

Business Processes Modelling

MPB (6 cfu, 295AA)

Roberto Bruni

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

10 - Petri nets properties



Object

$$N \vdash \psi$$

We give a formal account of some key properties
of Petri nets



Free Choice Nets (book, optional reading)

<https://www7.in.tum.de/~esparza/bookfc.html>

Disclaim

A node (place or transition) is called **isolated** if its pre- and post-sets are empty

In the following we only consider nets **without isolated nodes**



Petri nets: behavioural properties

Properties of Petri nets

We introduce some of the properties of Petri nets that can play an important role in the verification of business processes

Liveness
Deadlock-freedom
Boundedness
Cyclicity (also Reversibility)

Let's practice with some formula

$$N = (P, T, F, M_0)$$

for any markings M and M' it follows that M' is reachable from M_0

$$\forall M, M', \quad M \in [M_0\rangle \wedge M' \in [M\rangle \quad \Rightarrow \quad M' \in [M_0\rangle$$

with M reachable from M_0 and M' reachable from M

any marking that is reachable from a
reachable marking is also reachable

Disclaim

When we say:
for any reachable marking M

we mean:
for any marking M reachable from M_0

Liveness, intuitively


A transition t is **live** if
from any reachable marking M another
marking M' can be reached where t is enabled

In other words:
*at any point in time of the computation, we
cannot exclude that t will fire in the future
or, equivalently,
at any point in time of the computation, it is still
possible to enable t in the future*

A Petri net is **live** if all of its transitions are live

Liveness illustrated

For any reachable marking M ...



...can we find a way to enable t ?

Liveness, formally

$$(P, T, F, M_0)$$

$$\forall t \in T, \quad \forall M \in [M_0 \rangle, \quad \exists M' \in [M \rangle, \quad M' \xrightarrow{t}$$

Digression


Order of quantifier is important:

quantification of the same kind can be
switched

the order of universal and existential
quantification is important

$$\forall n. \exists m. n < m \quad \neq \quad \exists m. \forall n. n < m$$

Example: Non Live




$$M_0 = p_1$$

$$[M_0] = \{ p_1, p_2 \}$$

t_1 non live!

$$p_2 \not\rightarrow$$

Example: Live



$$M_0 = p_1$$


$$[M_0] = \{ p_1, p_2, p_3 \}$$

$$[p_2] = \{ p_1, p_2, p_3 \}$$

$$[p_3] = \{ p_1, p_2, p_3 \}$$

if $M = p_1$ take $M' = p_1 \xrightarrow{t_1}$
 if $M = p_2$ take $M' = p_1 \xrightarrow{t_1}$
 if $M = p_3$ take $M' = p_1 \xrightarrow{t_1}$

Example: Live



$$M_0 = p_1$$

$$[M_0] = \{ p_1, p_2, p_3 \}$$


$$[p_2] = \{ p_1, p_2, p_3 \}$$

$$[p_3] = \{ p_1, p_2, p_3 \}$$

if $M = p_1$ take $M' = p_2 \xrightarrow{t_2}$
 if $M = p_2$ take $M' = p_2 \xrightarrow{t_2}$
 if $M = p_3$ take $M' = p_2 \xrightarrow{t_2}$

t_2 live

Example: Live



$$M_0 = p_1$$

$$[M_0] = \{ p_1, p_2, p_3 \}$$


$$[p_2] = \{ p_1, p_2, p_3 \}$$

$$[p_3] = \{ p_1, p_2, p_3 \}$$

t_3 live

if $M = p_1$ take $M' = p_3 \xrightarrow{t_3}$
 if $M = p_2$ take $M' = p_3 \xrightarrow{t_3}$
 if $M = p_3$ take $M' = p_3 \xrightarrow{t_3}$

Example: Live



$$M_0 = p_1$$

$$[M_0] = \{ p_1, p_2, p_3 \}$$

$$[p_2] = \{ p_1, p_2, p_3 \}$$

$$[p_3] = \{ p_1, p_2, p_3 \}$$

t_1 live
 t_2 live
 t_3 live
 N live

Liveness: pay attention!

Liveness of t should not be confused with the following property:

starting from the initial marking M_0 it is possible to reach a marking M that enables t

$$\exists M \in [M_0\rangle. M \xrightarrow{t}$$

(this property just ensures that t is not "dead" at M_0)

Dead transition


Given a marking M

A transition t is **dead** at M

if t will never be enabled in the future

(i.e., t is not enabled at any marking reachable from M)

Example: t1 non live
(but t1 non dead!)



Liveness, a formal recap

$$N = (P, T, F, M_0) \quad t \in T$$

$$\text{Live}(t, N) \equiv \forall M \in [M_0], \exists M' \in [M], M' \xrightarrow{t}$$

$$\text{NonLive}(t, N) \equiv \neg \text{Live}(t, N)$$

$$\text{Dead}(t, N) \equiv \forall M \in [M_0], M \not\xrightarrow{t}$$

$$\text{NonDead}(t, N) \equiv \neg \text{Dead}(t, N)$$

$$\text{Live}(N) \equiv \forall t \in T, \text{Live}(t, N)$$

$$\text{NonLive}(N) \equiv \neg \text{Live}(N)$$

Liveness, a formal recap

$$N = (P, T, F, M_0) \quad t \in T$$

$$\text{Live}(t, N) \equiv \forall M \in [M_0], \exists M' \in [M], M' \xrightarrow{t}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{NonLive}(t, N) &\equiv \neg \text{Live}(t, N) \\ &\equiv \neg(\forall M \in [M_0], \exists M' \in [M], M' \xrightarrow{t}) \\ &\equiv \exists M \in [M_0], \forall M' \in [M], M' \not\xrightarrow{t} \end{aligned}$$

Liveness, a formal recap

$$N = (P, T, F, M_0) \quad t \in T$$

$$\text{Dead}(t, N) \equiv \forall M \in [M_0], \quad M \not\stackrel{t}{\rightarrow}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{NonDead}(t, N) &\equiv \neg \text{Dead}(t, N) \\ &\equiv \neg(\forall M \in [M_0], \quad M \not\stackrel{t}{\rightarrow}) \\ &\equiv \exists M \in [M_0], \quad M \stackrel{t}{\rightarrow} \end{aligned}$$

Liveness, a formal recap

$$N = (P, T, F, M_0)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{NonLive}(N) &\equiv \neg \text{Live}(N) \\ &\equiv \neg(\forall t \in T, \text{Live}(t, N)) \\ &\equiv \exists t \in T, \text{NonLive}(t, N) \\ &\equiv \exists t \in T, \exists M \in [M_0\rangle, \forall M' \in [M\rangle, M' \not\xrightarrow{t} \end{aligned}$$

Non-live vs Dead


$$\forall M \in [M_0], \quad M \not\stackrel{t}{\rightarrow}$$

$$\text{Dead}(t, N) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{NonLive}(t, N)$$

$$\exists M \in [M_0], \quad \forall M' \in [M], \quad M' \not\stackrel{t}{\rightarrow}$$

just take $M = M_0$

$$\text{NonLive}(t, N) \quad \not\Rightarrow \quad \text{Dead}(t, N)$$



Digression

How to disprove an implication?

$$P \not\Rightarrow Q$$

$$P \wedge \neg Q$$

Non-live vs Dead


$$\text{NonLive}(t, N) \equiv \exists M \in [M_0], \quad \text{Dead}(t, N' = (P, T, F, M))$$

$$\text{NonLive}(t, N) \equiv \exists M \in [M_0], \quad \forall M' \in [M], \quad M' \not\stackrel{t}{\rightarrow}$$

$$\text{Dead}(t, N') \equiv \forall M' \in [M], \quad M' \not\stackrel{t}{\rightarrow}$$

a system is not live
iff it has a non-live transition
iff it has a transition that **can become** dead

Liveness: example




Which transitions are live?

Which are not?

Which are dead?

Is the net live?

Liveness: example



<p>t4, t5</p> <p>t1, t2, t3</p> <p>none</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Which transitions are live?</p> <p>Which are not?</p> <p>Which are dead?</p> <p>Is the net live?</p>	<p>all</p> <p>none</p> <p>none</p> <p>Yes</p>
---	---	---

Liveness on the occurrence graph





A transition t is live
iff

From any node of the occurrence graph we can reach a node with an outgoing arc labelled by t

A transition t is dead (at M_0)
iff

There is no t -labelled arc in the occurrence graph

Liveness: example



Marked place

Given a marking M

We say that a place p is **marked** (at M)
if $M(p) > 0$

(i.e., there is a token in p in the marking M)

We say that p is **unmarked**
if $M(p) = 0$

(i.e., there is no token in p in the marking M)

Place-liveness, intuitively

A place p is **live** if
every time it becomes unmarked
there is still the possibility to be marked in the future
(or if it always stays marked)

A Petri net is **place-live** if all of its places are live

Live place

Definition: Let (P, T, F, M_0) be a net system.

A place $p \in P$ is **live** if $\forall M \in [M_0 \rangle. \exists M' \in [M \rangle. M'(p) > 0$

Place-liveness, formally

$$(P, T, F, M_0)$$

$$\forall p \in P. \quad \forall M \in [M_0]. \quad \exists M' \in [M]. \quad M'(p) > 0$$

Dead nodes, intuitively

Given a marking M

A transition t is **dead** at M

if t will never be enabled in the future

(i.e., t is not enabled in any marking reachable from M)

A place p is **dead** at M

if p will never be marked in the future

(i.e., p is unmarked in any marking reachable from M)

Dead nodes

Definition: Let (P, T, F) be a net

A transition $t \in T$ is **dead** at M if $\forall M' \in [M \rangle. M' \not\xrightarrow{t}$

A place $p \in P$ is **dead** at M if $\forall M' \in [M \rangle. M'(p) = 0$


Non-live vs Dead

If a transition is dead at some reachable marking M
then it is non-live

If a place is dead at some reachable marking M
then it is non-live


being non-live implies possibly becoming dead
(but not necessarily in the current marking)

Place Liveness: example



Which places are live?
Which are not?
Which are dead?
Is the net place live?

Place Liveness: example



p4, p5
 p1, p2
 none
 No

Which places are live?
 Which are not?
 Which are dead?
 Is the net place live?

all
 none
 none
 Yes

Place liveness, a formal recap

$$N = (P, T, F, M_0) \quad p \in P$$

$$\text{PLive}(p, N) \equiv \forall M \in [M_0], \exists M' \in [M], M'(p) > 0$$

$$\text{NonPLive}(p, N) \equiv \neg \text{PLive}(p, N)$$

$$\text{Dead}(p, N) \equiv \forall M \in [M_0], M(p) = 0$$

$$\text{NonDead}(p, N) \equiv \neg \text{Dead}(p, N)$$

$$\text{PLive}(N) \equiv \forall p \in P, \text{PLive}(p, N)$$

$$\text{NonPLive}(N) \equiv \neg \text{PLive}(N)$$

Question time

$$N = (P, T, F, M_0) \quad p \in P$$

$$\text{PLive}(p, N) \equiv \forall M \in [M_0], \exists M' \in [M], M'(p) > 0$$

$$\text{NonPLive}(p, N) \equiv \neg \text{PLive}(p, N)$$

write the explicit formula for NonPLive(p,N)

Question time

$$N = (P, T, F, M_0) \quad p \in P$$

$$\text{PLive}(p, N) \equiv \forall M \in [M_0\rangle, \exists M' \in [M\rangle, M'(p) > 0$$

$$\text{NonPLive}(p, N) \equiv \neg \text{PLive}(p, N)$$

$$\equiv \exists M \in [M_0\rangle, \forall M' \in [M\rangle, M'(p) = 0$$

write the explicit formula for NonPLive(p,N)

Question time

$$N = (P, T, F, M_0) \quad p \in P$$

$$\text{Dead}(p, N) \equiv \forall M \in [M_0], \quad M(p) = 0$$

$$\text{NonDead}(p, N) \equiv \neg \text{Dead}(p, N)$$

write the explicit formula for NonDead(p,N)

Question time

$$N = (P, T, F, M_0) \quad p \in P$$

$$\text{Dead}(p, N) \equiv \forall M \in [M_0\rangle, \quad M(p) = 0$$

$$\text{NonDead}(p, N) \equiv \neg \text{Dead}(p, N)$$

$$\equiv \exists M \in [M_0\rangle, \quad M(p) > 0$$

write the explicit formula for NonDead(p,N)

Question time

$$N = (P, T, F, M_0) \quad p \in P$$

$$\text{PLive}(p, N) \equiv \forall M \in [M_0], \exists M' \in [M], M'(p) > 0$$

$$\text{PLive}(N) \equiv \forall p \in P, \text{PLive}(p, N)$$

$$\text{NonPLive}(N) \equiv \neg \text{PLive}(N)$$

write the explicit formula for NonPLive(N)

Question time

$$N = (P, T, F, M_0) \quad p \in P$$

$$\text{PLive}(p, N) \equiv \forall M \in [M_0], \exists M' \in [M], M'(p) > 0$$

$$\text{PLive}(N) \equiv \forall p \in P, \text{PLive}(p, N)$$

$$\text{NonPLive}(N) \equiv \neg \text{PLive}(N)$$

$$\equiv \exists p \in P, \exists M \in [M_0], \forall M' \in [M], M'(p) = 0$$

write the explicit formula for NonPLive(N)

Some obvious facts

a system is not live iff it has a transition that can become dead at some reachable marking

a system is not place-live iff it has a place that can become dead at some reachable marking

If a place / transition is dead at M , then it remains dead at any marking reachable from M
(the set of dead nodes can only increase during a run)


True or false?

Every transition in the pre- or post-set of a dead place
is also dead

True or false?

Every transition in the pre- or post-set of a dead place is also dead

True



suppose p is dead
if p remains empty then t_3 and t_4 cannot fire
so they are dead


suppose p is dead
if t_1 or t_2 could fire then some token would arrive in p
since no token can arrive in p
it means that t_1 and t_2 will never fire

True or false?

Every place in the pre- or post-set of a dead transition
is also dead

True or false?

Every place in the pre- or post-set of a dead transition is also dead



False

t_1 is dead but p_1 and p_3 are not dead

Liveness implies place-liveness

Proposition: Live systems are also place-live

Assume the net is live

Take any $p \in P$ and $M \in [M_0\rangle$

We want to find $M' \in [M_0\rangle$ s.t. $M'(p) > 0$

Take any $t \in \bullet p \cup p \bullet$

By liveness: there are $M'', M''' \in [M_0\rangle$ s.t. $M'' \xrightarrow{t} M'''$

Then $M''(p) > 0$ or $M'''(p) > 0$

Place liveness on the occurrence graph


A place p is live
iff

From any node of the occurrence graph we can reach a
node with a token in p

A place p is dead (at M_0)
iff

All the nodes of the occurrence graph have no token in p

Place Liveness: example



Exercise

Draw a net that
is place-live but not live
(if you can)


Deadlock-freedom

A Petri net is **deadlock free**, if every reachable marking enables some transition

In other words, we are guaranteed that at any point in time of the computation, some transition can be fired

Deadlock-freedom illustrated

For any reachable marking M ...





...can we fire some transition?

Deadlock freedom, formally

(P, T, F, M_0)



$\forall M \in [M_0 \rangle, \quad \exists t \in T, \quad M \xrightarrow{t}$

Deadlock-freedom: example



Is the net deadlock-free?

Deadlock-freedom: example



Yes Is the net deadlock-free? **No**

$$[p_1] = \{ p_1, p_2, p_3 \}$$

$$[p_1] = \{ p_1, p_2 + p_3, p_5, \dots \}$$

$$p_1 \rightarrow \quad p_2 \rightarrow \quad p_3 \rightarrow$$

$$p_5 \nrightarrow$$

Deadlock freedom on the occurrence graph

A net is deadlock free
iff

Every node of the occurrence graph has an outgoing arc

Question time

Does liveness imply deadlock-freedom?

(Can you exhibit a live Petri net that is not deadlock-free?)

Does deadlock-freedom imply liveness?


(Can you exhibit a deadlock-free net that is not live?)

Question time

Does liveness imply deadlock-freedom? **YES**
(Can you exhibit a live Petri net that is not deadlock-free?)

NO

Does deadlock-freedom imply liveness? **NO**
(Can you exhibit a deadlock-free net that is not live?) **YES**



Liveness implies deadlock freedom

Lemma If (P, T, F, M_0) is live, then it is deadlock-free

By contradiction, let $M \in [M_0 \rangle$, with $M \not\rightarrow$

Let $t \in T$ (T cannot be empty).

By liveness, $\exists M' \in [M \rangle$ with $M' \xrightarrow{t}$.

Since $M \not\rightarrow$, we have $[M \rangle = \{M\}$.

Therefore $M = M' \xrightarrow{t}$, which is absurd.

Digression: for next exercises

Contraposition

$$P \Rightarrow Q \quad \equiv \quad (\neg Q) \Rightarrow \neg P$$

Exercises

Prove each of the following properties
or give some counterexamples

If a system is not place-live, then it is not live

If a system is not live, then it is not place-live

If a system is place-live, then it is deadlock-free

If a system is deadlock-free, then it is place-live

k -Boundedness

Let k be a natural number

A place p is **k -bounded** if no reachable marking has more than k tokens in place p

A net is **k -bounded** if all of its places are k -bounded

In other words, if a net is k -bounded, then k is a capacity constraint that can be imposed over places without any risk of causing “overflow”

Safe nets

A place p is **safe** if it is 1-bounded

A net is **safe** if all of its places are safe

In other words, if the net is safe, then we know that, in any reachable marking, each place contains one token at most

Boundedness

A place p is **bounded** if it is k -bounded for some natural number k

A net is **bounded** if all of its places are bounded



A net is **unbounded** if it is not bounded (i.e., there is at least one place in which any number of tokens can appear)

Boundedness, formally

$$(P, T, F, M_0)$$

$$\exists k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall M \in [M_0 \rangle, \quad \forall p \in P, \quad M(p) \leq k$$

Boundedness: example





Which places are bounded?

Is the net bounded?

Which places are safe?

Is the net safe?

Boundedness: example



all
Yes
all
Yes

Which places are bounded?
Is the net bounded?
Which places are safe?
Is the net safe?

none
No
none
No

Boundedness and the reachability graph

A system is bounded
iff
its reachability graph is finite

Boundedness implies finiteness

Theorem: If a system is **bounded**
then its reachability graph is finite

Proof: if the system is bounded there exists k
such that each place contains at most k tokens.

If there are n places it means that there are at
most $(k+1)^n$ reachable markings.

Hence the occurrence graph has a finite number
of nodes

Finiteness implies boundedness

Theorem: A system is **bounded**
if its reachability graph is finite

Proof: for each node M we take k_M be the
maximum number of tokens in the same place.

Then we let k be the largest among all k_M
 $k = \max \{k_M \mid M \text{ is a node of the graph}\}$
(k exists because the reachability graph is finite)

Clearly the system is k -bounded and thus bounded

Cyclicity (aka Reversibility)

A marking M is a **home marking** if it can be reached from every reachable marking

A net is **cyclic** (or **reversible**) if its initial marking is a home marking

Orthogonal properties

Liveness, boundedness and cyclicity are independent of each other





In other words, you can find nets that satisfy any arbitrary combination of the above three properties (and not the others)

Exercises

Write the formal definition of the predicates
 $\text{Home}(M,N)$ and $\text{Cyclic}(N)$





Exercises

For each of the following nets, say if they are live, deadlock-free, bounded, safe, cyclic



Exercises

For each of the following nets, say if they are live, deadlock-free, bounded, safe, cyclic



Petri nets: structural properties

Structural properties

All the properties we have seen so far are
behavioural (or dynamic)

(i.e. they depend on the initial marking and firing rules)

It is sometimes interesting to connect them to
structural properties

(i.e. the shape of the graph representing the net)

This way we can give **structural characterization** of
behavioural properties for a class of nets
(computationally less expensive to check)

A matter of terminology

To better reflect the above distinction, it is frequent:

to use the term **net system** for denoting a Petri net
with a given initial marking
(we study behavioural properties of systems)

to use the term **net** for denoting a Petri net
without specifying any initial marking
(we study structural properties of nets)

Paths and circuits

$$(P, T, F)$$

A **path** is a non-empty sequence of nodes $x_1x_2\dots x_k$ such that

$$(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in F \quad \text{for every } 1 \leq i \leq k$$

and we say it leads from x_1 to x_k

A path $x_1x_2\dots x_k$ is called a **circuit** if

$$\text{all its nodes are distinct and } (x_k, x_1) \in F$$

since there is no node x with $(x, x) \in F$, any circuit has at least two nodes

Paths and circuits

$$(P, T, F)$$

An **undirected path** is a non-empty sequence of nodes $x_1x_2\dots x_k$ s.t.

$$(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in (F \cup F^{-1}) \quad \text{for every } 1 \leq i \leq k$$

(denotes the inverse of a binary relation)

$$F^{-1} = \{ (y, x) \mid (x, y) \in F \}$$

(a path where we disregard the orientation of arcs)

Connectedness

A net (P, T, F) is **weakly connected** if there is an undirected path between any two distinct nodes

A net (P, T, F) is **strongly connected** if there is a path between any two distinct nodes


Connectedness, again

A net (P,T,F) is **weakly connected**
iff

it cannot be splitted in separated components



A weakly connected net is **strongly connected** iff
for every arc (x,y) there is a path from y to x

Examples




weakly connected
not strongly connected

Examples



not weakly connected
not strongly connected

Examples



weakly connected
strongly connected





A note

In the following we will consider (implicitly) weakly connected nets only

(if they are not, then we can study each of their subsystems separately)

Question time



Is the net strongly connected?



Question time



Is the net strongly connected?

YES



YES

YES



NO


Interference of conflicts and synch

Typical situation:

initially t1 and t2 are not in conflict

but when t3 fires they are in conflict
(the firing of t3 is not controllable)

How to rule this situation out?



S-systems / S-nets

A Petri net is called **S-system** if every transition has one input place and one output place
(S comes from *Stellen*, the German word for place)

This way any synchronization is ruled out

The theory of S-systems is very simple

T-systems / T-nets

A Petri net is called **T-system** if every place has one input transition and one output transition





This way all choices/conflicts are ruled out

T-systems are concurrent but essentially deterministic

T-systems have been studied extensively since the early Seventies

Question time



Is the net an S-net, a T-net?



Question time



Is the net an S-net, a T-net?

S-net
T-net



S-net
T-net

S-net
T-net



S-net
T-net

Free-choice nets

The aim is to avoid that a choice between transitions is influenced by the rest of the system

Easiest way:

keep places with more than one output transition apart from transitions with more than one input place

In other words, if (p,t) is an arc, then it means that t is the only output transition of p (no conflict)

OR

p is the only input place of t (no synch)

Free-choice systems / nets





But we can study a slightly more general class of nets by requiring a weaker constraint

A Petri net is **free-choice** if
for any pair of transitions
their pre-sets are either disjoint or equal

or, equivalently, if
for any pair of places
their post-sets are either disjoint or equal

Question time



Is the net free-choice?



Question time



Is the net free-choice?

FC-net



FC-net

FC-net



FC-net

Exercises

Prove that every S-net is free-choice

Prove that every T-net is free-choice

Show a net for each area of the Eulero-Venn diagram below

