Languages and Systems

for Global Computing

MPRI, 4/1/2006

Concurrency theory

- concurrent programs are always difficult to understand
- concurrency theory (1978 \rightarrow 1992) is an elegant theory, mainly interested by non-distributed systems
- distributed systems are asynchronous (no output guards, no broadcasts)
- routing is important in distributed systems
- failure detection has to be handled

Concurrency, Locality and Mobility

- π -calculus is a calculus for reconfigurable (extendible) communicating systems, named "mobile processes".
- its variants make localization more explicit: distributed Join calculus, distributed π -calculus, π 1-calculus, etc
- the calculus of Mobile Ambients has all its synchronization based on localization.

Goals

- global computing can be used to access and synchronize large data, to access large computing resources, to customize groupware environments.
- global computing \Rightarrow scalability and decentralized systems.
- global computing is a very (too?) ambitious project
- basic theory: concurrent and localized objects, extendible languages and systems, security, etc
- engineering: compiling for several run-times, inter-pointer analysis, distributed garbage collection, etc
- reality and vaporware: Java, .Net, peer-to-peer, etc

Already existing

- agents in AI
- distributed systems
- theory of concurrency: CSP, CCS, π -calculus

From π -calculus to Join calculus (1/3)

Suppose we have:

- one sender on location *s* communicates on channel *x*,
- several receivers on locations *a* and *b* wait for data on channel *x*,

Then which routing strategy?

- sending one of them, but fairness?
- sending both ⇒ distributed consensus between sender *s* and receivers *a* and *b*.
- protocol for atomic broadcast?
- \Rightarrow receivers are uniquely located (per channel name)
- \equiv point-to-point one-way communications from senders to channel managers

2

1

3

From π -calculus to Join calculus (2/3)

Extra problems

- if *x*-channel manager dies, where to send a message for *x* ?
 ⇒ channel managers are always alive ≡ permanent receivers
- in CCS/π-calculus, synchronization acheived by consumption of receivers, E.g. a lock is a channel without receiver during the critical section.
- permanent receivers ⇒ synchronization acheived by waiting for several messages on several channels.

 \Rightarrow receivers are guards joining several messages (as for Petri nets)

The Join-Calculus Language, release 1.05

See [Fournet, Gonthier, Maranget]

ML style (1/2)

let x = 1 ;; Type inference val x: int # let y = x+1 ;;val y: int # do print(x); print(y) Synchronous expr. 12 # let id(x) = reply x ;; Polymorphism val id: $\langle \alpha \rangle \rightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle$ # do print(id(1)); print_string (id("hello")) 1hello # let succ(x) = reply x+1;; val succ: $\langle \text{int} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{int} \rangle$ # let s = id (succ) ;; val s: $\langle \text{int} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{int} \rangle$ # spawn echo(1) Asynchronous expr. # let e = id (echo) val e: $\langle int \rangle$

5

6

From π -calculus to Join calculus (3/3)

Caveat

- remote procedure calls are nearly transparent [B. Nelson]
- RPCs \rightarrow big success for programming
- remote synchronization should also be quasi transparent [Magic Cap]
- \Rightarrow local and remote communication follow the same schemes.

ML style (2/2)

```
# let f(x,y) = reply x+y, x-y ;; Tuples val f: \langle int \times int \rangle \rightarrow \langle int \times int \rangle
```

```
# let fib(n) = Recursive let
    if x <= 1 then { reply 1 }
    else { reply fib (n-1) + fib (n-2)}
val fib: \langle int \rangle \rightarrow \langle int \rangle
```

```
# let twice (f) = High-order
let r(x) = reply f(f(x)) in
reply r
val twice: \langle \langle \alpha \rangle \rightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle \rangle \rightarrow \langle \langle \alpha \rangle \rightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle \rangle
```

7

Concurrency

Locks

let new_lock () =
 let free() | lock() = reply to lock
 and unlock() = free() | reply to unlock in
 free() | reply lock, unlock
val new_lock: ⟨ ⟩ → ⟨⟨ ⟩ → ⟨ ⟩ × ⟨ ⟩ → ⟨ ⟩⟩
spawn ... lock(); ...; unlock(); ...

Barriers

Local definitions

let count(n) | inc() = count(n+1) | reply to inc and count(n) | get() = count(n) | reply n to get val count: $\langle int \rangle$ val inc: $\langle \rangle \rightarrow \langle \rangle$ val get: $\langle \rangle \rightarrow \langle int \rangle$

let new_counter () = Scope extrusion let count(n) | inc() = count(n+1) | reply to inc

apple pie

blueberry pie

blueberry crumble or

apple crumble or ...

and count(n) | get() = count(n) | reply n to get in count (0) | reply inc,get val new_counter: $\langle \rangle \rightarrow \langle \langle \rangle \rightarrow \langle \rangle * \langle \rangle \rightarrow \langle \langle \text{int} \rangle \rangle \rangle$

Full-duplex channels

- # let new_channel () = Asynchronous ch. let send(x) | receive() = reply x to receive in reply send, receive val new_channel: $\langle \rangle \rightarrow \langle \langle \alpha \rangle \times \langle \rangle \rightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle \rangle$

 $\texttt{val new_schannel:} \quad \langle \ \rangle \to \langle \langle \alpha \rangle \to \langle \ \rangle \times \langle \ \rangle \to \langle \alpha \rangle \rangle$

9

11



Distribution and mobility (1/2)

let new cell m (a) = Cell server loc applet with get() | some(x) = none() | reply x to get and put(x) | none() = some(x) | reply to put in init go(a); none() end in reply get, put

do ns.register ("cell_m", new_cell_m)

```
# let new_cell_m = ns.lookup ("cell") Cell client
```

```
# loc user
```

```
init
let read, write = new_cell_m(user) in {
  write ("world");
  write ("hello," ^ read());
  print_string (read());
  print_newline();
}
end
```

a, applet, user are locations. Subjective moves.

```
let log (s) = print_string ("cell" ^ s ^ "\n"); reply to log in
# let new_cell_mlog = ns.lookup ("cell") ;; Cell client
```

The join-calculus			
P,Q	::=		processes
		$x \langle \tilde{v} \rangle$	sending $ ilde{v}$ on x
		${\tt def}D{\tt in}P$	(rec) definition of D in P
		$P \mid Q$	parallel composition
		0	empty process
D, E	::=		definitions
		$J \triangleright P$	elementary clause
		$D \wedge E$	simultaneous definitions
		т	empty definition
J, J'	::=		join-patterns
		$x \langle \tilde{v} \rangle$	receiving \tilde{v} on x
		$J \mid J'$	composed patterns

x, v_1 , v_2 , ... defined and receiving variables

Defined variables are bound in def D in PReceiving variables are bound in $J \triangleright P$

Free and bound variables	Structural equivalence and calculus (2/2)
efined varfree var $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{T}) = \emptyset$ $\mathbf{fv}(0) = \emptyset$ Processes $\mathbf{v}(D \land D') = \mathbf{dv}(D) \cup \mathbf{dv}(D')$ $\mathbf{fv}(P P') = \mathbf{fv}(P) \cup \mathbf{fv}(P')$ $\mathbf{v}(J \triangleright P) = \mathbf{dv}(J)$ $\mathbf{fv}(x\langle v \rangle) = \{x\} \cup \{u \in \tilde{v}\}$ $\mathbf{v}(J J') = \mathbf{dv}(J) \cup \mathbf{dv}(J')$ $\mathbf{fv}(\det D \ in P) = (\mathbf{fv}(P) \cup \mathbf{fv}(D)) - \mathbf{dv}(D)$ $\mathbf{v}(x\langle \tilde{v}\rangle) = \{x\}$ $\mathbf{fv}(a[D:P]) = \{a\} \cup \mathbf{fv}(D) \cup \mathbf{fv}(P)$ $\mathbf{v}(a[D:P]) = \{a\} \uplus \mathbf{dv}(D)$ $\mathbf{fv}(go\langle a, \kappa\rangle) = \{a, \kappa\}$ ecceiving var $\mathbf{v}(J J')$ $\mathbf{rv}(J) \uplus \mathbf{rv}(J')$ $\mathbf{v}(x\langle \tilde{v}\rangle) = \{u \in \tilde{v}\}$ $\mathbf{fv}(D \land D') = \mathbf{fv}(D) \cup \mathbf{fv}(D')$ $\mathbf{v}(x\langle \tilde{v}\rangle) = \{u \in \tilde{v}\}$ $\mathbf{fv}(D \land D') = \mathbf{dv}(J) \cup (\mathbf{fv}(P) - \mathbf{rv}(J))$	Mononoty $P =_{\alpha} Q \implies P \equiv Q$ $P \equiv Q \implies P \mid R \equiv Q \mid R$ $P \equiv Q \implies J \triangleright P \equiv J \triangleright Q$ $D \equiv D', P \equiv Q \implies \text{def } D \text{ in } P \equiv \text{def } D' \text{ in } Q$ Reduction rules $def D \land J \triangleright P \text{ in } J\sigma \mid Q \implies def D \land J \triangleright P \text{ in } P\sigma \mid Q$ $P \equiv R \rightarrow S \equiv Q \implies P \rightarrow Q$
¹⁷ Structural equivalence and calculus (1/2)	Join-Calculus wrt other calculi (1/2)
Monoidal rules $P \mid Q \equiv Q \mid P$ $(P \mid Q) \mid R \equiv P \mid (Q \mid R)$ $P \mid 0 \equiv P$ $D \land D' \equiv D' \land D$ $(D \land D') \land D'' \equiv D \land (D' \land D'')$ $D \land \mathbf{T} \equiv D$ Binding rules $P \mid \det D \text{ in } Q \equiv \det D \text{ in } P \mid Q \qquad \text{fv}(P) \cap d\mathbf{v}(D) = \emptyset$ $\det D \text{ in } def D' \text{ in } P \equiv \det D \land D' \text{ in } P \qquad \text{similar}$ $\det \mathbf{T} \text{ in } P \equiv P$	 wrt the π-calculus [Milner, Parrow, Walker] one-way channels fixed static set of receptors per channel permanent definitions JC is a subset of the π-calculus easily implementable in a standard distributed environment (Unix/WinXXX). No need for distributed-consensus protocols (Isis-like). Simple failures. Channel and receptors fail at same time (permanent failure model)

Join-Calculus wrt other calculi (2/2)

wrt Ambients [Cardelli, Gordon]

- lexically scoped
- communication and migration are orthogonal
- JC = communication, Ambients = administration
- Ambients good for security

wrt π 1-calculus [Amadio]

- pi-one relies on a condition on types
- JC based on its syntax
- quasi identical

Join-Calculus with migrations

 $P, Q ::= \ldots \mid go\langle a, \kappa \rangle$

current location becomes a sublocation of a, then send a trigger on channel κ

Remarks: hierarchy

- a location moves with its sublocations

- if a goes to b, then b must not be a sublocation of a. Syntactic check at compile time (move lock freeness).

23

Join-Calculus with locations

 $D, E ::= \dots \mid a[D:P]$

21

a is a location

Caution: scopes and linearity

- the scope of a in a[D:P] delimited by the enclosing def statement
- a location only defined once, e.g. the following definition is illegal

$\operatorname{def} \mathbf{a}[D:P] \wedge \mathbf{a}[E:Q] \triangleright R \text{ in } S$

• a defined name appears in the join-patterns of a unique location, e.g. the following definition is illegal

$\operatorname{def} a[\boldsymbol{x}\langle u\rangle \triangleright P:Q] \wedge b[\boldsymbol{x}\langle v\rangle \triangleright R:S] \text{ in } T$

Join-Calculus and Failures

- permanent failures
- a location fails with its sublocations
- emission or moves from dead sites are impossible
- sending to or moves to dead sites are possible
- failure detection impossible in an asynchronous world [Fisher, Lynch, Paterson], [Chandra, Toueg]
- a trace-semantics equivalent implementation is feasible
- positive information about failures in practice.
- only suicides presently implemented (next version with asynchronous failures ?)
- failures of channels \neq failures of sites

Failures are a big and large problem \leftrightarrow Distributed algorithms? \leftrightarrow distributed operating systems ?

Failures should be part of semantics of languages.

Jocaml (1/3)

Interface with the outside world

let agent = ref 0 ;;

let def register_me (loc, name, (args:string list)) =
reply () |
let name = incr agent; Printf.sprintf
 "%s %d" (match args with [name] -> name | _ -> "Agent") !agent in
let name =
 match args with
 | s :: 1 -> s
 | [] -> name in
let name = if String.length(name) > 8 then String.sub name 0 8
 else name in
let job, kill = make_comp (loc) in
 next (name, job, kill) ;;

let _ =

Ns.register !ns_name register_me (vartype: (Join.location * string * string list -> unit) metatype); Join.server () ;; ;;

Jocaml (3/3)

let ww = 6 and hh = 6 and let w = size_x () / ww and h = size_y () / hh

let def s!(n,m) | next!(name,job,kill) =

let w = min w (sx-n) and h = min h (sy-m) in print_name (n,m,w,h,name,black) ; let def finished r | mutex! () = draw_square (name,n,m,w,h,r); job_done (); next(name,job,kill) | reply or restart () | mutex! () = s(n,m) | reply in mutex () | loc boss do { { Join.fail job; restart (); Join.halt (); } | { Thread.delay 15.0; restart (); Join.halt (); } | let r = job (n/pixel,m/pixel,w/pixel,h/pixel) in print_string "job done"; print_newline (); finished r: Join.halt (): 7 or killAll! () | next! (name, job, kill) = killAll() | kill() and counter! n | job_done () = { if ww * hh = n+1 then killAll () else counter (n+1) } | reply ()

Then go!

Jocaml (2/3)

```
let _ =
 spawn { counter 0 };
 for i = ww - 1 downto 0 do
   for i = hh - 1 downto 0 do
     spawn { s(i*w, j*w) }
   done
 done ;;
let def make_comp (there) =
 let loc mandel [Quad;Calc]
 def square (i0, j0, w, h) =
   let r = Quad.empty w h limit in
   for i = 0 to w - 1 do
     for j = 0 to h - 1 do
       Quad.set r i j m
     done
   done;
   reply r to square
 and kill! () = Join.kill Join.here;
 do { Join.go there } in
 reply (square, kill)
```

Join Research (1/2)

- semantics of equivalence [Fournet, Gonthier]
- labeled transition systems (open JC) [Boreale, Fournet, Laneve]
- semantics of security [Abadi, Fournet, Gonthier]
- types and interference [Conchon, Pottier]
- dynamic ressources [Schmitt]
- implementation JC 1.05 [Fournet, Maranget]
- implementation Jocaml [Fournet, le Fessant, Schmitt]
- compiling join patterns [le Fessant, Maranget]
- distributed runtime (GC) [Fournet, le Fessant]
- control of communication and migration, the M-calculus [Schnitt, Stefani]
- coding of pi-calculus and Ambients [Fournet, Lévy, Schmitt]
- distributed objects [Fournet, Laneve, Maranget, Qin, Rémy]

Join Research (2/2)

- functional nets [Odersky]
- typed marshalling [Leifer, Peskine, Sewell, Wansbrough]
- Petri nets and JC [Bruni, Montanari, Sassone]
- Distributed patterns [Bruni, Montanari]
- Symmetric run-times (P2P) To be done! ... ML-Donkey [le Fessant]

see http://join.inria.fr

29

Conclusion and Future work

- usefulness of mobility
 Missing the Global Computing Fibonacci
 - worldwide computing
 - customization of groupware applications
 - extendible systems, hot restart
 - distributed games
- in Jocaml: games, mobile editor, hevea
- reconsidering compilation problems
- locality and interference analysis
- connection with security
- correct handling of failures
- mastering Jocaml releases