



Composition, Renaming and Generic Instantiation in Event-B Development

Renato Silva

ras07@ecs.soton.ac.uk

Supervisor: Michael Butler

DSSE Dependable Systems & Software Engineering

17/07/2009

Overview

- Simple Composition Model
- Composition
- Renaming/Refactory
- Generic Instantiation
- Conclusions
- Future Work



Machine M1 and Machine M2

MACHINE m1	
VARIABLES	
x	
INVARIANTS	
$inv1: x \in \mathbb{N}$	
EVENTS	
Initialisation	
begin	
act1: x := 100	
end	
Event dec $\hat{=}$	
any	
i	
where	
grd2: x > 0	
$grd1: i \in 1 \dots x$	
then	
act1: x := x - i	
end	
END	



Renato Silva



Simple Composition



Simple Composition

MACHINE cm1	EVENTS	Event transfer $\widehat{=}$
VARIABLES	Initialisation begin	i
$x \\ y$	act1: x := 100 $act2: y := 0$	where grd1: x > 0 $grd2: i \in 1x$
INVARIANTS	end	then act1: x := x - i
$inv1: x \in \mathbb{N}$ $inv2: y \in \mathbb{N}$		act2: y := y + i end
inv3: x + y = 100		END

Machine *cm1* – Abstract Machine



Demonstration

 Demonstration of the Composition plug-in for Rodin Platform using the Simple Composition





Composition

- Allows aggregation of sub-systems and generate a larger system (interaction between subsystems)
- Reusability of systems that are already created and validated
- Sub-systems may be refined independently

Composition Plug-in

- Shared Event Composition: systems are composed through synchronisation of events
- Properties of each machine are merged (Contexts, Variables,...)
- Conjunction of the invariant predicates
- Composed events:
 - Merged parameters
 - Conjunction of guards
 - Assignment of actions are done in parallel
 - $evt3 \cong ANY t?, x$ WHERE $t? \in A \land G(t?, x, m)$ THEN S(t?, x, m) END
 - $evt4 \cong \mathbf{ANY} \ t!, y \ \mathbf{WHERE} \ H(t!, y, n) \ \mathbf{THEN} \ T(t!, y, n) \ \mathbf{END}$
 - $evt3 \parallel evt4 \cong$

ANY t!, x, y **WHERE** $t! \in A \land G(t!, x, m) \land H(t!, y, n)$ **THEN** $S(t!, x, m) \parallel T(t!, y, n)$ **END**





Semantics of Composition

- Event-B has the same semantics structure and refinement definitions as Action Systems
- It is possible to make a correspondence between parallel composition in CSP and an event-based view of parallel composition for Action Systems
- A failure-divergence definition (CSP) can be applied to Event-B machines

 $S \in Machine \rightarrow FD$ where FD is the set of Failure-Divergence for Machine

PAR(P,Q) where $P,Q \in FD$ (function that defines the semantics of the process P||Q in CSP)

 $S(M \parallel N) = PAR(S(M), S(N))$

PAR is monotonic, so machines M and N can be refined independently



Renaming/Refactory: WHY?

- Shared Event Composition constraint:
 - No shared variables
- If machines to be composed have the same variable name, it is necessary to rename (at least) one of the variables
- Occurrences of variables in other elements need to reflect renaming (invariants, actions, guards,...)
- Occurrences also need to propagate over related files like refinements...
- (Long time) request by Event-B developers in the Rodin Platform

Renaming/Refactory plug-in

- Renaming/Refactory plug-in allows the renaming of variables but not only:
 - Carrier Sets
 - Constants
 - Events
 - Labelled elements (invariants, axioms, guards, etc)
- Uses Rodin Indexer to accelerate search of elements and be more accurate
- Goal: refactory of elements should not affect the behaviour of machines/contexts - no change at the semantic level

Renaming/Refactory plug-in

How it works?

- User selects element to be renamed
- User introduces new element name
- A list of related files is created
- Looks for possible clashes and returns a report
- User decides if he wants to execute renaming



Renaming/Refactory plug-in

- Prototype (not a final version)
- Available to install from Rodin Update Site in version Rodin 1.0

Limitation

 Renaming is not applied to proofs obligations (but the intention is to be applied in the future)



Generic Instantiation

- Generic Instantiation reuses components and tries to solve difficulties raised by the construction of large models
- We propose a Generic Instantiation approach for Event-B by instantiating machines.
- Instances inherit properties from the *pattern* and *personalised* it by renaming/replacing those properties to more specific names to the instance.
- This approach uses the Renaming plug-in



Generic Instantiation

- Generation of proof obligations to ensure assumptions (axioms) used in the patterns are satisfied in the instance.
- Contexts work as Parameterisation of instantiated machines



CONTEXT Ctx **SETS** $S_1...S_m$ **CONSTANTS** $C_1...C_n$ **AXIOMS** $Ax_1...Ax_p$ MACHINE M SEES Ctx VARIABLES $v_1...v_q$ EVENTS $ev_1...ev_r$

UNIVERSITY OF

Southampton

INSTANTIATED MACHINE IMINSTANTIATES M VIA CtxSEES D /* context containing the instance properties */REPLACE /* replace parameters defined in context C */SETS
$$S_1 := DS_1, \dots, S_m := DS_m$$
 /* Carrier Sets or Constants */CONSTANTS $C_1 := DC_1, \dots, C_n := DC_n$ RENAME /* rename variables, events and parameters at machine M */VARIABLES $v_1 := nv_1, \dots, v_q := nv_q$ EVENTS $ev_1 := nev_1, \dots, ev_r := nev_r$ /* optional */ $p_1 := np_1, \dots, p_s := np_s$ /* parameters: optional */END

Renato Silva

Instantiated Machine

- An INSTANTIATED MACHINE that instantiates a generic machine (*pattern*):
 - Has a name.
 - Defines which machine is used as generic.
 - Defines which variables and events are renamed.
 - Elements (sets and constants) from seen contexts are replaced by instance elements.
- Axioms in the pattern are converted into theorems in the instance.
 - The proof obligations associated with theorems assure that the assumptions in the pattern are satisfied in the instance.



Instantiated Machine: example

Case study: Model a Protocol (Problem)

Protocol





Generic Context and Machine: Pattern

CONTEXT ChannelParameters SETS Message CONSTANTS max_size AXIOMS $axm1 : max_size \in \mathbb{N}$ END	MACHINE ChannelEvent $Send \cong$ SEES ChannelParametersanyVARIABLES m $channel$ $grd1 : m \in Message$ $channel$ $grd2 : card(channel) < max_size$ $inv1 : channel \subseteq Message$ $then$ $inv2 : card(channel) \leq max_size$ $act1 : channel := channel \cup \{m\}$ end end EVENTS end Initialisation any begin m $act1 : channel := \emptyset$ m m $act1 : channel := \emptyset$ m m end m
	then skip end END



Instantiated Machine

Context is used as Parameterisation of machines where the instance properties are defined



CONTEXTChannelParametersSETSMessageCONSTANTS max_size AXIOMSaxm1 : $max_size \in \mathbb{N}$ END

Renato Silva



Instantiated Machine: QChannel

machine Channel sees ChannelParameters	machine QChannel sees ProtocolTypes
INSTANTIATED MACHINE QChannel	
INSTANTIATES Channel VIA Chamid Plass netter nel	variables qchannel
SEES ProtocolTypes /* context REPLACE /* replace SETS Message := Request CONSTANTS max_size := qcontaining the instance properties */ ipardimeters defined in ChannelParameters */ @inv1 channel \subseteq Message mixize finite(channel)RENAME /* rename VARIABLES channel := q Revents Send := QSend m := q/* rename containing the instance properties */ ipardimeters defined in ChannelParameters */ @inv1 channel \subseteq Message @inv2 card(channel)RENAME /* rename VARIABLES channel := q Receive := Receive m := q/* rename containing the instance properties */ ipardimeters defined in ChannelParameters */ @inv2 card(channel) @inv2 card(channel) @in	<pre>invariants @inv1 qchannel ⊆ Request @inv3 finite(qchannel) @inv2 card(qchannel) ≤ qmax_size theorem @thm1 qmax_size ∈ N events events event INITIALISATION then @act1 qchannel ≔ Ø end</pre>
event Send any m where @grd1 m ∈ Message @grd2 card(channel) < max_size then @act1 channel = channel ∪ {m} end	<pre>event QSend any q where @grd1 q ∈ Request @grd2 card(qchannel) < qmax_size then @act1 qchannel ≔ qchannel ∪ {q} end</pre>
event Receive any m where @grd1 m ∈ channel end end	event Receive any q where @grd1 q ∈ qchannel end end



Instantiated Machine + Composition





Instantiation of a chain of refinements

- Expand notion of reuse to a chain of refinements
- Creation of Instantiated Refinements





UNIVERSITY OF

Southampton



Instantiated Machine/Refinement: Instantiating Theorems and Invariants

- Invariants define model properties in machines
- Theorems work as assertions
 - If theorem proof obligation is discharged, the same should happen in the instance: no re-proving
- Ideally:
 - add to the instance the assumptions and assertions given by the theorems and invariants without the hassle of re-proving them.
- Possible solution: proved-theorem, similar to a theorem but without a proof obligation associated



Conclusions

- Composition plug-in: Ability to apply shared event parallel composition of machines using Event-B
- Rodin works as a modelling tool support
- Renaming plug-in: renaming of elements in Event-B models using Rodin
- Generic Instantiation: proposal for instantiation of machines

Future Work

- Validation of output machine in the composed machine file while using the Composition plug-in
- Development in the Rodin platform of the generic instantiation – Instantiated Machines
- Instantiated Contexts??
- Study of Decomposition (can be considered the inverse operation of Composition) using Event-B and the Rodin platform.
 - Shared Event: event-based viewpoint
 - Application of case-studies







The End

QUESTIONS???

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION

Southampton

Renato Silva