

Semantics and Verification of Software

Summer Semester 2015

Lecture 16: Nondeterminism and Parallelism II (Channel Communication)

Thomas Noll
Software Modeling and Verification Group
RWTH Aachen University

http://moves.rwth-aachen.de/teaching/ss-15/sv-sw/





Recap: Shared-Variables Communication

The ParWHILE Language

Definition (Syntax of ParWHILE)

```
a := z \mid x \mid a_1 + a_2 \mid a_1 - a_2 \mid a_1 * a_2 \in AExp
b := t \mid a_1 = a_2 \mid a_1 > a_2 \mid \neg b \mid b_1 \land b_2 \mid b_1 \lor b_2 \in BExp
c := \text{skip} \mid x := a \mid c_1; c_2 \mid \text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \text{ end } \mid \text{while } b \text{ do } c \text{ end } \mid c_1 \mid c_2 \in Cmd
```



Recap: Shared-Variables Communication

Semantics of ParWHILE II

Definition (Small-step execution relation for ParWHILE)

The small-step execution relation, $\rightarrow_1 \subseteq (Cmd \times \Sigma) \times (Cmd \times \Sigma)$, is defined by the following rules:

$$\begin{array}{c} \langle a,\sigma \rangle \rightarrow z \\ \hline \langle \text{skip},\sigma \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle \downarrow,\sigma \rangle & \overline{\langle x := a,\sigma \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle \downarrow,\sigma [x \mapsto z] \rangle} \\ \hline \langle c_1,\sigma \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle c_1',\sigma' \rangle & \langle b,\sigma \rangle \rightarrow \text{true} \\ \hline \langle c_1;c_2,\sigma \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle c_1';c_2,\sigma' \rangle & \overline{\langle \text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \text{ end},\sigma \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle c_1,\sigma \rangle} \\ \hline \langle b,\sigma \rangle \rightarrow \text{false} & \langle b,\sigma \rangle \rightarrow \text{false} \\ \hline \langle \text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \text{ end},\sigma \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle c_2,\sigma \rangle & \overline{\langle \text{while } b \text{ do } c \text{ end},\sigma \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle \downarrow,\sigma \rangle} \\ \hline \langle b,\sigma \rangle \rightarrow \text{true} \\ \hline \langle \text{while } b \text{ do } c \text{ end},\sigma \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle c_1',\sigma' \rangle & \overline{\langle c_1 \parallel c_2,\sigma \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle c_1' \parallel c_2,\sigma' \rangle} \\ \hline \langle c_1 \parallel c_2,\sigma \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle c_1' \parallel c_2,\sigma' \rangle & \overline{\langle c_1 \parallel c_2,\sigma \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle c_1 \parallel c_2',\sigma' \rangle} \\ \hline \end{array}$$



Communicating Sequential Processes

- Approach: Communicating Sequential Processes (CSP) by T. Hoare and R. Milner
- Models system of processors that
 - have (only) local store and
 - run a sequential program ("process")
- Communication proceeds in the following way:
 - processes communicate along channels
 - process can send/receive on a channel if another process simultaneously performs the complementary I/O operation
 - ⇒ no buffering (synchronous communication)
- New syntactic domains:

Channel names: $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \ldots \in Chn$

Input operations: α ?x where $\alpha \in Chn$, $x \in Var$ Output operations: α !a where $\alpha \in Chn$, $a \in AExp$

Guarded commands: $gc \in GCmd$





Syntax of CSP

Definition 16.1 (Syntax of CSP)

The syntax of CSP is given by

```
a := z \mid x \mid a_1 + a_2 \mid a_1 - a_2 \mid a_1 * a_2 \in AExp
b := t \mid a_1 = a_2 \mid a_1 > a_2 \mid \neg b \mid b_1 \land b_2 \mid b_1 \lor b_2 \in BExp
c := \text{skip} \mid x := a \mid \alpha?x \mid \alpha!a \mid
c_1; c_2 \mid \text{if } gc \text{ fi} \mid \text{do } gc \text{ od } \mid c_1 \mid c_2 \in Cmd
gc := b \rightarrow c \mid b \land \alpha?x \rightarrow c \mid b \land \alpha!a \rightarrow c \mid gc_1 \square gc_2 \in GCmd
```

- In $c_1 \parallel c_2$, commands c_1 and c_2 must not use common variables (only local store)
- Guarded command $gc_1 \square gc_2$ represents an alternative
- In $b \to c$, b acts as a guard that enables the execution of c only if evaluated to true
- $b \wedge \alpha$? $x \rightarrow c$ and $b \wedge \alpha$! $a \rightarrow c$ additionally require the respective I/O operation to be enabled
- If none of its alternatives is enabled, a guarded command gc fails (configuration fail)
- if nondeterministically picks an enabled alternative
- A do loop is iterated until its body fails





Semantics of CSP I

- Most important aspect: I/O operations
- E.g., $\langle \alpha ? x; c, \sigma \rangle$ can only execute if a parallel command provides corresponding output
- ⇒ Indicate communication potential by labels

$$L := \{\alpha?z \mid \alpha \in Chn, z \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\alpha!z \mid \alpha \in Chn, z \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

Yields following labelled transitions:

$$\langle \alpha ? x; c_1, \sigma \rangle \xrightarrow{\alpha ? z} \langle c_1, \sigma [x \mapsto z] \rangle$$
 (for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}$)
 $\langle \alpha ! a; c_2, \sigma \rangle \xrightarrow{\alpha ! z} \langle c_2, \sigma \rangle$ (if $\langle a, \sigma \rangle \to z$)

Now both commands, if running in parallel, can communicate:

$$\langle (\alpha?x; c_1) \parallel (\alpha!a; c_2), \sigma \rangle \rightarrow \langle c_1 \parallel c_2, \sigma[x \mapsto z] \rangle.$$

• To allow communication with other processes, the following transitions should also be enabled (for $\langle a, \sigma \rangle \to z$ and all $z' \in \mathbb{Z}$):

$$\langle (\alpha?x; c_1) \parallel (\alpha!a; c_2), \sigma \rangle \xrightarrow{\alpha?z'} \langle c_1 \parallel (\alpha!a; c_2), \sigma[x \mapsto z'] \rangle$$
$$\langle (\alpha?x; c_1) \parallel (\alpha!a; c_2), \sigma \rangle \xrightarrow{\alpha!z} \langle (\alpha?x; c_1) \parallel c_2, \sigma \rangle$$





Semantics of CSP II

Definition of transition relation

$$\overset{\lambda}{\longrightarrow} \subseteq (\textit{Cmd} \times \Sigma) \times (\textit{Cmd} \times \Sigma) \cup (\textit{GCmd} \times \Sigma) \times (\textit{Cmd} \times \Sigma \cup \{\text{fail}\})$$

(see following slides)

- Marking λ can be a label or empty: $\lambda \in L \cup \{\varepsilon\}$
- Again: uniform treatment of configurations of the form $\langle c, \sigma \rangle \in Cmd \times \Sigma$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$:
 - $-\sigma$ interpreted as $\langle\downarrow,\sigma\rangle$ with "terminated" command \downarrow
 - $-\downarrow$ satisfies \downarrow ; $c=\downarrow\parallel c=c\parallel\downarrow=c$





Semantics of CSP III

Definition 16.2 (Semantics of CSP – Commands (Cmd))



Semantics of CSP IV

Definition 16.2 (Semantics of CSP – Guarded commands (GCmd))

$$\begin{array}{c|c} \langle b,\sigma \rangle \to \text{true} & \frac{\langle b,\sigma \rangle \to \text{false}}{\langle b \to c,\sigma \rangle \to \langle c,\sigma \rangle} \\ \hline \langle b,\sigma \rangle \to \text{true} & \frac{\langle b,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail}}{\langle b,\sigma \rangle \to \text{false}} \\ \hline \langle b \wedge \alpha?x \to c,\sigma \rangle \xrightarrow{\alpha?z} \langle c,\sigma[x \mapsto z] \rangle & \frac{\langle b,\sigma \rangle \to \text{false}}{\langle b \wedge \alpha?x \to c,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail}} \\ \hline \langle b,\sigma \rangle \to \text{true} & \langle a,\sigma \rangle \to z & \langle b,\sigma \rangle \to \text{false} \\ \hline \langle b \wedge \alpha!a \to c,\sigma \rangle \xrightarrow{\alpha!z} \langle c,\sigma \rangle & \frac{\langle b,\sigma \rangle \to \text{false}}{\langle b \wedge \alpha!a \to c,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail}} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda} \langle c,\sigma' \rangle & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda} \langle c,\sigma' \rangle \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} & \langle gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to \text{fail} \\ \hline \langle gc_1 \sqcap gc_2,\sigma \rangle \to$$



CSP Examples

CSP Examples

Example 16.3

(on the board)

- 1. do (true $\land \alpha?x \to \beta!x$) od describes a process that repeatedly receives a value along α and forwards it along β (i.e., a one-place buffer)
- 2. do true $\land \alpha?x \to \beta!x$ od \parallel do true $\land \beta?y \to \gamma!y$ od specifies a two-place buffer that receives along α and sends along γ (using β for internal communication)
- 3. Nondeterministic choice between input channels:
 - i. if (true $\wedge \alpha$? $x \rightarrow c_1 \square$ true $\wedge \beta$? $y \rightarrow c_2$) fi
 - ii. if $(\text{true} \to (\alpha?x; c_1) \square \text{true} \to (\beta?y; c_2))$ fi

Expected: progress whenever environment provides data on α or β

- i. correct
- ii. incorrect (can deadlock)





Fairness in CSP

Fairness I

- Informally: unfair behaviour excludes processes from being executed
- Here: consider parallel composition of $n \ge 1$ sequential programs with executions of the form $\kappa_0 \to \kappa_1 \to \kappa_2 \to \dots$ where $\kappa_j = \langle c_1^{(j)} \parallel \dots \parallel c_n^{(j)}, \sigma_j \rangle$ and, for some $1 \le i \le n$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $c_i^{(k)} = c_i^{(k_0)}$ for all $k \ge k_0$
- But: only unfair if c_i not enabled

Definition 16.4 (Enabledness)

 c_i is enabled in configuration $\kappa = \langle c_1 \parallel \ldots \parallel c_n, \sigma \rangle$ if there exists $\kappa' = \langle c'_1 \parallel \ldots \parallel c'_n, \sigma' \rangle$ with $\kappa \to \kappa'$ and $c'_i \neq c_i$.

Example 16.5

- 1. x := 0 enabled in $\langle x := 0 \parallel y := 1, \sigma \rangle$ (actually always enabled)
- 2. α ?x enabled in $\langle \alpha$? $x \parallel \alpha$! $0, \sigma \rangle$
- 3. α ?x not enabled in $\langle \alpha$? $x \parallel \beta!1, \sigma \rangle$





Fairness in CSP

Fairness II

Definition 16.6 (Fairness)

An execution $\kappa_0 \to \kappa_1 \to \kappa_2 \to \dots$ where $\kappa_j = \langle c_1^{(j)} \parallel \dots \parallel c_n^{(j)}, \sigma_j \rangle$ and, for some $1 \le i \le n$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $c_i^{(k)} = c_i^{(k_0)}$ for all $k \ge k_0$ is called

- 1. strongly unfair if $c_i^{(k)}$ is enabled in κ_k for all $k \geq k_0$
- 2. weakly unfair if $c_i^{(k)}$ is enabled in κ_k for infinitely many $k \geq k_0$



Fairness in CSP

Fairness III

Example 16.7

```
1. \langle \text{do true} \rightarrow x := x + 1 \text{ od } || y := y + 1, \ldots \rangle

\rightarrow \langle x := x + 1; \text{ do true} \rightarrow x := x + 1 \text{ od } || y := y + 1, \ldots \rangle

\rightarrow \langle \text{do true} \rightarrow x := x + 1 \text{ od } || y := y + 1, \ldots \rangle \rightarrow \ldots

is strongly unfair since y := y + 1 is always enabled
```

```
2. \langle \text{do true} \rightarrow x := x + 1 \text{ od } \| \alpha! 1 \| \alpha? y, \ldots \rangle

\rightarrow \langle x := x + 1; \text{ do true} \rightarrow x := x + 1 \text{ od } \| \alpha! 1 \| \alpha? y, \ldots \rangle

\rightarrow \langle \text{do true} \rightarrow x := x + 1 \text{ od } \| \alpha! 1 \| \alpha? y, \ldots \rangle \rightarrow \ldots

is strongly unfair since both I/O operations are always enabled
```

```
3. \langle \operatorname{do} \alpha ! 1 \to \operatorname{skip} \operatorname{od} \parallel \operatorname{do} \alpha ? x \to \operatorname{skip} \operatorname{od} \parallel \alpha ? y, \ldots \rangle
\to \langle \operatorname{skip}; \operatorname{do} \alpha ! 1 \to \operatorname{skip} \operatorname{od} \parallel \operatorname{skip}; \operatorname{do} \alpha ? x \to \operatorname{skip} \operatorname{od} \parallel \alpha ? y, \ldots \rangle
\to \langle \operatorname{skip}; \operatorname{do} \alpha ! 1 \to \operatorname{skip} \operatorname{od} \parallel \operatorname{do} \alpha ? x \to \operatorname{skip} \operatorname{od} \parallel \alpha ? y, \ldots \rangle
\to \langle \operatorname{do} \alpha ! 1 \to \operatorname{skip} \operatorname{od} \parallel \operatorname{do} \alpha ? x \to \operatorname{skip} \operatorname{od} \parallel \alpha ? y, \ldots \rangle \to \ldots
is weakly unfair since \alpha ? y is enabled in every third configuration
```



Summary: Nondeterminism and Parallelism

Summary: Nondeterminism and Parallelism

- Important modelling aspects:
 - parallelism (here: interleaving = nondeterminism + sequential execution)
 - interaction (here: via shared variables/channels)
- Interleaving requires small-step execution relation
- Parallelism raises new issues such as fairness



