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ABSTRACT

DREGS, a distributed environment for game support, simplifies the task of implementing multi-player games. DREGS solves the problems of concurrency control, synchronization, and communication as they apply to distributed games. DREGS provides support for the update and control of replicated objects and uses a central arbitration scheme to enforce a strict ordering of events. DREGS has been implemented to run under any 4.3BSD Unix compatible system and operates across a network of heterogeneous architectures.

A game description language, GDL, provides a framework for programming multi-player distributed games. GDL is a simple language that generates complex distributed programs. It is an object-based language, where objects are defined in terms of their input events and their corresponding actions. The programmer writes the game as if it were a serial program, without concern for concurrent activities. GDL also frees the programmer from the details of device and network interfaces.

The combination of the DREGS runtime and GDL frees a game designer from the distributed aspects of multi-player games. This freedom allows designers to concentrate their efforts on better, more interesting games. DREGS has been used to implement an N-way talk program, a tank game, and a flying saucer space game.

1. Introduction

Powerful, low-priced personal workstations with bit-mapped displays are becoming an integral part of a modern computing environment. This trend, combined with computer scientists' natural aptenidity for computer games, results in the need for more sophisticated game technology. The goal of DREGS is to provide a distributed runtime environment for game support that will allow multi-player games to be easily implemented for any 4.3BSD Unix system. DREGS is not in itself a game; it provides a framework on which to build multi-player games. This paper describes the DREGS system and the manner in which it simplifies a game designer's task.

One may question the validity of devoting resources to the development of a game writing system. Game research, however, is important for several reasons. First, games are a primary tool for introducing people to the use of computers. Second, distributed games represent a specific area within distributed computing systems. Finally, games are fun.

Historically, computer games have been limited to single-player games; improvements to
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these games generally concentrated on display techniques. Early games depended primarily on textual descriptions. Later games attempted to provide a graphical interface on ASCII terminals, representing various objects with normal characters. More recent games were designed to use high resolution graphic displays, such as those used for video arcade games or those attached to personal workstations, to provide a more realistic image of the objects. *Adventure, Rogue,* and the arcade game *Pit Fall,* games in which players seek treasures in a dangerous environment, exemplify the trend towards improving display techniques. Many versions of *Star Trek* have also been produced, culminating in a vector graphics video arcade version of this classic computer game.

A recent direction taken in the development of computer games is to allow multiple players to compete against one another. For example, *Perquacky®,* a word game from the company Lakeside, has been implemented as a multi-player game that uses a textual interface. *MazeWar,* a game in which players hunt each other in a two-dimensional maze, has been implemented for several systems. A Unix implementation uses ASCII characters to display the game board, while implementations for various Xerox operating systems use bit-mapped displays. Multi-player computer games, though generally very popular, are notably scarce because they are more difficult to implement than single-player games.

The *Game Space* concept can be used when classifying computer games. Game Space is defined as a two-dimensional coordinate system with display technology as one axis and the number of players allowed as the other. Figure 1 lists several existing games and shows their positions in Game Space. The list of single-player games is hardly exhaustive; the list of multi-player games, however, is fairly comprehensive.

DREGS provides a framework that frees the multi-player game designer from the details of implementing a distributed system. This freedom is available because DREGS provides the necessary communication and synchronization mechanisms, allowing game designers to concentrate their efforts on creating a wide variety of interesting multi-player games. The use of DREGS in conjunction with high resolution graphic display techniques allows games to be created that effectively span Game Space.

The remainder of this paper discusses the problems involved with distributed games and our
solutions to these problems. Section 2 briefly presents some problems in distributed programming and indicates how they affect distributed games. Section 3 develops an abstraction for describing games, and uses this abstraction to present the DREGS model of a game. The section then discusses how this model solves the problems presented in section 2. Section 4 describes the Game Description Language (GDL), and shows how using the language simplifies the task of the game designer. Section 5 presents some performance considerations and explains certain limitations of DREGS. Finally, section 6 presents the current state of DREGS and GDL, and discusses our experiences using them.

2. Problems

A common belief is that writing distributed programs is more difficult than writing sequential programs. The difficulties arise because the programmer has to contend with concurrency, synchronization, communication protocols, and fault tolerance (e.g., see [1]): issues not encountered when writing sequential programs. A distributed game has the added complexity of requiring the capability of updating replicated data structures concurrently. Tight timing constraints result because the game must be responsive to player input. DREGS addresses the issues of concurrency, synchronization, and communication protocols while attempting to provide real time response. Currently, DREGS makes no attempt to provide fault tolerance.

3. The Game Model

We first present an abstract model to describe a distributed game. We then present the DREGS model of a game using this abstraction. We go on to discuss how the DREGS model solves the problems associated with concurrency, synchronization, communication protocols, concurrent updates, and timing constraints.

3.1. The Abstract Model

A distributed game consists of a collection of game sites, one for each player. Within each game site is an input facility, a display facility, and a set of game objects for each player (see Figure 2). Each object represents a distinct thread of control at the game site. There are two types of objects: those created at the local site and those created at remote sites. Objects created locally are termed natives while objects created remotely, and replicated locally, are termed clones. All objects, native or clone, accept events as input and perform corresponding actions. As events are generated by a user, they are delivered to the local native objects and to its remote clones. These events are delivered to each object at the same time, and in the same order, to ensure that the corresponding actions are performed simultaneously at each site.

3.2. The DREGS Model

In the DREGS model, each game site includes an Input Manager, a Game Manager, and an Output Manager. In addition to the collection of game sites, a DREGS game includes
one central Arbiter (see Figure 3). The following subsections discuss the functions of the Input, Game, and Output Managers, and the function of the Arbiter. Subsection 3.2.3 describes the communication paths of a DREGS game.

3.2.1. Input, Game, and Output Managers

The Input Manager takes input from the player and translates it into an event. This event will eventually be delivered to all Game Managers.

The Game Manager receives all events generated by each Input Manager, and dispatches them to the appropriate objects. The objects then perform the corresponding actions. Next, the native objects are queried about interactions with other objects, clone or native, possibly producing new events. These new events are delivered to all Game Managers, including the Game Manager that produced the new events, as though they had come from the Input Manager. Only the native objects are queried to avoid concurrent updates and to reduce the amount of work to be done at each site. Finally, the display output is sent to the Output Manager.

The Output Manager displays the output produced by the objects. No Output Manager is provided by DREGS, but X [2], Andrew [3], and Curses [4] are examples of available Output Managers.

3.2.2. Arbiter

The Arbiter accepts events from all Input Managers and distributes them to all Game Managers. In this way, the Arbiter simplifies the communication machinery of the Input Manager and Game Manager by allowing them to perform their respective input and output of events on a single data stream. The alternative is to have each Input Manager connected to each Game Manager, forcing them to manage a data stream for every active player. The simplified process interconnect structure also drastically reduces the number of messages transmitted.

By quantizing time, the Arbiter guarantees a temporally consistent execution of all actions. The Arbiter buffers all events it receives during a given time-quantum. At the end of each time-quantum the Arbiter sends the events as one message to each Game Manager. Sending a message at the end of each time-quantum also serves to synchronize the Game Managers.
3.2.3. DREGS Communication

The Input Manager has one data path to the Arbiter on which it sends events. The Game Manager has two data paths: one on which it receives events from the Arbiter, and the other on which it sends events to the Arbiter. The Game Manager needs this second path to generate new events as a result of an object's action. Figure 3 shows the communication paths between the Input Manager, Arbiter, Game Manager, and Output Manager. To support heterogeneous architectures, messages sent between the Input Manager, Arbiter, and Game Manager are encoded using XDR, Sun Microsystems®, Inc.'s external data representation protocol [5].

4. GDL

We have created GDL, a game description language, to facilitate automatic generation of DREGS games. A game is specified by defining all objects within the game. An object consists of state information and input events for that object. Event types fall into four categories: generic object events generated by DREGS, user-defined events generated by the Input Manager, events generated by a Game Manager calling a replicated procedure, and events which occur due to an interval timer expiring. For each specified input event, the game designer defines the corresponding action routine. Given a game defined in GDL, a GDL compiler will automatically generate the appropriate Input and Game Managers, as well as an Arbiter. Figure 4 shows what a GDL compiler generates based on game designer's GDL program. An example of a GDL program to implement a simple game is given in the Appendix. The following subsections describe the four event types.
4.1. Generic Object Events

There are several generic events defined for all objects. These events deal with object creation, destruction, update, and display. The game designer can optionally specify code for any of the following generic events:

*STARTUP* This event will cause code to be executed once when the Game Manager is initially invoked. This code is used to initialize the game-specific state as well as an Output Manager.

*INITIALIZE* This event will cause code to be executed after an object is created. For each object, a procedure *object Create* is automatically generated. This procedure creates an instance of the object.

*TERMINATE* This event will cause code to be executed before the DREGS runtime removes an object after a player quits.

*UPDATE* This event will cause code to be executed once per time-quantum even if the object has not received new input events. This code typically will be used to update the positions of movable objects.

*CONTACT* This event will cause code to be executed on native objects to allow them to check for intersections with other objects.

*DISPLAY* This event will cause code to be executed once per time-quantum to give an object the opportunity to display itself.

4.2. Input Manager Events

The game designer defines Input Manager events by specifying the mapping of user inputs, such as mouse or keyboard input, to object-specific events. The game designer is also responsible for specifying the corresponding code to be executed when an event occurs.

4.3. Replicated Procedure Events

Replicated procedures are used by DREGS for performing remote procedure calls at multiple sites. They are not used to ensure reliability as in Circus [6]. When a replicated procedure is called, an event is generated by the Game Manager and sent to the Arbiter in the same way that the Input Manager sends an event to the Arbiter. Thus the event will be distributed to all Game Managers during the following time-quantum and the body of the replicated procedure will be executed at all game sites.

4.4. Interval Timer Events

The game designer may specify an arbitrary number of interval timer events. An interval timer is specified by giving a time-quantum, \( Q \), and action code to execute every \( Q \) ticks. The timer is automatically reset to \( Q \) after expiring.

5. Performance Considerations and Constraints

One of the performance considerations of DREGS is to allow a game designer to provide real-time animation. Animation in television or in movies is obtained by displaying a sequence of still images quickly enough so that the eye will blend them into smooth motion. The number of frames shown per second ranges from 30 frames per second for television, to 24 frames per second for a 32 millimeter film, to 18 frames per second for an 8 millimeter film. The goal for the current version of DREGS is to allow a minimum of 10 screen updates per second.

Smooth animation in DREGS is limited by several factors: the inter-machine message delay, the number of players, the desired time-quantum between updates, and the screen update time. We have derived a simple relationship that holds among the first three factors. Since DREGS does not provide an Output Manager, the screen update time was not taken into consideration.

We have observed the inter-machine message delay, \( D \), to be about 10ms for our implementation, which uses XDR Record Streams [5] over a 10Mb Ethernet between DEC Vaxstation IIIs running 4.3BSD Unix. The number of players, \( N \), and the time-quantum, \( Q \), are bound by the relationship:

\[
N \times D \leq Q.
\]

Intuitively this means that the delay for sending messages to all players (\( N \times D \)) must be less than the time-quantum between updates. By fixing the smallest acceptable time-quantum, \( Q \), you can derive the maximum number of players, \( N \). For example, in our current configuration \( D \) is 10ms and we have set \( Q \) to 1/10th of a second (100ms), limiting the number of players to 10.
6. Concluding Remarks

We have implemented several games using DREGS. From our experiences, we have found that the DREGS game model is appropriate, workable, and easy to use. The central Arbiter plays a crucial role in this model by simplifying the operation of the Input and Game Managers and by providing synchronization. Further, by using XDR to encode messages, we are able to operate in a heterogeneous environment with little overhead.

Although we have not yet completed a GDL compiler, hand-compiling several GDL programs has shown us that such a compiler is feasible. Our experiences have shown that implementing a game using GDL is straightforward. Currently, the most time consuming part of implementing a DREGS game is hand-compiling the GDL program. Once the GDL compiler has been completed, the task of implementing a DREGS game will be greatly simplified.

To date, we have written three programs using DREGS and GDL. PLine, an N-way talk program, was the first. We wrote PLIne because it is simple and does not require an extensive graphical interface. The program demonstrated the workability of DREGS and showed that adequate performance could be obtained.

To further test DREGS and GDL, we wrote Tank, a game in which the player manipulates a two-dimensional tank. Tank is a more complicated game, consisting of two types of graphical objects (tanks and missiles) which can move vertically or horizontally. Implementing Tank showed us that GDL is a versatile, and therefore powerful, tool for specifying games.

We modified and improved Tank to create our most recent game, SpaceWar. The premise of SpaceWar is the same as that of Tank; however, in SpaceWar the tanks have been replaced by flying saucers that can move at arbitrary angles. Again, DREGS and GDL made this otherwise challenging task relatively simple and straightforward.

Finally, from the experiences of implementing PLine, Tank, and SpaceWar we learned that games really are fun!
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9. Appendix

This Appendix contains an example of a GDL program for a simple game in which balls move on the screen. When a ball collides with another, it explodes and a new ball is created. The player can control the speed at which the ball moves by inputting a single digit ranging from 0 (stopped) through 9 (very fast).

```gdl
STARTUP BEGIN
  struct Ball b;
  InitOutputManager();
  InitGame();
  InitBall(&b);
  Ball_Create(&b);
END

OBJECT Ball
BEGIN
  STATE BEGIN
    int b_x, b_y;
    int b_dir;
    int b_speed;
  END

  /* Define an object called 'Ball' */
  /* Define Ball state information */
  /* X and Y coordinates of the ball */
  /* Direction of travel */
  /* Speed at which the ball is moving */

  /* For each object the following variables are
  automatically defined and set by the runtime environment:
  object_Ptr    a pointer to the object
  object_Input  a structure containing the input
  that caused the event. */

  CONTACT BEGIN
    if( HitBall(Ball_Ptr) ) {
      Ball_Explode(Ball_Ptr);
    } else if( HitWall(Ball_Ptr) ) {
      Ball_Bounce(Ball_Ptr);
    }
  END

  UPDATE BEGIN
    /* Define code to update a ball's position */
    /* Xincrement and Yincrement are externally defined */
    Ball_Ptr->b_x += Xincrement[Ball_Ptr->b_dir] * Ball_Ptr->b_speed;
    Ball_Ptr->b_y += Yincrement[Ball_Ptr->b_dir] * Ball_Ptr->b_speed;
  END

  DISPLAY BEGIN
    /* Define code to display a ball */
    DisplayBall(Ball_Ptr);
  END
```
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REPLICATED Ball_Explode
BEGIN
  struct Ball b;
  Explode(Ball_Ptr);
  InitBall(&b);
  Ball_Create(&b);
END

REPLICATED Ball_Bounce
BEGIN
  Ball_Ptr->b_dir = Reflect(Ball_Ptr);
END

INPUT '0-9'
BEGIN
  /*
   ** Ball_Input.i_char will be set to the input character
   */
  Ball_Ptr->b_speed = (int) (Ball_Input.i_char - '0');
END

TIMER 60 SECONDS
BEGIN
  CheckForMail();
END