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Synchronous and asynchronous languages

• Systems build from communicating components: parallelism, communication, concurrency
• Asynchronous Processes
  - Synchronous communications (rendez-vous)
    Process calculi: CCS, CSP, Lotos
  - Asynchronous communications (message queues)
    SDL modelisation of channels
• Synchronous Processes (instantaneous diffusion)
  Esterel, Sync/State-Charts, Lustre

Question on D. Caromel course: how do you classify ProActive?

Processes Calculi – Asynchrony in CCS

• A proposal in π-calculus: Asynchronous π-calculus
• No consequence of output actions
• Equivalent in CCS:

\[ P, Q ::= \begin{array}{ll}
0 & \text{inaction} \\
\mu.P & \text{prefix} \\
P | Q & \text{parallel} \\
P + Q & \text{(external) choice} \\
(\nu a)P & \text{restriction} \\
\text{rec}_K P & \text{process } P \text{ with definition } K = P \\
K & \text{(defined) process name}
\end{array} \]

Exercise: rewrite the following example in asynchronous CCS:

\[(a \cdot b \cdot a + c \cdot b \cdot c) \parallel (\overline{a} \cdot b \cdot \overline{a} + c \cdot b \cdot \overline{c})\]
Communication Ordering; A Deeper Study

Synchronous, asynchronous, and causally ordered communication
Bernadette Charron–Bost, Friedemann Mattern, Gerard Tel
1996

Happened Before Relation = Asynchronous Communication

- asynchronous communications, any order is valid (provided messages are received after being sent)
- \((s,r) \in \Gamma\) a communication
- \(\prec\), local causality relation (total order on LOCAL events)
- Global causality \(\prec\), verifies at least
  a \(\prec\) b \(\Rightarrow\) a \(\prec\) b
  s \(\prec\) r if \((s,r) \in \Gamma\)
  + transitivity: if \(e_1 \prec e_2\), and \(e_2 \prec e_3\), then, \(e_1 \prec e_3\)
- If \(\prec\) is a partial order (antisymmetric) then it represents a valid asynchronous communication
- i.e. there must be no cycle of different events

Happened before relation

- Not all events are mandatorily related along \(\prec\)
  - Incomparable, independent, concurrent: \(\parallel\)
    - \(e_1\parallel e_2\) if neither \(e_1 \prec e_2\) nor \(e_2 \prec e_1\)
    - Non transitivity of \(\parallel\)

Time and processes representation

- these execution are identical -> event representation
- Only the order of message reception matters, whatever the transmission and execution duration
**Exercise**

- Why is the above execution not asynchronous?
- Make it a correct execution by changing just the red arrow
- Find 2 unrelated events

**Synchronous communication**

- Emission and reception is almost the same event
- A first characterization: Asynchronous +
  if \((s,r) \in \Gamma\), then \(a<s \implies a<r \) and \(r<a \implies s<a\)
  (still no cycle)
  strong common past, strong common future
- OR: in execution diagram messages can be all drawn vertically at the same time
- OR: no crown
  \((s_1<r_2 \text{ and } s_2<r_3 \text{ and } \ldots \text{ sn }<r_1)\)

**FIFO**

- Order of messages sent between two given processes is guaranteed (reception order is the sending order)
- Let \(a=b\) if \(a\) and \(b\) on the same process
- Asynchronous +
  if \((s,r) \in \Gamma, (s',r') \in \Gamma, s\sim s'\) and \(r\sim r'\)
  then \(s<s' \implies r<r'\)
  (still no cycle)

**Causal Ordering**

- More constrained than FIFO
- Asynchronous +
  if \((s,r) \in \Gamma, (s',r') \in \Gamma, \text{ and } r\sim r'\)
  then \(s<s' \implies r<r'\)
  (still no cycle)
- A nice characterization: for each message \(m\) the diagram can be drawn with \(m\) as a vertical arrow and no other message go backward
- Or no message is bypassed by a chain of messages
Causal ordering (2): Causality Violation

- Causality violation occurs when order of messages causes an action based on information that another host has not yet received.

Causal ordering (3): The “triangle pattern”

Objective: Ensure that 3 arrive at C after 1.

Summary of communication orderings

- Asynchronous ⊆ FIFO channels ⊆ Causal ordering ⊆ Synchronous
- Several characterization of communication timing (equations, diagram, …)
- Such characterizations are useful for
  - Identifying coherent states (states that could exist)
  - Performing fault-tolerance and checkpointing
  - Study which algorithms are applicable on which communication orderings
  - Might be useful for debugging, or replaying an execution

Exercise: Are the execution CO, synchronous, asynchronous or FIFO?
Weak common past – weak common future

- if \((s, r) \in \Gamma\), for a CO computation, then \(a < r \Rightarrow \text{NOT } s < a\) (WCP)
- and \(s < a \Rightarrow \text{NOT } a < r\) (WCF)

Exercise: find a computation that does not ensure weak common past
- is it async FIFO CO or synch?

Exercise

- Rendez-vous:

  No event between sending and reception

  Exercise: What does rendez-vous ensure?

  - So why is ProActive said asynchronous?
GCM: “Asynchronous” Fractal Components

GCM – Quick Context

- Designed in the CoreGrid Network of Excellence, implemented in the GridCOMP European project
- Add distribution to Fractal components
- OUR point of view in OASIS:
  - No shared memory between components
  - Components evolve asynchronously
  - Components are implemented in ProActive
  - Communicate by request/replies (Futures)
- A good context for presenting asynchronous components futures and many-to-many communications

What are (GCM/Fractal) Components?

A Primitive GCM Component

Primitive components communicating by asynchronous remote method invocations on interfaces (requests)

- Components abstract away distribution and concurrency in ProActive components are mono-threaded
- simplifies concurrency but can create deadlocks
Composition in GCM

Bindings:
Requests = Asynchronous method invocations

Component are independent entities
(threads are isolated in a component)

Asynchronous method invocations with results

Futures are necessary

Replies

First-class Futures

• Only strict operations are blocking (access to a future)
• Communicating a future is not a strict operation
Without first-class futures, one thread is systematically blocked in the composite component.

Almost systematic dead-lock in ProActive
A lot of blocked threads otherwise

In ASP / ProActive, the result is insensitive to the order of replies (shown for ASP-calculus)
experiments with different strategies

How to bring future values to components that need them
Different strategies can be envisioned
A “naive” approach: Any component can receive a value for a future reference it holds.
More operational is the lazy approach:

« On demand » future update
No-unnecessary transfer of values - Single step update
« registration delay + time for transfer »
Results stored for long term → Not much operational.
Eager home-based future update

- A strategy avoiding to store future values indefinitely
- Relies on future registration and sends the value as soon as it is calculated

Results sent as soon as available - Un-necessary transfers
Every component with future reference registers
Garbage collection of computed results possible

Eager forward-based strategy

- Future updates follow the same path as future flow
- Each component remembers only the components to which it forwarded the future

Results sent as soon as available
No registration required
Future updates form a chain → intermediate components
Easy to garbage collection computed results

A Distributed Component Model with Futures

- Primitive components contain the business code
- Primitive components act as the unit of distribution and concurrency (each thread is isolated in a component)
- Communication is performed on interfaces and follows component bindings
- Futures allow communication to be asynchronous requests
- Futures are transparent can lead to optimisations and are a convenient programming abstraction but ...

What Can Create Deadlocks?

- A race condition:
- Detecting deadlocks can be difficult → behavioural specification and verification techniques (cf Eric Madelaine)
Conclusion

• An overview of asynchronism and different communication timings
• Applied to components with richer language constructs (futures, collective interfaces, …)
• Still a lot of other distributed computing paradigms exist (Ambient Talk, creol, X10 for example)
• A formalism for expressing communication ordering

Exercise 1: Request queue

• In CCS with parameters (a value can be a request)
  - Express a request queue:
    
    ![Request queue diagram](image)
    
  - Also express 2 simple processes accessing it

    
    \[
    \text{Enqueue}(R) \quad \text{Dequeue}(R)
    \]

    
    Hint from last course: \( \text{Reg}_i = \text{read}(i) \).\( \text{Reg}_i + \text{write}(x) \).\( \text{Reg}_x \)

• Same thing in asynchronous CCS (without and with RDV)

Exercise 2: find a solution to the deadlock slide 37

Exercise 3: Ensuring causal ordering with a sending queue

In the example below, suppose that the bottom thread has a sending queue, that is it sends all messages to an additional thread that emits the final messages.

- Draw the new message exchanges
- Suppose the communications are synchronous, what is lost by adding this new thread? what is the new overall ordering (what if CO, FIFO, or asynch?)

Exercise 4: Ensuring causal ordering with many sending queues

• Same thing but with one sending queue per destination process
  - Draw the new message exchanges
  - Suppose the communications are synchronous, what is lost by adding this new thread? what is the new overall ordering (what if CO, FIFO, or asynch?)
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