Interacting Process Classes

P.S. Thiagarajan National University of Singapore

Joint with: Ankit Goel, Abhik Roychoudhury

Outline

- Many reactive systems consist of *classes* of active objects interacting with each other.
- Active objects:
 - Phones, trains, airplanes, ...
- Similar behaviors:
 - Take part in the same sequences of *transactions*.
 - Play same *roles* in these transactions.

Outline

- A modeling technique using familiar notations.
- An efficient symbolic simulation technique.
 - Don't maintain a name space.
 - Thousands of objects in a class.
 - **Don't** fix the number of objects in a class.

A Process 、d' С d





0



But the actions c, r, d, d' can represent transactions between different objects of the same class.

















Depict Two way flow of information.

Define *roles.*





Call

Interacting Process Classes

- Multiple process Classes
- Transactions:
 - Can involve multiple objects
 - Belonging to the same class
 - Belonging to different classes
 - Will have guards
 - Histories of the participating objects
 - States of the participating objects
 - Values of the variables of the objects.
 - Static and dynamic associations.



g1:

a regular expression over the local "actions" [(TR, role)] of the transition system of C1.



 ϕ 1: A boolean predicate over the values of the variables associated with the object in C1 chosen to play the role r1.



Local Call

Static associations capture the structural constraints.

Relations with *fixed extensions*.



Dynamic Associations:

Established across classes.

Relations with *changing extensions*.



Symbolic Simulation

- Do not maintain name spaces.
- Group the objects of a class into **behavioral subclasses**.
- Track only the number of objects in a behavioral subclass.
- When a transaction executes these counts will be updated

– Behavioral subclasses get split and merged.

Symbolic simulation

- This is an (over) approximation.
- There may be spurious symbolic runs with no corresponding concrete runs.
- But one can check –not efficiently!whether a symbolic run corresponds to a concrete run.

Current Status

- Drastically cuts simulation (resource) time/memory requirements for realistic controllers
 - CTAS weather update controller
 - Rail Shuttle system
 - Rail car system
 - Telephone switch network
- Presented at ICSE'06.

This is all very well in practice but What about the theory?

Research Issues

- Abstraction-based verification methods.
- What is a good **first order temporal logic** for this language?

For this workshop.....

- Components *classes*.
- Clear separation of *computations* and *communications*.
- Not specific to synchronous/asynchronous.
- No timing features yet.
 - No clear separation of system/environment.