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Important note
Corrections have been made to the CTL part.
An important hypothesis was missing (see slide 15)

Crash course – Verification of Finite Automata
CTL model-checking

Exercise session - 08.12.2016
Romain Jacob
Formulation of CTL properties

Proper CTL formula: \{A,E\} [X,F,G,U]ϕ

→ Quantifiers go by pairs, you need one of each.

Missing Hypothesis
Interpretation on CTL formula

→ Transition functions are fully defined
  (i.e. every state has at least one successor)

Simple “means” that we get rid of leaf nodes...
→ They transition to themselves
Crash course – Petri nets
General definitions
Coverability

Romain Jacob
Questions?
Clicker time!
Basic Petri net syntax

- Is it a valid Petri Net?
- Which transitions are activated?
- What is the marking after firing?
Basic Petri net syntax

- Is it a valid Petri Net?
- Which transitions are activated?
- What is the marking after firing?
Basic definitions

- State ⇔ Marking  (Do not confuse states and places !!!)
- Pre and Post sets for transitions: Pre set: \( \bullet t := \{ p \mid (p, t) \in F \} \)
  Post set: \( t\bullet := \{ p \mid (t, p) \in F \} \),
  (likewise for places)
- Upstream \( W^- \) and Downstream \( W^+ \) incidence matrices:

\[
W^- = \begin{bmatrix}
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Transitions

\( W^- (i, j) = \begin{cases} 
w & \text{if } p_i \in \bullet t_j \text{ and has weight } w \\
0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \)

- Incidence matrix: \( A = W^+ - W^- \)
Basic definitions

- **Token game**

  From a marking $M_0$, for a firing sequence vector $T$, the marking obtained is

  \[ M = M_0 + A \cdot T \]

  \[
  \begin{bmatrix}
  3 \\
  0 \\
  0 \\
  2
  \end{bmatrix}
  =
  \begin{bmatrix}
  2 \\
  0 \\
  1 \\
  0
  \end{bmatrix}
  +
  \begin{bmatrix}
  -2 & 1 & 1 \\
  1 & -1 & 0 \\
  1 & 0 & -1 \\
  0 & -2 & 2
  \end{bmatrix}
  \begin{bmatrix}
  0 \\
  0 \\
  1
  \end{bmatrix}
  \]

  **BEWARE !** All firing sequences are not necessary allowed by the net...
Coverability Tree

- **Question**: What token distributions are reachable?
- **Problem**: There might be infinitely many reachable markings, but we must avoid an infinite tree.
- **Solution**: Introduce a special symbol $\omega$ to denote an arbitrary number of tokens:

\[
\begin{align*}
M_0 &= [1 \ 0 \ 0] \\
M_1 &= [0 \ 0 \ 1] \\
M_3 &= [1 \ \omega \ 0] \\
M_4 &= [0 \ \omega \ 1] \\
M_5 &= [0 \ \omega \ 1] \\
M_6 &= [1 \ \omega \ 0]
\end{align*}
\]
Coverability Graph -> Merge nodes

- **Question**: What token distributions are reachable?
- **Problem**: There might be infinitely many reachable markings, but we must avoid an infinite tree.
- **Solution**: Introduce a special symbol $\omega$ to denote an arbitrary number of tokens:

```latex
\begin{align*}
M_0 &= [1 \ 0 \ 0] \\
M_1 &= [0 \ 0 \ 1] \\
M_3 &= [1 \ \omega \ 0] \\
M_4 &= [0 \ \omega \ 1]
\end{align*}
```

**deadlock**
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Your turn to work!
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1 Structural Properties of Petri Nets and Token Game

a) $t_5 = \{p_5, p_9\}$, $t_5^* = \{p_6\}$

$t_8 = \{p_8\}$, $t_8^* = \{p_{10}, p_5\}$

$p_3 = \{t_2\}$, $p_3^* = \{t_3\}$
1 Structural Properties of Petri Nets and Token Game

a) \[ t_5 = \{p_5, p_9\}, \quad t_5\bullet = \{p_6\} \]
\[ t_8 = \{p_8\}, \quad t_8\bullet = \{p_{10}, p_5\} \]
\[ p_3 = \{t_2\}, \quad p_3\bullet = \{t_3\} \]

b) T1 fires...
1 Structural Properties of Petri Nets and Token Game

a) \( t_5 = \{p_5, p_9\} \), \( t_5\bullet = \{p_6\} \)
   \( t_8 = \{p_8\} \), \( t_8\bullet = \{p_{10}, p_5\} \)
   \( p_3 = \{t_2\} \), \( p_3\bullet = \{t_3\} \)

b) \( t_1 \) fires... \( t_2 \) fires...
   \( \rightarrow \) \( t_5 \) is enabled
   \( \rightarrow \) \( t_3 \) is not

c) 3 tokens in the bet after \( t_2 \) has been fired.

d) 

![Petri Net Diagram](image-url)
2 Basic Properties of Petri Nets

- Bounded for any $k \leq 1$
- Deadlock-free if $k \geq 1$
3 Identifying a deadlock

a) Example of blocking sequence:
\[ t_{A0}t_{B0} \]

\[ M_0 = (1,0,0,1,1,1,0,0,0,1,0,0) \]

\[ (0,1,0,0,1,1,0,0,0,1,0,0) \]

\[ (1,0,0,1,1,0,0,1,0,0) \]

\[ (1,0,0,1,0,0,1,0,0) \]

\[ (1,0,0,0,0,0,1,0) \]

\[ (1,0,0,0,0,0,0,1) \]
3 Identifying a deadlock

b) Just read it from the graph

\[
W^+ = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix},
W^- = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
A = W^+ - W^- = \begin{bmatrix}
-1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1
\end{bmatrix}
\]
3 Identifying a deadlock

b) Just read it from the graph

\[ W^+ = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix}, \quad W^- = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\end{bmatrix} \]

\[ A = W^+ - W^- = \begin{bmatrix}
-1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\
\end{bmatrix} \]
3 Identifying a deadlock

b) Just read it from the graph

\[
A = W^+ - W^- = \begin{bmatrix}
-1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
M_{\text{deadlock}} = M_0 + A \cdot \begin{bmatrix}
1 \\
0 \\
0 \\
1 \\
0 \\
0 \\
1 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
1 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]
3 Identifying a deadlock

c) Proving marking is blocking

\[
W^- = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
M_{\text{deadlock}} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
1 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
1 \\
0 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Do not cover any column
3 Identifying a deadlock

d) Correct by adding a semaphore
4 From mutual exclusion to starvation

a) Derive the net from the specification

1. One process executes its program.
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a) Derive the net from the specification

1. One process executes its program.
2. In order to enter the critical section, the mutex value must be 1 (i.e. the mutex is available).
4 From mutual exclusion to starvation

a) Derive the net from the specification

1. One process executes its program.
2. In order to enter the critical section, the mutex value must be 1 (i.e. the mutex is available).
3. If this is the case, the process sets the mutex to 0 and executes its critical section.
4 From mutual exclusion to starvation

a) Derive the net from the specification

1. One process executes its program.
2. In order to enter the critical section, the mutex value must be 1 (i.e. the mutex is available).
3. If this is the case, the process sets the mutex to 0 and executes its critical section.
4. When it is done, it resets the mutex to 1 and enters an uncritical section.
5. It loops back to start.
4 From mutual exclusion to starvation

a) Derive the net from the specification

1. One process executes its program.
2. In order to enter the critical section, the mutex value must be 1 (i.e. the mutex is available).
3. If this is the case, the process sets the mutex to 0 and executes its critical section.
4. When it is done, it resets the mutex to 1 and enters an uncritical section.
5. It loops back to start.
4 From mutual exclusion to starvation

b) How to avoid starvation?

Add a semaphore/resource kind of place
→ Consumed by one process
→ Generated by the other process

To avoid starvation in both directions, you need two of such places.

The total number of tokens in those places in the maximal number of possible executions in a row.
4 From mutual exclusion to starvation

b) How to avoid starvation? Add a semaphore/resource kind of place

- Consumed by one process
- Generated by the other process

To avoid starvation in both direction, you need two of such places

The total number of tokens in those places in the maximal number of possible execution in a row.
4 From mutual exclusion to starvation

c) What’s the problem with this?

→ If B does not executes anymore, A is forced to stop as well. And vice versa.

What would you propose as specification?

For example:

→ “If both processes want to access the resource, they get it in turns.”

d) **Bonus** Try to implement this specification in your Petri Net...
5 Coverability tree and graph

a) Coverability tree

\[ M_0 = (1,0,0) \]
5 Coverability tree and graph

a) Coverability tree

\[ M_0 = (1,0,0) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1,0,0) \text{ new} \]
5 Coverability tree and graph

a)  Coverability tree

$$M_0 = (1, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1, \omega, 0) \xrightarrow{t_2} (1, \omega, 0) \xrightarrow{t_3} (1, \omega, \omega)$$

- **old**
- **new**

The figure on the right shows a Petri net with transitions and places labeled $p_1$, $p_2$, and $p_3$. The transitions are labeled $t_1$, $t_2$, and $t_3$. The net's structure is consistent with the transition labeling in the text.
5 Coverability tree and graph

a) Coverability tree

\[ M_0 = (1,0,0) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,0) \xrightarrow{t_2} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_3} (1,\omega,0) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_3} (1,\omega,\omega) \]

Done!

\[
\begin{align*}
M_0 &= (1,0,0) \\
&\xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,0) \\
&\xrightarrow{t_2} (1,\omega,\omega) \\
&\xrightarrow{t_3} (1,\omega,0) \\
&\xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,\omega) \\
&\xrightarrow{t_3} (1,\omega,\omega) \\
&\text{Done!}
\end{align*}
\]
5 Coverability tree and graph

b) Coverability graph

\[ M_0 = (1,0,0) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,0) \xrightarrow{t_2} (1,\omega,0) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_2} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_3} (1,\omega,\omega) \]

\[ M_0 = (1,0,0) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,0) \xrightarrow{t_3} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_3} (1,\omega,\omega) \]

\[ \xrightarrow{t_2} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_3} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_2} (1,\omega,\omega) \]

\[ \xrightarrow{t_3} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_3} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_2} (1,\omega,\omega) \]

\[ \xrightarrow{t_3} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_3} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_2} (1,\omega,\omega) \]

\[ \xrightarrow{t_3} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_3} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_1} (1,\omega,\omega) \xrightarrow{t_2} (1,\omega,\omega) \]
6 Reachability Analysis for Petri Nets

a) Not feasible in general because infinite number of states
→ When do we stop if looking for a non-reachable marking?
Coverability? Always finite!
→ Can only prove non-reachability in the general case.

b) Is \( s = (101, 99, 4) \) reachable?
→ Start with necessary condition using the incidence matrix: \( \exists F, s = s_0 + A \cdot F \)?

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
-1 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\
1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
-1 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\
1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\
\end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix}
f_1 \\
f_2 \\
f_3 \\
f_4 \\
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
100 \\
99 \\
4 \\
\end{pmatrix} = s - s_0
\]
6 Reachability Analysis for Petri Nets

b) Is \( s = (101, 99, 4) \) reachable?

→ Start with necessary condition using

the incidence matrix: \( \exists F, s = s_0 + A \cdot F \)?

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
-1 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\
1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\
\end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix}
f_1 \\
f_2 \\
f_3 \\
f_4 \\
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 100 \\ 99 \\ 4 \\
\end{pmatrix} = s - s_0
\]

No systematic approach... Look at the net and try it out.

\( F_1 = (203, 0, 203, 203) \Rightarrow s_1 = (204,0,0) \)

\( F_2 = (103, 0, 0,0) \Rightarrow s_2 = (101,103,0) \)

\( F_3 = (0,0,4,0) \Rightarrow s_3 = (101,99,4) = s \)
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See you next week!
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