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occam Obviously

If the title of this talk is the answer, we need to know the question …
I shall assume *some* knowledge of occam though …

How about:

Which language most irritates programmers who want to hack?

“The stupid compiler keeps refusing to compile my code” 😞

Which language most supports programmers who want to hack?

“The clever compiler keeps refusing to compile my code” 😊

“… but when it does, my code works first time!” 😊
If the title of this talk is the answer, we need to know the question …

Which language has concurrency built into its core design, with a compositional *(wysiwyg)* semantics founded on process algebra?

*occam* is almost its own process algebra, with laws and proof rules supported by a model checker *that enables* formal verification to be part of the normal program writing experience (by programmers who are not mathematicians).

Which language has concurrency safety rules built into its design that prohibits data races and guarantees sequential consistency?

*occam* processes are, therefore, immune to instruction re-ordering tricks played by modern multicore architectures *and* exploit the performance gains automatically and safely.
If the title of this talk is the answer, we need to know the question …

Which language has a concurrency model that is deterministic \textit{by default}, but which can simply and safely build non-deterministic systems (when needed) \textit{by design}?

\textit{occam PAR} is deterministic (like the CSP parallel operator). Non-determinism is only introduced through \texttt{ALT} (choice), \texttt{SHARED} channel-ends, random number generators and any (foolish) reliance on absolute time.

Which language has a concurrency model that is highly dynamic, allowing process networks to form and break up autonomously?

Thanks to the \texttt{\pi-calculus} extensions (mobile channel ends, mobile processes) introduced with \textit{occam-\pi}.
If the title of this talk is the answer, we need to know the question …

Which language has the fastest and most scalable multicore scheduler on the planet?

Probably … thanks to Carl / Fred / Adam / Kevin / et al.

Minimal use of atomic instructions, automatic and dynamic scheduling of frequently communicating processes to the same core (minimise cache misses), …

Millions of processes per processor are manageable (with sufficiently simple processes and enough memory). Hundreds of thousands or processes are typical (e.g. large-scale complex systems simulations and research into emergent behaviour), with 6x speed-up on quad-core i7 with hyper-threading obtained with no special programming care.
If the title of this talk is the answer, we need to know the question …

Which language can be introduced to undergraduates in *Fresher Week* so that they can be programming Lego robots to navigate their environment (reacting to bumps, following tracks) using concurrent processes for sensor gathering, brain logic and motor drivers … in one 90 minute class?

Yep …
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Which language had large-scale and successful industrial use 20-25 years ago … but is now mostly forgotten *(even as its ideas are slowly and expensively and painfully being reinvented piece-by-piece, as they must be)*?

Yep …
Computers were invented: programmable calculating machines that were Turing complete … meaning they could do anything any future computer could do (which was pretty cool).

Babbage’s Analytical Engine (1837). Sadly, too far ahead of its time, not enough funding and a bad choice (in retrospect) of number representation (decimal).

Working machines had to wait for a better understanding of theory:

Russell’s Principia Mathematica (1910-13) …
Godell’s Incompleteness Theorem (1931) …
Church’s Lambda Calculus (1936) …
Turing’s On Computable Numbers (1936) …

And seriously better funding:

The Second World War (1939-45) …
A Long Long Time Ago ...

Following the war, the pace picked up as the commercial potential became obvious … in the USA at least (ENIAC, 1946), but eventually everywhere.

Ideas for hardware and software developed and were put into practice at a rate unprecedented for any other technology.

From 1970 to this day, a new and unfortunate race started. It involves the phenomenon known as Moore’s Law. Paraphrasing (and only slightly mis-quoting) David May (2005):

“Hardware capabilities double every 18 months. Unfortunately, software overheads respond by doubling every 17 months …”

We experience this every day. Our laptops/tablets/phones are millions of times more powerful than the computers that landed the Apollo astronauts on the moon. But what are they doing most of the time … why, so often, won’t they respond to us … why the spinning wheel of death?
A Long Long Time Ago ...

Sometime in the late 60s (or early 70s), Dijkstra made a similar point:

“In the beginning when we had no computers, we had no problems. Then when we had small computers, we had small problems. Now that we have big computers, we have big problems …”

Now (2012), we have tiny computers again – mass-produced and in most everyone’s pockets.

Thanks to the ingenuity of our hardware engineers, their astonishing power is barely related to their physical size.

Thanks to the ingenuity of our software engineers, we have astonishing problems …
Bad News on the Doorstep ...

Something went wrong.

The foundations of computing from the first half of the 20th. Century show that mathematics is probably important. The pioneers were mathematicians or engineers (who relied on mathematical models of the materials they were engineering).

Such foundations seem mostly abandoned today:

Walk into a class of (say) second-year CS undergraduates in any (maybe, almost any) university and ask them what a loop invariant is … or recursion invariant (if they are into functional programming) or class invariant (if they are into object orientation). Result?

I did this in my university this academic year (2011-12). Mostly blank stares – this is not an uncommon reaction – but gentle further questioning revealed that they really didn’t know. Some, thank goodness, did express curiosity though.
Bad News on the Doorstep ...

Nailing invariance is one of the most powerful forms of analysis – whether in mathematics or programming. It is necessary before construction.

How can (and why do) we teach loops or recursion or classes without teaching the concept of invariance? We must form invariants in our head whenever we program a loop (recursive function, class) – otherwise, our code will just be guesswork. So, why not declare those invariants explicitly in our code (where they could also play a crucial role in verification)? We don’t need to be mathematicians to write invariants – just good engineers. And we need to be good engineers to develop software.

Perhaps invariance is taught in a theory course somewhere? Not good enough! Programming practice cannot be taught independently of theory – they must be together. Programming practice cannot be engaged in independently of theory – they must be together. Ignoring elementary theory means programming blind … and the eventual result is chaos.
Missing *invariance*, however, is only one of our problems with software.

Dijkstra suggested that only well-trained mathematicians should be allowed to program computers.

That is not my opinion ... but I believe that in failing to engineer certain crucial mathematics into the tools provided for programming, we have failed as engineers and should not be surprised when things go very wrong.

Addressing such failure is long overdue ...
Where does concurrency fit in?

Computer systems – to be of use in this world – need to model that part of the world for which it is to be used.

If that modeling can reflect the natural concurrency in the system … it should be simpler.

Yet concurrency is thought to be an advanced topic, harder than serial computing (which therefore needs to be taught and mastered first).
A Generation Lost in Space ...

Where does concurrency fit in?

This *serial-first* tradition makes no sense ...

... which has *(radical)* implications on how we educate people for computer science ...

... and on how we apply what we have learnt ...
A Generation Lost in Space ...

Where does concurrency fit in?

This *serial-first* tradition makes no sense ...

Concurrency is a powerful tool for *simplifying* the description of systems.

*Performance* spins out from the above, but is *not* the primary focus.

Of course, we need a model of concurrency that is *mathematically clean*, yields no engineering surprises and scales well with system complexity.
The story of **The Dining Philosophers** is due to **Edsger Dijkstra** – one of the founding fathers of Computer Science.

It illustrates a classic problem in concurrency: *how to share resources safely between competing consumers.*

[http://www.cs.utexas.edu/users/EWD/ewd03xx/EWD310.PDF](http://www.cs.utexas.edu/users/EWD/ewd03xx/EWD310.PDF)
The story of **The Dining Philosophers** is due to **Edsger Dijkstra** – one of the founding fathers of Computer Science.

It illustrates a classic problem in concurrency: **how to share resources safely between competing consumers**.

In this example, the **resources** are the forks and the **consumers** are the philosophers.

Problems arise because of the limited nature of the resources (only 5 forks) and because each consumer (5 of them) needs 2 forks at a time.
The story of *The Dining Philosophers* is due to Edsger Dijkstra – one of the founding fathers of Computer Science.

The source of the story was a deadlock that would mysteriously arise from time to time in an early multiprocessing operating system.

*The philosophers are user processes* that need file I/O.

To read or write a file, a process has to acquire a data buffer (to smooth data transfer and make it fast). If 2 files need to be open at the same time, 2 buffers are needed.

In those days, memory was scarce – so the number of buffers was limited. *The forks are the buffers.*
The story of *The Dining Philosophers* is due to Edsger Dijkstra – one of the founding fathers of Computer Science.

Today – some 37 years later – memory is not so scarce!

Yet, operating system (or specific application) deadlock is rampant. How often does your whole laptop/tablet/phone (or one of its apps) lock up on you?

We have been, and still are, making the same mistakes again and again and again ...
*This serial-first tradition makes no sense …*

Concurrency is a powerful tool for *simplifying* the description of systems.

*Performance* spins out from the above, but is *not* the primary focus.

Of course, we need a model of concurrency that is *mathematically clean*, yields no engineering surprises and scales well with system complexity.

These lessons have not been learned …
A Generation Lost in Space ...

And object orientation?

What we tell our students:

"An opaque object interacting with a wider system of objects via its formal public interface."

-private' data
A Generation Lost in Space ...

Class invariants:

“Predicates on private data held within an object that are always true between method calls.”

And object orientation?
A Generation Lost in Space ...

Class invariants:

*When writing method code, we may assume the invariants ... and must re-establish them by the end.*

And object orientation?

Not good enough!
A Generation Lost in Space ...

Class invariants:

*Invariants must also be established before any call-out ...
... in case of call-back!* 😞

Who does this?

And object orientation?

private 
data
A Generation Lost in Space ...

Class invariants:

*Invariants must also be established before any call-out ... in case of call-back! 😞*

But not doing this is safe only if no callbacks can happen ...
A Generation Lost in Space ...

Class invariants:

*Invariants must also be established before any call-out ... in case of call-back!* 😞

... its semantics depends on its context ... we need whole-system knowledge.
The truth:

“Undeclared interactions between the object and any other parts of the system …”

Documentation = Source Code
A Generation Lost in Space ...

It gets worse ...

'private' data
Suppose class \texttt{X} has a \texttt{private} integer field, \texttt{count}, and \texttt{private} methods that see and change it.

Suppose the following code occurs in one of those methods:

\begin{verbatim}
    count = 42; thing.f();
\end{verbatim}

What is the value of \texttt{count} after these two statements?
Whether thing is an interface or a class, its \( f() \) method could be implemented or overridden to call us back and modify our \( \text{count} \).
A Generation Lost in Space ...

Note that synchronized monitor locks do nothing to prevent such side-effecting call backs …
A Generation Lost in Space ...

We don’t know the value of `count` after the following two statements:

```
count = 42; thing.f();
```

This lack of ability to reason locally about local data is strangely familiar. In the bad old days, free use of global variables led us into exactly the same mess.  

*Structured programming* led us out of that mire. Did *object orientation* just take us back in?
What is the value of \texttt{count} after these two statements?

\begin{itemize}
  \item \texttt{count} := 42
  \item \texttt{thing} ! \texttt{anything}
\end{itemize}

This time we do know. \emph{What-you-see-is-what-you-get.} The answer is \textbf{42}.

The only way \texttt{count} can be changed is if \emph{this process} changes it - and it doesn’t! Local analysis is sufficient. We don’t need to worry about what lies beyond the \texttt{thing} channel. Our intuitive understanding about the sequence of instructions has been honoured.
public class Counter {
  private int n = 0;
  private Logger logger;

  public Counter (Logger logger) {
    this.logger = logger;
  }

  public void increment () {
    n++;
    logger.log (n);
  }

  public int getCount () {
    return n;
  }
}

Can the value of \( n \) change? 

YES 😞 😞 😞
Can the value of $n$ change?

NO 😊😊😊

Local reasoning is enough … what you see is what you get.
The semantics of **counter** does not depend on context.

Even if the **logger** process is one of its clients, it makes no difference to **counter**.

```plaintext
SHARED ! CHAN COUNTER.ASK ask:
SHARED ? CHAN COUNTER.ANSWER answer:
SHARED ! CHAN LOGGER logger:

PAR
  counter (ask?, answer!, logger!)
  PAR i = 0 FOR 5
  smiley (ask!, answer?)
```
The semantics of `counter` does not depend on context.

If the `logger` process calls back, its request will be queued until `counter` can take it.
The semantics of \texttt{counter} does not depend on context.

If the call-back is part of an \textit{extended input}, there will be deadlock – but \texttt{counter} semantics has not changed.
Local reasoning is all that’s needed.

PROC counter (CHAN COUNTER.ASK ask?,
             CHAN COUNTER.ANSWER answer!,
             CHAN LOGGER logger)

INITIAL INT n IS 0:
WHILE TRUE
  ask ? CASE
    increment
      SEQ
      n := n + 1
      logger ! n
    get.count
      answer ! n
  :

Can the value of $n$ change?

NO 😊😊😊
Process Oriented Design

A Diagram Language (in 4 pictures)
Process Oriented Design (in 4 diagrams)

(a) a network of three processes, connected by four internal (hidden) and three external channels.

(b) three processes sharing the writing end of a channel to a server process.

(c) three processes sharing the writing end of a channel to a bank of servers sharing the reading end.

(d) n processes enrolled on a shared barrier (any process synchronising must wait for all to synchronise).
(a) a network of three processes, connected by four internal (hidden) and three external channels.

CHAN BYTE a, b, c, d:
PAR
  foo (in?, left!, a?, b!, c!)
  bar (a!, b?, d!)
  merge (c?, d?, right!)
PROC thing (CHAN INT in?, left!, right!)
CHAN BYTE a, b, c, d:
PAR
  foo (in?, left!, a?, b!, c!)
  bar (a!, b?, d!)
  merge (c?, d?, right!)
:
PROC thing (CHAN INT in?, left!, right!)
CHAN BYTE a, b, c, d:
PAR
  foo (in?, left!, a?, b!, c!)
  bar (a!, b?, d!)
  merge (c?, d?, right!)
:
Like *foo*, *bar* and *merge* previously, *thing* is a process that can be used as a component in another network.

Concurrent systems have structure – networks within networks. We must be able to express this! And we can … 😊😊😊
(b) three processes sharing the writing end of a channel to a server process.

```
SHARED ! CHAN SOME_SERVICE c:
PAR
  circle (c!)
  triangle (c!)
  square (c!)
  server (c?)
```
(c) three processes sharing the writing end of a channel to a bank of servers sharing the reading end.
BARRIER \( b \):
\[
\text{PAR } i = 0 \text{ FOR } n \text{ ENROLL } b \\
p(i, b)
\]

(d) \( n \) processes enrolled on a shared barrier (any process synchronising must wait for all to synchronise).
CSP Semantics

Traces, failures, divergences and refinement (in 3 slides)
An event (e.g. channel communication, barrier sync) happens when, and only when, all processes relevant to it choose to engage.

A process trace is a finite sequence of events in which a process may engage.

Safety (trace refinement)

\( P \) trace-refines \( Q \) means the traces of \( P \) are also traces of \( Q \) -- anything \( P \) may do, so may \( Q \). Turning this round, if there is something \( Q \) cannot do, \( P \) cannot do it either. Now, if \( Q \) is a specification, then \( P \) is safe in the sense that \( P \) cannot exhibit behaviour (presumably ‘bad’) disallowed by \( Q \).

This is not enough -- e.g. STOP trace-refines anything, since it does nothing; but it’s not an acceptable implementation of anything!
A process **state** is what a process has become after executing one of its traces. An event is **external** to a process if other processes may engage on it. A state is **stable** if it can only proceed by engaging in an external event (i.e. engage with its **environment**).

A process **failure** is a stable state together with a set of external events on which it *may* refuse to engage.

**Liveness (failure refinement)***

\[ P \text{ failure-refines } Q \text{ means } (P \text{ trace-refines } Q) \text{ and } (\text{the failures of } P \text{ are also failures of } Q). \] So, if a **state-and-event-set** is *not* a failure of *Q*, it is *not* a failure of *P* either. Now, if *Q* is a spec, then *P* fulfills its **liveness** conditions: if the spec (Q) says that in this state you *will react* to one of these events (i.e. there is no failure here), the implementation (P) *will react*. 
A process state is *divergent* if, from that state, the process *may* engage in an infinite sequence of *internal* events (i.e. it *may* forever refuse to engage with its environment). This is usually a bad thing.

**Livellock-free (failure-divergence refinement)**

\( P \text{ failure-divergence-refines } Q \) means \( P \text{ failure-refines}^* Q \) and (the divergences of \( P \) are also divergences of \( Q \)). Now, if \( Q \) is a specification *with no divergences* (which would be usual), then the implementation \( P \) *also has no divergences*.

* Note: a divergent state is unstable but *may* recover to a stable state. However, stable states reached via divergent ones are not considered as candidates for failures in this failure-refinement sub-clause of failure-divergence-refinement. Under failure-divergence semantics, *a divergent state is considered so dangerous* that further consideration of process behaviour is not worth pursuing.
Dynamic networks (and occam-π)

Emergent engineering:
a generic space-time modelling and
swarm architecture

(in 45 slides)
Modelling Bio-Mechanisms

- **In-vivo ⇔ In-silico**
  - One of the UK ‘Grand Challenge’ areas.
  - Move *life-sciences* from *description* to *modelling / prediction*.
  - Example: *the Nematode worm*.
  - Development: *from fertilised cell to adult (with virtual experiments)*.
  - Sensors and movement: *reaction to stimuli*.
  - Interaction *between organisms and other pieces of environment*.

- **Modelling technologies**
  - Communicating process networks – fundamentally good fit.
  - Cope with growth / decay, combine / split (evolving topologies).
  - Mobility and location / neighbour awareness.
  - Simplicity, dynamics, performance and safety.

- **occam-π (and JCSP)**
  - Robust and lightweight – good theoretical support.
  - ~10,000,000 processes with useful behaviour in useful time.
  - Enough to make a start …
Mobility and Location Awareness

- Classical communicating process applications
  - Static network structures.
  - Static memory / silicon requirements (pre-allocated).
  - Great for hardware design and software for embedded controllers.
  - Consistent and rich underlying theory – CSP.

- Dynamic communicating processes – some questions
  - Mutating topologies: how to keep them safe?
  - Mobile channel-ends and processes: dual notions?
  - Simple operational semantics: low overhead implementation? Yes.
  - Process algebra: combine the best of CSP and the $\pi$-calculus? Yes.
  - Refinement: for manageable system verification … can we keep?
  - Location awareness: how can mobile processes know where they are, how can they find each other and link up?
  - Programmability: at what level – individual processes or clusters?
  - Overall behaviour: planned or emergent?
Location (Neighbourhood) Awareness

The Matrix

Mobile Agents
Location (Neighbourhood) Awareness
Location (Neighbourhood) Awareness
Location (Neighbourhood) Awareness
The Matrix

- A network of (mostly passive) server processes.
- Responds to client requests from the mobile agents and, occasionally, from *neighbouring* server nodes.
- Deadlock avoided (in the matrix) *either* by one-place buffered server channels *or* by pure-client slave processes (one per matrix node) that ask their server node for elements (e.g. mobile agents) and forward them to neighbouring nodes.
- Server nodes only see neighbours, maintain registry of currently located agents (and, maybe, agents on the neighbouring nodes) and answer queries from local agents (including moving them).

The Agents

- Attached to one node of the Matrix at a time.
- Sense presence of other agents – on local or neighbouring nodes.
- Interact with other local agents – must use agent-specific protocol to avoid deadlock. May decide to reproduce, split or move.
- Local (or global) *sync barriers* to maintain sense of time.
A Thesis and Hypothesis

Thesis

- Natural systems are concurrent at all levels of scale. Control is devolved. Central command cannot manage the complexity.
- Natural systems are complex, robust, efficient, long-lived and continuously evolving. **We should take the hint!**
- Natural mechanisms should map on to simple engineering principles with low cost and high benefit. Concurrency is a natural mechanism.
- We should look on **concurrency** as a **core design mechanism** – not as something difficult, used only to boost performance.
- Computer science took a wrong turn once. Concurrency should not introduce the algorithmic distortions and hazards evident in current practice. It should **simplify** and **hasten** the construction, commisioning and maintenance of systems.

Hypothesis

- The wrong turn can be corrected and this correction is needed now.
Case Study: blood clotting

**Haemostasis:** we consider a greatly simplified model of the formation of blood clots in response to damage in blood vessels.

**Platelets** are passive quasi-cells carried in the bloodstream. They become **activated** when a balance between chemical suppressants and activators shift in favour of activation.

When activated, they become **sticky** …

We are just going to model the clumping together of such sticky activated platelets to form **clots**.

To learn and refine our modelling techniques, we shall start with a simple one-dimensional model of a bloodstream.
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Unfinished Business (occam-$\pi^2$)

- recursive union types
- remove current protocols
- introduce session protocols
- unify static/dynamic allocation
- self-verifying code
- BARRIER and output guards
- what else ... ???

(in 16 slides)
There has been a proposal (OEP 156) for \texttt{UNION} types, since 2006:

\begin{verbatim}
DATA TYPE FOO
  CASE
    sugar, BOOL, REAL32, [8]BYTE
    salt, BYTE, BYTE
    pepper
  :

DATA TYPE COLOUR
  CASE
    red
    green
    blue
  :
\end{verbatim}

Example literals:

\begin{verbatim}
[sugar, TRUE, 99.99, "Krakatoa"]
[salt, 42, 'A']
[pepper]

[red]
[green]
[blue]
\end{verbatim}
(occam-$\pi^2$) Recursive Union Types

Processing values of a union variable requires a `CASE` process to determine the variant:

```plaintext
DATA TYPE FOO
  CASE
    sugar, BOOL, REAL32, [8]BYTE
    salt, BYTE, BYTE
    pepper
:
```

Therefore, values of one variant cannot be processed as another.

```plaintext
CASE my.foomy.foo
  sugar, BOOL b, REAL32 x, [8]BYTE s
  ... 'b', 'x' and 's' abbreviate the component fields
  salt, BYTE m, BYTE n
  ... 'm' and 'n' abbreviate the component fields
  pepper
  ...
:
```
Recursive union types are allowed:


given
\begin{align*}
\text{RECURSIVE DATA TYPE THING} \\
\text{CASE} \\
\text{node, THING, SOME\_DATA, THING} \\
\text{empty} \\
\end{align*}

Only \textbf{tree} structures will be allowed to be constructed. This means all elements of a recursive structure have only a single reference – i.e. \textit{no aliasing} (in line with all \textit{occam} elements). This enables simple and safe parallel processing of all such structures.

We \textit{think} that the compiler can enforce the constraint to \textbf{tree} structures – thanks to its anti-alias checking. \textit{To be researched} …
**Recursive Union Types**

Recursive union types are allowed:

```
RECURSIVE DATA TYPE THING
CASE
  node, THING, SOME.DATA, THING
  empty
  :
```

Garbage collection is automatic upon a lost reference, with costs directly proportional to the (recursive) size of the lost structure.

In line with all *occam* elements, no “null pointer exceptions” can occur – though the compiler may complain about the *defined status* of union variables or fields.

Recursive union types are an enabling data structure for writing compilers (and more), missing from *occam* for too long. Novel and simple parallel approaches are possible ... *to be efficiently consumed by multicore.*
Sequential Protocols

Mostly, these are simply replaced by RECORD data types.

The one semantic win for sequential protocols over RECORDs was taking advantage of the sequence in the protocol – for example:

```
in ? i; A[i]
```

where an early item of data is used to address the location of a later one.

However, this is won back with session protocols, with no loss of syntactic clarity or runtime efficiency. See later.
Counted Array Protocols

These are replaced by dynamically sized arrays.
**(occam-π^2) Remove Current Protocols**

Variant *(CASE)* Protocols

These are replaced by *union* data types.

The one *pragmatic* win for variant protocols over *union* types was when program logic meant that a *large* data variant did not need to be considered by the receiving process – so that space for that *large* variant did not need to be allocated.

In the new proposal (see later), this is won back (and more) through all *large* data items being on the heap and only references being (safely) moved.

The above paragraph assumes processes connected in the same memory space. But it’s still true for processes in different memory spaces – the data is copied from heap to heap and the reference obtained by the receiving process will be valid for its memory.
Adam Sampson’s “Two-Way Protocols” (CPA 2008, York)

These are communication protocols in the sense normally understood (i.e. patterns of communication).

They are associated with a single channel, which may have shared ends.

The channel is directed (in the same sense as a current channel record is directed), but may be used in both directions (possibly at the same time!).
(occam-π²) Session Protocols

Adam Sampson’s “Two-Way Protocols” (CPA 2008, York)

The simplest session protocol is one data type, sent one way, once. This corresponds to a classical channel.

Structured sessions consist of separately typed messages flying in (nested) SEQ, ALT and/or PAR. This declared structure is the session protocol – syntactic details are not yet settled. The compiler checks that all code operating on the channel conforms, tracking use across all processes and procedures. Channel parameters carrying a session protocol will have to declare which (named) part of the protocol their PROC implements.

We may be able to drop channel records from the language. These are mainly used for two-way conversations and are more safely handled by a session protocol (and with less syntactic clutter).
(occam-$\pi^2$) Unify Static / Dynamic

Compiler-known *small* items (<= 8 or 16 bytes?) are pre-allocated on their process stack.

Everything else is dynamically allocated on the heap, with references on the stack.

The programmer is blind to the above. In particular, there is the same syntax for declaring sized arrays, regardless of whether the size is known to the compiler:

\[(n)\text{THING } t:\]  -- 'n' may be a run-time value

Array size is no longer part of the type. An array variable declared with one size may be assigned to an array with another size (same type, of course). An array variable may be declared without size, but must then be assigned (either by assignment or incoming communication) to an actual array value before being used.
Assignment and communication are handled in the most efficient way.

Stack items (always **small**) are assigned/communicated by **copying**.

Heap items are assigned/communicated by **reference**:

Normally, this is the reference to the item held by the sender …

However, if compiler usage analysis of the sending process shows the assigned/communicated data is used later by that process, a reference to a (deeply) cloned copy is sent.

Assignment and communication are handled in the most efficient way.

Data may optionally qualified as **MOBILE** (if the application semantics demands that only one copy may exist at all times):

- **Small MOBILE** items (on the stack) are assigned/communicated by **copying** – as before.
- **Large MOBILE** items (on the heap) are assigned/communicated by **reference** – as before. The reference will be to the item held by the sender …

However, if compiler usage analysis of the sending process shows the assigned/communicated data is used later by that process, this is a semantic error and the compilation fails (reporting the error).

This is the current algorithm for **occam-π** mobiles.
This is a proposal to make formal verification of occam-π programs manageable entirely within the language.

The language is extended with qualifiers on types and processes (to indicate relevance for verification and/or execution) and assertions about refinement (including deadlock, livelock and determinism).

The compiler abstracts a set of CSP equations and assertions, delegates their analysis to the FDR2 model checker and reports back in terms related to the occam-π source. The full (FDR2) range of CSP assertions is accessible, with no knowledge of CSP formalism required by the occam-π programmer.

Programs are proved just by writing and compiling programs.
We have them in \textit{JCSP} ... why not in \textit{occam-π²}? 

\begin{verbatim}
\textbf{ALT}
\texttt{SYNC bar}
\begin{verbatim}
... over the barrier, carry on
out! n
... message taken, continue
in? x
... message arrived, process it
\texttt{tim? AFTER timeout}
... response
\end{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

So long as the additional costs on \textbf{ALT}s not using them can be made negligible ...
Allow barriers and channels to be mixed with data in record fields?

Classically, synchronising elements and passive data have been kept separate. Operations on them have different syntax (e.g. sending on a channel is *not* a procedure call). The latter has clear semantic benefit and should remain. Can we relax on the former? What are the benefits?

What else … ???
Almost done ...
Observation

Can we teach students *(those who love to program, anyway)* concurrency so that:

- they quickly develop a correct and intuitive understanding of the primitive mechanisms *(e.g. processes, communication, synchronisation, networks)* and higher level patterns *(e.g. client-server, phased barrier, I/O-PAR)* …?

- they can use those primitives and patterns with the same fluency as they use serial computing primitives, *without tripping over dark hazards* …?

- they can develop their own patterns when the standard ones don’t apply …?

- they can use formal methods to verify good behaviour *(e.g. freedom from deadlock and livelock, safety, liveness)*, without training in the underlying mathematics *(process algebra, denotational semantics)* …?

- they can do this as *normal everyday practice*, without any sense of fear …?
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Can we teach students *(those who love to program, anyway)* concurrency so that:

- they quickly develop a correct and intuitive understanding of the primitive mechanisms *(e.g. processes, communication, synchronisation, networks)* and higher level patterns *(e.g. client-server, phased barrier, I/O-PAR)* ...

- they can use those primitives and patterns with the same fluency as they use serial computing primitives, without tripping over dark hazards ...

- they can develop their own patterns when the standard ones don’t apply ...

- they can use formal methods to verify good behaviour *(e.g. freedom from deadlock and livelock, safety, liveness)*, without training in the underlying mathematics *(process algebra, denotational semantics)* ...

- they can do this as normal everyday practice, without any sense of fear ...

And not only students ...

Yes, we can!
So ...
Which language has …

- a dynamic concurrency model built into its core design … with full denotational semantics (based on the CSP traces/failures/divergences model) …

- no data race hazards (eliminated by compiler aliasing analysis) …

- deterministic concurrency by default. Non-determinism is introduced only by explicit use of special features (e.g. choice, shared channels) …

- the fastest and most effective multicore scheduler on the planet (probably) …

- program verification by programming (and a little thinking) …

- ease of learning, ease of use (e.g. 90 min Lego Robots ‘Fresher’ workshop) …

- past major industrial use (20-25 years ago) …

- demonstrated powers of expression and performance in a range of currently important application areas (e.g. large-scale modelling, emergence, embedded micro-systems) …
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occam Obviously

... but has now been mostly forgotten, along with all its lessons?
Which language has ...

- a dynamic concurrency model built into its core design … with full denotational semantics (based on the CSP traces/failures/divergences model) …
- no data race hazards (eliminated by compiler aliasing analysis) …
- deterministic concurrency by default. Non-determinism is introduced only by explicit use of special features (e.g. choice, shared channels) …

Any questions?

Bye Bye, occam-$\pi$
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... but has now been mostly forgotten, along with all its lessons?