Relational Reasoning for Mergeable Replicated Data Types

KC Sivaramakrishnan

joint work with Gowtham Kaki, Swarn Priya, Suresh Jagannathan



















Weak Consistency & Isolation

- Serializability
- Linearizability

When system-level concerns like replication & availability affect application-level design decisions, programming becomes complicated.



Seems like Twitter wants me to follow this guy.

Who to follow



Ooug Woos @dougwoos

Follow

 \sim

PhD student, joining @BrownCSDept as a lecturer in Fall 2019. Into programming languages, distributed systems, baseball, and other stuff. he/him



Doug Woos @dougwoos



PhD student, joining @BrownCSDept as a lecturer in Fall 2019. Into programming languages, distributed systems, baseball, and other stuff. he/him



Doug Woos @dougwoos



PhD student, joining @BrownCSDept as a lecturer in Fall 2019. Into programming languages, distributed systems, baseball, and other stuff. he/him

5:43 AM \cdot May 14, 2019 \cdot Twitter for iPhone

Sequential Counter

```
module Counter : sig
  type t
  val read : t -> int
  val add : t -> int -> t
  val sub : t -> int -> t
end = struct
  type t = int
  let read x = x
  let add x d = x + d
  let sub x d = x - d
end
```

Sequential Counter

```
module Counter : sig
  type t
  val read : t -> int
  val add : t -> int -> t
  val sub : t -> int -> t
end = struct
  type t = int
  let read x = x
  let add x d = x + d
  let sub x d = x - d
end
```

- Written in idiomatic style
- Composable

type counter_list = Counter.t list





















```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
 let read x = x
 let add x d = x + d
 let sub x d = x - d
 let mult x n = x * n
end
```

```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
 let read x = x
 let add x d = x + d
 let sub x d = x - d
 let mult x n = x * n
end
```



```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
 let read x = x
 let add x d = x + d
 let sub x d = x - d
 let mult x n = x * n
end
```



```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
 let read x = x
 let add x d = x + d
 let sub x d = x - d
 let mult x n = x * n
end
```



```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
 let read x = x
 let add x d = x + d
 let sub x d = x - d
 let mult x n = x * n
end
```



```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
 let read x = x
 let add x d = x + d
 let sub x d = x - d
 let mult x n = x * n
end
```



```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
 let read x = x
 let add x d = x + d
 let sub x d = x - d
 let mult x n = x * n
end
```



CITA



Addition and multiplication do not commute

```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
 let read x = x
 let add x d = x + d
 let sub x d = x - d
 let mult x n = x * n
end
```

```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
 let read x = x
  let add x d = x + d
  let sub x d = x - d
 let mult x n = x * n
end
```

```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
 let read x = x
  let add x d = x + d
  let sub x d = x - d
 let mult x n = x * n
end
```



















- Capture the effect of multiplication through the commutative addition operation
- CRDTs
Conflict-free Replicated Data Types (CRDT)

Conflict-free Replicated Data Types (CRDT)

- CRDT is guaranteed to ensure strong eventual consistency (SEC)
 - ★ G-counters, PN-counters, OR-Sets, Graphs, Ropes, docs, sheets
 - ★ Simple interface for the clients of CRDTs

Conflict-free Replicated Data Types (CRDT)

- CRDT is guaranteed to ensure strong eventual consistency (SEC)
 - ★ G-counters, PN-counters, OR-Sets, Graphs, Ropes, docs, sheets
 - ★ Simple interface for the clients of CRDTs
- Need to reengineer every datatype to ensure SEC (commutativity)
 - ★ Do not mirror sequential counter parts => implementation & proof burden
 - ★ Do not compose!
 - counter set is not a composition of counter and set CRDTs

Can we program & reason about replicated data types as an extension of their sequential counterparts?

```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
 val merge : lca:t -> v1:t -> v2:t -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
  let read x = x
  let add x d = x + d
  let sub x d = x - d
  let mult x n = x * n
 let merge ~lca ~v1 ~v2 =
   lca + (v1 - lca) + (v2 - lca)
```

```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
 val merge : lca:t -> v1:t -> v2:t -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
  let read x = x
  let add x d = x + d
  let sub x d = x - d
  let mult x n = x * n
 let merge ~lca ~v1 ~v2 =
   lca + (v1 - lca) + (v2 - lca)
```

7

```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
 val merge : lca:t -> v1:t -> v2:t -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
 let read x = x
  let add x d = x + d
 let sub x d = x - d
  let mult x n = x * n
 let merge ~lca ~v1 ~v2 =
   lca + (v1 - lca) + (v2 - lca)
```



```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
 val merge : lca:t -> v1:t -> v2:t -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
 let read x = x
  let add x d = x + d
  let sub x d = x - d
  let mult x n = x * n
 let merge ~lca ~v1 ~v2 =
   lca + (v1 - lca) + (v2 - lca)
```



module Counter : sig type t val read : t -> int val add : t -> int -> t val sub : t -> int -> t val mult : t -> int -> t val merge : lca:t -> v1:t -> v2:t -> t end = struct type t = int let read x = xlet add x d = x + d let sub x d = x - d let mult x n = x * nlet merge ~lca ~v1 ~v2 = lca + (v1 - lca) + (v2 - lca)



```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
 val merge : lca:t -> v1:t -> v2:t -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
 let read x = x
 let add x d = x + d
 let sub x d = x - d
  let mult x n = x * n
 let merge ~lca ~v1 ~v2 =
   lca + (v1 - lca) + (v2 - lca)
```



```
module Counter : sig
 type t
 val read : t -> int
 val add : t -> int -> t
 val sub : t -> int -> t
 val mult : t -> int -> t
 val merge : lca:t -> v1:t -> v2:t -> t
end = struct
 type t = int
 let read x = x
 let add x d = x + d
 let sub x d = x - d
  let mult x n = x * n
 let merge ~lca ~v1 ~v2 =
   lca + (v1 - lca) + (v2 - lca)
```







3-way merge function makes the counter suitable for distribution





- 3-way merge function makes the counter suitable for distribution
- Does not appeal to individual operations => independently extend data-type

 CRDTs need to take care of systems level concerns such as exactly once delivery

- CRDTs need to take care of systems level concerns such as exactly once delivery
- 3-way merge handles it automatically

- CRDTs need to take care of systems level concerns such as exactly once delivery
- 3-way merge handles it automatically



- CRDTs need to take care of systems level concerns such as exactly once delivery
- 3-way merge handles it automatically



- CRDTs need to take care of systems level concerns such as exactly once delivery
- 3-way merge handles it automatically



22 = 21 + (21 - 21) + (22 - 21)

Does the 3-way merge idea generalise?

```
module type Queue = sig
  type 'a t
  val push : 'a t -> 'a -> 'a t
  val pop : 'a t -> ('a * 'a t) option
  (* at-least once semantics *)
end
```

```
module type Queue = sig
  type 'a t
  val push : 'a t -> 'a -> 'a t
  val pop : 'a t -> ('a * 'a t) option
  (* at-least once semantics *)
end
```

```
module type Queue = sig
  type 'a t
  val push : 'a t -> 'a -> 'a t
  val pop : 'a t -> ('a * 'a t) option
  (* at-least once semantics *)
end
```



```
module type Queue = sig
  type 'a t
  val push : 'a t -> 'a -> 'a t
  val pop : 'a t -> ('a * 'a t) option
  (* at-least once semantics *)
end
```



```
module type Queue = sig
  type 'a t
  val push : 'a t -> 'a -> 'a t
  val pop : 'a t -> ('a * 'a t) option
  (* at-least once semantics *)
end
```



```
module type Queue = sig
  type 'a t
  val push : 'a t -> 'a -> 'a t
  val pop : 'a t -> ('a * 'a t) option
  (* at-least once semantics *)
end
```



```
module type Queue = sig
  type 'a t
  val push : 'a t -> 'a -> 'a t
  val pop : 'a t -> ('a * 'a t) option
  (* at-least once semantics *)
end
```



```
module type Queue = sig
  type 'a t
  val push : 'a t -> 'a -> 'a t
  val pop : 'a t -> ('a * 'a t) option
  (* at-least once semantics *)
end
```



```
module type Queue = sig
  type 'a t
  val push : 'a t -> 'a -> 'a t
  val pop : 'a t -> ('a * 'a t) option
  (* at-least once semantics *)
end
```





```
module type Queue = sig
  type 'a t
  val push : 'a t -> 'a -> 'a t
  val pop : 'a t -> ('a * 'a t) option
  (* at-least once semantics *)
end
```



```
module type Queue = sig
  type 'a t
  val push : 'a t -> 'a -> 'a t
  val pop : 'a t -> ('a * 'a t) option
  (* at-least once semantics *)
end
```



```
module type Queue = sig
  type 'a t
  val push : 'a t -> 'a -> 'a t
  val pop : 'a t -> ('a * 'a t) option
  (* at-least once semantics *)
end
```



```
module type Queue = sig
  type 'a t
  val push : 'a t -> 'a -> 'a t
  val pop : 'a t -> ('a * 'a t) option
  (* at-least once semantics *)
end
```



Concretising Intent

Concretising Intent

- Intent is a woolly term
 - ★ How can we formalise the intent of operations on a data structure?

Concretising Intent

- Intent is a woolly term
 - ★ How can we formalise the intent of operations on a data structure?


- Intent is a woolly term
 - ★ How can we formalise the intent of operations on a data structure?
- For a replicated queue,



- Intent is a woolly term
 - ★ How can we formalise the intent of operations on a data structure?
- For a replicated queue,
 - I. Any element popped in either vI or v2 does not remain in v



- Intent is a woolly term
 - ★ How can we formalise the intent of operations on a data structure?
- For a replicated queue,
 - I. Any element popped in either vI or v2 does not remain in v
 - 2. Any element pushed into either v1 or v2 appears in v



- Intent is a woolly term
 - ★ How can we formalise the intent of operations on a data structure?
- For a replicated queue,
 - I. Any element popped in either vI or v2 does not remain in v
 - 2. Any element pushed into either v1 or v2 appears in v
 - 3. An element that remains untouched in I, vI, v2 remains in v



- Intent is a woolly term
 - ★ How can we formalise the intent of operations on a data structure?
- For a replicated queue,
 - I. Any element popped in either vI or v2 does not remain in v
 - 2. Any element pushed into either v1 or v2 appears in v
 - 3. An element that remains untouched in I, vI, v2 remains in v
 - 4. Order of pairs of elements in I, vI, v2 must be preserved in m, if those elements are present in v.



- Let's define relations R_{mem} and R_{ob} to capture membership and ordering
 - ★ R_{mem} [1,2,3] = {1,2,3}
 - ★ R_{ob} [1,2,3] = { (1,2), (1,3), (2,3) }

- Let's define relations R_{mem} and R_{ob} to capture membership and ordering
 - ★ R_{mem} [1,2,3] = {1,2,3}
 - ★ R_{ob} [1,2,3] = { (1,2), (1,3), (2,3) }



- Let's define relations R_{mem} and R_{ob} to capture membership and ordering
 - ★ R_{mem} [1,2,3] = {1,2,3}
 - ★ R_{ob} [1,2,3] = { (1,2), (1,3), (2,3) }



$$R_{mem}(v) = R_{mem}(l) \cap R_{mem}(v_1) \cap R_{mem}(v_2)$$

$$\cup R_{mem}(v_1) - R_{mem}(l) \quad \cup \quad R_{mem}(v_2) - R_{mem}(l)$$

- Let's define relations R_{mem} and R_{ob} to capture membership and ordering
 - ★ R_{mem} [1,2,3] = {1,2,3}

★
$$R_{ob}$$
 [1,2,3] = { (1,2), (1,3), (2,3) }



$$R_{mem}(v) = \frac{R_{mem}(l) \cap R_{mem}(v_1) \cap R_{mem}(v_2)}{\cup R_{mem}(v_1) - R_{mem}(l) \cup R_{mem}(v_2) - R_{mem}(l)}$$

I. Any element popped in either vI or v2 does not remain in v

v2

v1

- Let's define relations R_{mem} and R_{ob} to capture membership and ordering
 - ★ R_{mem} [1,2,3] = {1,2,3}

★
$$R_{ob}$$
 [1,2,3] = { (1,2), (1,3), (2,3) }

$$R_{mem}(v) = R_{mem}(l) \cap R_{mem}(v_1) \cap R_{mem}(v_2)$$

$$\cup R_{mem}(v_1) - R_{mem}(l) \quad \cup \quad R_{mem}(v_2) - R_{mem}(l)$$

I. Any element popped in either vI or v2 does not remain in v

2. Any element pushed into either v1 or v2 appears in v

- Let's define relations R_{mem} and R_{ob} to capture membership and ordering
 - ★ R_{mem} [1,2,3] = {1,2,3}

★
$$R_{ob}$$
 [1,2,3] = { (1,2), (1,3), (2,3) }



$$R_{mem}(v) = \begin{array}{c} R_{mem}(l) \cap R_{mem}(v_1) \cap R_{mem}(v_2) \\ \cup R_{mem}(v_1) - R_{mem}(l) \quad \cup \quad R_{mem}(v_2) - R_{mem}(l) \end{array}$$

- I. Any element popped in either vI or v2 does not remain in v
- 2. Any element pushed into either v1 or v2 appears in v
- 3. An element that remains untouched in I, vI, v2 remains in v

 $\begin{array}{rcl} R_{ob}(v) &\supseteq & (R_{ob}(l) \cap R_{ob}(v_1) \cap R_{ob}(v_2) \\ & \cup & R_{ob}(v_1) - R_{ob}(l) & \cup & R_{ob}(v_2) - R_{ob}(l)) \\ & \cap & (R_{mem}(v) \times R_{mem}(v)) \end{array}$







- RHS has to be confined to R_{mem}(v) x R_{mem}(v) since certain orders might be missing
 - ★ Consider I = [0], vI = [0, I], v2 = [], v = [I]

v2

V





★ Consider I = [0], vI = [0, I], v2 = [], v = [I]

- RHS is an underspecification since orders between concurrent insertions will only be present in $R_{ob}(v)$
 - ★ Consider I = [], vI = [0], v2 = [I], v = [0, I]

$$R_{mem} = \{1,2\}$$

 $R_{ob} = \{(1,2)\}$
[1,2]







$$R_{mem} = \{I\}$$

 $R_{ob} = \{\}$
[1]







Use < as an arbitration function between concurrent insertions



Use < as an arbitration function between concurrent insertions

Characteristic Relations

A sequence of relations R_T is called a characteristic relation of a data type T, if for every x : T and y : T, $\overline{R}_T(x) = \overline{R}_T(y)$ iff x and y are extensionally equal as interpreted under T.

Characteristic Relations

A sequence of relations \overline{R}_T is called a characteristic relation of a data type T, if for every x : T and y : T, $\overline{R}_T(x) = \overline{R}_T(y)$ iff x and y are extensionally equal as interpreted under T.

• R_{mem} and R_{ob} are the characteristic relations of queue

Characteristic Relations

A sequence of relations \overline{R}_T is called a characteristic relation of a data type T, if for every x : T and y : T, $\overline{R}_T(x) = \overline{R}_T(y)$ iff x and y are extensionally equal as interpreted under T.

- R_{mem} and R_{ob} are the characteristic relations of queue
- Appeals only to the sequential properties of the data type
 - ★ Ignore distribution when defining characteristic relations.

• Semantics of merge in relational domain is quite standard across data types

- Semantics of merge in relational domain is quite standard across data types
 - ★ Can we synthesise merge functions for arbitrary data type?

- Semantics of merge in relational domain is quite standard across data types
 - ★ Can we synthesise merge functions for arbitrary data type?



- Semantics of merge in relational domain is quite standard across data types
 - ★ Can we synthesise merge functions for arbitrary data type?



- Semantics of merge in relational domain is quite standard across data types
 - ★ Can we synthesise merge functions for arbitrary data type?



- Semantics of merge in relational domain is quite standard across data types
 - ★ Can we synthesise merge functions for arbitrary data type?


Synthesizing Merge

- Semantics of merge in relational domain is quite standard across data types
 - ★ Can we synthesise merge functions for arbitrary data type?



 R_{mem} : {v : int list} $\rightarrow \mathcal{P}(int)$

 R_{mem} : {v : int list} $\rightarrow \mathcal{P}(int)$

let rec
$$R_{ob}$$
 = function
 | [] -> 0
 | x::xs -> ({x} × $R_{mem}(xs)$) $\cup R_{ob}(xs)$

 R_{mem} : {v : int list} $\rightarrow \mathcal{P}(int)$

let rec
$$R_{ob}$$
 = function
 | [] -> 0
 | x::xs -> ({x} × R_{mem}(xs)) ∪ R_{ob}(xs)
 R_{ob} : {v : int list} \to \mathcal{P}(R_{mem}(v) × R_{mem}(v))

Abstraction Function: Binary Tree

Abstraction Function: Binary Tree

let rec R_{mem} = function
| E -> Ø
| N(1,x,r) -> $R_{mem}(1) \cup \{x\} \cup R_{mem}(r)$

Abstraction Function: Binary Tree

```
let rec R_{mem} = function
| E -> Ø
| N(1,x,r) -> R_{mem}(1) \cup \{x\} \cup R_{mem}(r)
```

```
type label = L | R
let rec R_{to} = function
| E -> Ø
| N(l,x,r) ->
let l_des = {x} × {L} × R_{mem}(l) in
let r_des = {x} × {R} × R_{mem}(r) in
R_{to}(l) \cup l_des \cup r_des \cup R_{to}(r)
```

Abstraction Function: Binary Heap

let rec R_{mem} = function
| E -> Ø
| N(1,x,r) -> $R_{mem}(1) \cup \{x\} \cup R_{mem}(r)$

Abstraction Function: Binary Heap

```
let rec R_{mem} = function
| E -> Ø
| N(1,x,r) -> R_{mem}(1) \cup \{x\} \cup R_{mem}(r)
```

```
let rec R_{ans} = function
| E -> Ø
| N(1,x,r) ->
let des_x = R_{mem}(1) \cup R_{mem}(r) in
let r_ans = {x} × des_x in
R_{ans}(1) \cup r_{ans} \cup R_{ans}(r)
```

Data Type	Characteristic Relations
Binary Heap	Membership (R_{mem}), Ancestor ($R_{ans} \subseteq R_{mem} \times R_{mem}$)
Priority Queue	Membership (R_{mem})
Set	Membership (R_{mem})
Graph	Vertex (R_V) , Edge (R_E)
Functional Map	Key-Value (R_{kv})
List	Membership (R_{mem}), Order (R_{ob})
Binary Tree	Membership (R_{mem}), Tree-order ($R_{to} \subseteq R_{mem} \times label \times R_{mem}$)
Binary Search Tree	Membership (R_{mem})

Table 1. Characteristic relations for various data types

• The merge of a pair is the merge of the corresponding constituents

- The merge of a pair is the merge of the corresponding constituents
- A pair data type is defined by the relations:

let $R_{fst} = fun(x, _) \rightarrow \{x\}$ let $R_{snd} = fun(_, y) \rightarrow \{y\}$

- The merge of a pair is the merge of the corresponding constituents
- A pair data type is defined by the relations:

let $R_{fst} = fun(x,) \rightarrow \{x\}$ let $R_{snd} = fun(, y) \rightarrow \{y\}$

• Assume that the pair is composed of 2 counters. The counter merge spec is: $\phi_c(l, v_1, v_2, v) \Leftrightarrow v = l + (v_1 - l) + (v_2 - l)$

- The merge of a pair is the merge of the corresponding constituents
- A pair data type is defined by the relations:

let $R_{fst} = fun(x,) \rightarrow \{x\}$ let $R_{snd} = fun(, y) \rightarrow \{y\}$

- Assume that the pair is composed of 2 counters. The counter merge spec is: $\phi_c(l, v_1, v_2, v) \Leftrightarrow v = l + (v_1 l) + (v_2 l)$
- Then, pair merge spec is:

 $\begin{aligned} \phi_{c \times c}(l, v_1, v_2, v) & \Leftrightarrow & \forall x, y, z, s. \ x \in R_{fst}(l) \land y \in R_{fst}(v_1) \land z \in R_{fst}(v_2) \\ & \land \phi_c(x, y, z, s) \Rightarrow s \in R_{fst}(v) \\ & \land \forall s. \ s \in R_{fst}(v) \Rightarrow \exists x, y, z. \ x \in R_{fst}(l) \land y \in R_{fst}(v_1) \\ & \land z \in R_{fst}(v_2) \land \phi_c(x, y, z, s) \\ & \land \dots (\text{respectively for } R_{snd}) \end{aligned}$

• An alternative characteristic relation for a pair is:

let R_{pair} (x,y) = {(1,x), (2,y)}

• An alternative characteristic relation for a pair is:

let R_{pair} (x,y) = {(1,x), (2,y)}

 $R_{pair}: \{v: \text{counter} * \text{counter}\} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{int} \times \text{counter})$

• An alternative characteristic relation for a pair is:

let R_{pair} (x,y) = {(1,x), (2,y)}

 $R_{pair}: \{v: \text{counter} * \text{counter}\} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{int} \times \text{counter})$

• Corresponding merge specification is:

• An alternative characteristic relation for a pair is:

let R_{pair} (x,y) = {(1,x), (2,y)}

 $R_{pair}: \{v: \text{counter} * \text{counter}\} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{int} \times \text{counter})$

• Corresponding merge specification is:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{c \times c} &= & \forall (k: \texttt{int}). \forall (x, y, z, s: \texttt{counter}). \ (k, x) \in R_{pair}(l) \land (k, y) \in R_{pair}(v_1) \\ & \land (k, z) \in R_{pair}(v_2) \land \phi_c(x, y, z, s) \Rightarrow (k, s) \in R(v) \\ & \land \forall (k: \texttt{int}). \forall (s: \texttt{counter}). \ (k, s) \in R_{pair}(v) \Rightarrow \exists (x, y, z: \texttt{counter}). \ (k, x) \in R_{pair}(l) \\ & \land (k, y) \in R_{pair}(v_1) \land (k, z) \in R_{pair}(v_2) \land \phi_c(x, y, z, s) \end{aligned}$$

• An alternative characteristic relation for a pair is:

let R_{pair} (x,y) = {(1,x), (2,y)}

 $R_{pair}: \{v: \text{counter} * \text{counter}\} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{int} \times \text{counter})$

• Corresponding merge specification is:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{c \times c} &= & \forall (k: \text{int}). \forall (x, y, z, s: \text{counter}). \ (k, x) \in R_{pair}(l) \land (k, y) \in R_{pair}(v_1) \\ & \land (k, z) \in R_{pair}(v_2) \land \phi_c(x, y, z, s) \Rightarrow (k, s) \in R(v) \\ & \land \forall (k: \text{int}). \forall (s: \text{counter}). \ (k, s) \in R_{pair}(v) \Rightarrow \exists (x, y, z: \text{counter}). \ (k, x) \in R_{pair}(l) \\ & \land (k, y) \in R_{pair}(v_1) \land (k, z) \in R_{pair}(v_2) \land \phi_c(x, y, z, s) \end{aligned}$$

 Given appropriate characteristic relation for a n-tuple (R_{n-tuple}), the same merge specification can be used.

• Similar encoding can be given to maps with non-mergeable types as keys and mergeable types as values

• Practical characteristic relations fall into 3 types:

- Practical characteristic relations fall into 3 types:
 - ★ Membership (R_{mem})

 $R: \{v:T\} \to \mathcal{P}(\overline{T}), \text{ where } T \text{ is a non-mergeable type}$

- Practical characteristic relations fall into 3 types:
 - ★ Membership (R_{mem})

 $R: \{v:T\} \to \mathcal{P}(\overline{T}), \text{ where } T \text{ is a non-mergeable type}$

★ Ordering (R_{ob}, R_{ans}, R_{to})

$$R: \{v:T\} \to \mathcal{P}\left(\rho\right)$$

 where ρ is a sequence of non-mergeable types and other relations, which flattens to a sequence of non-mergeable types

- Practical characteristic relations fall into 3 types:
 - ★ Membership (R_{mem})

 $R: \{v:T\} \to \mathcal{P}(\overline{T}), \text{ where } T \text{ is a non-mergeable type}$

★ Ordering (R_{ob}, R_{ans}, R_{to})

$$R: \{v:T\} \to \mathcal{P}\left(\rho\right)$$

- where ρ is a sequence of non-mergeable types and other relations, which flattens to a sequence of non-mergeable types
- ★ Ordinates (R_{pair}, R_{kv})

 $R: \{v:T\} \to \mathcal{P}\left(\overline{T} \times \overline{\tau}\right)$, where τ is a mergeable type

Deriving merge spec



 $\phi_T(l, \upsilon_1, \upsilon_2, \upsilon) \supseteq \forall (k:1). \forall (s:\tau). (k, s) \in R(\upsilon) \Rightarrow (k, s) \in \rho$ $\land \exists (\overline{x}, \overline{y}, \overline{z}:\overline{\tau}). (\overline{k}, \overline{x}) \in R_+(l) \land (\overline{k}, \overline{y}) \in R_+(\upsilon_1) \land (\overline{k}, \overline{z}) \in R_+(\upsilon_2)$ $\land \overline{k} \in (R_k(l) \diamond R_k(\upsilon_1) \diamond R_k(\upsilon_2)) \land \land_i \phi_{\tau_i}(x_i, y_i, z_i, s_i)$

Deriving merge spec



 $\wedge \overline{k} \in (R_k(l) \diamond R_k(v_1) \diamond R_k(v_2)) \land \land \land_i \phi_{\tau_i}(x_i, y_i, z_i, s_i)$

- Not complete, but practical
- Can derive merge spec for
 - ★ Data structures: Set, Heap, Graph, Queue, TreeDoc
 - ★ Larger apps: TPC-C, TPC-E, Twissandra, Rubis

Distributed Implementation

Distributed Implementation

- For making this programming model practical, we need to:
 - ★ Quickly compute LCA
 - ★ Optimise storage through sharing
 - ★ Optimise network transmissions (state based merge)

Distributed Implementation

- For making this programming model practical, we need to:
 - ★ Quickly compute LCA
 - ★ Optimise storage through sharing
 - ★ Optimise network transmissions (state based merge)
- Irmin
 - ★ A reimplementation of Git in pure OCaml
 - * Arbitrary OCaml objects, not just files + User-defined 3-way merges
 - ★ Only transmit diffs over the network
 - ★ Multiple storage backends including in-memory, filesystems, log-structuredmerge database, distributed databases

Performance

Performance

• What is the size of diff compared to the size of data structure?
Performance

- What is the size of diff compared to the size of data structure?
- Setup
 - ★ 2 Replicas, fixed number of rounds, each round has N operations
 - ★ 75% inserts, 25% deletions
 - ★ Synchronise after each round

Performance

- What is the size of diff compared to the size of data structure?
- Setup
 - ★ 2 Replicas, fixed number of rounds, each round has N operations
 - ★ 75% inserts, 25% deletions
 - ★ Synchronise after each round



150

Thanks for listening!