

Opal Semantics

Alex Renda

October 30, 2017

1 Description

Tiny turing-incomplete language based on IMP with sexps:

2 Grammar

```
 $\langle Com \rangle ::= \text{skip}$   
|  $\langle Com \rangle; \langle Com \rangle$   
|  $\text{if } \langle Bool \rangle \text{ then } \{ \langle Com \rangle \} \text{ else } \{ \langle Com \rangle \}$   
|  $\text{with } \langle Node \rangle \text{ do } \{ \langle Com \rangle \}$   
|  $\text{at } \langle Node \rangle \text{ do } \{ \langle Com \rangle \}$   
|  $\langle World \rangle := \text{hyp } \{ \langle Com \rangle \}$   
|  $\text{commit } \langle World \rangle$   
|  $\text{handle } \langle Node \rangle. \langle Var \rangle := \langle Op \rangle \text{ with } \langle Sexp \rangle \text{ merge } \langle Sexp \rangle \text{ in } \{ \langle Com \rangle \}$   
|  $\langle Op \rangle$ 
```

```
 $\langle Sexp \rangle ::= \emptyset$   
|  $\langle Node \rangle. \langle Var \rangle$   
|  $( \langle Sexp \rangle . \langle Sexp \rangle )$ 
```

```
 $\langle Bool \rangle ::= \langle Sexp \rangle = \langle Sexp \rangle$   
|  $\langle Sexp \rangle \in \langle Sexp \rangle$   
|  $\langle Bool \rangle \wedge \langle Bool \rangle$   
|  $\langle Bool \rangle \vee \langle Bool \rangle$   
| true  
| false
```

2.1 Values

```
 $\langle SexpValue \rangle ::= \emptyset$   
|  $( \langle SexpValue \rangle . \langle SexpValue \rangle )$ 
```

```
 $\langle BoolValue \rangle ::= \text{true}$   
| false
```

3 Small Step Semantics

3.1 Terminology

$\sigma :$	$\langle Node \rangle \times \langle Var \rangle \rightarrow \langle Sexp Value \rangle$	function representing each node's store
$\Sigma :$	$\bullet \mid (\sigma, \Sigma)$	stack of stores (for HYP and AT)
$\omega :$	$\langle World \rangle \rightarrow (\Sigma \times \sigma)$	function representing each world's initial stack and final store
$\pi :$	$2^{\langle Node \rangle}$	current authorized set of principals
$\rho :$	$\langle Node \rangle$	current execution location
$\eta :$	$\langle Op \rangle \rightarrow (\langle Node \rangle \times \langle Var \rangle \times \langle Sexp \rangle)$	mapping of handlers to their destinations and expressions
$\mu :$	$(\langle Node \rangle \times \langle Var \rangle) \rightarrow \langle Sexp \rangle$	mapping of handler results to their merge expressions
$\Downarrow_{\langle Com \rangle} :$	$(\langle Com \rangle \times \Sigma \times \omega \times \pi \times \rho \times \eta \times \mu) \rightarrow (\sigma \times \omega)$	Commands step to a new top-level store and new set of hypothetical worlds
$\Downarrow_{\langle Sexp \rangle} :$	$(\langle Sexp \rangle \times \Sigma \times \pi) \rightarrow \langle Sexp Value \rangle$	Sexps step to a value, or nothing if it cannot be evaluated due to undefined variables or lack of permission
$\Downarrow_{\langle Bool \rangle} :$	$(\langle Bool \rangle \times \Sigma \times \pi) \rightarrow \langle Bool Value \rangle$	Bools step to a value, or nothing if it cannot be evaluated due to undefined variables or lack of permission

3.2 Basic commands

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\langle \text{skip}, (\sigma, \Sigma), \omega, \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma, \omega \rangle} \text{SKIP} \\
\\
\frac{\langle c_1, (\sigma, \Sigma), \omega, \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma', \omega' \rangle \quad \langle c_2, (\sigma', \Sigma), \omega', \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma'', \omega'' \rangle}{\langle c_1; c_2, (\sigma, \Sigma), \omega, \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma'', \omega'' \rangle} \text{SEQ} \\
\\
\frac{\langle b, \Sigma, \pi \rangle \Downarrow \text{true} \quad \langle c_1, \Sigma, \omega, \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma', \omega' \rangle}{\langle \text{if } b \text{ then } \{c_1\} \text{ else } \{c_2\}, \Sigma, \omega, \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma', \omega' \rangle} \text{IF-TRUE} \\
\\
\frac{\langle b, \Sigma, \pi \rangle \Downarrow \text{false} \quad \langle c_2, \Sigma, \omega, \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma', \omega' \rangle}{\langle \text{if } b \text{ then } \{c_1\} \text{ else } \{c_2\}, \Sigma, \omega, \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma', \omega' \rangle} \text{IF-FALSE}
\end{array}$$

3.3 Distribution commands

In this semantics, AT is effectively a noop/passthrough, resulting in behavior that would be identical with or without it (modulo endorsement taking location into account). It does have real-world semantics though: AT represents executing a command on another computer, starting with a new empty store on the top of the stack, and shipping back the new store at the end. Beyond this, exact semantics are implementation dependent. An implementation could, in theory, send the entire stack of stores over in addition to just the command. Alternatively, the new machine could request any specific variables it needs, to mitigate the amount of data shuttled over the network.

WITH is also a passthrough in a similar regard: its runtime effects consist of asking the specified user for permission to run the specified command on the current machine (represented by $\langle n, \rho, c \rangle \checkmark$ in the semantics – the details of this function are implementation dependent).

$$\frac{\langle c, (\sigma_\emptyset, (\sigma, \Sigma)), \omega, \pi, n, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma', \omega' \rangle}{\langle \text{at } n \text{ do } \{c\}, (\sigma, \Sigma), \omega, \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma'; \sigma, \omega' \rangle} \text{AT}$$

$$\frac{\langle n, \rho, c \rangle \checkmark \quad \langle c, \Sigma, \omega, \pi \cup \{n\}, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma', \omega' \rangle}{\langle \text{at } n \text{ do } \{c\}, \Sigma, \omega, \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma', \omega' \rangle} \text{WITH}$$

3.4 Handler commands

We describe handlers as a tuple of $(\langle Node \rangle, \langle Var \rangle, \langle Op \rangle, \langle Sexp \rangle_h, \langle Sexp \rangle_m, \langle Com \rangle)$, where $\langle Node \rangle$ is the node to write results to, $\langle Var \rangle$ is the variable on that node to write results to, $\langle Op \rangle$ is the name of the handler, $\langle Sexp \rangle_h$ is a sexp that gets lazily evaluated with its results written to $\langle Node \rangle.\langle Var \rangle$ each time $\langle Op \rangle$ is called, and $\langle Sexp \rangle_m$ is a sexp that gets lazily evaluated upon merge conflicts within a variable upon committing a hypothetical world, with $\emptyset.\text{ORIG}$ set to the original value of the variable before the hypothetical execution, $\emptyset.\text{HYP}$ set to the value of the variable after the hypothetical execution, and $\emptyset.\text{CURR}$ set to the value of the variable in the context of where `commit` is being called.

$$\frac{\langle c, \Sigma, \omega, \pi, \rho, \eta[op \mapsto (n, v, s_h)], \mu[(n, v) \mapsto s_m] \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma', \omega' \rangle}{\langle \text{handle } n.v := op \text{ with } s_h \text{ merge } s_m \text{ in } \{c\}, \Sigma, \omega, \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma', \omega' \rangle} \text{HANDLE}$$

$$\frac{\eta(op) = (n, v, s_h) \quad \langle s_h, \Sigma, \pi \rangle \Downarrow s \quad n \in \pi}{\langle op, \Sigma, \omega, \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma[(n, v) \mapsto s], \omega \rangle} \text{OP}$$

3.5 Hypothetical commands

$$\frac{\langle c, (\sigma_\emptyset, \Sigma), \omega_\emptyset, \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma', \omega' \rangle}{\langle u := \text{hyp } \{c\}, \Sigma, \omega, \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \dots, \omega[u \mapsto (\Sigma, \sigma)] \rangle} \text{HYP}$$

$$\frac{\omega(u) = (\Sigma_{\text{orig}}, \sigma_{\text{hyp}}) \quad \forall (n, v, s) \in \sigma_{\text{hyp}}. \langle \mu((n, v)), \Sigma[], \pi \rangle \Downarrow s_f \Rightarrow \sigma'((n, v)) = s_f}{\langle \text{commit } u, \Sigma, \omega, \pi, \rho, \eta, \mu \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma', \omega \rangle} \text{COMMIT}$$