Disciplining Orchestration and Conversation in Service-Oriented Computing

Ivan Lanese (Bologna), **Vasco T. Vasconcelos** (Lisbon), Francisco Martins (Lisbon), Antonio Ravara (Lisbon)

• Ubiquitous in business:

Ubiquitous in business:
 New technologies, acquisitions, mergers.

Ubiquitous in business:
 New technologies, acquisitions, mergers.

• Evil to programmers:

Ubiquitous in business:
 New technologies, acquisitions,

mergers.

• Evil to programmers:

Separation of soft development and soft maintenance is vanishing.

Existing technologies won't do

Existing technologies won't do

• **Objects** incapable to cope with the rapidly change of software systems

Existing technologies won't do

- **Objects** incapable to cope with the rapidly change of software systems
- **Components** are usually delivered physically; do not take advantage of internet-based computing

Accommodating change: software services

• Definitions abound. Here's a recent one:

A coarse grain, discoverable entity that [..] interacts with applications and other services. Elfatatry, CACM, Aug 2007

Aim

- Develop formal bases for Service Oriented Computing (SOC):
 - including models and techniques
 - allowing for safe development of applications
 - check that systems provide the required functionalities

• Web services

- Web services
- XML, SOAP, WSDL, ...

- Web services
- XML, SOAP, WSDL, ...
- Service discovery, negotiation, brokerage

Outline

• A motivating example

- Semantics
- Analyses
- Conclusion

• A process

(date) {query-the-hotel-db}.price

• A process

receive a value

(date) {query-the-hotel-db}.price







• A service



• A service

 $bologna => (date) {query-the-hotel-db}.price$



• A service

 $bologna => (date) {query-the-hotel-db}.price$

service name



• A service

bologna => (date) {query-the-hotel-db}.price

service name right arrow indicates provider

• A service consumer

bologna \leq 31Jul2007.(price) {use-price}

• A service consumer

bologna ≤ 31 Jul 2007. (price) {use-price}

• An interaction

• A service consumer

bologna $\leq = 31$ Jul 2007. (price) {use-price}

• An interaction

bologna => ... | bologna <= ...

• A service consumer

bologna ≤ 31 Jul2007.(price) {use-price}

• An interaction

bologna => ... | bologna <= ... provider

• A service consumer

bologna $\leq = 31 Jul 2007.(price) \{use-price\}$

• An interaction

bologna => ... | bologna <= ... provider consumer

• A service consumer

bologna ≤ 31 Jul2007.(price) {use-price}

• An interaction

parallel composition

bologna => ... | bologna \leq ...

provider

consumer

...calls three services

...calls three services

bologna <= date.(price1) ... |
azores <= date.(price2) ... |
lisbon <= date.(price3) ...</pre>

...calls three services

bologna <= date.(price1) ... |
azores <= date.(price2) ... |
lisbon <= date.(price3) ...</pre>

• How to collect the three prices in a single process, for further processing?

Streams to the rescue

• A service orchestrator

stream

bologna <= date.(price1).feed price1 |
azores <= date.(price2).feed price2 |
lisbon <= date.(price3).feed price3
as f in
f(x).f(y).{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}</pre>

Streams to the rescue

• A service orchestrator

write into the stream

stream

bologna <= date.(price1).feed price1
azores <= date.(price2).feed price2 |
lisbon <= date.(price3).feed price3
as f in
f(x).f(y).{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}</pre>
Streams to the rescue

• A service orchestrator

write into the stream

stream

bologna <= date.(price1).feed price1
azores <= date.(price2).feed price2 |
lisbon <= date.(price3).feed price3
as f in
f(x).f(y).{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}</pre>

read from the stream

(call bologna(date) |
call azores(date) |
call lisbon(date)) > x y >
{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}

call service bologna; write the result into the pipe

(call bologna(date) |
call azores(date) |
call lisbon(date)) > x y >
{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}

call service bologna; write the result into the pipe

(call bologna(date) |
call azores(date) |
call lisbon(date)) > x y >
{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}

read two values from the pipe; call them x and y

call service bologna; write the result into the pipe

(call bologna(date) |
call azores(date) |
call lisbon(date)) > x y >
{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}

read two values from the pipe; call them x and y

> Inspired in Orc!

broker => (date).(
 (call bologna(date) |
 call azores(date) |
 call lisbon(date)) > x y >
 call min(x,y) > m > m)

a service definition

broker => (date).(
 (call bologna(date) |
 call azores(date) |
 call lisbon(date)) > x y >
 call min(x,y) > m > m)

a service definition

broker => (date).(
 (call bologna(date) |
 call azores(date) |
 call lisbon(date)) > x y >
 call min(x,y) > m > m)

call a service to compute the min

a service definition

broker => (date).(
 (call bologna(date) |
 call azores(date) |
 call lisbon(date)) > x y >
 call min(x,y) > m > m)

call a service to compute the min

read the result

a service definition

broker => (date).(
 (call bologna(date) |
 call azores(date) |
 return
 call lisbon(date)) > x y
 it
 call min(x,y) > m > m)

call a service to compute the min

read the result

Clients won't notice the difference

• The client

broker ≤ 31 Jul 2007. (price) {use-price}

• Interaction as before

broker $\leq = \dots$ | broker $= > \dots$

Clients won't notice the difference

• The client

broker ≤ 31 Jul 2007. (price) {use-price}

• Interaction as before

broker $<= \dots$ | broker $=> \dots$

Central to services!

Syntax

P,Q	::=	Processes	
	P Q	Parallel composition	
	$(\nu a)P$	Name restriction	
	0	Terminated process	Process
	X	Process variable	calculus
	$\operatorname{rec} X.P$	Recursive process definition	
	$a \Rightarrow P$	Service definition	
	$a \Leftarrow P$	Service invocation	Service
	v.P	Value sending	
	(x)P	Value reception	Protocol
	stream P as f in Q	Stream	
	feed $v.P$	Feed the process' stream	
	f(x).P	Read from a stream	Stream

Operational semantics: service invocation

bologna =>
(date) {...date...}.price

bologna <= 31Jul2007.(price) {...price...}

Operational semantics: service invocation

bologna =>
(date) {...date...}.price

bologna <= 31Jul2007.(price) {...price...}

(date)
{...date...}.price

31Jul2007.(price) {...price...}

Operational semantics: service invocation

bologna => (date) {...date...}.price

bologna <= 31Jul2007.(price) {...price...}

new session channel



31Jul2007.(price) {...price...}

Operational semantics: protocol

r | >(date) {...date...}.price r|> 31Jul2007. (price) {...price...}

Operational semantics: protocol

r | >(date) {...date...}.price

r | > 31Jul2007. (price) {...price...}

r | > {... 31Jul2007...}.price

r | >(price) {...price...}

stream
... |feed 196 |...
as f in
f(x).f(y).{...x...y...}

stream ... | **feed** 196 | ... **as** f **in** f(x).f(y).{...x...y...}

stream ... | nil | ... as f=196 in f(x).f(y).{...x...y...}

stream ... | **feed** 196 | ... **as** f **in** f(x).f(y).{...x...y...}

enqueue

stream
... | nil | ...
as f=196 in
f(x).f(y).{...x...y...}

stream ... | nil | ... as f=196 in f(x).f(y).{...x...y...}

stream
... | nil | ...
as f=196 in
f(x).f(y).{...x...y...}

stream ... | **nil** | ... **as** f **in** f(y).{...196...y...}

stream
... | nil | ...
as f=196 in
f(x).f(y).{...x...y...}

dequeue

stream ... | **nil** | ... **as** f **in** f(y).{...196...y...}

Reduction semantics

• Structural congruence - allows the syntactic rearrangement of terms

 $(\nu n)P|Q \equiv (\nu n)(P|Q) \text{ if } n \notin \text{fn}(Q)$

Reduction semantics

• Structural congruence - allows the syntactic rearrangement of terms

$$(\nu n)P|Q \equiv (\nu n)(P|Q) \text{ if } n \notin \text{fn}(Q)$$

Allows reduction at certain places in a term

 $\mathcal{C}[\![]\!]$ does not bind w or f

 $\overline{\operatorname{stream} P \operatorname{as} f = \vec{v} :: w \operatorname{in} \mathcal{C}\llbracket f(x).Q \rrbracket} \to \operatorname{stream} P \operatorname{as} f = \vec{v} \operatorname{in} \mathcal{C}\llbracket Q[w/x] \rrbracket$

Reduction semantics

• Structural congruence - allows the syntactic rearrangement of terms

 $(\nu n)P|Q \equiv (\nu n)(P|Q) \text{ if } n \notin \text{fn}(Q)$

Sample

rules!

Allows reduction at certain places in a term

 $\mathcal{C}[\![]\!]$ does not bind w or f

 $\overline{\operatorname{stream} P \operatorname{as} f = \vec{v} :: w \operatorname{in} \mathcal{C}\llbracket f(x).Q \rrbracket} \to \operatorname{stream} P \operatorname{as} f = \vec{v} \operatorname{in} \mathcal{C}\llbracket Q[w/x] \rrbracket$

Labeled transition system

• Sample rule:

read v from stream f

 $Q \xrightarrow{f \Downarrow v} Q'$ stream P as $f = \vec{w} :: v \text{ in } Q \xrightarrow{\tau} \text{ stream } P \text{ as } f = \vec{w} \text{ in } Q'$

• Correspondence

$$P \to Q \text{ if and only if } P \xrightarrow{\tau} Q$$

• Leads to bisimulation-based equivalences



39.Q

25.P

two outputs -> no sync

39.Q

25.P

25.P

two outputs -> no sync

39.Q

two outputs -> no sync



25.P

nobody listening -> no sync

39.Q

two outputs -> no sync



25.P

25.P

nobody listening -> no sync

What can go wrong? II: intra-thread comm



What can go wrong? II: intra-thread comm

25.P | (x).Q

am I writing or reading?

What can go wrong? II: intra-thread comm

am I writing or reading?




What can go wrong? II: intra-thread comm

25.P | (x).Q

25.P | **39**.Q

am I writing or reading?

> am I writing or writing?

What can go wrong? II: intra-thread comm

am I writing or reading?

> am I writing or writing?



25.P | (x).Q

25.P | **39**.Q

plus duals of the above

(date) {query-the-hotel-db}.price

(date) {query-the-hotel-db}.price

?Date.!Int.end

(date) {query-the-hotel-db}.price

?Date.!Int.end

end of the protocol

no input or output here

(date) {query-the-hotel-db}.price

?Date.!Int.end

end of the protocol

no input or output here

(date) {query-the-hotel-db}.price

?Date.!Int.end

end of the protocol

31Jul2007.(price) {use-price}

no input or output here

(date) {query-the-hotel-db}.price

?Date.!Int.end

end of the protocol

?Date.!Int.end

!Date.?Int.end

the type of the service provider

?Date.!Int.end

!Date.?Int.end

the type of the service provider

?Date.!Int.end

!Date.?Int.end

the type of the client

the type of the service provider

?Date.Int.end

the type of the client

the type of the service provider

?Date.!Int.end

!Date.?Int.end

Compatible protocols -> type safe

the type of the client

stream
...feed price1 |
...feed price2 |
...feed price3
as f in
f(x).f(y).{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}

stream ...feed price1 ...feed price2 ...feed price3 as f in f(x).f(y).{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}

all feeds of the same type

stream
...feed price1 |
...feed price2 |
...feed price3
as f in
f(x).f(y).{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}

all reads of the same type

stream
...feed price1 |
...feed price2 |
...feed price3
as f in
f(x).f(y).{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}

all reads of the same type Streams are monomorphic

(date).
stream
... | ...feed price2 | ...
as f in
f(x).f(y).{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}

(date).
stream
... | ...feed price2 | ...
as f in
f(x).f(y).{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}

(?Date.!Int.end, Int)

(date). **stream** ... | ...**feed** price2 | ... **as** f **in** f(x).f(y).{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y} (?Date.!Int.**end**, Int)

(date). **stream** ... |...**feed** price2 |... **as** f **in** f(x).f(y).{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}

(?Date.!Int.end, Int)

the type of the protocol

(date).
stream
... | ...feed price2 | ...
as f in
f(x).f(y).{publish-the-min-of-x-and-y}

(?Date.!Int.end, Int)

the type of the protocol

the type of the stream

Sample rules

$$\frac{\Gamma, x \colon T' \vdash P \colon (U, T)}{\Gamma \vdash (x)P \colon (?T'.U, T)}$$

 $\frac{\Gamma \vdash P \colon (U,T) \quad \Gamma \vdash a \colon [U]}{\Gamma \vdash a \Rightarrow P \colon (\mathsf{end},T)}$

 $\frac{\Gamma \vdash P \colon (U,T) \quad \Gamma \vdash Q \colon (\mathsf{end},T)}{\Gamma \vdash P | Q \colon (U,T)}$

Sample rulinput

 $\frac{\Gamma, x \colon T' \vdash P \colon (U, T)}{\Gamma \vdash (x)P \colon (?T'.U, T)}$

within a session

 $\frac{\Gamma \vdash P \colon (U,T) \quad \Gamma \vdash a \colon [U]}{\Gamma \vdash a \Rightarrow P \colon (\mathsf{end},T)}$

 $\frac{\Gamma \vdash P \colon (U,T) \quad \Gamma \vdash Q \colon (\mathsf{end},T)}{\Gamma \vdash P | Q \colon (U,T)}$

Sample rulinput

 $\frac{\Gamma, x \colon T' \vdash P \colon (U, T)}{\Gamma \vdash (x)P \colon (?T'.U, T)}$

within a segment

service definition

 $\frac{\Gamma \vdash P \colon (U,T) \quad \Gamma \vdash a \colon [U]}{\Gamma \vdash a \Rightarrow P \colon (\mathsf{end},T)}$

 $\frac{\Gamma \vdash P \colon (U,T) \quad \Gamma \vdash Q \colon (\mathsf{end},T)}{\Gamma \vdash P | Q \colon (U,T)}$

Sample rulin

 $\frac{\Gamma, x \colon T' \vdash P \colon (U, T)}{\Gamma \vdash (x)P \colon (?T'.U, T)}$

input within a sector

> service definition

 $\frac{\Gamma \vdash P \colon (U,T) \quad \Gamma \vdash a \colon [U]}{\Gamma \vdash a \Rightarrow P \colon (\mathsf{end},T)}$

parallel composition

 $\frac{\Gamma \vdash P \colon (U,T) \quad \Gamma \vdash Q \colon (\mathsf{end},T)}{\Gamma \vdash P | Q \colon (U,T)}$

Sample rulinput

 $\frac{\Gamma, x \colon T' \vdash P \colon (U, T)}{\Gamma \vdash (x)P \colon (?T'.U, T)}$

within a sector

service definition

 $\frac{\Gamma \vdash P \colon (U,T) \quad \Gamma \vdash a \colon [U]}{\Gamma \vdash a \Rightarrow P \colon (\mathsf{end},T)}$

parallel composition

 $\frac{\Gamma \vdash P \colon (U,T) \quad \Gamma \vdash Q \colon (\mathsf{end},T)}{\Gamma \vdash P | Q \colon (U,T)}$

(empty) stream

Type safety

Subject reduction

types for the free identifiers

If $\Gamma \vdash P \colon (U,T)$ and $P \to P'$, then $\Gamma \vdash P' \colon (U,T)$

• Type safety

"Well typed programs do not go wrong"

thread-sync + intra-thread comm

Further analyses

- Program equivalence (mentioned before)
 - congruence; axiomatic laws
- Deadlock avoidance:
 - communication errors within a session (addressed before)
 - no service for a particular consumer (several proposals in process calculi)
 - read from an empty stream (see paper)

Summary

 Presented language
 "Stream-based Service Centered Calculus"

describing services, conversations, and orchestration

- Amenable to different sort of analyses
- Encoded all van der Aalst workflow patterns -> expressiveness "test"

Future

- Develop bisimulation techniques
- Extend the language with some form of failure/exception and corresponding **compensation** mechanism



http://www.sensoria-ist.eu/