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Communication is Ubiquitous

➤ Internet, the WWW, Cloud Computing, the next-generation manycore chips, message-passing parallel computations, large-scale cyberinfrastructure for e-Science.

➤ The way to organise software is increasingly based on communications.

➤ Applications need *structured* series of communications.

➤ Question

➤ How to formally abstract/specify/implement/control communications?
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Communication is Ubiquitous

- Internet, the WWW, Cloud Computing, the next-generation manycore chips, message-passing parallel computations, large-scale cyberinfrastructure for e-Science.

- The way to organise software is increasingly based on communications.

- Applications need structured series of communications.

Question $\Rightarrow$ Multiparty session type theory

- How to formally abstract/specify/implement/control communications?
Ocean Observatories Initiative

➤ A NSF project (400M$, 5 Years) to build a cyberinfrastructure for observing oceans around US and beyond.

➤ Real-time sensor data constantly coming from both off-shore and on-shore (e.g. buoys, submarines, under-water cameras, satellites), transmitted via high-speed networks.
Ocean Observatories Initiative
Ocean Observatories Initiative
Challenges

➤ The need to specify, catalogue, program, implement and manage *multiparty message passing protocols*.

➤ Communication assurance

➤ Correct message ordering and synchronisation

➤ Deadlock-freedom, progress and liveness

➤ Dynamic message monitoring and recovery

➤ Logical constraints on message values

➤ Shared and used over a long-term period (e.g. 30 years in OOI).
Why Multiparty Session Types?

➤ Robin Milner (2002): *Types are the leaven of computer programming; they make it digestible.*

⇒ Can describe communication protocols as *types*
⇒ Can be materialised as *new communications programming languages* and *tool chains*.

➤ *Scalable* automatic verifications (deadlock-freedom, safety and liveness) without *state-space explosion problems* (*polynomial time complexity*).

➤ Extendable to *logical verifications* and flexible *dynamic monitoring*. 
Dialogue between Industry and Academia

Binary Session Types \cite{PARL94, ESOP98}

\[\Downarrow\]

Milner, Honda and Yoshida joined W3C WS-CDL (2002)

\[\Downarrow\]

Formalisation of W3C WS-CDL \cite{ESOP07}

\[\Downarrow\]

Scribble at $\pi^4$ Technology
CDL Equivalent

• Basic example:

```java
package HelloWorld {
    roleType YouRole, WorldRole;
    participantType You{YouRole}, World{WorldRole};
    relationshipType YouWorldRel between YouRole and WorldRole;
    channelIdType WorldChannelType with roleType WorldRole;

    choreography Main {
        WorldChannelType worldChannel;

        interaction operation=hello from=YouRole to=WorldRole
            relationship=YouWorldRel channel=worldChannel {
                request messageType=Hello;
            }
    }
}
```

Dr Gary Brown (Pi4 Tech) in 2007
Scribble Protocol

- "Scribbling is necessary for architects, either physical or computing, since all great ideas of architectural construction come from that unconscious moment, when you do not realise what it is, when there is no concrete shape, only a whisper which is not a whisper, an image which is not an image, somehow it starts to urge you in your mind, in so small a voice but how persistent it is, at that point you start scribbling" - Kohei Honda 2007

- Basic example:

```plaintext
protocol HelloWorld {
    role You, World;
    Hello from You to World;
}
```
Dialogue between Industry and Academia

Binary Session Types [PARL’94, ESOP’98]

⇒

Milner, Honda and Yoshida joined W3C WS-CDL (2002)

⇒

Formalisation of W3C WS-CDL [ESOP’07]

⇒

Scribble at π4 Technology

⇒

Multiparty Session Types [POPL’08]
Dialogue between Industry and Academia

Binary Session Types [PARL’94, ESOP’98]

⇓

Milner, Honda and Yoshida joined W3C WS-CDL (2002)

⇓
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Scribble at \(\pi^4\) Technology

⇓

Multiparty Session Types [POPL’08]
Binary Session Types: Buyer-Seller Protocol

Buyer

Seller

- title
- quote
- OK
- address
- date
- quit

branch
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buyer</th>
<th>Seller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

`String ? Int; ⊕{ok: String ? Date; end, quit : end}`
\[\text{branch} \quad \{ \text{! String; ? Int; } \oplus \{ \text{OK: ! String; ? Date; end, quit: end} \}\quad \text{P has } T \]

\[Q \text{ has } \overline{T} \quad \text{dual} \quad \text{ Pike typable} \]
Multiparty Session Types
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Buyer 2
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quote ÷ 2
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Session Types Overview

- **Properties**
  - Communication safety (no communication mismatch)
  - Communication fidelity (the communication follow the protocol)
  - Progress (no deadlock/stuck in a session)
Evolution Of MPST

- Binary Session Types [THK98, HVK98]
- Multiparty Session Types [POPL'08]
- A Theory of Design-by-Contract for Distributed Multiparty Interactions [Concur’11]
- Multiparty Session Types Meet Communicating Automata [ESOP’12, ICALP’13]
- Network Monitoring through Multiparty Session Types [FMOODS’13]
- SPY: Local Verification of Global Protocols [RV’13]
- Distributed Runtime Verification with Session Types and Python [RV’13]
Ocean Observatory Initiative (OOI)

**OOI aims:** to deploy an infrastructure (global network) to expand the scientists’ ability to remotely study the ocean

**Usage:** Integrate real-time data acquisition, processing and data storage for ocean research,…
OOI: verification challenges

- applications written in **different** languages, running on **heterogeneous** hardware in an **asynchronous** network.
- different authentication domains, external **untrusted** applications
- various distributed protocols
- requires correct, safe interactions
Session Types for Runtime Verification

- **Methodology**
  - Developers design protocols in a dedicated language - Scribble
  - Well-formedness is checked by Scribble tools
  - Protocols are projected into local types
  - Local types generate monitors
1. Writing correct global protocols with Scribble Compiler
2. Verify programs via *local monitors*
3. Build additional verification modules via *annotations*
I. Writing correct global protocols with **Scribble Compiler**

2. Verify programs via *local monitors*

3. Build additional verification modules via *annotations*
Meet Scribble

Scribble
Protocol Language

*Scribbling is necessary for architects, either physical or computing, since all great ideas of architectural construction come from that unconscious moment, when you do not realise what it is, when there is no concrete shape, only a whisper which is not a whisper, an image which is not an image, somehow it starts to urge you in your mind, in so small a voice but how persistent it is, at that point you start scribbling.* Kohei Honda 2007.

What is Scribble?

Scribble is a language to describe application-level protocols among communicating systems. A protocol represents an agreement on how participating systems interact with each other. Without a protocol, it is hard to do a meaningful interaction: participants simply cannot communicate effectively, since they do not know when to expect the other parties to send their data, or whether the other party is ready to receive a datum it is sending. In fact it is not clear what kinds of data is to be used for each interaction. It is too costly to carry out communications based on guess works and with inevitable communication mismatch (synchronisation bugs). Simply, it is not feasible as an engineering practice.
A Global Protocol

```
import type  # type <python> "StringType" from "Lib/types.py" as str;

protocol def
send-receive

recursion
choice

global protocol Negotiation(role P, role R, role A) {
    offer(string) from P to R;
    offer(string) from R to A;
    (string) from A to R;
    rec START {
        choice at R {
            accept() from R to P;
            confirm() from P to R;
        } or {
            offer(string) from R to P;
            (conditions:string) from P to R;
            continue START;
        } or {
            reject() from R to P;
            confirm() from R to P;}
    }
```
module Bookstore;

type <java> "java.lang.Integer" from "rt.jar" as Integer;
type <java> "java.lang.String" from "rt.jar" as String;

global protocol TwoBuyers(role A, role B, role S) {
  title(String) from A to S;
  quote(Integer) from S to A, B;
  rec LOOP {
    share(Integer) from A to B;
    choice at B {
      accept(address:String) from B to A, S;
      date(String) from S to B;
    } or {
      retry() from B to A, S;
      continue LOOP;
    } or {
      quit() from B to A, S;
    }
  }
}
module Bookstore_TwoBuyers_A;

type <java> "java.lang.Integer" from "rt.jar" as Integer;
type <java> "java.lang.String" from "rt.jar" as String;

local protocol TwoBuyers_A at A(role A, role B, role S) {
    title(String) to S;
    quote(Integer) from S;
    rec LOOP {
        share(Integer) to B;
        choice at B {
            accept(address: String) from B;
        } or {
            retry() from B;
            continue LOOP;
        } or {
            quit() from B;
        } } }

Global protocol well-formedness 1/2

global protocol ChoiceAmbiguous(role A, role B, role C) {
    choice at A {
        m1() from A to B; // X
        m2() from B to C;
        m3() from C to A;
    } or {
        m1() from A to B; // X
        m5() from B to C;
        m6() from C to A;
    }
}

global protocol ChoiceNotCommunicated(role A, role B, role C) {
    choice at A {
        m1() from A to B;
        m2() from B to C; // X
    } or {
        m4() from A to B;
    }
}
Global protocol well-formedness 2/2

```plaintext

global protocol ParallelNotLinear(role A, role B, role C) {
  par {
    m1() from A to B; // X
    m2() from B to C;
  } and {
    m1() from A to B; // X
    m4() from B to C;
  }
}

global protocol RecursionNoExit(role A, role B, role C, role D) {
  rec X {
    m1() from A to B;
    continue X;
  }
  m2() from A to B; // Unreachable for A, B
  m3() from C to D;
}
```
Application-level service call composition

// Direct specification

global protocol P3(role C, role S1, role S2, role S3, role S4)
{
    () from C to S1;
    () from S1 to S2;
    () from S2 to S1;
    () from S1 to S3;
    () from S3 to S4;
    () from S4 to S3;
    () from S3 to S4;
    () from S4 to S3;
    () from S3 to S1;
    () from S1 to C;
}
Scoping

\[ \text{global protocol ServiceCall}(\text{role Client}, \text{role Service}) \{ \]
\[ \quad \text{() from Client to Server;} \]
\[ \quad \text{() from Server to Client;} \]
\[ \} \]

// By composing basic ServiceCalls
\[ \text{global protocol P2}(\text{role C, role S1, role S2, role S3, role S4}) \{ \]
\[ \quad \text{() from C to S1;} \]
\[ \quad \text{do ServiceCall(S1 as Client, S2 as Server);} \]
\[ \quad \text{() from S1 to S3;} \]
\[ \quad \text{do ServiceCall(S3 as Client, S4 as Server);} \]
\[ \quad \text{do ServiceCall(S3 as Client, S4 as Server);} \]
\[ \quad \text{() from S3 to S1;} \]
\[ \quad \text{() from S1 to C;} \]
\[ \} \]
Scoping

// "Middleman" pattern
global protocol Middleman(
    role L, role M, role R, role S)
{
    () from L to M;
    do ServiceCall(M as Client, S as Server);
    do ServiceCall(M as Client, S as Server);
    () from M to R;
}

// By composing ServiceCall and Middleman patterns
global protocol P3(role C, role S1, role S2, role S3, role S4)
{
    () from C to S1;
    do ServiceCall(S1 as Client, S2 as Server);
    do Middleman(S1 as L, S3 as M, S4 as R);
    () from S1 to C;
}
https://confluence.oceanobservatories.org/display/syseng/CIAD+COI+OV+Negotiate+Protocol
type "SAPDoc1" from "SAPDoc1.yml" as SAP;

global protocol Negotiate(role Consumer as C, role Producer as P) {

}
OOI agent negotiation 3/5 (choice)

type <yml> "SAPDoc1" from "SAPDoc1.yml" as SAP;

global protocol Negotiate(role Consumer as C, role Producer as P) {
    propose(SAP) from C to P;

    choice at P {
        accept() from P to C;
        confirm() from C to P;
    } or {
        reject() from P to C;
    } or {
        propose(SAP) from P to C;
    }
}
type <yml> "SAPDoc1" from "SAPDoc1.yml" as SAP;

global protocol Negotiate(role Consumer as C, role Producer as P) {
    propose(SAP) from C to P;

    choice at P {
        accept() from P to C;
        confirm() from C to P;
    } or {
        reject() from P to C;
    } or {
        propose(SAP) from P to C;
        choice at C {
            accept() from C to P;
            confirm() from P to C;
        } or {
            reject() from C to P;
        } or {
            propose(SAP) from C to P;
        }
    }
}
type <yml> "SAPDoc1" from "SAPDoc1.yml" as SAP;

global protocol Negotiate(role Consumer as C, role Producer as P) {
    propose(SAP) from C to P;
    rec X {
        choice at P {
            accept() from P to C;
            confirm() from C to P;
        } or {
            reject() from P to C;
        } or {
            propose(SAP) from P to C;
        }
        choice at C {
            accept() from C to P;
            confirm() from P to C;
        } or {
            reject() from C to P;
        } or {
            propose(SAP) from C to P;
            continue X;
        }
    }
}
1. Writing correct global protocols with **Scribble Compiler**

2. Verify programs via **local monitors**

3. Build additional verification modules via **annotations**
Local Protocol Conformance

Global Protocol

**PROJECTION**
(At design time)

**FSM GENERATION**
(At runtime)

**LOCAL PROTOCOL FOR P**

**LOCAL PROTOCOL FOR R**

```plaintext
local protocol Negotiation at R(role P, role A) {
    offer(string) from P;
    offer(string) to A;
    (string) from A;
    rec START {
        choice at R {
            accept() to R;
            (conditions:string) from R;
        } or {
            offer(string) to P;
            continue START;
        } or {
            reject() to P;
            (reason:string) from R;
        }
    }
}
```

**LOCAL PROTOCOL FOR A**

**FSM FOR P**

Verification

**FSM FOR R**

**PROGRAM FOR P**

**PROGRAM FOR R**

**PROGRAM FOR A**
The Scribble Framework

- Scribble global protocols
  - Well-formedness validation

- Scribble local protocols
  - FSM generation (for endpoint monitoring)

- (Heterogeneous) endpoint programs
  - Scribble Conversation API
  - (Interoperable) Distributed Conversation Runtime
Local protocol projection (Negotiation Consumer)

// Global
propose(SAP) from C to P;
rec START {
  choice at P {
    accept() from P to C;
    confirm() from C to P;
  } or {
    reject() from P to C;
  } or {
    propose(SAP) from P to C;
    choice at C {
      accept() from C to P;
      confirm() from P to C;
    } or {
      reject() from C to P;
    } or {
      propose(SAP) from C to P;
      continue START;
    }
  }
}

// Projection for Consumer
propose(SAP) to P;
rec START {
  choice at P {
    accept() from P;
    confirm() to P;
  } or {
    reject() from P;
  } or {
    propose(SAP) from P;
    choice at C {
      accept() to P;
      confirm() from P;
    } or {
      reject() to P;
    } or {
      propose(SAP) to P;
      continue START;
    }
  }
}
FSM generation (Negotiation Consumer)
**FSM Generator**

**Scribble:**
Order(x:int) to Seller @\{x==1\}

**AST:**

```
nil
\|-- PROTOCOL
    \|-- SEND
        \|-- VALUE
            \|-- Order
                \|-- Seller
                    \|-- ASSERT
                        \|-- x
                            \|-- int
                                \|-- @\{x==1\}
```

**FSM:**

```
1 (SEND, Order, Seller) -->
    \|-- 2
```

**FSM transition table:**

```
(1, (send, order, seller)) -->
    (2, assertion_object, \{x:'int'\})
```
1. Writing correct global protocols with **Scribble Compiler**

2. Verify programs via *local monitors*

3. Build additional verification modules via **annotations**
Validation via Annotations

Annotations = @{Logic} Scribble Construct

- The monitor passes {'type':param, ...} to the upper layers
- Upper layers recognize and process the annotation type or discard it
- Statefull assertion

```plaintext
@{assert: payment + overdraft>=1000} offer(payment: int) from C to I;
```

```plaintext
@{deadline: 5s} offer(conditions string) from C to I;
```

```plaintext
rec Loop {
  @guard: repeat<10
  propose(string) from C to I;
}
```
Scribble Community

- **Webpage:**
  - [www.scribble.org](http://www.scribble.org)

- **GitHub:**
  - [https://github.com/scribble](https://github.com/scribble)

- **Tutorial:**
  - [www.doc.ic.ac.uk/~rhu/scribble/tutorial.html](http://www.doc.ic.ac.uk/~rhu/scribble/tutorial.html)

- **Specification (0.3):**
  - [www.doc.ic.ac.uk/~rhu/scribble/langref.html](http://www.doc.ic.ac.uk/~rhu/scribble/langref.html)
A theory for network monitoring

- Formalise MPST-monitoring and asynchronous networks.
- Introduce monitors as first-class objects in the theory
- Justify monitoring by soundness theorems.
  - Safety
    - monitors enforces specification conformance.
  - Transparency
    - monitors does not affect correct behaviours.
  - Fidelity
    - correspondence to global types is maintained.
Multiparty Sessions for Runtime Monitors

\[ A ::= \text{tt} \mid \text{ff} \mid e_1 = e_2 \mid e_1 < e_2 \mid \neg A \mid A_1 \land A_2 \mid A_1 \lor A_2 \]
\[ e ::= v \mid e_1 + e_2 \mid e_1 - e_2 \mid e_1 \times e_2 \mid e_1 \mod e_2 \quad S ::= \text{bool} \mid \text{int} \mid \text{string} \]
\[ G ::= r_1 \to r_2 : \{l_i(x_i:S_i)\{A_i\}.G_i\}_{i \in I} \mid G_1 \mid G_2 \mid G_1 ; G_2 \mid \mu t.G \mid t \mid \epsilon \mid \text{end} \]
\[ T ::= r!\{l_i(x_i:S_i)\{A_i\}.T_i\}_{i \in I} \mid r?\{l_i(x_i:S_i)\{A_i\}.T_i\}_{i \in I} \mid T_1 \mid T_2 \mid T_1 ; T_2 \mid \mu t.T \mid t \mid \epsilon \mid \text{end} \]
\[ P ::= \overline{a}(s[x]:T) \mid a(y[x]:T).P \mid k[r_1,r_2]!l(e) \mid k[r_1,r_2]?\{l_i(x_i).P_i\}_{i \in I} \]
\[ \text{if } e \text{ then } P \text{ else } Q \mid P \mid Q \mid 0 \mid \mu X.P \mid X \mid P ; Q \mid (\nu a).P \mid (\nu s)P \]
\[ N ::= [P]_x \mid N_1 ; N_2 \mid 0 \mid (\nu a)N \mid (\nu s)N \mid \langle r ; h \rangle \]
\[ r ::= a \mapsto \alpha \mid s[x] \mapsto \alpha \quad h ::= m \cdot h \mid \emptyset \quad m ::= \overline{a}(s[x]:T) \mid s\langle r_1,r_2,l(v) \rangle \]
Formal Semantics

\[
[\overline{a}(s[r]:T)]_\alpha \mid \langle r ; h \rangle \quad \rightarrow \quad [0]_\alpha \mid \langle r ; h \cdot \overline{a}(s[r]:T) \rangle \\
[a(y[r]:T).P]_\alpha \mid \langle r ; \overline{a}(s[r]:T) \cdot h \rangle \quad \rightarrow \quad [P[s/y]]_\alpha \mid \langle r \cdot s[r] \rightarrow \alpha ; h \rangle \uparrow \\
[s[r_1,r_2]!j(v)]_\alpha \mid \langle r ; h \rangle \quad \rightarrow \quad [0]_\alpha \mid \langle r ; h \cdot s(r_1,r_2,j(v)) \rangle \uparrow \uparrow \\
[s[r_1,r_2]?\{l_i(x_i).P_i\}_i]_\alpha \mid \langle r ; s(r_1,r_2,j(v)) \cdot h \rangle \quad \rightarrow \quad [P_j[v/x_j]]_\alpha \mid \langle r ; h \rangle \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\
\]

\[\uparrow : r(a) = \alpha \quad \uparrow \uparrow : r(s[r_2]) \neq \alpha \quad \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow : r(s[r_2]) = \alpha\]

- processes \( P \) located at principals \( \alpha \)
  - Abstracts local applications
- router \( r \)
  - abstracts network routing information updated on-the-fly
Formalism: Monitor

- **Specifications**

\[ \Sigma ::= \emptyset \mid \Sigma, \alpha : \langle \Gamma ; \Delta \rangle, \]

\[ \Gamma ::= \emptyset \mid \Gamma, a : ?(T[r]) \mid \Gamma, a : !(T[r]) \]

\[ \Delta ::= \emptyset \mid \Delta, s[r] : T, \]

\[ \Sigma : \text{spec.}, \Delta : \text{session env}, \Gamma : \text{shared env.} \]

- **Monitors**

\[ M = \alpha : \langle \Gamma ; \Delta \rangle \]

- Monitors are introduced as component of monitored networks

\[
\begin{align*}
M & \xrightarrow{s[r_1,r_2]!/\langle v \rangle} M' & r(s[r_2]) \neq \alpha \\
[s[r_1,r_2]!/\langle v \rangle]_{\alpha} \cdot M \cdot \langle r ; h \rangle & \xrightarrow{[0]_{\alpha}} [M']_{\langle r ; h \cdot s[r_1,r_2,l\langle v \rangle]\rangle} \\
M & \xrightarrow{s[r_1,r_2]!/\langle v \rangle} [s[r_1,r_2]!/\langle v \rangle]_{\alpha} \cdot M \cdot \langle r ; h \rangle & \xrightarrow{[0]_{\alpha}} [M]_{\langle r ; h \rangle}
\end{align*}
\]
Satisfaction

The satisfaction relation \( \models N : \Sigma \) relates networks and specification:
- if \( \Sigma \) expects an input, \( N \) should be able to process it.
- if \( N \) performs an output, \( \Sigma \) should be expecting it.
- still holds after reduction (coinductive definition).

Satisfaction equivalence
If \( N_1 \cong N_2 \) and \( \models N_1 : \Sigma \) then \( \models N_2 : \Sigma \).
Results (Safety)

Local Safety
\[ \models [P]_\alpha \mid M : \alpha : \langle \Gamma; \Delta \rangle \text{ with } M = \alpha : \langle \Gamma; \Delta \rangle. \]
- A monitored process satisfies its specification.

Global Safety
If $N$ is fully monitored w.r.t. $\Sigma$, then $\models N : \Sigma$.
- Monitored networks behave as expected.
Results (Transparency)

Local Transparency
If $\models [P]_\alpha : \alpha : \langle \Gamma ; \Delta \rangle$, then $[P]_\alpha \approx ([P]_\alpha | M)$ with $M = \alpha : \langle \Gamma ; \Delta \rangle$.

- unmonitored correct processes are undistinguishable from their monitored counterparts.
- allows one to mix monitored and typechecked processes.

Global Transparency
Assume $N$ and $\hat{N}$ have the same global transport $\langle r ; h \rangle$.
Assume:

1. $N$ is fully monitored w.r.t. $\Sigma$ and
2. $\hat{N} = M | \langle r ; h \rangle$ is unmonitored but $\models M : \Sigma$.

We have $N \cong \hat{N}$.

- monitors does not alterate behaviors of correct networks.
- monitor actions are not observable on correct components.
Results (Fidelity)

- a configuration is consistent: when it corresponds to a well-formed array of global types \((G_1, \ldots, G_n)\) through projection.
- conformance is satisfaction + receivability (queue can be emptied).

Session Fidelity

Assume:

1. configuration \(\Sigma; \langle r \; h \rangle\) is consistent,
2. network \(N \equiv M|\langle r \; h \rangle\) conforms to configuration \(\Sigma; \langle r \; h \rangle\).

For any \(\ell\), whenever we have \(N \xrightarrow{\ell_g} N'\) s.t. \(\Sigma; \langle r \; h \rangle \xrightarrow{\ell_g} \Sigma'; \langle r' \; h' \rangle\), it holds that \(\Sigma'; \langle r' \; h' \rangle\) is consistent and \(N'\) conforms to \(\Sigma'; \langle r' \; h' \rangle\).

- consistence is preserved by reduction,
- at any time, the network correspond to a well-formed specification.
Distribute Application Facility

Ocean Observatories Initiative
Figure 5: A coordinated set of autonomous underwater vehicles
Figure 3: Observatory comprised of ships, aircraft and autonomous vehicles linked to assimilation modeling capabilities on shore
**Multiparty Session Type Theory**

- Multiparty Asynchronous Session Types [POPL’08]
- Progress
  - Inference of Progress Typing [Coordination’13]
- Asynchronous Optimisations and Resource Analysis
  - Global Principal Typing in Partially Commutative Asynchronous Sessions [ESOP’09]
  - Higher-Order Pi-Calculus [TLCA’07, TLCA’09]
  - Buffered Communication Analysis in Distributed Multiparty Sessions [CONCUR’10]
Logics

- Design-by-Contract for Distributed Multiparty Interactions [CONCUR’10]
- Specifying Stateful Asynchronous Properties for Distributed Programs [CONCUR’12]
- Multiparty, Multi-session Logic [TGC’12]

Extensions of Multiparty Session Types

- Multiparty Symmetric Sum Types [Express’10]
- Parameterised Multiparty Session Types [FoSSaCs’10, LMCS]
- Dynamic Multirole Session Types [POPL’11]
- Nested Multiparty Sessions [CONCUR’12]
Dynamic Monitoring

Asynchronous Distributed Monitoring for Multiparty Session Enforcement [TGC’11]

Monitoring Networks through Multiparty Sessions [FORTE’13]

Automata Theories

Multiparty Session Automata [ESOP’12]

Synthesis in Communicating Automata [ICALP’13]

Typed Behavioural Theories

On Asynchronous Eventful Session Semantics [FORTE’11]


Governed Session Semantics [CONCUR’13]

Choreography Languages

Compositional Choreographies [CONCUR’13]
Language and Implementations

- Carrying out large-scale experiences with OOI, Pivotal, Red Hat, Congnizant, UNIFI, TrustCare
- JBoss SCRIBBLE [ICDCIT’10, COB’12] and SAVARA projects
- High-performance computing Session Java [ECOOP’08, ECOOP’10, Coordination’11] ⇒ Multiparty Session C [TOOLS’12][Hearts’12][EuroMPI’12][PDP’14]
- Multiparty session languages Ocaml, Java, C, Python, Scala, Jolie
- Trustworthy Pervasive Healthcare Services via Multiparty Session Types [FHIES’12]
- SPY: Local Verification of Global Protocols [RV’13]
- Practical interruptible conversations: Distributed dynamic verification with session types and Python [RV’13]
Session Type Projects

➤ **COST Action**: Behavioural Types for Reliable Large-Scale Software Systems, over 60 academic members in 17 countries

➤ **SADEA EPSRC** Exploiting Parallelism through Type Transformations for Hybrid Manycore Systems, with Vanderbauwhede, Scholz, Gay and Luk

➤ **Programme Grant**: From Data Types to Session Types: A Basis for Concurrency and Distribution, with Wadler and Gay

➤ **EPSRC** Conversation-Based Governance for Distributed Systems by Multiparty Session Types

➤ **NSF** Ocean Observatories Initiative

➤ **Pivotal** Dynamic Assurance based on Multiparty Session Types

➤ **Cognizant/Qualit-e**: EPSRC Knowledge Transfer Secondments
Session Type Reading List

[ESOP’98] Honda, Vasconcelos and Kubo, Language Primitives and Type Disciplines for Structured Communication-based Programming,

[SecRet’06] Yoshida and Vasconcelos, Language Primitives and Type Disciplines for Structured Communication-based Programming Revisited, ENTCS.

[ECOOP’08] Hu, Yoshida and Honda, Session-Based Distributed Programming in Java

[POPL’08] Carbone, Yoshida and Honda, Multiparty Asynchronous Session Types

[WS-FM’09] Dezani-Ciancaglini and de’Liguoro, Sessions and Session Types

[TOOLS’12] Ng, Yoshida and Honda, Multiparty Session C

[CONCUR’10] Caires and Pfenning, Session Types as Intuitionistic Linear Propositions; [ICFP’12] Walker, as Classical Linear Propositions.

[OOI] Video by John Orcutt, Professor of Geophysics, UCSD, Ocean Observing: Oceanography in the 21st Century
A rare cluster of qualities

From the team of OOI CI:

*Kohei has lead us deep into the nature of communication and processing. His esthetics, precision and enthusiasm for our mutual pursuit of formal Session (Conversation) Types and specifically for our OOI collaboration to realize this vision in very concrete terms were, as penned by Henry James, lessons in seeing the nuances of both beauty and craft, through a rare cluster of qualities - curiosity, patience and perception; all at the perfect pitch of passion and expression.*