a core model for choreographic programming

luís cruz-filipe

(joint work with fabrizio montesi)

department of mathematics and computer science university of southern denmark

facs'16, besançon, france october 21st, 2016

outline

 $the \ zoo \ of \\ communication$

 \mathcal{E} computation

practical consequences

models of communicating systems

process calculi

 π -calculus and its variants

- low-level modeling of communication
- too technical for many purposes
- many interesting fragments are undecidable

models of communicating systems

process calculi

 π -calculus and its variants

- low-level modeling of communication
- too technical for many purposes
- many interesting fragments are undecidable

choreographies

- global view of the system
- directed communication (from alice to bob)
- deadlock-free by design
- compilable to process calculi

choreographies and computation

trivially turing-complete (arbitrary computation at each process)

choreographies and computation

- trivially turing-complete (arbitrary computation at each process)
- typically geared towards applications (many complex primitives)

choreographies and computation

- trivially turing-complete (arbitrary computation at each process)
- typically geared towards applications (many complex primitives)

focus communication

- reduce local computation to a minimum
- reduce system primitives to a minimum
- how far can we go?

our contribution

- i/o-based notion of function implementation
- computation by message-passing
- reminiscent of memory models (e.g. urm)

our contribution

- i/o-based notion of function implementation
- computation by message-passing
- reminiscent of memory models (e.g. urm)
 - focus of this talk:
- minimal choreographies
- their turing completeness

outline

the zoo of communication

 $\begin{array}{c} communication \\ \mathcal{E} \ computation \end{array}$

practical consequences

typical primitives in choreographies

- termination
- message passing
- label selection
- conditionals
- recursion
- process creation
- channel creation
- channel passing
- role assignment
-

typical primitives in choreographies

- termination
- message passing
- label selection
- conditionals
- recursion
- process creation
- channel creation
- channel passing
- role assignment
- **.** . . .

typical primitives in choreographies

- termination
- message passing
- label selection
- conditionals
- recursion
- process creation
- channel creation
- channel passing
- role assignment
- ...

 $\begin{array}{c} minimal \\ choreographies \end{array}$

$$M ::= \mathbf{0} \mid \eta; M \mid \text{if (p.* = q.*) then } M_1 \text{ else } M_2 \ \mid \text{def } X = M_2 \text{ in } M_1 \mid X$$

$$\eta ::= \text{p.} e \rightarrow \text{q} \mid \text{p} \rightarrow \text{q[/]}$$

$$\textit{l} ::= \text{L} \mid \text{R}$$

$$e ::= \varepsilon \mid * \mid \text{s} \cdot *$$

$\begin{array}{c} minimal \\ choreographies \end{array}$

$$M ::= \mathbf{0} \mid \eta; M \mid \text{if (p.* = q.*) then } M_1 \text{ else } M_2 \ \mid \text{def } X = M_2 \text{ in } M_1 \mid X$$

$$\eta ::= p.e \rightarrow q \mid p \rightarrow q[I]$$

$$I ::= L \mid R$$

$$e ::= \varepsilon \mid * \mid s \cdot *$$

urm machine

classical model of computation

- similar to physical memory
- memory cells store natural numbers
- memory operations: zero, successor, copy
- jump-on-equal

$\begin{array}{c} minimal \\ choreographies \end{array}$

$$M ::= \mathbf{0} \mid \eta; M \mid \text{if (p.* = q.*) then } M_1 \text{ else } M_2$$

$$\mid \text{def } X = M_2 \text{ in } M_1 \mid X$$

$$\eta ::= p.e \rightarrow q \mid p \rightarrow q[I]$$

$$I ::= L \mid R$$

$$e ::= \varepsilon \mid * \mid s \cdot *$$

urm machine

classical model of computation

- similar to physical memory
- memory cells store natural numbers \(\sim \) processes
- memory operations: zero, successor, copy
- jump-on-equal → conditional / loop



$\begin{array}{c} minimal \\ choreographies \end{array}$

$$M ::= \mathbf{0} \mid \eta; M \mid \text{if (p.* = q.*) then } M_1 \text{ else } M_2$$

$$\mid \text{def } X = M_2 \text{ in } M_1 \mid X$$

$$\eta ::= p.e \rightarrow q \mid p \rightarrow q[I]$$

$$I ::= L \mid R$$

$$e ::= \varepsilon \mid * \mid s \cdot *$$

- but...! very different computation model
 - no centralized control
 - no self-change

$\begin{array}{c} minimal \\ choreographies \end{array}$

$$M ::= \mathbf{0} \mid \eta; M \mid \text{if (p.* = q.*) then } M_1 \text{ else } M_2$$

$$\mid \text{def } X = M_2 \text{ in } M_1 \mid X$$

$$\eta ::= \mathsf{p}.e \to \mathsf{q} \mid \mathsf{p} \to \mathsf{q}[/]$$
 $/ ::= \mathsf{L} \mid \mathsf{R}$
 $e ::= \varepsilon \mid * \mid \mathsf{s} \cdot *$

on selections

- not needed for computational completeness
- useful for projectability (e.g. to π -calculus)
- known algorithms for inferring selections

implementation of functions

state

a *state* of an minimal choreography is a mapping from the set of process names to the set of values

implementation of functions

state

a state of an minimal choreography is a mapping from the set of process names to the set of values

implementation choreography M implements $f: \mathbb{N}^n \to \mathbb{N}$ with inputs p_1, \ldots, p_n and output q if: for every σ such that $\sigma(p_i) = \lceil x_i \rceil$,

- if $f(\tilde{x})$ is defined, then $M, \sigma \to^* \mathbf{0}, \sigma'$ and $\sigma'(q) = \lceil f(\tilde{x}) \rceil$
- if $f(\tilde{x})$ is not defined, then $M, \sigma \not\to^* \mathbf{0}$ (diverges)

 $\begin{array}{c} addition \\ from \ \mathsf{p}, \ \mathsf{q} \ to \ \mathsf{r} \\ using \ \mathsf{t} \end{array}$

```
\begin{aligned} \operatorname{def} X &= \\ & \operatorname{if} \big( \operatorname{r.*} = \operatorname{q.*} \big) \operatorname{then} \\ & \operatorname{p.*} \to \operatorname{r}; \ \mathbf{0} \\ & \operatorname{else} \\ & \operatorname{p.*} \to \operatorname{t}; \ \operatorname{t.} (\operatorname{s} \cdot \ast) \to \operatorname{p}; \\ & \operatorname{r.*} \to \operatorname{t}; \ \operatorname{t.} (\operatorname{s} \cdot \ast) \to \operatorname{r}; \ X \\ & \operatorname{in} \operatorname{t.} \varepsilon \to \operatorname{r}; \ X \end{aligned}
```

 $\begin{array}{c} addition \\ from \ \mathsf{p}, \ \mathsf{q} \ to \ \mathsf{r} \\ using \ \mathsf{t} \end{array}$

```
\begin{aligned} \operatorname{def} X &= \\ & \operatorname{if} \big( \operatorname{r.*} = \operatorname{q.*} \big) \operatorname{then} \\ & \operatorname{p.*} \to \operatorname{r;} \ \mathbf{0} \\ & \operatorname{else} \\ & \operatorname{p.*} \to \operatorname{t;} \ \operatorname{t.} (\operatorname{s} \cdot \ast) \to \operatorname{p;} \\ & \operatorname{r.*} \to \operatorname{t;} \ \operatorname{t.} (\operatorname{s} \cdot \ast) \to \operatorname{r;} \ X \\ & \operatorname{in} \operatorname{t.} \varepsilon \to \operatorname{r;} \ X \end{aligned}
```

- → does not compile!
- projection of p does not know whether to send a message to r or t
- projection of t does not know whether to wait for a message or terminate



 $\begin{array}{c} addition \\ from \ \mathsf{p}, \ \mathsf{q} \ to \ \mathsf{r} \\ using \ \mathsf{t} \end{array}$

```
\begin{split} \text{def } X = \\ & \text{if } \big( r.* = \text{q.*} \big) \, \text{then } r \to \text{p[L]; } r \to \text{q[L]; } r \to \text{t[L];} \\ & \text{p.*} \to r; \, \boldsymbol{0} \\ & \text{else } r \to \text{p[R]; } r \to \text{q[R]; } r \to \text{t[R];} \\ & \text{p.*} \to \text{t; } \text{t.} (\text{s} \cdot *) \to \text{p;} \\ & \text{r.*} \to \text{t; } \text{t.} (\text{s} \cdot *) \to r; \, X \\ & \text{in } \text{t.} \varepsilon \to r; \, X \end{split}
```

→ does not compile!

- projection of p does not know whether to send a message to r or t
- projection of t does not know whether to wait for a message or terminate

 $\begin{array}{c} addition \\ from \ \mathsf{p}, \ \mathsf{q} \ to \ \mathsf{r} \\ using \ \mathsf{t} \end{array}$

```
\begin{split} \text{def } X = \\ & \text{if } \big( r.* = q.* \big) \, \text{then } r \to p[\mathtt{L}]; \, r \to q[\mathtt{L}]; \, r \to t[\mathtt{L}]; \\ & p.* \to r; \, \boldsymbol{0} \\ & \text{else } r \to p[\mathtt{R}]; \, r \to q[\mathtt{R}]; \, r \to t[\mathtt{R}]; \\ & p.* \to t; \, t.(s \cdot *) \to p; \\ & r.* \to t; \, t.(s \cdot *) \to r; \, X \\ & \text{in } t.\varepsilon \to r; \, X \end{split}
```

- → compiles!
- projections of p and t wait for notification from r
- projection of q also needs to be notified

partial recursive functions i/vi

successor $S: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that S(x) = x + 1 for all x

partial recursive functions i/vi

successor

 $S: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that S(x) = x + 1 for all x

implementation

$$[\![S]\!]^{p\mapsto q}=p.(s\cdot *)\to q$$

partial recursive functions i/vi

successor

implementation

soundness

$$S: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$$
 such that $S(x) = x + 1$ for all x

$$\llbracket S
rbracket^{\mathsf{p} \mapsto \mathsf{q}} = \mathsf{p}.(\mathsf{s} \cdot *) \to \mathsf{q}$$

$$p.(s \cdot *) \rightarrow q, \{p \mapsto \ulcorner x \urcorner\} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{0}, \left\{\begin{matrix} p \mapsto \ulcorner x \urcorner \\ q \mapsto \ulcorner x + 1 \urcorner\end{matrix}\right\}$$

partial recursive functions ii/vi

zero

 $Z: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that Z(x) = 0 for all x

implementation

$$[\![Z]\!]^{\mathsf{p}\mapsto\mathsf{q}}=\mathsf{p}.arepsilon\to\mathsf{q}$$

soundness

$$p.\varepsilon \to q, \{p \mapsto \ulcorner x \urcorner\} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{0}, \left\{\begin{matrix} p \mapsto \ulcorner x \urcorner \\ q \mapsto \ulcorner 0 \urcorner\end{matrix}\right\}$$

partial recursive functions iii/vi

 $projections \\ implementation$

$$P_m^n: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$$
 such that $P_m^n(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_m$ for all \tilde{x}

$$\llbracket P_m^n
rbracket^{\mathsf{p}_1,\ldots,\mathsf{p}_n \mapsto \mathsf{q}} = \mathsf{p}_{\mathsf{m}}.* \to \mathsf{q}$$

$$p_{\textbf{m}}.* \rightarrow q, \{p_i \mapsto \lceil x_i \rceil\} \longrightarrow \textbf{0}, \left\{\begin{matrix} p_i \mapsto \lceil x_i \rceil \\ q \mapsto \lceil x_m \rceil\end{matrix}\right\}$$

inductive cases (omitted)

three recursive constructions (see paper)

- composition
- recursion
- minimization

minimality

$\begin{array}{c} minimal \\ choreographies \end{array}$

- no exit points \(\sim \) nothing terminates
- no communication ~> no output
- less expressions → cannot compute base cases
- no conditions \(\simes \) termination is decidable
- no recursion \(\simes \) everything terminates

minimality

$\begin{array}{c} minimal \\ choreographies \end{array}$

$$M ::= \mathbf{0} \mid \eta; M \mid \text{if } (p.* = q.*) \text{ then } M_1 \text{ else } M_2 \ \mid \text{def } X = M_2 \text{ in } M_1 \mid X \ \eta ::= p.e \rightarrow q \mid p \rightarrow q[I] \ I ::= L \mid R \ e ::= \varepsilon \mid * \mid s \cdot *$$

- only zero-testing \(\sim \) termination is decidable (skipping proof...)
- only (arbitrary) constant-testing → termination is decidable

minimality

 $\begin{array}{c} minimal \\ choreographies \end{array}$

$$M ::= \mathbf{0} \mid \eta; M \mid \text{if } (p.* = q.*) \text{ then } M_1 \text{ else } M_2 \ \mid \text{def } X = M_2 \text{ in } M_1 \mid X \ \eta ::= p.e \rightarrow q \mid p \rightarrow q[I] \ I ::= L \mid R \ e ::= \varepsilon \mid * \mid s \cdot *$$

selections can be encoded as communications (but...)

outline

the zoo of communication

communication & computation

 $\begin{array}{c} practical \\ consequences \end{array}$

 sound encoding of partial recursive functions as minimal choreographies

- sound encoding of partial recursive functions as minimal choreographies
- by embedding into other choreography models → sound encoding of partial recursive functions in that model

- sound encoding of partial recursive functions as minimal choreographies
- by embedding into other choreography models → sound encoding of partial recursive functions in that model
- by adding necessary selections (deterministically) → sound encoding of partial recursive functions as minimal processes

- sound encoding of partial recursive functions as minimal choreographies
- by embedding into other choreography models → sound encoding of partial recursive functions in that model
- by adding necessary selections (deterministically) sound encoding of partial recursive functions as minimal processes
- by adding necessary selections and embedding into other choreography models → sound encoding of partial recursive functions in a process model (in particular, π-calculus)

conclusions

- turing completeness of minimal choreographies
- minimal set of primitives
- identifies a deadlock-free, turing-complete fragment of π -calculus
- core language for studying fundamental properties of choreographies

thank you!