palmer, and Nathan Schneider. 2013. Abstract Meaning Representation for Sembanking. In *Linguistic Annotation Workshop and Interoperability with Discourse*.
- Markus Bauer, Clemens van Dinther, and Daniel Kiefer. 2020. Machine Learning in SME: An Empirical Study on Enablers and Success Factors. In *AMCIS*.
- Tom Bocklisch, Joey Faulkner, Nick Pawlowski, and Alan Nichol. 2017. Rasa: Open Source Language Understanding and Dialogue Management. *arXiv:1712.05181*.
- Djallel Bouneffouf, Raphael Feraud, Sohini Upadhyay, Mayank Agarwal, Yasaman Khazaeni, and Irina Rish. 2021. Toward Skills Dialog Orchestration with Online Learning. In *ICASSP*.
- Paweł Budzianowski, Tsung-Hsien Wen, Bo-Hsiang Tseng, Inigo Casanueva, Stefan Ultes, Osman Ramadan, and Milica Gašić. 2018. MultiWOZ – A Large-Scale Multi-Domain Wizard-of-Oz Dataset for Task-Oriented Dialogue Modelling. *arXiv:1810.00278*.
- Tanja Bunk, Daksh Varshneya, Vladimir Vlasov, and Alan Nichol. 2020. DIET: Lightweight Language Understanding for Dialogue Systems. *arXiv:2004.09936*.
- Pat Calhoun. 2018. Building a Chatbot is Much Harder Than You Might Think. Espresso.
- Tathagata Chakraborti, Shubham Agarwal, Yasaman Khazaeni, Yara Rizk, and Vatche Isahagian. 2020a. D3BA: A Tool for Optimizing Business Processes Using Non-Deterministic Planning. In *BPM Workshop on AI4BPM*.
- Tathagata Chakraborti, Sarath Sreedharan, and Subbarao Kambhampati. 2020b. The Emerging Landscape of Explainable AI Planning and Decision Making. In *IJCAI*.
- Christopher Clarke, Joseph Joshua Peper, Karthik Krishnamurthy, Walter Talamonti, Kevin Leach, Walter Lasecki, Yiping Kang, Lingjia Tang, and Jason Mars. 2022. One Agent To Rule Them All: Towards Multi-agent Conversational AI. *Findings of ACL*.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. *arXiv:1810.04805*.
- Marlon Dumas, Marcello La Rosa, Jan Mendling, Hajo A Reijers, et al. 2013. *Fundamentals of Business Process Management*. Springer.
- Arash Einolghozati, Panupong Pasupat, Sonal Gupta, Rushin Shah, Mrinal Mohit, Mike Lewis, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. Improving Semantic Parsing for Task Oriented Dialog. *NeurIPS*.
- Mihail Eric, Rahul Goel, Shachi Paul, Abhishek Sethi, Sanchit Agarwal, Shuyag Gao, and Dilek Hakkani-Tur. 2019. MultiWOZ 2.1: Multi-Domain Dialogue State Corrections and State Tracking Baselines. *arXiv:1907.01669*.
- Vrushil Gajra, Khwajaavais Lakdawala, Rahul Bhanushali, and Sunita Patil. 2020. Automating Student Management System Using Chatbot and RPA Technology. In *ICAST*.
- Rashmi Gangadharaiah and Balakrishnan Narayanaswamy. 2019. Joint Multiple Intent Detection and Slot Labeling for Goal-Oriented Dialog. In *NAACL*.
- Junxiong Gao, Sebastiaan J van Zelst, Xixi Lu, and Wil MP van der Aalst. 2019. Automated Robotic Process Automation: A Self-Learning Approach. In *OTM Confederated International Conferences On the Move to Meaningful Internet Systems*.
- Chih-Wen Goo, Guang Gao, Yun-Kai Hsu, Chih-Li Huo, Tsung-Chieh Chen, Keng-Wei Hsu, and Yun-Nung Chen. 2018. Slot-Gated Modeling for Joint Slot Filling and Intent Prediction. In *NAACL*.
- Patrick Haffner, Gokhan Tur, and Jerry H Wright. 2003. Optimizing SVMs for Complex Call Classification. In *ICASSP*.

- Carolin Ischen, Theo Araujo, Hilde Voorveld, Guda van Noort, and Edith Smit. 2019. Privacy Concerns in Chatbot Interactions. In *International Workshop on Chatbot Research and Design*.
- Lucija Ivančić, Dalia Suša Vugec, and Vesna Bosilj Vukšić. 2019. Robotic Process Automation: Systematic Literature Review. In *BPM*.
- Markus Jakob and Helmut Krcmar. 2018. Which barriers hinder a successful digital transformation in small and medium-sized municipalities in a federal system? In *Central and Eastern European eDem and eGov Days*, pages 141–150.
- Byeongchang Kim, Seonghan Ryu, and Gary Geunbae Lee. 2017. Two-Stage Multi-Intent Detection for Spoken Language Understanding. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*.
- Martin Lambert. 2018. Chatbot Decision Trees: Seriously, how hard can they be? Medium.
- Yijin Liu, Fandong Meng, Jinchao Zhang, Jie Zhou, Yufeng Chen, and Jinan Xu. 2019. CM-Net: A Novel Collaborative Memory Network for Spoken Language Understanding. *arXiv:1909.06937*.
- Samuel Louvan and Bernardo Magnini. 2020. Recent neural methods on slot filling and intent classification for task-oriented dialogue systems: A survey. *arXiv:2011.00564*.
- Jasper McChesney. 2016. You should summarize data with the geometric mean. Medium.
- Blake McGregor. 2020. Why is it STILL so hard to build a useful chatbot? Medium.
- Lior Messinger. 2019. How to Build an End-to-End Conversational AI System using Behavior Trees. freeCodeCamp.
- Patrick Meyer. 2021. Ethics And Conversational Assistants. Medium.
- Christian Muise, Tathagata Chakraborti, Shubham Agarwal, Ondrej Bajgar, Arunima Chaudhary, Luis A. Lastras-Montano, Josef Ondrej, Miroslav Vodolan, and Charlie Wiecha. 2020. Planning for Goal-Oriented Dialogue Systems. In *arXiv:1910.08137*.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D Manning. 2014. Glove: Global Vectors for Word Representation. In *EMNLP*.
- Libo Qin, Xiao Xu, Wanxiang Che, and Ting Liu. 2020. AGIF: An Adaptive Graph-Interactive Framework for Joint Multiple Intent Detection and Slot Filling. *arXiv:2004.10087*.
- Qin, Libo and Che, Wanxiang and Li, Yangming and Wen, Haoyang and Liu, Ting. 2019. A Stack-Propagation Framework with Token-Level Intent Detection for Spoken Language Understanding. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*.
- Yara Rizk, Vatche Isahagian, Scott Boag, Yasaman Khazaeni, Merve Unuvar, Vinod Muthusamy, and Rania Khalaf. 2020. A Conversational Digital Assistant for Intelligent Process Automation. In *BPM*.
- Subendhu Rongali, Konstantine Arkoudas, Melanie Rubino, and Wael Hamza. 2022. Training Naturalized Semantic Parsers with Very Little Data. *arXiv:2204.14243*.
- Ruhi Sarikaya, Geoffrey E Hinton, and Bhavana Ramabhadran. 2011. Deep Belief Nets for Natural Language Call-Routing. In *ICASSP*.
- Stephan Schlögl, Claudia Postulka, Reinhard Bernsteiner, and Christian Ploder. 2019. Artificial Intelligence Tool Penetration in Business: Adoption, Challenges and Fears. In *International Conference on Knowledge Management in Organizations*.
- Sarath Sreedharan, Tathagata Chakraborti, Yara Rizk, and Yasaman Khazaeni. 2020. Explainable Composition of Aggregated Assistants. In *ICAPS Workshop on Explainable AI Planning*.
- Gokhan Tur, Dilek Hakkani-Tür, and Larry Heck. 2010. What is left to be understood in ATIS? In *IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop*.
- Mathias Weske, Wil MP Van Der Aalst, and HMW Verbeek. 2004. Advances in business process management. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*.
- Congying Xia, Chenwei Zhang, Xiaohui Yan, Yi Chang, and Philip S Yu. 2018. Zero-Shot User Intent Detection via Capsule Neural Networks. *arXiv:1809.00385*.
- Tian Xie, Xinyi Yang, Donald Rose, and Angela Lin. 2022. Converse Task-Oriented Dialogue System Simplifies Chatbot Building, Handles Complex Tasks. Technical report, Salesforce AI Research.
- Puyang Xu and Ruhi Sarikaya. 2013. Exploiting Shared Information for Multi-Intent Natural Language Sentence Classification. In *Interspeech*.
- Chaoting Xuan. 2020. Improving Sequence-to-Sequence Semantic Parser for Task Oriented Dialog. In *EMNLP Workshop on Interactive and Executable Semantic Parsing*.
- Xiaoxue Zang, Abhinav Rastogi, Srinivas Sunkara, Raghav Gupta, Jianguo Zhang, and Jindong Chen. 2020. MultiWOZ 2.2: A Dialogue Dataset with Additional Annotation Corrections and State Tracking Baselines. In *ACL Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Conversational AI*.
- Jiawei Zhou, Tahira Naseem, Ramón Fernandez Asudillo, Young-Suk Lee, Radu Florian, and Salim Roukos. 2021. Structure-aware Fine-tuning of Sequence-to-sequence Transformers for Transition-based AMR Parsing. *arXiv:2110.15534*.

A Ethics and Impact Statement

While usual ethical concerns about conversational agents apply (Meyer, 2021), an unique concern attached to conversational agents realized as an aggregate of agents is that of privacy and security (Ischen et al., 2019) of user data shared across agents – this is particularly of concern since these agents are sourced from different sources and the assistant by itself may not have full view into the inner workings of the agents.

Additionally, this architectural choice raises issues with the transparency of the behavior of the assistant, since how the aggregate is combining and responding to the user is hidden away from the user. Some previous works like (Sreedharan et al., 2020) have explored how explainable AI planning techniques (Chakraborti et al., 2020b) can be used to surface those internal behaviors to engender trust and transparency, as well as enforce locking mechanisms on how data is sourced and shared internally. But there is much work to be done.

On the flip side, this work can have tremendous impact on how the community adopts computationally expensive neural networks. Our work demonstrates that we can outperform deep networks with more computationally efficient approaches (for the sake of the environment and accessibility for less privileged/resource-rich business like small and medium ones).

B Limitations

The space of natural language phrases is large and diverse. The multi-intent heuristic parser we implement improves the intent recognition of a subset of multi-intent phrases: those that fall within the set of sentences defined by the heuristic rules (e.g., include conjunctions). Furthermore, the accuracy of the intent recognition pipeline depends on the accuracy of the decentralized NLU models (which may produce noisy confidences). The optimal parse from TESS is only as accurate as the confidences. The calibration of confidences coming from independent sources in a multi-agent system presents a different set of challenges e.g. bandit based approaches have tried to attempt it in the past (Bouneffouf et al., 2021).

C Publicly-Available Dataset Details

We test our framework on the following single-intent and multi-intent datasets.

D NLU Training

The NLU models were trained using the pipeline in Figure 5.

D.1 Single-intent

Even though we mainly focus on multi-agent multi-intent utterances, our pipeline supports single-intent utterances as well. The first dataset is Airline Travel Information System (ATIS) (Tur et al., 2010), which has 17 different intents, such as *flight* or *meal*. ATIS dataset is composed of 5871 utterances. The semantic frames used to represent the ATIS utterances have slots for phrases and a goal(s) (also known as intent) for each sentence. The values of the slots are not normalized or interpreted.

The second dataset is the Multi Domain Wizard-of-Oz dataset (MultiWOZ), which is a large-scale multi-turn conversational corpus with dialogues spanning across several domains and topics (Budzianowski et al., 2018; Eric et al., 2019; Zang et al., 2020). In contrast to ATIS dataset, this one includes dialogues from different domains/settings such as *restaurant*, *hotel*, and *taxi* and has about 10,000 dialogues, which is a lot more than any organized corpus that is currently available. This dataset has 13 different act types such as *inform*, *request*, *book*, and *decline*.

D.2 Multi-intent

In addition to collect our own dataset, we also use the MixATIS dataset (Qin et al., 2020). This dataset is composed of multi-intent utterances that are empirically constructed. Authors use some conjunctions (e.g., and, or) and punctuation marks (e.g., comma, semi-colon) to construct the dataset using the intents available in the ATIS dataset. The training set is composed of 18,000 utterances, the validation set is composed of 1,000 utterances and the test set is composed of 1,000 utterances.

MultiWoz		ATIS	
Intent	Number of Samples	Intent	Number of Samples
hotel-find	12244	flight	4298
police-find	154	flight-time	55
hotel-book	2111	airfare	471
train-find	10351	aircraft	90
train-book	2458	ground-service	291
attraction-find	4915	airport	38
restaurant-find	12271	airline	195
restaurant-book	2526	distance	30
hospital-find	263	ground-fare	25
-	-	quantity	54
-	-	flight-number	20
-	-	meal	12

Table 7: We list all intents along with corresponding number of samples for both datasets. We remove some intents from the original datasets to keep the intents same for generating multi-intent multi-agent utterances.




Figure 5: Pipeline to train RASA NLU agents. The utterance is processed through different tokenizers and feature extraction methods. Then, we train the DIET model for intent classification and entity detection.




Figure 6: Confusion matrix for the trained model using RASA framework in the ATIS dataset




Figure 8: Confusion matrix for the trained model using RASA framework in the MultiWoz dataset




Figure 7: Prediction confidences for the samples in the ATIS test dataset




Figure 9: Prediction confidences for the samples in the MultiWoz test dataset

Terminology

	Single Intent	Multi Intent
Single Agent	List all borrowers: {NLQ}	----
Multi Agent	Plot the borrowers <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (<NLQ>,<Viz>) Give me the weather in French <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (<NLQ>,<Translate>)	Plot the data and email it <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (<Viz>,<email>) Submit the travel request to AAAI and approve Yara's ICML one. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (<bpm-submit>,<bpm-approve>)

Figure 10: Terminology we used for the survey

Agents

- a. restaurant-find
- b. restaurant-book
- c. attraction-find
- d. hotel-find
- e. hotel-book
- f. taxi-book
- g. train-find
- h. train-book
- i. bus-find
- j. hospital-find
- k. police-find

Figure 11: MultiWoz dataset agents used in the survey

Examples

Rules & Examples

- + You can only use the agents listed below.
- + Do not invoke the same agent multiple times with different parameters in the same utterance.
- + Agents should be explicitly invoked in the utterance i.e. their evaluators should be able to catch this utterance.

DO's:

- "Can you find an Asian restaurant close to my current location and book me a hotel close to Piazza del Popolo?"
- "List me all trains from Rhode Island to Boston arriving between 18:00 - 20:00 on Tuesday, also, can you list popular attractions near Harvard Square?"
- "List me nearest police stations. Also, I need you to book me a taxi."

DONT's:

- "List me the buses that travel to Rome from Milan" => Invokes only one agent
- "I will stay in a hotel in Cambridge if there is a hotel cheaper than \$100 per night" => Invokes only one agent with a condition

Format

Example

Utterance: "List me all trains from Rhode Island to Boston arriving between 18:00 - 20:00 on Tuesday, also, can you list popular attractions near Harvard Square?"

Agents: <train-find>, <attraction-find>

Tags: (List me all trains from Rhode Island to Boston arriving between 18:00 - 20:00 on Tuesday, <train-find>); (can you list popular attractions near Harvard Square, <attraction-find>)

Figure 12: Data collection rules and format