

# Worlds: A distributed MMO

Ryan Walker  
ryan.cjw@gmail.com

**Abstract.** A protocol defining how anyone can join or contribute to a completely unbounded universe could allow the flexibility to organically grow an MMO faster and more efficiently than any proprietary closed system. This paper will overview a truly limitless protocol that allows developers to bolt their code into in common universe.

## 1 Introduction

For an open software ecosystem to grow organically there should be outlets for contribution. In the context of a massively multiplayer online game the outlets become more complicated than a simple code repository. Fair game mechanics are built on a fragile ecosystem that could have negative consequences if managed improperly. The fairness and security of the game are entirely dependent on the network forming consensus on what is considered to be the truth. This is trivially done with conventional methods. A server maintains a secure connection with a player and the player pipes his actions to the server. The server then provides ground truth for the network. Distributed systems require a very different approach. Blockchains present clear deficiencies, they are too slow and the chain would get too large. A completely alternate consensus method will now be presented...

## 2 Worlds

### 2.1 Overview

A world, defined as  $w_k$ , is a node that forms consensus among it's own domain. It's possible for any node in the network to be a world. A world can have up to four adjacent worlds determined by itself. Players, defined as  $P_k$ , can enter a world one of two ways, the first being a **player genesis**(2.5), and the second being a **world transfer** (2.4). Worlds and players both have their own RSA key pair.

### 2.2 Action Ledger

An action ledger, defined as  $AL(P_k, w_k)$ , is a chronological list of all the signed actions and reactions that has happened to a player in a world. In order to commit an action a player must concatenate current unix time with the action, then sign and sent to the world. If the action is legal, it is entered into the

world's action ledger for that player. If reactions are to occur to a player, the world must concatenate current unix time with the reaction then sign and sent to the player. Players are required to keep their actions ledger dating back to their genesis, worlds are only required to keep **transport hashes** (2.3).

### 2.3 Transport Hash

A transport hash is a hash of an action ledger,  $h_s(AL(P_k, w_k))$ , these are secured by the worlds and are used to prove a player is presenting an honest action ledger. The transport hash is formed when a player leaves the world. A **Forward Transport Hash** is just a transport hash kept in a special location. This is explained more in the world transfer section, it is defined as  $h_{sf}(AL(P_k, w_k))$

### 2.4 World Transfer

A detailed state machine outlines how players can move about neighboring worlds. Honest worlds must follow this procedure to maintain fairness, if they misbehave they could be risking a **World Disconnect** (3.2) from their neighboring worlds.

**Eg:** Lets say a player, defined as  $P_1$ , wants to move from  $w_1$  to  $w_2$  (Figure 1) and then to  $w_3$ , The network values in this scenario are defined as...

**Fig. 1.**  $P_1$  moving from  $w_1$  to  $w_2$

$$w_1 \xrightarrow{P_1} w_2 \text{ --- } w_3$$

|                        | $w_1$       | $w_2$            | $w_3$       |
|------------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|
| $h_s(AL(P_1, w_k))$    | <i>NULL</i> | <i>NULL</i>      | <i>NULL</i> |
| $h_{sf}(AL(P_1, w_k))$ | <i>NULL</i> | <i>NULL</i>      | <i>NULL</i> |
| Neighbor               | $w_2$       | $w_1 \ \& \ w_3$ | $w_2$       |

1.  $P_1$  sends a signed world entry packet to  $w_2$
2.  $w_2$  insures that  $w_1$  is adjasent to itself
3.  $w_2$  must verify that  $P_1$  currently resides in  $w_1$ , this is done by ensuring  $h_{sf}(AL(P_1, w_k)) = \text{NULL}$ . This is found by sending a signed data request to  $w_1$
4.  $P_1$  presents  $AL(P_1, w_1)$  to  $w_2$
5.  $w_1$  calculates  $h_s(AL(P_1, w_1))$  using the  $AL$  on the serverside
6.  $w_2$  calculates  $h_s(AL(P_1, w_1))$  using the  $AL$  provided by  $P_1$ , the hashes must match
7. (Optional) An **Action Ledger Traceback** (3.1) can be complete

8.  $P_1$  is now granted access to  $w_2$  and can submit actions
9.  $w_1$  must store  $h_s(AL(P_1, w_1))$ ,  $AL(P_1, w_1)$  can be deleted

**Fig. 2.**  $P_1$  in  $w_2$

$$w_1 \text{ — } w_2, P_1 \text{ — } w_3$$

|                        | $w_1$               | $w_2$            | $w_3$       |
|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------|
| $h_s(AL(P_1, w_k))$    | $h_s(AL(P_1, w_1))$ | <i>NULL</i>      | <i>NULL</i> |
| $h_{sf}(AL(P_1, w_k))$ | <i>NULL</i>         | <i>NULL</i>      | <i>NULL</i> |
| Neighbor               | $w_2$               | $w_1 \ \& \ w_3$ | $w_2$       |

**Fig. 3.**  $P_1$  in  $w_3$

$$w_1 \text{ — } w_2 \text{ — } w_3, P_1$$

|                        | $w_1$               | $w_2$               | $w_3$       |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| $h_s(AL(P_1, w_k))$    | $h_s(AL(P_1, w_1))$ | $h_s(AL(P_1, w_2))$ | <i>NULL</i> |
| $h_{sf}(AL(P_1, w_k))$ | $h_s(AL(P_1, w_2))$ | <i>NULL</i>         | <i>NULL</i> |
| Neighbor               | $w_2$               | $w_1 \ \& \ w_3$    | $w_2$       |


## 2.5 Player Genesis

Player Genesis is the creation of a new player, for this to occur a player must digitally sign a genesis package with the current nuance of the world. The world must ensure there are no existing values entered for that player. The player is then instated into the world with all the initial player values set to zero.

## 3 Trust

The system is not entirely trustless, the neighboring worlds need to trust each other. It's possible for neighboring worlds to have disagreements and still function. For instance,  $w_1$  might introduce an item  $w_2$  consider to be too powerful. In a case like this  $w_1$  world can just neglect it. Actions presented using that item would be considered illegal and not entered into the action ledger of the  $w_1$ . Worlds that have rules that are considered to be completely egregious can be neglected, consider Figure 4

**Fig. 4.** Three adjacent worlds



It's entirely possible that  $w_1$  might have conflicts with the rules of  $w_3$ . During the worlds transfer,  $w_1$  would not get the action ledger from  $w_3$ . Completely illegal action could have been committed in  $w_3$  (eg. free money). In this case  $w_1$  can required an Action **Action Ledger Traceback**(3.1).

### 3.1 Action Ledger traceback

Depending on the required security of a world, an Action Ledger Traceback (ALT) may be requested upon a world transfer. If this is requested, the player must provide a list of action ledgers that date back to either the player genesis or to the last entry of the world committing the audit. The world then needs to obtain  $h_s AL(P_k, w_{k:n})$  from  $w_k$  to  $w_n$ . If the hashes match then the players history has been confirmed.

It's still entirely possible for the  $AL(P_k, w_{k:n})$  to contain actions considered illegal by the world doing the audit. In this case the rewards and actions committed in the offending world are neglected in the world. An ALT should not often return illegal actions as it will result in **Action Ledger Fragmentation** (6.1), if this is seen often the world should consider a disconnect from the offending world.

### 3.2 World Disconnects

It's possible a world may issue a disconnect of an adjacent world, this means that players may no longer travel between these worlds. This could leave players orphaned in the disconnected world. It would be logical for the world that issued the disconnect to accept the player back into the world in an earlier state. The history of that player is now forked into two separate paths.

### 3.3 One Way Gates

Worlds can only control their adjacent neighbors, they have no way of controlling the neighbors of their neighbors. Consider Figure 4,  $w_1$  might have serious issues with  $w_3$ . There are three ways of dealing with this. The first is to issues a disconnect from  $w_2$ , this has the disadvantage of players now not being able to travel to  $w_2$ . The second is to threaten to disconnect from  $w_2$  it does not disconnect from  $w_3$ . The third and final way to is implement a one-way-gate. This is a method of ensuring that illegal rules don't make their way into the issuing world. If  $w_1$  issues a one-way-gate against  $w_3$  player are no longer allowed to travel back into  $w_1$  if they have traveled through  $w_3$ .

### 3.4 World Economic Caps

It's possible that worlds may require neighboring worlds to employ a *world economic cap*.

### 3.5 Beyond

The

## 4 Action Listing

### 4.1 Construct

An *action listing* is a data construct containing possible player actions. It's possible for a world to make their own action listing, defining an unlimited amount of possible player actions. World reactions are also reside on this list and start at address code: *0x7F*. There are three types of actions. **Legal Actions** are action that a world will accept into a players action ledger if presented, they reside in the worlds action listing. **Acceptable Actions** are action that are to be performed in other worlds only, results from these actions are respected. **Illegal Actions** are actions that a world does not consider to be fair. Illegal actions will simply not show up on a worlds action listing. Action ledger tracebacks (3.1) can deal with the occurrence of illegal actions on players action ledgers.


**Fig. 5.** Section of an Action Listing

```
# toolkit/ActionListing.yaml

# Actions
## Movement commands
Move:
  Code: 0x00
  N: 0x00 # Move North
  E: 0x01 # Move East
  S: 0x02 # Move South
  W: 0x03 # Move West
  Up: 0x04 # Move Up
  Down: 0x05 # Move Down
```

## 4.2 Action Listing Translation

## 5 System Architecture



## 6 Outstanding Issues

### 6.1 Action Ledger Fragmentation

Action ledger fragmentation is when a significant portion of a players action ledger has become 'neglected' due to worlds with action disagreements.