

Extending EB4EB for Parameterised Events

Peter Rivière¹ Neeraj Kumar Singh² Yamine Aït-Ameur²
Guillaume Dupont²

¹ Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Ishikawa 923-1292, Japan

² Toulouse National Polytechnique Institute
IRIT-CNRS, University of Toulouse, France

June 10-13, 2023



International Conference
ABZ'2025



JAIST
JAPAN ADVANCED INSTITUTE OF
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
1990

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Event-B
- 3 The EB4EB reflexive framework
- 4 Revised EB4EB
- 5 Conclusion

Introduction

Motivation

EB4EB Framework ⇒ Access to Event-B Component + Advanced Reasoning + New PO

Event Parameter ⇒ Missing explicit manipulation in EB4EB

- Local bind to Event
- Each event parameters have different types

Our proposal

Upgrade EB4EB framework with explicit manipulation of Event-Parameter

- Polymorphic operator to instantiate at the event level
- Axiomatic data-type instead of Constructive data-type

1 Introduction

2 Event-B

3 The EB4EB reflexive framework

4 Revised EB4EB

5 Conclusion

Event-B

Contexts (definitions/axioms/theorems) + Machines (state and events/inductive invariants)

Context	Machine
CONTEXT Ctx	MACHINE M^A
SETS s	SEES Ctx
CONSTANTS c	VARIABLES x^A
AXIOMS A	INVARIANTS $I^A(x^A)$
THEOREMS T_{ctx}	THEOREMS $T_{mch}(x^A)$
END	VARIANT $V(x^A)$
	EVENTS
	INITIALISATION $\hat{=}$
	...
	$evt^A \hat{=}$
	ANY α^A
	WHERE $G^A(x^A, \alpha^A)$
	THEN
	$x^A : BAP^A(\alpha^A, x^A, x^{A'})$
	END
	END

Theorems Context (THM_ctx)	$A \Rightarrow T_{ctx}$
Theorems machine (THM_mch)	$A \wedge I^A(x^A) \Rightarrow T_{mch}(x^A)$
Initialisation (INIT)	$A \wedge AP^A(\alpha^A, x^{A'}) \Rightarrow I^A(x^{A'})$
Invariant preservation (INV)	$A \wedge I_A(x^A) \wedge G_A(x^A, \alpha^A)$ $\wedge BAP^A(x^A, \alpha^A, x^{A'}) \Rightarrow I^A(x^{A'})$
Event feasibility (FIS)	$A \wedge I_A(x^A) \wedge G^A(x^A, \alpha^A)$ $\Rightarrow \exists x^{A'} \cdot BAP^A(x^A, \alpha^A, x^{A'})$
Variant progress (VAR)	$A \wedge I^A(x^A) \wedge G^A(x^A, \alpha^A)$ $\wedge BAP^A(x^A, \alpha^A, x^{A'}) \Rightarrow V(x^{A'}) < V(x^A)$

- Automatic generation of POs.
- Rodin \Rightarrow Editor + POs generator + automatic/interactive provers

Event-B Theories

Formalisation of new data-types for Event-B \Rightarrow Theories

Theory
THEORY Th
IMPORT Th1, ...
TYPE PARAMETERS E, F, ...
DATATYPES
Type2(E, ...)
constructors
cstr1($p_1:T_1, \dots$)
OPERATORS
Op1<nature> ($p_1:T_1, \dots$)
well-definedness WD(p_1, \dots)
direct definition D ₁
AXIOMATIC DEFINITIONS
TYPES A ₁ , ...
OPERATORS
AOp2<nature> ($p_1:T_1, \dots$): T _r
well-definedness WD(p_1, \dots)
AXIOMS A ₁ , ...
THEOREMS T ₁ , ...
END

- Algebraic definition for data-types
 \Rightarrow Constructive definitions and/or axiomatic definitions.
- Each operator may be associated with Well-Definedness (WD) conditions (partial definitions).
- Relevant proved theorems.
- Relevant inference/rewrite rules.
- Tool-support in Rodin environment.

Event-B theories: an example

Extend Event-B with **mathematical structures** or **domain knowledge**
⇒ *reals, differential equations, kinematics, ontologies...*

```
THEORY Reals IMPORT Relations , Rings
AXIOMATIC DEFINITIONS
TYPES R
OPERATORS
  Rzero : R ,
  Rone : R ,
  plus : R × R → R ,
  times : R × R → R ,
  leq : R ↔ R ,
  ...
AXIOMS
  order: order(leq) ∧ total(leq)
  reals: Field(plus, times, Rzero, Rone) ∧
    integral(times, Rzero) ∧
    ringCompatible(plus, times, Rzero, Rone, leq)
  ...
```

```
MACHINE M
VARIABLES x , y ,
INVARIANTS
  inv1: x, y ∈ R
  inv2: Rzero leq x ∧ x ≠ Rzero
  inv3: y = Rzero ∨ y = Rone
EVENTS
  ...
Evt
WHERE
  grd1: x times y = Rzero
  grd2: v = Open
THEN y := y plus Rone
END
```

1 Introduction

2 Event-B

3 The EB4EB reflexive framework

4 Revised EB4EB

5 Conclusion

The EB4EB Meta Theory

- Explicit manipulation of Event-B features
 ⇒ a constructive data-type for Event-B machines.

EventBTheory

```

THEORY EventBTheory
TYPES PARAMETERS STATE,EVENT
DATATYPES
Machine(STATE,EVENT)  $\triangleq$ 
  > Cons-machine(  

    Init:EVENT,  

    Progress: $\mathbb{P}(\text{EVENT})$ ,  

    AP: $\mathbb{P}(\text{STATE})$ ,  

    BAP:  

       $\mathbb{P}(\text{EVENT} \times (\text{STATE} \times \text{STATE}))$ ,  

    Grd:  

       $\mathbb{P}(\text{EVENT} \times \text{STATE})$ ,  

    Inv: $\mathbb{P}(\text{STATE})$ ,  

    ...)  

OPERATORS  

...  

check_Machine_consistency(m)...
```

- **STATE**: machine states
- **EVENT**: machine events
- **Init**: initialisation event
- **Progress**: progress events
- **AP (After Predicate)**: initialisation event action
- **BAP (Before-After Predicate)**: actions of progress events
- **Grd**: progress events guards
- **Inv**: machine invariants
- **Check_Machine_Consistency**: core Event-B POs

Machine

```

MACHINE M SEES ...
VARIABLES x
INVARIANTS I(x)
...
EVENTS
INITIALISATION  $\triangleq$ 
  THEN
   $x :| AP(\alpha, x)$ 
END
EVTi  $\triangleq$ 
  ANY $\alpha$ 
  WHERE Gi(x,  $\alpha$ )
  THEN
   $x :| BAP_i(\alpha, x, x)$ 
END
...
```

$$\text{Check_Machine_Consistency}(m) \equiv \text{PO_INV}(m) \wedge \text{PO_THM}(m) \wedge \text{PO_FIS}(m) \wedge \text{PO_VAR}(m) \wedge \text{PO_NAT}(m)$$

Instantiation of the EB4EB Meta Theory

Event-B Machines as a FOL expression

- An Event-B machine is seen as a FOL formula (sets, constants, and axioms)

```
CONTEXT Deep
SETS St Ev
CONSTANTS m, ...
AXIOMS
  axm1: partition(Ev, ...)
  axm2: m ∈ Machine(St, Ev)
  axm3: Event(m) = Ev
  axm4: State(m) = ...
  axm5: Init(m) = ...
  axm6: Progress(m) = {...}
  axm7: Thm(m) = {...}
  axm8: Inv(m) = {...}
  axm9: AP(m) = {...}
  axm10: Grd(m) = {...}
  axm11: BAP(m) = {...}
  axm12: Convergent(m) = {...}
  axm13: Ordinary(m) = {...}
  axm14: Variant(m) = {...}
THEOREMS
  thm1: check_Machine_consistency(m)
END
```

- Machine consistency is ensured by discharging the *THM_ctx* PO generated for the *thm1* theorem

$$\begin{aligned} & axm1 \wedge \dots \wedge axm14 \\ \Rightarrow & \text{Check_Machine_consistency}(m) \end{aligned}$$

1 Introduction

2 Event-B

3 The EB4EB reflexive framework

4 Revised EB4EB

5 Conclusion

Event Parameter

Example

$$\text{Param}(M) = \{\text{ev1} \mapsto T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{ev1}}\} \cup \dots \cup \{\text{evn} \mapsto T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{evn}}\}$$

```
MACHINE M
...
EVENTS
  ev1  ≈ ANY p WHEN p ∈ TParev1
  ...
  evn  ≈ ANY p WHEN p ∈ TParevn
```

Event Parameter

Example

MACHINE M

...

EVENTS

ev1 \triangleq ANY p WHEN $p \in T_{Par}^{ev1}$
...
evn \triangleq ANY p WHEN $p \in T_{Par}^{evn}$

$$\text{Param}(M) = \{\text{ev1} \mapsto T_{Par}^{\text{ev1}}\} \cup \dots \cup \{\text{evn} \mapsto T_{Par}^{\text{evn}}\}$$

$$\text{Param}(M) : \text{Progress}(M) \rightarrow \text{Type}$$

Event Parameter

Example

MACHINE M

...

EVENTS

ev1 \triangleq ANY p WHEN $p \in T_{Par}^{ev1}$
...
evn \triangleq ANY p WHEN $p \in T_{Par}^{evn}$

$$\text{Param}(M) = \{\text{ev1} \mapsto T_{Par}^{\text{ev1}}\} \cup \dots \cup \{\text{evn} \mapsto T_{Par}^{\text{evn}}\}$$

$$\text{Param}(M) \circ \text{Progress}(M) \rightarrow \text{Type}$$

$$\text{BAP}(M) \circ (\text{e} \circ \text{Progress}(M) \leftrightarrow (\text{Param}(M)(\text{e}) \times \text{STATE} \leftrightarrow \text{STATE}))$$

Event Parameter

Example

MACHINE M

...

EVENTS

ev1 \triangleq ANY p WHEN $p \in T_{Par}^{ev1}$
...
evn \triangleq ANY p WHEN $p \in T_{Par}^{evn}$

$$\text{Param}(M) = \{\text{ev1} \mapsto T_{Par}^{\text{ev1}}\} \cup \dots \cup \{\text{evn} \mapsto T_{Par}^{\text{evn}}\}$$

$$\text{Param}(M) \circ \text{Progress}(M) \rightarrow \text{Type}$$

$$\text{BAP}(M) \circ (e \circ \text{Progress}(M) \leftrightarrow$$

$$(\text{Param}(M)(e) \times \text{STATE} \leftrightarrow \text{STATE}))$$

Natively Impossible

Event Parameter

Example

MACHINE M

...

EVENTS

ev1 \triangleq ANY p WHEN $p \in T_{Par}^{ev1}$
...
evn \triangleq ANY p WHEN $p \in T_{Par}^{evn}$

$$\text{Param}(M) = \{\text{ev1} \mapsto T_{Par}^{ev1}\} \cup \dots \cup \{\text{evn} \mapsto T_{Par}^{evn}\}$$

$$\text{Param}(M) \circ \text{Progress}(M) \rightarrow \text{Type}$$

$$\text{BAP}(M) \circ (\text{e} \circ \text{Progress}(M) \leftrightarrow$$

$$(\text{Param}(M)(\text{e}) \times \text{STATE} \leftrightarrow \text{STATE}))$$

Natively Impossible

Solutions

1) Global parameters

THEORY EventBTheory

TYPE PARAMETERS PARAM, ...

$$\text{PARAM}(M) \equiv T_{Par}^{ev1} \times \dots \times T_{Par}^{evn}$$

Event Parameter

Example

```
MACHINE M
...
EVENTS
  ev1 ≈ ANY p WHEN p ∈ TParev1
  ...
  evn ≈ ANY p WHEN p ∈ TParevn
```

$\text{Param}(M) = \{\text{ev1} \mapsto T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{ev1}}\} \cup \dots \cup \{\text{evn} \mapsto T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{evn}}\}$

$\text{Param}(M) \triangleq \text{Progress}(M) \rightarrow \text{Type}$

$\text{BAP}(M) \triangleq (e \triangleq \text{Progress}(M) \leftrightarrow (\text{Param}(M)(e) \times \text{STATE} \leftrightarrow \text{STATE}))$

Natively Impossible !

Solutions

1) Global parameters

```
THEORY EventBTheory
TYPE PARAMETERS PARAM, ...
```

$$\text{PARAM}(M) \equiv T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{ev1}} \times \dots \times T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{evn}}$$

No local definition of Event

Parameter

Event Parameter

Example

```
MACHINE M
...
EVENTS
  ev1 ≈ ANY p WHEN p ∈ TParev1
  ...
  evn ≈ ANY p WHEN p ∈ TParevn
```

$\text{Param}(M) = \{\text{ev1} \mapsto T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{ev1}}\} \cup \dots \cup \{\text{evn} \mapsto T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{evn}}\}$
 $\text{Param}(M) \triangleq \text{Progress}(M) \rightarrow \text{Type}$
 $\text{BAP}(M) \triangleq (e \triangleq \text{Progress}(M) \leftrightarrow (\text{Param}(M)(e) \times \text{STATE} \leftrightarrow \text{STATE}))$
Natively Impossible

Solutions

1) Global parameters

```
THEORY EventBTheory
TYPE PARAMETERS PARAM, ...
```

$$\text{PARAM}(M) \equiv T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{ev1}} \times \dots \times T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{evn}}$$

No local definition of Event

Parameter

2) Axiomatic definition

```
AXIOMATIC DATATYPE
  Cons_mch(EVENT, STATE)
  Cons_Event(PARAM, STATE)
```

$$\text{Cons_Event}(T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{ev1}}, \dots)$$

Event Parameter

Example

```
MACHINE M
...
EVENTS
  ev1 ≈ ANY p WHEN p ∈ TParev1
  ...
  evn ≈ ANY p WHEN p ∈ TParevn
```

$\text{Param}(M) = \{\text{ev1} \mapsto T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{ev1}}\} \cup \dots \cup \{\text{evn} \mapsto T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{evn}}\}$
 $\text{Param}(M) \triangleq \text{Progress}(M) \rightarrow \text{Type}$
 $\text{BAP}(M) \triangleq (e \triangleq \text{Progress}(M) \leftrightarrow (\text{Param}(M)(e) \times \text{STATE} \leftrightarrow \text{STATE}))$
Natively Impossible

Solutions

1) Global parameters

```
THEORY EventBTheory
TYPE PARAMETERS PARAM, ...
```

$$\text{PARAM}(M) \equiv T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{ev1}} \times \dots \times T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{evn}}$$

No local definition of Event Parameter

2) Axiomatic definition

```
AXIOMATIC DATATYPE
  Cons_mch(EVENT, STATE)
  Cons_Event(PARAM, STATE)
```

$$\text{Cons_Event}(T_{\text{Par}}^{\text{ev1}}, \dots)$$

Solutions presented here

Inspiration

Record in classical Event-B

```
SETS Records, A, B // record A {dest1 : A ; dest2 : B}
CONSTANTS dest1, dest2
AXIOMS
  axm1 dest1 ∈ Records → A
  axm1 dest2 ∈ Records → B
```

Polymorphic operator

```
TYPE PARAMETERS α, β, ...
OPERATORS
  op1(x : α) ≡ ...
  op2(y : P(α), z : α × β) ≡ ...
  op3(w : β × α × Z × ...) ≡ ...
```

```
CONTEXT Ctx
AXIOMS
  axm1: op1(x : Z × Z) ... // α := Z × Z
  axm2: op1(x : P(Z)) ... // α := P(Z)
  axm3: op2(y : P(Z × BOOL), z : (Z × BOOL) × BOOL) ... // α := Z × BOOL, β := BOOL
```

Revised Datatype

- 1) Definition of the record type in Data-Type with Type parameter common for all the data-type

```
THEORY EvtBTheoPar
TYPE PARAMETERS STATE, EVENT, PARAM
DATATYPES
Machine(STATE, EVENT) //No PARAM
CONSTRUCTORS
Cons_machine(
Event : P(EVENT),
State : P(STATE))
```

Revised Datatype

2) Field are definition with Axiomatic Operator

AXIOMATIC DEFINITIONS

OPERATORS

```
Init <expression> (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT)) : EVENT
    // Init ∈ Machine(STATE, EVENT) ↔ EVENT
Progress <expression> (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT)) : P(EVENT)
Param <expression> (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT), e : EVENT,
    // Param ∈ Machine(STATE, EVENT) × EVENT ↔ P(PARAM))
Grd_par <expression> (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT), e : EVENT,
    ) : P(PARAM × STATE)
BAP_par <expression>
    (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT), e : EVENT,
        ) : P((PARAM × STATE) × STATE)
Inv <expression> (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT)) : P(STATE)
Thm <expression> (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT)) : P(STATE)
...
```

- Type parameter **Param** is Bound to the definition of the field not to Machine.
- **No axioms** in the theory ⇒ Definition provide in instantiation.

Revised Datatype

2) Field are definition with Axiomatic Operator

AXIOMATIC DEFINITIONS

OPERATORS

```
Init <expression> (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT)) : EVENT
    // Init ∈ Machine(STATE, EVENT) ↔ EVENT
Progress <expression> (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT)) : P(EVENT)
Param <expression> (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT), e : EVENT, p : P(PARAM)) : P(PARAM)
    // Param ∈ Machine(STATE, EVENT) × EVENT ↔ P(PARAM)
Grd_par <expression> (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT), e : EVENT, p : P(PARAM)) : P(PARAM × STATE)
BAP_par <expression>
    (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT), e : EVENT, p : P(PARAM)) : P((PARAM × STATE) × STATE)
Inv <expression> (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT)) : P(STATE)
Thm <expression> (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT)) : P(STATE)
...
```

- Type parameter **Param** is Bound to the definition of the field not to Machine.
- No axioms in the theory ⇒ Definition provide in instantiation.
- New argument for correct **type checking**.

New methodology of instantiation for deep medelling

- Classical Event-B

MACHINE M

...

EVENTS

ev1 \triangleq ANY p WHEN $p \in T_{Par}^{ev1}$

...

evn \triangleq ANY p WHEN $p \in T_{Par}^{evn}$

New methodology of instantiation for deep medelling

- Classical Event-B

MACHINE M

...

EVENTS

$ev1 \triangleq \text{ANY } p \text{ WHEN } p \in T_{Par}^{ev1}$

...

$evn \triangleq \text{ANY } p \text{ WHEN } p \in T_{Par}^{evn}$

- Revised Instantiation

CONTEXT EvtInstantiationSchema
AXIOMS

...

$\text{AxmParEv.1 : Param}(m, ev1, T_{Par}^{ev1}) = T_{Par}^{ev1}$

...

$\text{AxmParEv.n : Param}(m, evn, T_{Par}^{evn}) = T_{Par}^{evn}$

$\text{AxmParGrd.1 : Grd_par}(m, ev1, T_{Par}^{ev1}) = \{par \mapsto s \mid par \in T_{Par}^{ev1} \wedge \dots\}$

...

$\text{AxmParGrd.n : Grd_par}(m, evn, T_{Par}^{evn}) = \{par \mapsto s \mid par \in T_{Par}^{evn} \wedge \dots\}$

$\text{AxmParBAP.1 : BAP_par}(m, ev1, T_{Par}^{ev1}) = \{(par \mapsto s) \mapsto sp \mid par \in T_{Par}^{ev1} \wedge \dots\}$

...

$\text{AxmParBAP.n : BAP_par}(m, evn, T_{Par}^{evn}) = \{(par \mapsto s) \mapsto sp \mid par \in T_{Par}^{evn} \wedge \dots\}$

- **Param** is instantiated with the **correct type** for each events.
 \Rightarrow Events components are definition **individually** for each events.

Revised Proof Obligation

Case of Invariance

OPERATORS

```
...  
Mch_INV_One_Ev_Par_Def predicate (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT) , e : EVENT, ))  
  well-definedness e ∈ Progress(m)  
  direct definition  
  BAP_par(m, e)[(Param(m, e, P(PARAM)) × Inv(m)) ∩ Grd_par(m, e, P(PARAM))] ⊆ Inv(m)  
Mch_INV_Init predicate (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT))  
  direct definition  
  AP(m) ⊆ Inv(m)  
Mch_INV predicate (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT))  
  direct definition  
  Mch_INV_Init(m) ∧ (∀e · e ∈ Progress(m) ⇒ Mch_INV_One_Ev_Def(m, e, )))  
...  
...
```

Revised Proof Obligation

Case of Invariance

OPERATORS

```
...  
Mch_INV_One_Ev_Par_Def predicate (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT), e : EVENT, p : P(PARAM))  
  well-definedness e ∈ Progress(m)  
  direct definition  
    BAP_par(m, e)[(Param(m, e, P(PARAM)) × Inv(m)) ∩ Grd_par(m, e, P(PARAM))] ⊆ Inv(m)  
Mch_INV_Init predicate (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT))  
  direct definition  
    AP(m) ⊆ Inv(m)  
Mch_INV predicate (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT))  
  direct definition  
    Mch_INV_Init(m) ∧ (∀e · e ∈ Progress(m) ⇒ Mch_INV_One_Ev_Def(m, e, P(PARAM))))  
...  
...
```

Revised Proof Obligation

Case of Invariance

OPERATORS

```
...  
Mch_INV_One_Ev_Par_Def predicate (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT) ,e : EVENT, p : P(PARAM))  
  well-definedness e ∈ Progress(m)  
  direct definition  
  BAP_par(m, e)[(Param(m, e, P(PARAM)) × Inv(m)) ∩ Grd_par(m, e, P(PARAM))] ⊆ Inv(m)  
Mch_INV_Init predicate (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT))  
  direct definition  
  AP(m) ⊆ Inv(m)  
Mch_INV predicate (m : Machine(STATE, EVENT))  
  direct definition  
  Mch_INV_Init(m) ∧ (∀e · e ∈ Progress(m) ⇒ Mch_INV_One_Ev_Def(m, e, P(PARAM))))  
...  
...
```

⚠️ Not possible ! \Rightarrow require opacity on type parameter PARAM

Revised Proof Obligation

Opacity Principle

AXIOMATIC OPERATORS

Mch-[P0].One_Ev_Par_Sig predicate ($m : \text{Machine}(\text{STATE}, \text{EVENT}), e : \text{EVENT}$)
OPERATORS

...
Mch-[P0].One_Ev_Par_Def predicate ($m : \text{Machine}(\text{STATE}, \text{EVENT}), e : \text{EVENT}, p : \mathbb{P}(\text{PARAM}))$
well-definedness $e \in \text{Progress}(m)$
direct definition
[update P0 definition with parameter]
Mch-[P0] predicate ($m : \text{Machine}(\text{STATE}, \text{EVENT})$)
direct definition
 $Mch-[P0].Init(m) \wedge (\forall e \cdot e \in \text{Progress}(m) \Rightarrow)$
...
)

AXIOMS

- Two operators defined :
 - Def : PARAM appears and definition provide.
 - Sig : PARAM does not appear and no definition.

Revised Proof Obligation

Opacity Principle

AXIOMATIC OPERATORS

Mch-[P0].One_Ev_Par_Sig predicate ($m : \text{Machine}(\text{STATE}, \text{EVENT}), e : \text{EVENT}$)
OPERATORS

...
Mch-[P0].One_Ev_Par_Def predicate ($m : \text{Machine}(\text{STATE}, \text{EVENT}), e : \text{EVENT}, p : \mathbb{P}(\text{PARAM}))$
well-definedness $e \in \text{Progress}(m)$
direct definition
[update P0 definition with parameter]
Mch-[P0] predicate ($m : \text{Machine}(\text{STATE}, \text{EVENT})$)
direct definition
 $Mch-[P0].Init(m) \wedge (\forall e \cdot e \in \text{Progress}(m) \Rightarrow)$
...
)

AXIOMS

PO[P0]Opacity: $\forall m, e \cdot m \in \text{Machine}(\text{STATE}, \text{EVENT}) \wedge e \in \text{Progress}(m)$
 $\Rightarrow (Mch-[P0].One_Ev_Par_Sig(m, e) \Leftrightarrow Mch-[P0].One_Ev_Par_Def(m, e, \mathbb{P}(\text{PARAM})))$

- Two operators defined :
 - Def : PARAM appears and definition provide.
 - Sig : PARAM does not appear and no definition.
- New axiom links the definition Def and the opaque operator Sig.

Revised Proof Obligation

Opacity Principle

AXIOMATIC OPERATORS

Mch-[P0].One_Ev_Par_Sig predicate ($m : \text{Machine}(\text{STATE}, \text{EVENT}), e : \text{EVENT}$)
OPERATORS

...
Mch-[P0].One_Ev_Par_Def predicate ($m : \text{Machine}(\text{STATE}, \text{EVENT}), e : \text{EVENT}, p : \mathbb{P}(\text{PARAM}))$
well-definedness $e \in \text{Progress}(m)$
direct definition
[update P0 definition with parameter]
Mch-[P0] predicate ($m : \text{Machine}(\text{STATE}, \text{EVENT})$)
direct definition
 $Mch-[P0].Init(m) \wedge (\forall e \cdot e \in \text{Progress}(m) \Rightarrow Mch-[P0].One_Ev_Par_Sig(m, e))$
...

AXIOMS

PO[P0]Opacity: $\forall m, e \cdot m \in \text{Machine}(\text{STATE}, \text{EVENT}) \wedge e \in \text{Progress}(m)$
 $\Rightarrow (Mch-[P0].One_Ev_Par_Sig(m, e) \Leftrightarrow Mch-[P0].One_Ev_Par_Def(m, e, \mathbb{P}(\text{PARAM})))$

- Two operators defined :
 - Def : PARAM appears and definition provide.
 - Sig : PARAM does not appear and no definition.
- New axiom links the definition Def and the opaque operator Sig.
- Sig can be used for stating the property for all event.

1 Introduction

2 Event-B

3 The EB4EB reflexive framework

4 Revised EB4EB

5 Conclusion

Conclusion

Axiomatic Data-type Comparaison

	Axiomatic DT	Classical DT	Record in Ctx
Polymorphism	Heterogeneous Type for field	Homogeneous type	No polymorphims
WD	Mix with WD and external operator	Need external operator	Axioms/invariant
Set	Partially the field	Only the field	Completely
Property	Operator with opacity	Operator	Classical Event-B.

Conclusion

Axiomatic Data-type Comparaison

	Axiomatic DT	Classical DT	Record in Ctx
Polymorphism	Heterogeneous Type for field	Homogeneous type	No polymorphims
WD	Mix with WD and external operator	Need external operator	Axioms/invariant
Set	Partially the field	Only the field	Completely
Property	Operator with opacity	Operator	Classical Event-B.

Limitations

- Equality on the Data-type machine
 - Multiple instantiation of PARAM for same event
- ⇒ No WD on the type instantiation mechanism

Conclusion

EB4EB: Proof Obligation and analyses

- Using same principle, all Native proof obligation updated with event parameter
- All analyses have been updated, deadlock, Invariant weakness, Reachability [RSAD24]
- Revised Clock models
- Bridge case study



Peter Riviere, Neeraj Kumar Singh, Yamine Aït Ameur, and Guillaume Dupont.
Extending the EB4EB framework with parameterised events.
Sc. of Computer Programming, 2024.