COP for Smart Contracts Activity Contexts

Toni Mattis, Robert Hirschfeld

Software Architecture Group Hasso Plattner Institute, University of Potsdam, Germany

COP '18 17 July 2018, Amsterdam, Netherlands

Centralized vs. Decentralized Services





HP

Smart Contracts as Decentralized Service

- » Set of executable rules according to which real-world actors can interact
 - "Game" (state, moves, players)
 - "Object" (identity, state, behavior)
- » Automated enforcement
 - Transfer digitally manageable > goods (money, rights, ...)
 - Can take external events as input > (deadlines, stock prices, ...)
- » No central authority
 - Consensus by quorum >
 - Lower transaction costs
 - Trustless

node (owned by participant)



logical perspective objects and messages



distribution perspective

replicated copies and messages





Mattis, Hirschfeld | COP'18, Amsterdam | Software Architecture Group, HPI Potsdam

Security and Consensus

- » User identity linked to public key
 - Same public keys = same user
 - > User signs all messages using corresponding private key
- » Consensus protocol establishes a unique global order of messages
 - Paxos, Byzantine Fault Tolerance (BFT)
 - > Proof of Work, Proof of Stake, ...





logical perspective objects and messages



instance of class User provided by platform, not modifiable

How can we add state & behavior?





Current Workaround: Mediator



» Lack of encapsulation

» Tendency to drift towards data classes and god-class like mediator

Example in Practice (Solidity)

```
/// @title Voting with delegation.
contract Ballot {
    // This declares a new complex type which will
    // be used for variables later.
    // It will represent a single voter.
    struct Voter {
        uint weight; // weight is accumulated by delegation
        bool voted; // if true, that person already voted
        address delegate; // person delegated to
        uint vote; // index of the voted proposal
    }
    [...]
    // This declares a state variable that
    // stores a `Voter` struct for each possible address.
    mapping(address => Voter) public voters;
```

[...]

https://solidity.readthedocs.io/en/v0.4.21/solidity-by-example.html

We want to add **behavior** ...

User >> canVote
 ^self eligible and:
 [self voted not]

and **state** to a platform object in the **context** of the voting **activity** verify sender's signature

lookup/initialize sender and receiver objects

create checkpoint

```
Ballot >> vote: id
    "check if enlisted and not voted"
    self assert: sender canVote.
    "update state"
    (self proposals at: id) addVote.
    sender voted: true.
```

[rollback on failure]

watch for next message

Activity Contexts

extend User objects in the context of Ballot (= during the voting activity)

Ballot >> User >> canVote
 ^self eligible and:
 [self voted not]

```
Ballot >> vote: id
  "check if enlisted and not voted"
  self assert: sender canVote.
  "update state"
  (self proposals at: id) addVote.
  sender voted: true.
```

behavior and state visible in control flows originating from Ballot

Activity Contexts

```
Ballot >> User >> canVote
  ^self eligible and:
  [self voted not]
```

Ballot >> vote: id
 "check if enlisted and not voted"
 self assert: sender canVote.
 "update state"
 (self proposals at: id) addVote.
 sender voted: true.

state (accessors)

•••• default value (when the object enters the activity first)

Activity Contexts: Dynamic Extent



Mattis, Hirschfeld | COP'18, Amsterdam | Software Architecture Group, HPI Potsdam

HΡ

Activity Contexts: State Scoping

Platform objects may be immutable, where do we store state?

State remains (lexically) scoped to the activity



Mattis, Hirschfeld | COP'18, Amsterdam | Software Architecture Group, HPI Potsdam

Activity Contexts: State Scoping

Platform objects may be immutable, where do we store state?

State remains (lexically) scoped to the activity





Activity Contexts: Names

ActivityA >> User >> eligible
 <activityAccessor>
 ^false

ActivityB >> User >> eligible
 <activityAccessor>
 ^false



eligible has no meaning outside an activity.

Recap: Layer-based COP





Activity Contexts vs. Layers

» Activity Contexts are **objects**

- Identity, state, behavior
- > Communicating via messages

» Activity Contexts are **layers**

- > Partial state/behavior for other objects
- Cross-cutting (adapts multiple objects/classes at once)
- Run-time activation and composition
- » Subtle differences
 - > State per activity (neither layer, nor layered object)
 - Composable with layers, but not other ACs (i.e., no proceed/next between activities)

Layers within Activities

» Can we exploit composability of layers (and Activity Contexts) to further improve contract code?

```
Ballot >> initialize
                                "contract constructor"
    Role (of a user)
                                sender isPollLeader: true.
                             Ballot >> startPoll
                                self assert: sender isPollLeader.
                                self open: true.
State (of the activity)
                             Ballot >> vote: id
                                self assert: self open.
                                "check if enlisted and not voted"
                                self assert: sender canVote.
                                "update state"
                                (self proposals at: id) addVote.
                                sender voted: true.
```

Roles as Layers

» Replace role checks by layer with role-specific behavior

Ballot >> initialize
"contract constructor"
sender isPollLeader: true.



Ballot >> startPoll
self assert: sender isPollLeader.
self open: true.



State as Layers

» Replace state checks by layer with state-specific behavior



[...] "check if enlisted and not voted" [...] "update state" (vote: invisible outside)

Layers in Smart Contracts

Traditional contract

Ballot >> initialize
"contract constructor"
sender isPollLeader: true.

Ballot >> startPoll
self assert: sender isPollLeader.
self open: true.

Ballot >> vote: id
 self assert: self open.
 "check if enlisted and not voted"
 self assert: sender canVote.
 "update state"
 (self proposals at: id) addVote.
 sender voted: true.

Roles and state as layer

Ballot >> initialize
"contract constructor"
sender attach: PollLeader

PollLeader >> **Ballot** >> startPoll

self attach: PollOpen.

PollOpen >> Ballot >> vote: id

"check if enlisted and not voted"
self assert: sender canVote.
"update state"
(self proposals at: id) addVote.
sender voted: true.

Layer Activation Mechanisms in Use







Limitations and Outlook

- » **Tooling:** Arrange code in a useful way
- » **Use cases:** Explore additional smart contract types
 - > (Blind) Double auctions
 - > Decentralized Market places
 - > Supply chain ledgers
 - **>** ...
- Integration: Explore how to target existing smart contract platforms (e.g. EVM on the Ethereum Blockchain)

Summary

- » Activity Contexts have layer and object personalities
- » ACs are a tool to decompose large mediators, such as smart contracts, back into smaller responsibilities
 - > Restore encapsulation
 - > Scope extensions to activity only
- Layers integrate with ACs and can provide further modularity









Backup Slides

Mattis, Hirschfeld | COP'18, Amsterdam | Software Architecture Group, HPI Potsdam

Implementation



HΡ

Implementation



HP