

The core of an approval-based PB instance can be empty for nearly all cost-based satisfaction functions and for the share

Jan Maly

DBAI, Institute of Logic and Computation, TU Wien, Vienna, Austria

November 13, 2023

Abstract

The core is a strong fairness notion in multiwinner voting and participatory budgeting (PB). It is known that the core can be empty if we consider cardinal utilities, but it is not known whether it is always satisfiable with approval-ballots. In this short note, I show that in approval-based PB the core can be empty for nearly all satisfaction functions that are based on the cost of a project. In particular, I show that the core can be empty for the cost satisfaction function, satisfaction functions based on diminishing marginal returns and the share. However, it remains open whether the core can be empty for the cardinality satisfaction function.

1 Introduction

Proportionality or fairness in (approval-based) multiwinner voting ([Lackner and Skowron, 2023](#)) and participatory budgeting (PB) ([Rey and Maly, 2023](#)) has been one of the most active research areas in (Computational) Social Choice in recent years. In this time, many different fairness notions have been introduced, some which can be satisfied, like EJR ([Aziz et al., 2017](#)), and some which are known to not always be satisfiable, like laminar proportionality ([Peters and Skowron, 2020](#)). There is, however, one important proportionality axiom for which it is unknown whether it is satisfiable or not, the core.

The core was introduced in multiwinner voting by [Aziz et al. \(2017\)](#). Intuitively, we say that a committee is in the core if no group of voters N can improve their outcome by ‘leaving’ the election with their share of the seats or budget. The question whether there always exists a committee that is in the core is considered one of the central open questions of the multiwinner voting literature ([Lackner and Skowron, 2023](#)).

In recent years, there has been a strong push to extend the theory of proportionality from multiwinner voting to PB (see the recent survey by [Rey and Maly \(2023\)](#) for a detailed account). PB is a generalization of multiwinner voting in which the candidates, usually called projects in PB, can have different weights. The core for PB was first introduced by [Fain et al. \(2016\)](#) for divisible projects. The definition for indivisible projects, which we are concerned with in this note, was introduced by [Fain et al. \(2018\)](#), who also showed that the core can be empty when voters are allowed to submit cardinal ballots. [Peters et al. \(2021\)](#) improved this result, by showing that it even holds for the unit-cost case. However, both counter-examples rely on voters having preferences that constitute a type of Condorcet cycle, which cannot occur if voters only submit approval ballots. Consequently, the question whether the core is always non-empty has remained open for approval-based PB.

In this note, I answer the question negatively for a large class of natural approval-based satisfaction functions. Approval-based satisfaction functions are, essentially, different ways of interpreting approval preferences in PB. In the past, a hand full of different satisfaction functions have been considered in the literature, with the cost satisfaction function and the cardinality satisfaction function being the two most prominent one (see again the survey by

Rey and Maly (2023) for a full list of which papers use which satisfaction function). Recently Brill et al. (2023) introduced a general framework for reasoning about different satisfaction functions in PB, which I will follow here. Using this framework, I will show that the core can be empty for a large and natural class of satisfaction functions. Crucially, this class contains the cost satisfaction function, which is the de-facto standard in real world applications, in particular in elections where proportional voting rules are used. However, it does not include the cardinality satisfaction function.

This note is organized as follows: First I will introduce the setting of approval-based PB and define the core. Then, I will show that the core can be empty for the cost satisfaction function. This will both serve as an illustration of the proof idea and also give a concrete example for the most important satisfaction function. Afterwards, I present a general result that covers essentially all natural satisfaction functions for which the satisfaction grows with the cost of a project. Finally, I show that the presented proof also works for a satisfaction function called the share, which is not covered by the general result.

2 Preliminaries

Let us first introduce the formal framework for approval-based PB. For this, we follow the survey of Rey and Maly (2023).

A PB instance is a tuple of three elements $I = \langle \mathcal{P}, c, b \rangle$ called an *instance* where $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ is the *set of projects*; $c : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is the *cost function*, associating every project $p \in \mathcal{P}$ with its cost $c(p) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$; and $b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is the *budget limit*. We assume that all projects are feasible $p \in \mathcal{P}$, i.e., that $c(p)$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$. For any subset of projects $P \subseteq \mathcal{P}$, we denote by $c(P)$ its total cost $\sum_{p \in P} c(p)$. An instance $I = \langle \mathcal{P}, c, b \rangle$ is said to have *unit costs* if for every project $p \in \mathcal{P}$, we have $c(p) = 1$ and $b \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. These instances are especially interesting because they correspond to multi-winner elections (Lackner and Skowron, 2023).

Let $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ be the *set of voters* involved in the PB process. When facing an instance $I = \langle \mathcal{P}, c, b \rangle$, they are asked to submit their preferences over the projects in \mathcal{P} . In this note we assume that they are using approval ballots. For agent $i \in \mathcal{N}$, their approval ballot $A_i \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ is a subset of \mathcal{P} , where $p \in A_i$ indicates that agent i approves of project p .

The outcome of a PB instance $I = \langle \mathcal{P}, c, b \rangle$ is a *budget allocation* $\pi \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ such that $c(\pi) \leq b$. We will denote by $\text{FEAS}(I)$ the set of all *feasible* budget allocations for instance I , defined as $\text{FEAS}(I) = \{\pi \subseteq \mathcal{P} \mid c(\pi) \leq b\}$. A budget allocation $\pi \in \text{FEAS}(I)$ is *exhaustive* if there is no $p \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \pi$ such that $c(\pi \cup \{p\}) \leq b$.

When it comes to approval ballots, there is no obvious way to define a measure of the satisfaction of a voter. Brill et al. (2023) introduced the concept of *approval-based satisfaction functions*, which are functions translating a budget allocation into a satisfaction level for the agents, given their approval ballots. Let us provide their definition.

Definition 1 (Approval-Based Satisfaction Functions). *Given an instance $I = \langle \mathcal{P}, c, b \rangle$ and a profile \mathbf{A} , an (approval-based) satisfaction function is a mapping $\text{sat} : 2^{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfying the following two conditions:*

- ▶ $\text{sat}(P) \geq \text{sat}(P')$ for all $P, P' \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ such that $P \supseteq P'$: the satisfaction is inclusion-monotonic;
- ▶ $\text{sat}(P) = 0$ if and only if $P = \emptyset$: the satisfaction is zero only for the empty set.

The satisfaction of agent $i \in \mathcal{N}$ for a budget allocation $\pi \in \text{FEAS}(I)$ is defined as:

$$\text{sat}_i(\pi) = \text{sat}(\{p \in \pi \mid A_i(p) = 1\}).$$

Note that in contrast to the case of cardinal ballots, satisfaction functions are not generally assumed to be additive.

Several satisfaction functions have been introduced in the literature, we define them below.

- **Cardinality Satisfaction Function** (Talmon and Faliszewski, 2019): measures the satisfaction of the voters as the number of selected and approved projects:

$$sat^{card}(P) = |P|.$$

- **Cost Satisfaction Function** (Talmon and Faliszewski, 2019): measures the satisfaction of the voters as the cost of the selected and approved projects:

$$sat^{cost}(P) = c(P).$$

Note that with indivisible projects, this is equivalent to the *overlap satisfaction function* of Goel et al. (2019).

- **Chamberlin-Courant Satisfaction Function** (Talmon and Faliszewski, 2019): measures the satisfaction of the voters as being 1 if at least one approved project was selected, and 0 otherwise:

$$sat^{CC}(P) = \mathbb{1}_{P \neq \emptyset}.$$

- **Share** (Lackner et al., 2021): measures the resources the decision maker used to satisfy the voters:

$$sat^{share}(P) = \sum_{p \in P} \frac{c(p)}{|\{i \in \mathcal{N} \mid A_i(p) = 1\}|}.$$

It is important to keep in mind that the share has not been introduced as a satisfaction function but can still be interpreted as one (while being cautious as to how to use it).

- **Square Root and Log Satisfaction Functions** (Brill et al., 2023): measures the satisfaction of the voters as (marginally) diminishing when the cost of a project increases:

$$sat^{\Sigma \ln}(P) = \sum_{p \in P} \ln(1 + c(p)) \quad sat^{\Sigma \sqrt{\cdot}}(P) = \sum_{p \in P} \sqrt{c(p)}.$$

Note that we could also consider satisfaction functions that implement global marginal diminishing satisfaction:

$$sat^{\ln}(P) = \ln(1 + c(P)) \quad sat^{\sqrt{\cdot}}(P) = \sqrt{c(P)}.$$

To finish our preliminaries, let us introduce the core. Observe that it is always defined with respect to a specific satisfaction function sat .

Definition 2 (The Core of PB with Approval Ballots). *Given an instance $I = \langle \mathcal{P}, c, b \rangle$, a profile \mathbf{A} of approval ballots and a satisfaction function sat , a budget allocation $\pi \in FEAS(I)$ is in the core[sat] of I for sat if there is no group of voters $N \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ and subset of projects $P \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ such that $|N|/n \geq c(P)/b$ and for all voter $i^* \in N$ we have:*

$$sat_{i^*}(\pi) < sat_{i^*}(P).$$

If such a group of voters N and set of projects P does exist, we say that the voters in N can deviate to P .

3 Cost-satisfaction function

First, let us show that the core can be empty for the cost satisfaction function.

Theorem 1. *There are PB instances for which the core[sat^{cost}] is empty.*

Proof. Consider the following PB-instance with three voters 1, 2 and 3, nine projects in three groups, the joint projects p_{12} , p_{13} and p_{23} , the large personal projects ℓ_1 , ℓ_2 and ℓ_3 and the small personal projects s_1 , s_2 and s_3 . The approvals are as follows: Voter 1 approves p_{12} , p_{13} , ℓ_1 and s_1 , voter 2 approves p_{12} , p_{23} , ℓ_2 and s_2 and voter 3 approves p_{13} , p_{23} , ℓ_3 and s_3 . In other words, each voter approves all projects that have their name in the subscript.

The costs of the projects are as follows: $c(p_{12}) = c(p_{23}) = c(p_{13}) = 8$ while $c(\ell_i) = 5$ and $c(s_i) = 2$, for all $i \in 1, 2, 3$. For the budget, we have $b = 15$.

We claim that no feasible allocation π can be in the core. First assume π does not contain any of the projects p_{12}, p_{13}, p_{23} . Then for all voters i , we have $\text{sat}_i^{\text{cost}}(\pi) \leq 5 + 2 = 7$. However, any set of two voters, say w.l.o.g. 1 and 2, deserves $2/3b = 10$, hence they can deviate to $\pi^* = \{p_{12}\}$. Then $\text{sat}_1^{\text{cost}}(\pi^*) = 8 > 7 = \text{sat}_1^{\text{cost}}(\pi)$ and the same for 2.

It follows that π contains at least one of the projects p_{12}, p_{13}, p_{23} . Due to the symmetry of the instance, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $p_{12} \in \pi$. Observe that $b = 15 < 16 = c(p_{12}) + c(p_{13}) = c(p_{12}) + c(p_{23})$. Hence p_{13} and p_{23} cannot be in π . Next, assume that π does not contain ℓ_3 . Then, as π does not contain ℓ_3, p_{13} and p_{23} , we know that $\text{sat}_3^{\text{cost}}(\pi) \leq 2$. However, $1/3b = 5$. Therefore, 3 can deviate to $\pi^* = \{\ell_3\}$, for which we have $\text{sat}_3^{\text{cost}}(\pi^*) = 5$.

It follows that we must have $p_{12} \in \pi$ and $\ell_3 \in \pi$. As $b - c(p_{12}) - c(\ell_3) = 15 - 8 - 5 = 2$, we can now only fit one more project from s_1, s_2, s_3 . This means that either s_1 or s_2 is not in π . Again w.l.o.g. assume s_1 is not in π . It follows that $\text{sat}_1^{\text{cost}}(\pi) = 8$ and $\text{sat}_3^{\text{cost}}(\pi) \leq 7$. However, as before, 1 and 3 together deserve $2/3b = 10$ units of money. This means they can deviate to $\pi^* = \{p_{13}, s_1\}$. Then $\text{sat}_1^{\text{cost}}(\pi^*) = 8 + 2 > \text{sat}_1^{\text{cost}}(\pi)$ and $\text{sat}_3^{\text{cost}}(\pi^*) = 8 > \text{sat}_3^{\text{cost}}(\pi)$. A contradiction. \square

4 A generalization to large class of satisfaction functions

Let us now provide a more general result. For the proof to work, we need some constraints on the satisfaction function.

Theorem 2. *Let sat be a satisfaction function such that*

1. $P \subsetneq P'$ implies $\text{sat}(P) < \text{sat}(P')$,
2. $c(p) < c(q)$ implies $\text{sat}(p) < \text{sat}(q)$ for all $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$

and such that there exist b and ϵ for which

3. $2b/3 - \epsilon > b/2$,
4. For any projects with $c(p_\epsilon) = \epsilon$, $c(p_{b/3}) = b/3$ and $c(p_{2b/3-\epsilon}) = 2b/3 - \epsilon$ we have

$$\text{sat}(\{p_{b/3}, p_\epsilon\}) < \text{sat}(p_{2b/3-\epsilon})$$

Then, there are PB instances for which the core $[\text{sat}]$ is empty.

Conditions 1 and 2 are very natural monotonicity conditions. Condition 1, which is a basic strict monotonicity notion, is satisfied by basically any satisfaction function that is not based on some type of minmax procedure like the Chamberlin-Courant satisfaction function. Condition 2 ensures that more expensive projects provide higher satisfaction. This is a more demanding property and is, for example, not satisfied by the cardinality satisfaction function or the share. In the next section, we will see that the proof idea shown in this note also works for the share. Unfortunately, this does not seem to be the case for the cardinality satisfaction function.

Condition 3 and 4 are more technical. Condition 3 is there to ensure that ϵ is small enough in relation to b and could be rewritten as $\epsilon < b/6$. However, the formulation above will be more useful in the proof. Condition 4 is not a very natural requirement, but, if b is large enough and ϵ is small enough, it should hold for essentially any natural satisfaction function that satisfies Condition 2. Consider, for example, $b = 9999$ and $\epsilon = 0.5$. Then $\text{sat}^{\sum \ln}$ satisfies Condition 4, as $\ln(1 + 3333) + \ln(1 + 0.5) \approx 8.5$, while $\ln(1 + 6666 - 1) \approx 8.8$. It is straightforward to check that the same b and ϵ also work for $\text{sat}^{\sum \sqrt{\cdot}}$, sat^{\ln} , $\text{sat}^{\sqrt{\cdot}}$.

Proof. We again consider a PB-instance with three voters 1, 2 and 3, and nine projects in the same three groups, p_{12}, p_{13} and p_{23} ; ℓ_1, ℓ_2 and ℓ_3 ; s_1, s_2 and s_3 . The approvals are as before: Voter 1 approves p_{12}, p_{13}, ℓ_1 , and s_1 , 2 approves p_{12}, p_{23}, ℓ_2 and s_2 , 3 approves p_{13}, p_{23}, ℓ_3 and s_3 . In other words, each voter approves all projects that have their name in the subscript.

In contrast to the first proof, the costs of the projects are, however, changed: $c(p_{12}) = c(p_{23}) = c(p_{13}) = 2b/3 - \epsilon$ while $c(\ell_i) = b/3$ and $c(s_i) = \epsilon$, for all $i \in 1, 2, 3$. For the budget, we have b . Now, we claim that basically the same argumentation as in the proof of Theorem 1 still works. Let us go through the steps one by one.

We claim that no feasible allocation π can be in the core. Let us assume for the sake of a contradiction that π is in the core. First assume additionally that π does not contain any of the projects p_{12}, p_{13}, p_{23} . Then for all voters i , we have $A_i \cap \pi \subseteq \{\ell_i, s_i\}$. However, any set of two voters, say w.l.o.g. 1 and 2, deserves $2/3b$, hence they can deviate to $\pi^* = \{p_{12}\}$. However, then $\text{sat}_1(\pi^*) = \text{sat}(p_{12})$, while, by Condition 1, $\text{sat}_1(\pi) \leq \text{sat}(\{\ell_1, s_1\})$, which implies by Condition 4 that $\text{sat}_1(\pi^*) > \text{sat}_1(\pi)$. The same holds for 2. This contradicts the assumption that π is in the core.

It follows that π contains at least one of the projects p_{12}, p_{13}, p_{23} . Due to the symmetry of the instance, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $p_{12} \in \pi$. Recall that $b < 2c(p_{12})$ by Condition 3. Hence p_{13} and p_{23} cannot be in π . Next, assume that π does not contain ℓ_3 . Then, as π does not contain ℓ_3, p_{13} and p_{23} , we know that $A_3 \cap \pi \subseteq \{s_3\}$. However, 3 deserve $1/3b$ units of money and $c(\ell_3) = b/3$. Therefore, 3 can deviate to $\pi^* = \{\ell_3\}$. Now, as $c(\ell_3) > c(s_3)$, we have $\text{sat}_3(\pi^*) > \text{sat}_3(\{s_3\}) \geq \text{sat}_3(\pi)$ by Condition 2. This again contradicts the assumption that π is in the core.

It follows that we must have $p_{12} \in \pi$ and $\ell_3 \in \pi$. As $b - c(p_{12}) - c(\ell_3) = b - (2/3b - \epsilon) - b/3 = \epsilon$, we can now only fit one more project from s_1, s_2, s_3 . This means that either s_1 or s_2 is not in π . Again w.l.o.g. assume s_1 is not in π . It follows that $A_1 \cup \pi = p_{12}$ and $A_3 \cap \pi \subseteq \{\ell_3, s_3\}$. However, 1 and 3 together deserve $2/3b$ units of money. This means they can deviate to $\pi^* = \{p_{13}, s_1\}$, as $c(\pi^*) = 2/3b$. Then $\text{sat}_1(\pi^*) = \text{sat}(\{p_{13}, s_1\}) > \text{sat}(\{p_{13}\}) = \text{sat}_1(\pi)$ by Condition 1. Moreover, we have $\text{sat}_3(\pi^*) = \text{sat}(p_{13})$ which is by Condition 4 larger than $\text{sat}(\{\ell_3, s_3\}) \geq \text{sat}_3(\pi)$. A contradiction. \square

5 The share

As mentioned above, the share does not satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2. However, the same proof still works with slightly different costs and a slight variation on the argumentation. In the following, we write $\text{share}(\pi)$ instead of $\text{sat}^{\text{share}}(\pi)$ to improve the readability.

Theorem 3. *There are PB instances for which the core[share] is empty.*

Proof. The voters, projects and approvals are the same as in Theorem 1 and 2, i.e., there are three voters 1, 2 and 3, nine projects in three groups, the joint projects p_{12}, p_{13} and p_{23} , the large personal projects ℓ_1, ℓ_2 and ℓ_3 and the small personal projects s_1, s_2 and s_3 . The approvals are as follows: Voter 1 approves p_{12}, p_{13}, ℓ_1 and s_1 , voter 2 approves p_{12}, p_{23}, ℓ_2 and s_2 and voter 3 approves p_{13}, p_{23}, ℓ_3 and s_3 . In other words, each voter approves all projects that have their name in the subscript.

The costs of the projects is slightly different than before: $c(p_{12}) = c(p_{23}) = c(p_{13}) = 11$ while $c(\ell_i) = 3$ and $c(s_i) = 2$, for all $i \in 1, 2, 3$. For the budget, we have $b = 21$.

As before, we claim that no feasible allocation π can be in the core. First assume π does not contain any of the projects p_{12}, p_{13}, p_{23} . Then for all voters i , we have $\text{share}_i(\pi) \leq \text{share}_i(\{\ell_i, s_i\}) = 5$. However, any set of two voters, say w.l.o.g. 1 and 2, deserves $2/3b = 14$, hence they can deviate to $\pi^* = \{p_{12}\}$. Then $\text{share}_1(\pi^*) = 11/2 = 5.5 > 5 = \text{share}_1(\pi)$ and the same for 2.

It follows that π contains at least one of the projects p_{12}, p_{13}, p_{23} . Due to the symmetry of the instance, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $p_{12} \in \pi$. Observe that $b = 21 < 22 = c(p_{12}) + c(p_{13}) = c(p_{12}) + c(p_{23})$. Hence, p_{13} and p_{23} cannot be in π . Next, assume that π contains at most one of ℓ_3 or s_3 . Then, as π also does not contain p_{13} and p_{23} , we know that $\text{share}_3(\pi) \leq \text{share}_3(\ell_3) = 3$. However, $1/3b = 7$. Therefore, 3 can deviate to $\pi^* = \{\ell_3, s_3\}$, for which we have $\text{share}_3(\pi^*) = 5$

It follows that we must have $p_{12} \in \pi$ and both ℓ_3 and s_3 in π . As $b - c(p_{12}) - c(\ell_3) - c(s_3) = 21 - 11 - 3 - 2 = 5$, we can now only fit either ℓ_1 or ℓ_2 in π , but not both. Again w.l.o.g. assume ℓ_1 is not in π . It follows that $\text{share}_1(\pi) \leq \text{share}_1(\{p_{12}, s_1\}) = 7.5$

and $share_3(\pi) \leq share_3(\{\ell_3, s_3\})$. However, as before, 1 and 3 together deserve $2/3b = 14$ units of money. This means they can deviate to $\pi^* = \{p_{13}, \ell_1\}$. Then $share_1(\pi^*) = 8.5 > share_1(\pi)$ and $share_3(\pi^*) = 5.5 > share_3(\pi)$. A contradiction. \square

Acknowledgments

First of all, I would like to thank Adrian Haret, Sophie Klumper, Guido Schäfer and Simon Rey. The work and discussions with them inspired the example underlying this note. Secondly, I would like to thank Julian Chingoma and, again, Simon Rey, who helped me check the correctness of Theorem 1 and Theorem 3. If there are nevertheless any mistakes in these proofs, they are all my fault. Finally, I would like to thank the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), which funded this research under grant number J4581.

References

- Haris Aziz, Markus Brill, Vincent Conitzer, Edith Elkind, Rupert Freeman, and Toby Walsh. 2017. Justified Representation in Approval-Based Committee Voting. *Social Choice and Welfare* 48, 2 (2017), 461–485.
- Markus Brill, Stefan Forster, Martin Lackner, Jan Maly, and Jannik Peters. 2023. Proportionality in Approval-Based Participatory Budgeting. In *Proceedings of the 37th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*.
- Brandon Fain, Ashish Goel, and Kamesh Munagala. 2016. The Core of the Participatory Budgeting Problem. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Workshop on Internet and Network Economics (WINE)*.
- Brandon Fain, Kamesh Munagala, and Nisarg Shah. 2018. Fair Allocation of Indivisible Public Goods. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (ACM-EC)*. 575–592.
- Ashish Goel, Anilesh K. Krishnaswamy, Sukolsak Sakshuwong, and Tanja Aitamurto. 2019. Knapsack Voting for Participatory Budgeting. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation* 7, 2 (2019), 8:1–8:27.
- Martin Lackner, Jan Maly, and Simon Rey. 2021. Fairness in Long-Term Participatory Budgeting. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*.
- Martin Lackner and Piotr Skowron. 2023. *Multi-Winner Voting with Approval Preferences*. Springer-Verlag.
- Dominik Peters, Grzegorz Pierczyński, and Piotr Skowron. 2021. Proportional Participatory Budgeting with Additive Utilities. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Dominik Peters and Piotr Skowron. 2020. Proportionality and the Limits of Welfarism. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (ACM-EC)*.
- Simon Rey and Jan Maly. 2023. The (Computational) Social Choice Take on Indivisible Participatory Budgeting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.00621* (2023).
- Nimrod Talmon and Piotr Faliszewski. 2019. A Framework for Approval-Based Budgeting Methods. In *Proceedings of the 33rd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*.