



[http://didawiki.di.unipi.it/doku.php/
magistraleinformatica/psc/](http://didawiki.di.unipi.it/doku.php/magistraleinformatica/psc/)

PSC 2020/21 (375AA, 9CFU)

Principles for Software Composition

Roberto Bruni

<http://www.di.unipi.it/~bruni/>

21 - CCS at work

CCS syntax

p, q	$::=$	nil	inactive process
		x	process variable (for recursion)
		$\mu.p$	action prefix
		$p \setminus \alpha$	restricted channel
		$p[\phi]$	channel relabelling
		$p + q$	nondeterministic choice (sum)
		$p q$	parallel composition
		rec $x. p$	recursion

(operators are listed in order of precedence)

Some notation

write $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i$ instead of $p_1 + \cdots + p_n$

write $\prod_{i=1}^n p_i$ instead of $p_1 | \cdots | p_n$

write $p \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ instead of $p \setminus a_1 \cdots \setminus a_n$

write $\mu^n . p$ instead of $\underbrace{\mu . \mu \dots \mu . p}_n$

CCS op. semantics

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{Act)} \frac{}{\mu.p \xrightarrow{\mu} p} \qquad \text{Res)} \frac{p \xrightarrow{\mu} q \quad \mu \notin \{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}\}}{p \setminus \alpha \xrightarrow{\mu} q \setminus \alpha} \qquad \text{Rel)} \frac{p \xrightarrow{\mu} q}{p[\phi] \xrightarrow{\phi(\mu)} q[\phi]} \\
 \\
 \text{SumL)} \frac{p_1 \xrightarrow{\mu} q}{p_1 + p_2 \xrightarrow{\mu} q} \qquad \text{SumR)} \frac{p_2 \xrightarrow{\mu} q}{p_1 + p_2 \xrightarrow{\mu} q} \\
 \\
 \text{ParL)} \frac{p_1 \xrightarrow{\mu} q_1}{p_1 | p_2 \xrightarrow{\mu} q_1 | p_2} \qquad \text{Com)} \frac{p_1 \xrightarrow{\lambda} q_1 \quad p_2 \xrightarrow{\bar{\lambda}} q_2}{p_1 | p_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} q_1 | q_2} \qquad \text{ParR)} \frac{p_2 \xrightarrow{\mu} q_2}{p_1 | p_2 \xrightarrow{\mu} p_1 | q_2} \\
 \\
 \text{Rec)} \frac{p[\mathbf{rec} \ x. \ p / x] \xrightarrow{\mu} q}{\mathbf{rec} \ x. \ p \xrightarrow{\mu} q}
 \end{array}$$

CCS

Encoding imperative languages

Preliminaries: termination


A dedicated channel *done*:

a message is sent when the current command terminates

$$\text{Done} \triangleq \overline{\text{done}}$$

$$\text{Done} \xrightarrow{\overline{\text{done}}} \mathbf{nil}$$

Termination



Skip

skip

does nothing and sends *done*

τ .Done

- $\xrightarrow{\tau}$ Done $\xrightarrow{\overline{done}}$ **nil**

Variables

x ranging over $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$

a dedicated process for managing each variable

we can read its current value (channel xr_i)

we can write any value (channel xw_i)

$$\begin{aligned} XW &\triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n xw_i.X_i \\ &= xw_1.X_1 + \dots + xw_n.X_n \end{aligned}$$

$$X_i \triangleq \overline{xr_i}.X_i + XW$$


Variable declaration

`var x`

releases an uninitialised variable and terminates

$XW \mid \text{Done}$

$V = \{v_0, v_1, v_2\}$



Assignment

$$x := v_i$$

sends a message to change the state of the variable
and then terminates

$$\overline{xw_i}.Done$$

- $\overline{xw_i} \rightarrow Done \xrightarrow{\overline{done}} \mathbf{nil}$

Sequential composition

$c_1 ; c_2$

suppose

p_1 models c_1

p_2 models c_2

$p_1 | done.p_2$


unfortunate choice: does not scale

$c_1 ; c_2 ; c_3$


$p_1 | done.p_2 | done.p_3$

p_3 can start after p_1

Sequential?



Sequential!



Sequential composition

$$c_1 ; c_2$$

suppose

p_1 models c_1

$$\phi_d(\text{done}) = d$$

p_2 models c_2

$$p_1 \frown p_2 \triangleq (p_1[\phi_d] \mid d.p_2) \setminus d$$

now d is local to p_1 and p_2

$$((p_1[\phi_{d_1}] \mid d_1.p_2) \setminus d_1)[\phi_{d_2}] \mid d_2.p_3) \setminus d_2$$

$$((p_1[\phi_d] \mid d.p_2) \setminus d)[\phi_d] \mid d.p_3) \setminus d$$

$$(p_1 \frown p_2) \frown p_3$$

Conditional


if $x = v_i$ then c_1 else c_2

suppose p_1 models c_1
 p_2 models c_2

receives the state of the variable
and then chooses accordingly

$$x r_i \cdot p_1 + \sum_{j \neq i} x r_j \cdot p_2$$

Conditional



Iteration

while $x = v_i$ do c

suppose p models c

receives the state of the variable

and then chooses accordingly, possibly recurring

$$\mathbf{rec} \ y. \ x r_i. (p[\phi_d] | d.y) \setminus d + \sum_{j \neq i} x r_j. \text{Done}$$

$$Y \triangleq x r_i. (p[\phi_d] | d.Y) \setminus d + \sum_{j \neq i} x r_j. \text{Done}$$

$$Y \triangleq x r_i. (p \frown Y) + \sum_{j \neq i} x r_j. \text{Done}$$

Concurrency

$$c_1 \mid c_2$$

suppose


p_1 models c_1

p_2 models c_2


$$p_1 \mid p_2$$

unfortunate choice: *done* is possibly issued twice

Concurrent termination



Joint termination



Concurrency

$$c_1 \mid c_2$$

suppose

p_1 models c_1

p_2 models c_2

$$(p_1[\phi_{d_1}] \mid p_2[\phi_{d_2}] \mid d_1.d_2.Done) \setminus d_1 \setminus d_2$$

the order is not important: both must be done to terminate

$$(p_1[\phi_d] \mid p_2[\phi_d] \mid d.d.Done) \setminus d$$

$$(p_1[\phi_d] \mid p_2[\phi_d] \mid d^2.Done) \setminus d$$

Finally

all channels for communicating with variables
must be restricted at the top
to guarantee read/write requests are synchronised

$$p \setminus \{xw_1, xr_1, \dots\}$$

several optimisations are possible:
action prefix instead of linking for sequential composition
allows more expressive guards
remove silent transitions
introduce constants for loops
implement expressions
...

Example: optimisation

$$x := 1; y := 2$$
$$\overline{xw_1.done} \quad \frown \quad \overline{yw_2.done}$$
$$((\overline{xw_1.done})[\phi_d] \mid d.\overline{yw_2.done}) \setminus d$$
$$\overline{xw_1.yw_2.done}$$

Example: optimisation


if $b(x)$ then c_1 else c_2

$$\sum_{b(v_i)} x r_i \cdot p_1 + \sum_{\neg b(v_j)} x r_j \cdot p_2$$

CCS

Playing with CAAL

Concurrency Workbench, Aalborg Edition



<http://caal.cs.aau.dk/>

CAAL

CAAL is a web-based tool for modeling, visualization and verification of concurrent processes in CCS (and its timed extension)

developed for educational purposes

Edit (recursively defined) processes

Explore their LTS (collapse states up to equivalences)

Verify HML formulas satisfaction (model checking)

Verify equivalences between processes
(generate distinguishing formulas)


play bisimulation **Game**

CAAL

Edit processes

```
CAAL Project Edit Explore Verify Games About Syntax
Orchard
Parse CCS TCCS 20
1 Man = 'shake.(redapple.walk.Man + greenapple.walk.Man);
2
3 AppleTree = shake.('greenapple.AppleTree + 'redapple.AppleTree);
4
5 Orchard = (AppleTree | Man) \ {shake, redapple, greenapple};
6
7 Spec = walk.Spec;
```


Explore LTS



Verify HML & Equivalences

Status	Time	Property	Verify	Edit	Delete	Options
✖	26 ms	Orchard ~ Spec	▶	✎	🗑️	☰
✔	25 ms	Orchard \models $\langle \text{tau} \rangle \text{tt}$	▶	✎	🗑️	☰
✖	25 ms	Spec \models $\langle \text{tau} \rangle \text{tt}$	▶	✎	🗑️	☰
✔	25 ms	Orchard \approx Spec	▶	✎	🗑️	☰

play bisimulation Game



CAAL syntax for CCS

	nil	0
$a.P$	$\bar{a}.P$	$\tau.P$
	$a.P$	$'a.P$
	$\text{tau}.P$	$\text{tau}.P$
	$P + Q$	$P + Q$
	$P Q$	$P Q$
	$P \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$	$P \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$
	$P[b_1/a_1, \dots, b_n/a_n]$	$P[b_1/a_1, \dots, b_n/a_n]$
	$A \triangleq P$	$A = P ;$

CAAL syntax for HML

tt tt

ff ff

$F \wedge G$ F and G

$F \vee G$ F or G

$\diamond_{\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}} F$ $\langle a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle F$

$\square_{\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}} F$ $[a_1, \dots, a_n] F$

CAAL

mutual exclusion protocols analysis

Peterson's mex algorithm

```
% Two processes P1, P2
% Two boolean variables b1, b2 (both initially false)
% when Pi wants to enter the critical section, then it sets bi to true
% An integer variable k, taking values in {1,2}
% (initial value is arbitrary)
% the process Pk has priority over the other process
%
% Process P1 in pseudocode
while (true) {
    ...                % non critical section
    b1 = true ;        % P1 wants to enter the critical section
    k = 2 ;            % P1 gives priority to the other process
    while (b2 && k==2) skip ; % P1 waits its turn
    ...                % P1 enters the critical section
    b1 = false        % P1 leaves the critical section
}

% Process P2 is analogous to P1
```

Peterson's mex in CCS

$$B1W \triangleq b1wf.B1f + b1wt.B1t$$

$$B1f \triangleq \overline{b1rf}.B1f + B1W$$

$$B1t \triangleq \overline{b1rt}.B1t + B1W$$

$$KW \triangleq kw1.K1 + kw2.K2$$

$$K1 \triangleq \overline{kr1}.K1 + KW$$

$$K2 \triangleq \overline{kr2}.K2 + KW$$

% Process P1 in pseudocode

```
while (true) {
  ...
  b1 = true ; % wants to enter
  k = 2 ; % gives priority to P2
  while (b2 && k==2) skip ; % waits
  ... % enters critical section
  b1 = false % leaves
}
```

% Process P2 is analogous to P1

$$P1 \triangleq \overline{b1wt}.\overline{kw2}.P1a$$

$$P1a \triangleq b2rf.P1b + b2rt.(kr1.P1b + kr2.P1a)$$

leave cycle loop

$$P1b \triangleq enter1.exit1.\overline{b1wf}.P1$$

just something to observe

$$SP \triangleq (B1f|B2f|KW|P1|P2) \setminus \{kw1, kr1, kw2, kr2, \dots\}$$

Peterson's mex in CCS

$$B1W \triangleq b1wf.B1f + b1wt.B1t$$

$$B1f \triangleq \overline{b1rf}.B1f + B1W$$

$$B1t \triangleq \overline{b1rt}.B1t + B1W$$

$$KW \triangleq kw1.K1 + kw2.K2$$

$$K1 \triangleq \overline{kr1}.K1 + KW$$

$$K2 \triangleq \overline{kr2}.K2 + KW$$

`% Process P1 in pseudocode`

`while (true) {`

`...`

`b1 = true ; % wants to enter`

`k = 2 ; % gives priority to P2`

`while (b2 && k==2) skip ; % waits`

`... % enters critical section`

`b1 = false % leaves`

`}`

`% Process P2 is analogous to P1`

$$P1 \triangleq \overline{b1wt}.\overline{kw2}.P1a$$

$$P1a \triangleq b2rf.P1b + \overbrace{kr1.P1b}^{\text{no busy wait}}$$

$$P1b \triangleq enter1.exit1.\overline{b1wf}.P1$$

$$SP \triangleq (B1f|B2f|KW|P1|P2) \setminus \{kw1, kr1, kw2, kr2, \dots\}$$

Peterson's mex in CCS

$$P1 \triangleq \overline{b1wt}. \overline{kw2}. P1a$$

$$P1a \triangleq b2rf.P1b + kr1.P1b$$

$$P1b \triangleq enter1.exit1.\overline{b1wf}.P1$$

$$SP \triangleq (B1f|B2f|KW|P1|P2) \setminus \{kw1, kr1, kw2, kr2, \dots\}$$

a formula for mutual exclusion? any label

$$F \triangleq [exit_1]\mathbf{ff} \vee [exit_2]\mathbf{ff}$$

$$F \wedge [-](\dots)$$

$$F \wedge [-](F \wedge [-](\dots))$$

$$MEX \triangleq_{(max)} F \wedge [-]MEX$$

$$F \wedge [-](F \wedge [-](F \wedge [-](\dots)))$$

a recursively defined formula!

Peterson's mex in CCS

$$P1 \triangleq \overline{b1wt}.\overline{kw2}.P1a$$

$$P1a \triangleq b2rf.P1b + kr1.P1b$$

$$P1b \triangleq enter1.exit1.\overline{b1wf}.P1$$

$$SP \triangleq (B1f|B2f|KW|P1|P2) \setminus \{kw1, kr1, kw2, kr2, \dots\}$$

has P1 the possibility to enter?

$$G \triangleq \langle enter_1 \rangle \mathbf{tt}$$

$$G \vee \langle - \rangle (\dots)$$

$$G \vee \langle - \rangle (G \vee \langle - \rangle (\dots))$$

$$EN_{(\min)} \triangleq G \vee \langle - \rangle EN$$

$$G \vee \langle - \rangle (G \vee \langle - \rangle (G \vee \langle - \rangle (\dots)))$$

a recursively defined formula!

Peterson's mex in CCS

$$P1 \triangleq \overline{b1wt}. \overline{kw2}. P1a$$

$$P1a \triangleq b2rf.P1b + kr1.P1b$$

$$P1b \triangleq enter1.exit1.\overline{b1wf}.P1$$

$$SP \triangleq (B1f|B2f|KW|P1|P2) \setminus \{kw1, kr1, kw2, kr2, \dots\}$$

has P1 the possibility to enter from any reachable state ?

$$EN \underset{(min)}{\triangleq} G \vee \langle - \rangle EN \quad EN \wedge [-](\dots)$$

$$EN \wedge [-](EN \wedge [-](\dots))$$

$$AEN \underset{(max)}{\triangleq} EN \wedge [-]AEN \quad EN \wedge [-](EN \wedge [-](EN \wedge [-](\dots)))$$

a recursively defined formula!

Peterson's mex in CCS

$$P1 \triangleq \overline{b1wt}.\overline{kw2}.P1a$$

$$P1a \triangleq b2rf.P1b + kr1.P1b$$

$$P1b \triangleq enter1.exit1.\overline{b1wf}.P1$$

$$SP \triangleq (B1f|B2f|KW|P1|P2) \setminus \{kw1, kr1, kw2, kr2, \dots\}$$

deadlock freedom?

$$H \triangleq \langle - \rangle \mathbf{tt}$$

$$H \wedge [-](\dots)$$

$$H \wedge [-](H \wedge [-](\dots))$$

$$DF_{(max)} \triangleq H \wedge [-]DF$$

$$H \wedge [-](H \wedge [-](H \wedge [-](\dots)))$$

a recursively defined formula!

Peterson's mex in CCS

$$P1 \triangleq \overline{b1wt}.req_1.\overline{kw2}.P1a$$

$$P1a \triangleq b2rf.P1b + kr1.P1b$$

$$P1b \triangleq enter1.exit1.\overline{b1wf}.P1$$

$$SP \triangleq (B1f|B2f|KW|P1|P2) \setminus \{kw1, kr1, kw2, kr2, \dots\}$$

does P1 access every time it issues a request?


$$A \triangleq_{(min)} \langle exit_1 \rangle \mathbf{tt} \vee [-]A$$

$$REQ \triangleq_{(max)} [req_1]A \wedge [-]REQ$$

a recursively defined formula!


Peterson's mex in CAAL

LTS




Peterson's mex in CAAL

LTS up to strong bisimilarity




Peterson's mex in CAAL

LTS up to weak bisimilarity




Peterson's mex in CAAL

LTS up to weak bisimilarity, after renaming *enter1/2* to *enter* and *exit1/2* to *exit*




Peterson's mex in CAAL


LTS




LTS up to strong bisimilarity



LTS up to weak bisimilarity



LTS up to weak bisimilarity,
enter and *exit*




Hyman's mex algorithm

```
% Two processes H1, H2
% Two boolean variables b1, b2 (both initially false)
% when Hi wants to enter the critical section, then it sets bi to true
% An integer variable k, taking values in {1,2}
% (initial value is arbitrary)
% the process Hk has priority over the other process
%
% Process H1 in pseudocode
while (true) {
    ...                               % non critical section
    b1 = true ;                       % H1 wants to enter the critical section
    while (k==2) {                   % while H2 has priority
        while (b2) skip ;           % H1 waits
        k = 1;                      % H1 sets priority to itself
    }
    ...                               % H1 enters the critical section
    b1 = false                       % H1 leaves the critical section
}

% Process H2 is analogous to H1
```

Peterson's mex in CAAL

LTS up to weak bisimilarity, after renaming *enter1/2* to *enter* and *exit1/2* to *exit*



50 prisoners puzzle

50 prisoners kept in separate cells got a chance to be released:
from time to time one of them will be carried in a special room and then back to cell.
(in no particular order, possibly multiple times consecutively, but fairly to avoid infinite wait)

The room is completely empty except for a switch that can turn the light on or off
(the light is not visible from outside).

At any time, if any of them claims rightfully that all the prisoners have already entered the
room at least once, then all prisoners will be released
(but if it proves wrong, then the chance ends and they will never be released).

The prisoners have the possibility to discuss in advance some protocol to follow
(not all prisoner must behave in the same way).

Can you find a winning strategy for the prisoners?
Can you formalise it in CCS (for 2 to 4 prisoners)?

- Easy case: it is known that the light in the room is initially off
- Hard case: the initial state of the light in the room is not known.

