introduction

choreographic programming 0000 the existing formalisation 000

new contribution:

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

conclusions

 $a \ formalised \ framework \ for \ choreographic \ programming$ 

luís cruz-filipe

with lovro lugović, fabrizio montesi, marco peressotti & robert r. rasmussen

department of mathematics and computer science university of southern denmark

types conference june 13th, 2023



choreographic programming •000

the existing formalisation 000

new contributions

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

conclusions

## $choreographic\ programming,\ conceptually$

#### what are choreographies?

high-level global specifications of concurrent and distributed systems

#### a new programming paradigm

implementations for the local endpoints are automatically generated

- guaranteed to be deadlock-free
- guaranted to satisfy the specification

| $_{\circ}^{introduction}$ | choreographic programming $0 \bullet 00$ | the existing formalisation | new contributions | conclu<br>00 |
|---------------------------|--|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
|                           |  |                            |                   |              |

## an example

#### authentication choreography

```
c.credentials --> ip.x;
If ip.(check x)
Then ip --> s[left]; ip --> c[left]; s.token --> c.t
Else ip --> s[right]; ip --> c[right]
```

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

| ntroduction | choreographic programming $0 \bullet 00$ | the existing formalisation 000 | new contributions |
|-------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------------|
|             |  |                                |                   |

## an example

#### authentication choreography

```
c.credentials --> ip.x;
If ip.(check x)
Then ip --> s[left]; ip --> c[left]; s.token --> c.t
Else ip --> s[right]; ip --> c[right]
```

#### local implementations

| с : | <pre>ip!credentials; ip &amp; {left: s?t; right: 0 }</pre> |
|-----|--|
| s : | <pre>ip &amp; {left: c!token; right: 0 }</pre>             |
| ip: | c?x; If (check x) Then (s(+)left; c(+)left)                |
|     | <pre>Else (s(+)right; c(+)right)</pre>                     |

| $_{\circ}^{introduction}$ | choreographic programming $0 \bullet 00$ | the existing formalisation 000 | $\begin{array}{c} new \ contributions \\ 0000 \end{array}$ |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|
|                           |  |                                |  |

## an example

#### authentication choreography

```
c.credentials --> ip.x;
If ip.(check x)
Then ip --> s[left]; ip --> c[left]; s.token --> c.t
Else ip --> s[right]; ip --> c[right]
```

#### local implementations

| c : | <pre>ip!credentials; ip &amp; {left: s?t; right: 0 }</pre> |
|-----|--|
| s : | <pre>ip &amp; {left: c!token; right: 0 }</pre>             |
| ip: | c?x; If (check x) Then (s(+)left; c(+)left)                |
|     | <pre>Else (s(+)right; c(+)right)</pre>                     |

(gets tricky in the presence of recursion...)

| $\stackrel{introduction}{\circ}$ | choreographic programming<br>00●0 | the existing formalisation<br>000 | $new \ contributor 0000$ |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
|                                  |                                   |                                   |                          |

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三 のへぐ

## a bird's-eye view





▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @





(forte'23, lpar'23, itp'23)

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

| introduction |  |
|--------------|--|
| 0            |  |

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

## why bother?

#### choreographies are a popular topic...

- active research field
- many relevant applications
- potential in choreographic programming

| introduction |  |
|--------------|--|
| 0            |  |

## why bother?

#### choreographies are a popular topic...

- active research field
- many relevant applications
- potential in choreographic programming

#### ... but there are many disturbing signs

process calculus and session types plagued by wrong proofs

- complex definitions, long proofs by structural induction
- situation pointed out at itp'15
  - formalization of a published journal article
  - most proofs were wrong (but the theorems held)
- big revision of decidability results in the last few years
  - published proofs of both A and  $\neg A$  for quite a few A...

| ntroduction | chore |
|-------------|-------|
| )           | 0000  |

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

## $our\ language$

#### a minimal choreography language

- value communication
- label selections (for projection)
- conditionals
- trailing procedure calls (for recursion)

| introduction |  |
|--------------|--|
| 0            |  |

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 のへの

## $our\ language$

#### a minimal choreography language

- value communication
- label selections (for projection)
- conditionals
- trailing procedure calls (for recursion)

#### $agnostic \ language$

- parametric on expressions and values
- only two labels

horeographic programming

the existing formalisation  $0 \bullet 0$ 

new contribution

conclusions

## $choreographies \ in \ coq$

#### choreographic language

- syntax and semantics
- progress and deadlock-freedom
- properties of the semantics: determinism, confluence
- turing completeness from the communication structure



▲□ > ▲圖 > ▲目 > ▲目 > ▲目 > ● ④ < ⊙

horeographic programming

the existing formalisation  $0 \bullet 0$ 

new contribution

conclusions

## $choreographies \ in \ coq$

#### choreographic language

- syntax and semantics
- progress and deadlock-freedom
- properties of the semantics: determinism, confluence
- turing completeness from the communication structure



(itp'21)

#### hard, but insightful

- motivated changes in the presentation of the semantics
- much "cleaner" and more elegant theory
- faster to formalise than to get the original article accepted...

| introd | lucti | on |
|--------|-------|----|
| 0      |       |    |

choreographic programming 0000 the existing formalisation  $\circ \circ \circ$ 

new contributions

conclusions

## projection

#### the epp theorem

- definition of a suitable process calculus
- formalisation of endpoint projection
- challenges: partial functions (branching terms, merging, projection)
- different solutions (dedicated terms, auxiliary types, indirect definitions)
- case explosion (partially) handled by automation



(ictac'21)

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

| introd | lucti | on |
|--------|-------|----|
| 0      |       |    |

choreographic programming 0000 the existing formalisation  $\circ \circ \circ$ 

new contribution:

conclusions

## projection

#### the epp theorem

- definition of a suitable process calculus
- formalisation of endpoint projection
- challenges: partial functions (branching terms, merging, projection)
- different solutions (dedicated terms, auxiliary types, indirect definitions)
- case explosion (partially) handled by automation



(ictac'21)

#### in hindsight...

several steps could be simplified; the current formalisation is significantly shorter than the original one :-)

| $_{\circ}^{introduction}$ | choreographic programming<br>0000 | the existing formalisation<br>000 | $\substack{new \ contributions} \\ \bullet 000$ | conclusion.<br>00 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------|
|                           |                                   |                                   |   |                   |

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 のへで

## the next steps

make the framework usable in practice

- build a compiler to a "real" programming language
- identify bottlenecks and extend the theory

| tions |
|-------|
| ti    |

## the next steps

make the framework usable in practice

- build a compiler to a "real" programming language
- identify bottlenecks and extend the theory

#### natural candidates

- amendment procedure
- elimination of label selections
- possibility of livelocks (essential for services)

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 のへの

horeographic programming 0000 the existing formalisation

 $new \ contributions$ 0000 conclusions

## generating executable code

#### compilation to jolie

- coq's extraction yields a certified implementation of epp
- networks must be translated to a programming language
- structural mapping to jolie
- new feature: annotations in communications



(forte'23)

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

horeographic programming 000 the existing formalisation

 $\begin{array}{c} new \ contributions \\ 0 \bullet 0 0 \end{array}$ 

conclusions

## generating executable code

#### compilation to jolie

- coq's extraction yields a certified implementation of epp
- networks must be translated to a programming language
- structural mapping to jolie
- new feature: annotations in communications



(forte'23)

#### to certify or not to certify?

- in principle this compilation could be formalised in coq
- ... but the benefits of the extra work are less obvious

horeographic programming

the existing formalisation

 $new \ contributions \\ 0000$ 

conclusions

## $choreography \ amendment$

#### authentication choreography, revisited

```
c.credentials --> ip.x;
If ip.(check x)
Then ip --> s[left]; ip --> c[left];
    s.token --> c.t
Else ip --> s[right]; ip --> c[right]
```

- selections can be inferred automatically
- operational correspondence (multi-step, up to permutation)



(itp'23)

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

horeographic programming 0000 he existing formalisation

new contributions

conclusions

## $choreography \ amendment$

#### authentication choreography, revisited

```
c.credentials --> ip.x;
If ip.(check x)
Then ip --> s[left]; ip --> c[left];
    s.token --> c.t
```

Else ip --> s[right]; ip --> c[right]

- selections can be inferred automatically
- operational correspondence (multi-step, up to permutation)



(itp'23)

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

#### oh, the irony

- the original theorem was wrong
- coq led us to counter-examples and to the correct statement



the existing formalisation 000

 $new \ contributions \\ 000 \bullet$ 

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

conclusions 00

## livelocks and services

#### authentication, now with retries

```
X = c.credentials --> ip.x;
If ip.(check x)
Then ip --> s[left]; ip --> c[left]; s.token --> c.t
Else ip --> s[right]; ip --> c[right]; X
```



 $new \ contributions \\ 000 \bullet$ 

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

conclusions

## livelocks and services

#### authentication, now with retries

```
X = c.credentials --> ip.x;
If ip.(check x)
Then ip --> s[left]; ip --> c[left]; s.token --> c.t
Else ip --> s[right]; ip --> c[right]; X
```



the existing formalisation 000

new contributions

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

conclusions 00

## livelocks and services

#### authentication, now with retries

```
X = c.credentials --> ip.x;
If ip.(check x)
Then ip --> c[left]; s.token --> c.t
Else ip --> c[right]; X[s]
```



noreographic programming

the existing formalisation  $_{\rm OOO}$ 

new contributions

conclusions

## livelocks and services

#### authentication, now with retries

```
X = c.credentials --> ip.x;
If ip.(check x)
Then ip --> c[left]; s.token --> c.t
Else ip --> c[right]; X[s]
```

- more permissive projection
  - s : c!token
- processes can be muted in recursive calls
- possibility for livelocks



(lpar'23)

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @



oreographic programming

the existing formalisation

new contributions

conclusions

## livelocks and services

#### authentication, now with retries

```
X = c.credentials --> ip.x;
If ip.(check x)
Then ip --> c[left]; s.token --> c.t
Else ip --> c[right]; X[s]
```

- more permissive projection
  - s : c!token
- processes can be muted in recursive calls
- possibility for livelocks

(lpar'23)

#### coq as a research tool

- a lot of adaptation of old proofs (very doable)
- many technical details that might have been overlooked

| $_{\circ}^{introduction}$ | choreographic programming<br>0000 | the existing formalisation | $new \ contributions$ | conclusions<br>$\bullet \circ$ |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
|                           |                                   |                            |                       |                                |

## closing remarks

#### conclusions

- a formalised framework for choreographic programming
- $\bullet\,$  compilation to jolie  $\rightsquigarrow$  can be used to produce executable code

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 のへの

 $\bullet$  robust and modular theory  $\leadsto$  can be used for research

| $_{\circ}^{introduction}$ | choreographic programming<br>0000 | the existing formalisation | $\begin{array}{c} new \ contributions \\ 0000 \end{array}$ | conclusion<br>●0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------|
|                           |                                   |                            |  |                  |

## closing remarks

#### conclusions

- a formalised framework for choreographic programming
- $\bullet\,$  compilation to jolie  $\rightsquigarrow$  can be used to produce executable code
- $\bullet$  robust and modular theory  $\leadsto$  can be used for research

#### future work

- proof automation
- formalisation of security protocols
- more features: non-deterministic choice, process spawning

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 のへの

| $_{\circ}^{introduction}$ | choreographic programming<br>0000 | the existing formalisation<br>000 | $new \ contributions$ | conclusion<br>●0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
|                           |                                   |                                   |                       |                  |

## closing remarks

#### conclusions

- a formalised framework for choreographic programming
- compilation to jolie  $\rightsquigarrow$  can be used to produce executable code
- $\bullet$  robust and modular theory  $\leadsto$  can be used for research

#### future work

- proof automation
- formalisation of security protocols
- more features: non-deterministic choice, process spawning

#### $expected \ challenges$

- full-fledged binders
- sublanguages

 ${}_{0}^{introduction}$  choreographic programming 0000

the existing formalisation  $_{\rm OOO}$ 

 $\substack{new \ contributions \\ 0000}$ 

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 - のへで

conclusions

# thank you!