



Technical Documentation Version 7.3

RPL Language Structure



Center for Advanced Decision Support for
Water and Environmental Systems (CADSWES)

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO **BOULDER**

These documents are copyrighted by the Regents of the University of Colorado. No part of this document may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, recording or otherwise without the prior written consent of The University of Colorado. All rights are reserved by The University of Colorado.

The University of Colorado makes no warranty of any kind with respect to the completeness or accuracy of this document. The University of Colorado may make improvements and/or changes in the product(s) and/or programs described within this document at any time and without notice.

RPL Language Structure Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Requirements for the Riverware Policy Language (RPL)	1
Imperative versus Functional Programming	2
Imperative Programming Paradigm	2
Referential Transparency	3
Functional Programming Paradigm	3
Examples	4
RiverWare Policy Language: A Hybrid Approach	7

RPL Language Structure

1. Introduction

One of the main goals of the RiverWare modeling system is to provide a way to express operating policy separate from the physical process model. Many older basin management models were “dedicated” software - they integrated complex operating policies into the code, intermingled with the code for the physical processes. This allowed ultimate flexibility and detail for the operations. Typically, general modeling tools allow only the specification of simple policies like guide curves.

RiverWare allows complex policies to be expressed in a general modeling framework. That is achieved by providing a programming language within RiverWare with which the modeler can express policy. The policy statements are interpreted at runtime and the policies interact with the simulation to drive the solution.

2. Requirements for the Riverware Policy Language (RPL)

The requirements for the language are

- that it be rich enough to express even the most complex operating policies,
- that it be an interpreted language, and
- that it can interact with RiverWare, primarily in being able to read and set slots in the model.

In the prototype development, Tcl (Tool Command Language) was used as the rule language. Tcl is a complete interpreted programming language that meets the requirements above (an interface was developed to allow Tcl to access model values, timesteps, etc.). Through observation of the use of that language, requirements for a more user-friendly language were developed. These included

- that the language be easy to read, so that interested parties can look at the logic and understand the policy relatively easily,
- that the language be relatively easy to formulate, so the modeler does not have to learn a new complex programming language,
- that the modeler does not have to “debug” spelling and similar syntax issues, i.e., that a syntax-directed editor is provided to ensure creation of valid expressions, and
- that performance of the interpretation and application of the language be fast enough for acceptable runtimes.

Based on these needs, the RiverWare Policy Language (RPL) was then developed. One of the primary design decisions for RPL was that it be, to a large extent, a *functional* programming language. This

section describes the main characteristics of functional languages, how they differ from *imperative* languages like FORTRAN or C, and takes you through some exercises in formulating logic using this approach.


3. Imperative versus Functional Programming

3.1 Imperative Programming Paradigm

Imperative (also called procedural) programming languages such as FORTRAN and C have been in use for a long time, and most engineers in the water management domain are familiar with the concepts. The structure of imperative, or statement-oriented languages is dominated by imperative statements, which, when evaluated in a given sequence, achieve the desired results of the program.

This type of language evolved as a natural extension of the Von Neumann computer architecture. Such languages are characterized by the existence of variables, the possibility of assigning values to variables, and mechanisms for repetition (iteration), mirroring the three computer architectural concepts of memory cells, storing or assigning values to memory cells, and the repetition of a set of instructions which are stored in memory.

The following example illustrates a how an imperative programming language might be used to implement a portion of a water management policy:



In this example `Inflow`, `Outflow`, and `Pool_Elevation` are global variables, that is, any part of the code can read from or write values to these memory locations. The first several statements provide these memory locations with initial values. Then a subroutine is called to perform the “surcharge release” computation. We don’t know what that computation is, but we can guess that it sets `Outflow` and `Pool_Elevation` to reflect high priority policy considerations. It could do other things as well, like modify other values (e.g., `Storage`). Next, another routine is called which performs the “flood release” computation. Again, we don’t know what this routine does, but perhaps it might readjust the values set by the `SurchargeRelease` routine to manage flooding scenarios.

The use of memory locations is a key aspect of imperative programs. The two subroutines executed by the program fragment above presumably takes advantage of the memory locations corresponding to the global variables by reading them to get their values and assigning values to them.

Two advantages of the imperative programming approach are that programs tend to be efficient (because the program organization mirrors the machine architecture) and most water resources engineers are accustomed to this style of computation.

3.2 Referential Transparency

Imperative languages have a problem related to the issue of *referential transparency*. A system is said to be referentially transparent if the meaning of the whole can be determined solely from the meaning of its parts. Mathematical expressions are referentially transparent. Imperative languages are not referentially transparent because the value of a variable or the meaning of an expression (result of its evaluation) depends on the history of computation. Assignment statements, parameters passed by reference, and global variables are the main reasons that imperative languages are not referentially transparent. The lack of referential transparency means that it is possible to create programs which are difficult to read, modify and prove correct.

3.3 Functional Programming Paradigm

A functional language, by contrast, makes use of the mathematical properties of functions. Recall from mathematics that a *function is a mapping from a set of values in some domain to a single value*. Thus $f(x, y, z)$ evaluates to a single value when specific values are given to x , y and z . A purely function programming language performs all of its computations by evaluating functions, i.e., by evaluating for various inputs the mathematical expressions which define the functions.

Notice that this description of purely functional programming languages contains no reference to memory locations. Since there is no setting of values in memory when evaluating a mathematical function, there are no hidden “side effects.” This lack of side effects allows functions to be combined hierarchically with predictable results. Knowledge of all the effects and predictability of the results makes the functional approach referentially transparent.

Let’s look at how the policy fragment from above might be written in a more functional manner:

```
Inflow = 100.0
Outflow = SurchargeRelease(Inflow)
Pool_Elevation = MassBalance(Inflow, Outflow)
Outflow = FloodRelease(Inflow)
Pool_Elevation = MassBalance(Inflow, Outflow)
```

If we allow functions to read (but not write!) global memory locations, then we don’t need to pass the inputs to the function in explicitly, and this policy fragment might be written:

```
Inflow = 100.0
Outflow = SurchargeRelease()
Pool_Elevation = MassBalance()
Outflow = FloodRelease()
Pool_Elevation = MassBalance()
```

This code is quite similar to the original code fragment, but a couple of differences from the original code are worth highlighting. First, since a function produces only one return value, the functional computation requires separate functions for computing the value of `Outflow` and `Pool_Elevation`. Thus the `SurchargeRelease` function now only computes `Outflow`, and we have introduced the `MassBalance` function, which uses `Inflow` and `Outflow` to compute the `Pool_Elevation`.

Note also that this code is not strictly “functional” -- we have retained from the original imperative program the idea of statements which assign values to memory locations, however we have moved the assignments to the outermost level. If we further stipulate that evaluating the three functions have no side effects (simply compute a value and don’t change any memory locations), then this policy fragment becomes quite easy to read and understand. That is, it is immediately obvious which portions of the policy are affecting `Outflow`, which `Pool_Elevation`, and so on.

This is the philosophy of the RPL in a nutshell: restrict the setting of global values (slot or model values) to the outermost level of policy statements, all other policy computation is via function and expression evaluation. The key aspects of function and expression evaluation are:

- functions operate on zero or more input values
- functions evaluate to a single value (or to a list of values, considered a single item)
- global memory values are not affected

The advantages of this approach are that we can easily see where and how values are computed. We can look at the functions to see what they do; there are no hidden side effects.


3.4 Examples

The purpose of the following examples is to familiarize the reader with RPL’s approach to describing computation and to provide the opportunity to practice this style of problem-solving.

The following subroutine finds the square of a number.

```
SUBROUTINE Square( FLOAT a, FLOAT answer )
    answer = a * a
END
```

Here is the same program written as a RPL function:



The following imperative-style function finds the minimum of two numbers.


Imperative versus Functional Programming Examples

```

FUNCTION Min( FLOAT a, FLOAT b )
  FLOAT answer
  IF ( a < b )
    answer = a
  ELSE
    answer = b
  END IF
  RETURN answer
END

```

Here is the same function implemented within RPL:



Note that the RPL IF expression evaluates to a single value, as do all functions and expressions.


The following procedure takes an array of numFlows flow values and returns the sum of these flows:

```

SUBROUTINE SumFlows( FLOAT ARRAY flows,
  INTEGER numFlows,
  FLOAT total )
  INTEGER i = 0
  total = 0
  WHILE ( i < numFlows )
    total = total + flows[i]
    i = i + 1
  END WHILE
END

```

Here is RPL code which accomplishes the same task:



Again, it is worth noting that the FOR expression evaluates to a single value.


Steps in evaluation of a FOR expression:

- the list expression is evaluated
- the initialization expression is evaluated and the result is assigned to the loop variable
- the first/next item in the result of evaluating the list expression is assigned to the index variable
- the body is evaluated and the result is assigned to the loop variables
- if there are more values in the result of evaluating the list expression, return to the third step
- return the value of the loop variable

The following procedure takes an array of numFlows reservoir releases and returns the minimum of these values:

```
SUBROUTINE GetMinRelease(FLOAT ARRAY flows,
    INTEGER numFlows,
    FLOAT min )
min = flows[0]
INTEGER i = 1
WHILE ( i < numFlows )
IF ( min > flows[i] )
    min = flows[i]
END IF
i = i + 1
END WHILE
END
```

The RPL version illustrates how iteration can be framed as an expression which evaluates to a single value (and uses the Min function defined above):



Given the pool elevation of numRes reservoirs, the following subroutine counts the number of reservoirs whose pool elevation is below a certain threshold:

```
SUBROUTINE CountLowReservoirs(FLOAT ARRAY PEs,
    INTEGER numRes,
    FLOAT threshold,
    INTEGER resCount )
resCount = 0
INTEGER i = 0
WHILE ( i < numRes )
IF ( PEs[i] < threshold )
```




```


    resCount = resCount + 1
  END IF
  i = i + 1
END WHILE
END

```

Here is one possible solution:



To illustrate the use of some of RPL's built-in list operations, consider a variation on the previous example, in which we would like a list of the reservoirs whose pool elevation is below a certain threshold:



4. RiverWare Policy Language: A Hybrid Approach

The requirements of RPL point to an ideal language which has some elements of both imperative and functional programming languages. For example, the ultimate purpose of RPL as the rule language is to set slots in the model in order to drive the simulation. Therefore, it is necessary to have assignment statements, particularly to slots. The slots in the model maintain the state of the system for the rules, thus are analogous to values in memory. To maintain clarity of meaning for rule assignments, all assignments are done at the very top level of the rules. In fact, rules contain only slot assignment

statements and print statements. Each slot is assigned the result of an expression or function evaluation, No slot assignments are “hidden” in lower level functions.

RiverWare rules have the form:

```
Object.slot[timestep] = <expression>
```

where the expression could contain complex logic or be as simple as a single function call.

The rules need to look at the current state of the model, so the language must have the ability to read slot values from memory. This does not diminish the referential transparency of the rules because slot values in the model can never change while a rule is executing. Data that is associated with policy, for example reservoir guide curves and minimum flow values, are kept in custom slots in the model.

Beyond the assignments to slots, policy computation is performed exclusively by evaluating functions and expressions, providing the benefits of being able to follow the meaning of the rule and not having hidden side effects. To assist in policy that frequently references the same variable, the WITH expression allows the use of a local variable within an expression. This feature helps the user to write policies which are more efficient and simpler than they might otherwise be.