### Dynamically Defined Processes for Spatial Computers

#### Jacob Beal Spatial Computing Workshop 2009



# **Dynamic Allocation of State**

# Many applications must create state (e.g. objects, processes) in response to their environment



Consider tracking flocks of birds...

#### Why is this hard?



#### Are the visible birds part of the same flock?



# Outline

- Defining spatial processes
- Problem of independent creation
- Dynamically defining processes

# **Related Work**

- Viral Programming: dynamic but unconstrained
  - e.g. Paintable computing [Butera, '02], TOTA [Mamei & Zambonelli, '06]
- Distributed algorithms: safe but costly
  - e.g. Virtual Mobile Nodes [Dolev et al., '04]
- Data aggregation: highly specialized
  - e.g. greedy incremental trees [Intanagonwiwat, '01]
- Spatial languages: mostly compile-time
  - e.g. Proto [Beal & Bachrach, '06], Meld [Ashley-Rollman et al., '07], OSL [Nagpal, 01]

## **Spatial Focus: Amorphous Medium**



Continuous space & time
Infinite number of devices
See neighbors' past state



Approximate with:Discrete network of devicesSignals transmit state

#### Amorphous Medium Definition (Simple)



- Compact, Riemannian manifold *M*, time interval *T*
- *N(m)* contains *ε*-ball around *m*; connected, compact
- Information flows at *c* 
  - Interval between (m,t) and (m',t'):  $s^2 = c^2(t-t')^2 d(m,m')^2$

# **Definition of Process**

- Let *p* be an executing instance of a program at a point *m*
- p' on m' ∈ N(m) is in the same process if p can use state from p'
- Specifiable by 5 behaviors: creation, growth, sharing, computation, termination



# Outline

- Defining spatial processes
- Problem of independent creation
- Dynamically defining processes

#### **Problem of Independent Creation**



#### Are the visible birds part of the same flock?



# UIDs can't distinguish processes

**Theorem:** if instances of processes form an equivalence class  $\sim$ , no algorithm for creating program instances exists that can guarantee safe creation in less than O(diameter/c) time

- Proof sketch:
  - Time bound  $\rightarrow$  space-like separation possible
  - choice of ~ only affected by causally related points
  - Algorithm must fail on one of:
    - m and m' create P
    - *m* and *m*' create *P*'
    - m creates P, m' creates P'

# Outline

- Defining spatial processes
- Problem of independent creation
- Dynamically defining processes

#### Solution: dynamically determined extent

Instead of identifying processes with UIDs specify neighborhood flow directly.

Let's make this concrete...

#### Proto



#### http://stpg.csail.mit.edu/proto.html

# Computing with fields



# Computing with fields





## **Branching = Restriction**



Processes will dynamically determine restriction

#### Possible Proto process primitives:

(procs (elt sources)
 ((var init evolve) ...)
 (same? run? &optional terminate?)
 . body)

(instances variable)

#### Example: tracking a flock



#### Implication: self-crossing!



#### Example: reporting on flocks



use a reporting UID calculated by flock

#### Example: finding the nearest nest



```
(def voronoi (source payload-fn)
 (procs ((src-id (if source (tup (mid)) nil)))
  ((d (distance-to (= (mid) src-id)))
  ((= src-id (nbr src-id))
    (= d (apply min (instances d))))
  (payload-fn src-id d)))
```

(voronoi (nest) (lambda (id d) (measure-shape)))

Processes compete on distance to nest

## Contributions

- Defined spatially-extended processes
- Proved process IDs are impractical
- Proposed general process primitive for Proto
  - exa: weakening transitivity to define a flock

# **Open Questions**

- What are good primitives for expressing dynamic process formation?
- What sorts of dynamic process-based
   algorithms are useful for various tasks?
- How can reportable identity be tracked for a process that splits and rejoins its parts?