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RESUME

Il est important d'analyser le parallélisme entre les différentes actions d'un protocole d'une part, et de valider le fonctionnement et d'évaluer les performances de protocoles d'autre part.

Le logiciel CS-PN, dans sa version actuelle [20], permet de spécifier les protocoles utilisés en systèmes répartis, de valider le comportement qualitatif et d'évaluer ensuite les performances des protocoles de façon modulaire et analytique en s'appuyant sur l'outil formel des réseaux de Petri stochastiques colorés [19].

Nous décrivons d'une part la spécification au moyen du langage C-DEOL [7], et d'autre part la vérification, la validation et ensuite l'évaluation qui constituent les différentes étapes du logiciel CS-PN [20].

Nous appliquons ce logiciel au protocole Blesse/Attend [12], développé à l'ENST, qui gère la prévention dynamique d'interblocage entre transactions concurrentes dans un système de gestion de bases de données réparties (Système R*).

Cet article fait parti des actes du congrès "4th International Workshop on Software, Specification and Design" sponsorisé par IEEE Computer Society, ACM SIGSOFT, LCRST (Japon), Alvey Directorate (Grande Bretagne), par l'Agence de l'Informatique et par l'AFCET (France).

Ce congrès a eu lieu les 3-4 Avril 1987 à Monterey en Californie.
RESUME

It is important to analyze the parallelism between a protocol's different actions, on the one hand, and to validate protocol function and evaluate performances, on the other.

The CS-PN software enables one to specify the protocols used in distributed systems, to validate qualitative behavior, and then, by relying on the CS-PN formal tool, to validate protocol performances by modular and analytic means [19].

We intend to describe the specification, verification, validation, and afterwards, evaluation, which make up the different steps of the CS-PN software.

We will apply this software to a Wound/Wait protocol [12] which manages the dynamic prevention between concurrent transactions in a distributed data management system (system R*).

II - THE CS-PN SOFTWARE

The CS-PN software is developed on a VAX 780-11 machine under VMS4.3 in Pascal language.

This consists in specifying a protocol with the aid of a C-DEOL language (a Colored Dependability Evaluation Oriented Language) in a predefined file named <file_name>.DEO, by using a classic VAX-VMS editor (EDIT,EVE). The file <file_name>.DEO is compiled in order to verify, validate, and then evaluate.

1. SPECIFICATION

While relying on the colored stochastic Petri nets, the specification in C-DEOL uses an editor to create a specification file to be compiled.

1.1° The C-DEOL Language

Specification in C-DEOL breaks down into four parts:

- The declaration of different objects intervening in the specification. These are primarily the places and transitions and, with the introduction of colors, the types or the color sets associated with places, transitions, variables, and functions.
- Topological specification, in other words, the static specification of the preconditions and postconditions relative to each of the transitions.
- The initial dynamic specification, in other words, the specification of the initial marking of each of the places concerned.
- The timed specification, which is to say, the specification of the firing rates of each transition. The firing rates are associated with the firing instances of transitions, which are exponentially distributed aleatory functions.
The general structure of a specification in C-DEOL is:

```plaintext
STUDY study_name;
/*Declarations*/
TYPE type_name = [color 1, ... , color c];
PLACE place_name 1, ... , place_name n[:
    type_name];
TRANS trans_name 1, ... , trans_name m[:
    type_name];
VAR variable_name 1, ..., variable_name v : type_name;
FUNCTION function_name (type_name 1) --> type_name 2;
    f_instruction 1;
    ... f_instruction k;
/* An f_instruction expresses itself in the following manner:
    color_name 1 --> color_name 2, ..., color_name c ;
where color_name 1 must belong to type_name 1, and color_name 2, ..., color_name c must belong to type_name 2 */
    EF;
/*Static Specification*/
IF precondition THEN postcondition;
/* An precondition expresses itself in the following manner:
    term 1 AND term 2 AND ... AND term n
where term is of the form:
    place_name [(color)]:= mark_number;
    place_name [(color)]:= mark_number;
    place_name [(color)]:= mark_number;
    place_name [(color)]:= mark_number;
/*Specification of the Initial Marking*/
INITIAL
    place_name [(color)]:= mark_number;
    place_name [(color)]:= mark_number;
END
/*Specification of Transition Firing Rates*/
RATES
    trans_name [(color)]:= λ . [α . m (place_name1) [(color)] + β . m (place_name2) [(color)]];
END
```

The type declaration TYPE permits the definition of a color set. This set will be associated with one or several places and variables. The type_name and color are the identifiers. The color identifier is implicitly defined as being one color.

Declaration PLACE (respectively TRANS) allows the definition of one or several places (respectively transitions).

Declaration TRANS (respectively PLACE) and type_name are the identifiers. The name_type identifier must obligatorily be defined in a type declaration. The mention type_name is optional. It serves to associate a set of colors, if one exists, with one or several places (respectively transitions).

The VAR declaration, allows the definition of one or several variables by specifying their color set.

variable_name and type_name are identifiers. The type_name identifier, must obligatorily have been defined in a type declaration.

The declaration of a function FUNCTION, enables one to define a correspondence between each of the colors of two sets. A color from the starting set can have several colors of the arrival set for an image.

In static specification, term, represents a part of the precondition respectively of the postcondition: a place-marking condition.

Two optional arguments are possible for specifying this condition:

- color enables one to specify the place's color marks used by the precondition respectively postcondition. This optional argument also serves to specify the color of a fireable transition. The possible color argument forms are:
  - EMPTY
  - EVERY variable_name
  - variable_name
  - function_name (color_name)
  - function_name (variable_name)

- valuation permits one to assign a coefficient to the arc etiquette inputting the transition respectively outputting the transition. It can have three forms:
  - = k : test if the marking of the place in input is superior or equal to k. during transition firing, the marks will be removed from the marking.
  - = 0 : test if the marking of the place in input is null.
  - += k : increments the marking of the place in output by k marks.

By default the valuation is equal to - = 1 respectively + = 1.

In the specification of the initial marking of a place:

place_name and color are the identifiers, mark_number is an unsigned natural number.

The color optional argument allows one to specify the color of the initial marks.

In the specification of the transition firing rates:

trans_name, place_name and color are identifiers, λ, α, β are the reals, and m designates the place marking.

The transition firing-rate depends on the optional color argument, and expresses itself either by means of a real constant, or with the aid of a linear function of the marking of one or several places.

If the real constant is be infinite, the corresponding transition is then immediate.

1.2° Editor

Any editor from the VAX-VMS, EDIT or EVE, for example, allows the specification of one or
The lexical analyzer acts as an interface between packages:

The compiler can break itself down into four generic compiler functions are: separately or with a link. The three principle the file source "DEO" and the syntactical analyzer: generates the file. When the syntactical analyzer meets an identifier (a the lexical analyzer is thus cyclic.

As soon as the syntactical analyzer ends the treatment of a lexical unit, it calls the lexical analyzer to obtain another lexical unit. The call to the lexical analyzer is thus cyclic. When the syntactical analyzer meets an identifier (a particular lexical unit), it calls the identifier handler, which entrusts itself with either filing this identifier or searching for it.

Filing takes place by attributing an identifying number, and an address in the identifier tables. The search for an identifier takes place through a test of the table of identifiers. When the syntactical analyzer detects an error, it calls the error handler, which takes over editing the corresponding error message. The syntactical analyzer is thus the kernel of the compiler, it verifies that the C-DEOL language's syntax is well obeyed and then generates the different files containing the codification of the specification.

2. VERIFICATION

The principle of verification is based on the resolution of a linear equation of the form $v^T \cdot W = 0^T$, for linear invariants $v$ at the places, and of a linear equation of the form $W \cdot w = 0$ for the linear invariants $w$ on the transitions. $W$ being the incidence matrix built from postconditions and preconditions. The $v$ (respectively $w$) obtained syntactic invariants with minimal supports, express the conservation relations of marks in the places (respectively of repetition of transition firing) and thus enable one to verify that specification realizes the properties required of the protocol (the property of mutual exclusion, the absence of certain deadlocks, the repetition of certain actions without modifying the rest of the protocol). If verification does not achieve the hoped-for results, it is then possible to start the specification once again.

3. VALIDATION

The dynamics of specified protocol are characterized by the accessible markings graph, from the specified initial marking. The construction of this graph consists in determining whether an obtained marking is truly accessible from the initial marking, and if it is equivalent to an already extant marking. The applied equivalence relation allows one to regroup several markings in a single c-marking (color marking). Thus, a color set is associated with each c-marking of the graph of accessible markings, and another color set, is associated with each arc linking two c-markings and characterizing the firing of a transition. The principle of the equivalency relation is based on the permutation of the different colors belonging to each color set. The advantage of such a construction is the optimization of the number of c-markings and the structuring of the different states of the specified protocol. This validation principle allows one to deduce the boundedness properties (which express the fact that a limited number of sites, transactions, granules, and messages are enough for
specification) of vivacity (which signifies the absence of deadlock) and of reinitializability (which validates the possibility of restarting the specific protocol from the initial marking, and the necessity of reinitializing the protocol for any repetition) for each module of the "DEO" file and for the complete protocol in particular.

In any case, the protocol's validation can be deduced from the validations of a protocol's different modules, hence the advantage of this principle's modularity.

This method of validation allows one to validate the good functioning of a protocol's different modules, the functioning of the protocol itself, and the operation of the service which each module and protocol must render.

If validation does not reach the protocol's wished-for properties, then one or several specification modules are restarted.

4. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Once the protocol is validated, it becomes possible to evaluate the performance of each of the specification's modules.

The evaluation principle is based on the isomorphism between the accessible c-markings graph, constructed during the previous step, and the Markov chain, obtained by replacing the names of transitions linking the c-markings with rates of associated firings.

The evaluation thus consists in building the matrix A of transitions expressing the probability of the passage of one c-marking to another, and resolving a linear equation of the form \( P^T \cdot A = 0 \); such that the vector \( P \) norm is equal to 1. Vector \( P^T \) designates the probabilities of the different c-markings in a steady state.

To resolve such an equation, one uses the same Farkas algorithm used to find the invariants in verification.

The c-markings probability vector, thus obtained, enables one to deduce the performance criteria associated with each module and protocol, such as the mean number of marks in a place, the mean firing frequency of a transition, and the mean mark sojourn time in a place, relative to a color or for any color.

Several file codifications
\(<\text{file\_name}>\cdot <\text{study\_name}>\cdot \text{RAT}\) are generated with the aid of separated compilation, and evaluation is applied to each codification, in order to deduce the performance criteria associated with several specifications of the transition firing-rate of the same static specification.

III - APPLICATION TO DS

The distributed data base is made up of a set of granules: distributed uniquely between geographically situated network sites.

Each granule is unique and local to a site (system \( R^* \)). The conflictual access to one granule by several sites requires a serializable coherence control protocol.

1. THE WOUND/ WAIT PROTOCOL

This protocol's principal is based on the timestamp of transactions which allow conflicts to be managed from the only local state of the granule in question.

It is also based on two-phase locking, where each transaction locks the granule in the compatible mode, before carrying out an operation, and unlocks it, after the end of the operation by not accepting any new locking requests following the first unlocking.

The Wound/ Wait protocol introduces a transaction's wound and an FWAIT queue with priority to the oldest transactions.

If there is conflict between a Tr transaction, which asks to lock granule g while it is already locked in an incompatible mode by transaction Ti, the Wound/ Wait protocol will use the following principle:

- If Tr is older than Ti THEN Ti is wounded
- ELSE Tr waits;

as well as the two following rules:

1. a healthy transaction can only be placed on queue from the end or abort of another transaction, one either older than it, or a wounded transaction.

2. a wounded transaction, is only authorized to await the unlocking of a granule if it is older than the lock transactions, and if no transaction older than it asks for g to be unlocked in an incompatible mode.

The Wound/ Wait protocol can be broken down into two principal modules:

1.1° The Request Treatment Module

Either a transaction Tr asking to lock granule g in mode m (shared or exclusive),
- If g is free, there is no conflict and Tr is authorized to lock g.
- If g is locked:
  - Either Tr is older than all the FWAIT transactions or FWAIT is empty, Tr is then allowed to try to lock g for itself.
  - If the present lock is compatible with Tr's request, Tr is authorized to lock g for itself.
  - Otherwise there is conflict. Let Ti be the set of transactions having locked the granule:
    - If no transaction Ti is older than Tr, Tr is placed on queue at the ending or roll back of Ti transactions. All Ti transactions are then wounded (rule i).
    - Otherwise:
      - If Tr is wounded, it is rolled back (rule ii).
      - If Tr is not wounded, it is authorized to wait. All Ti transactions younger than Tr are then wounded (rule i).
      - Otherwise Tr is never allowed to try and wound transactions having locked g.
  - If Tr is not wounded it is authorized to queue.
  - Otherwise:
If Tr's wait respects rule ii, it is authorized to queue.

Otherwise Tr is rolled back.

In every case, if Tr has been placed in queue or authorized to lock g, the wound transactions in queue, which no longer respect rule ii, must be rolled back.

1.2° The Wound Treatment Module

The Wound/Wait protocol's delicate point, is situated at the level of treatment for a transaction wound.

When a transaction Ta wounds transaction Tv, it only wounds one of its agents. However, this agent can no longer be active on this site. The wound has conflict handling for a goal; knowing whether the transaction must be rolled back or not (rule ii). It is only of interest to the active agents and must thus send them the message. When a site must send a wound, the following principle is applied to each granule which the transaction has already locked:

- If the local agent is terminated, the message is transmitted to the invoking agent.
- If the local agent awaits the termination of an agent, the message is sent to the last agent which it initialized.

'Optimization' is sending a message from a site. If locally, the transaction has not been wounded. In any case, this does not prevent several emissions for the same transaction. This is due simply to transmission delays and to site desynchronization.

When a site receives a wound message:

- If the local agent is already wounded locally, there is no treatment to undertake.
- Otherwise the local agent passes into the wounded state.

If the local agent is in unlock queue of another granule:

- If it does not respect rule ii, it is rolled back.
- Otherwise its queue pursual is authorized.

2. SPECIFICATION

The specification of the Wound/Wait protocol breaks down into four modules:

2.1° Request Treatment Module

STUDY Request_Treatment_Module

TYPE TRANSACTIONS = [t]; GRANULES = [g]; SITES = [s]; REQUESTS = [tg]; AGENTS = [ts]; TRANSCONFLICT = [tg']; EVENTS = [tdie,tterm]; PLACE GT : TRANSACTIONS; RG : GRANULES; TR, LOCK, CF, NEXT, FWAIT, TWAIT, TLOCK : REQUESTS; WOUND, TW : AGENTS; WK : TRANSCONFLICT; UNLOCK : EVENTS;

TRANS \( \alpha_1 \) : TRANSACTIONS; \( \alpha_2 \), \( \alpha_4 \), \( \alpha_6 \), \( \alpha_7 \), \( \alpha_9 \); REQUESTS;

FUNCTION INIT ( TRANSACTIONS ) ---> REQUESTS;

FUNCTION S ( GRANULES ) ---> SITES;

FUNCTION V ( TRANSACTIONS ) ---> TRANSACTIONS;

END

2.2° Wound Treatment Module

STUDY Wound_Treatment_Module

TYPE TRANSACTIONS = [t]; GRANULES = [g]; SITES = [s]; REQUESTS = [tg]; AGENTS = [ts]; EVENTS = [tdie,tterm]; CUPTREE = [tss']; PLACE RG : GRANULES; FWAIT, DW, LOCK : REQUESTS; TW, NW, WOUND, EW : AGENTS; UNLOCK : EVENTS; PT : CUPTREE;

TRANS \( \beta_4 \), \( \beta_7 \), \( \beta_8 \) : REQUESTS; \( \beta_1 \), \( \beta_2 \), \( \beta_3 \), \( \beta_6 \) ;
AGENTS; \( \beta_s : \text{CUPTREE}; \)

FUNCTION \( S(\text{GRANULES}) \rightarrow \text{SITES}; \)

\( g \rightarrow s; \)

\[\text{EF}; \]

\( \forall \) \( \text{EVERY} \) \((\text{respectively} \ \text{EVERY}_{i+} \) \) \( \text{designates the} \) \( \text{projection onto the} \ i^{th} \) \( \text{component (respectively} \ \text{verifying condition} \) \( \text{c of the function} \ \text{EVERY} \) \( \forall \)

IF \( \text{TW}(ts) \ \text{AND} \ \text{WOUND}(ts) = 0 \) \( \text{THEN} \ \beta_1 : \text{NW}(ts) \ \text{AND} \ \text{WOUND}(ts); \)

IF \( \text{TW}(ts) \ \text{AND} \ \text{WOUND}(ts) \) \( \text{THEN} \ \beta_2 : ; \)

IF \( \text{NW}(ts) \ \text{AND} \ \text{FWAIT}(\text{EVERY}_{2,\text{S}(g) = s}) = 0 \) \( \text{THEN} \ \beta_3 : \text{EW}(ts); \)

IF \( \text{RG}(g) \ \text{AND} \ \text{NW}(\text{EVERY}_{2,\text{S}(g) = s}) \) \( \text{AND} \) \( \text{FWAIT}(\text{tg}) \) \( \text{THEN} \ \beta_4 : \text{RG}(g) \ \text{AND} \ \text{FWAIT}(\text{tg}); \)

IF \( \text{TW}(tg) \ \text{AND} \ \text{WOUND}(tg) \) \( \text{THEN} \ \beta_5 : \text{TW}(ts); \)

IF \( \text{NW}(tg) \ \text{AND} \ \text{FWAIT}(\text{EVERY}_{1,\text{t} < \text{tg}}) = 0 \) \( \text{THEN} \ \beta_6 : \text{NW}(tg) \ \text{AND} \ \text{WOUND}(tg); \)

IF \( \text{RG}(g) \ \text{AND} \ \text{NW}(\text{EVERY}_{2,\text{S}(g) = s}) \) \( \text{AND} \) \( \text{FWAIT}(\text{tg}) \) \( \text{THEN} \ \beta_7 : \text{RG}(g) \ \text{AND} \ \text{WOUND}(tg); \)

IF \( \text{AW}(tg') \ \text{AND} \ \text{TR}(\text{IS}(g)\text{S}(g')) = 0 \) \( \text{THEN} \ \mu_1 : \text{TR}(tg') \ \text{AND} \ \text{PT}(\text{IS}(g)\text{S}(g')); \)

END

2.4 \text{ Unlock Module}

STUDY \text{Unlock\_Module};

TYPE \text{TRANSACTIONS} = \{t\}; \text{GRANULES} = \{g\}; \text{REQUESTS} = \{tg\}; \text{AGENTS} = \{ts\}; \text{EVENTS} = \{t \text{die}, t \text{term}\}; \text{CUPTREE} = \{\text{tss}^*\}; \text{MESSAGES} = \{\text{die, term}\}; \text{GRAREQ} = \{tg\};

PLACE \text{RG, LG} : \text{GRANULES}; \text{LOCK, TR, FWAIT}; \text{NEXT : REQUESTS}; \text{WOUND, TW, NW, EW : AGENTS}; \text{UNLOCK : EVENTS}; \text{PT : CUPTREE}; \text{ACK : MESSAGES};

TRANS \( \gamma_5 : \text{TRANSACTIONS}; \gamma_2 : \text{GRANULES}; \gamma_1 : \text{REQUESTS}; \gamma_3 : \text{AGENTS}; \gamma_4 : \text{CUPTREE}; \gamma_2 : \text{GRATRAME}; \)

VAR \text{mes} : \text{MESSAGES};

FUNCTION \text{INIT ( TRANSACTIONS )} \rightarrow \text{REQUESTS};

\text{t} \rightarrow \text{tg};

\[\text{EF}; \]

\( \forall \) \( \text{EVERY}_2 \) \((\text{respectively} \ \text{EVERY}_{2,3} \) \) \( \text{designates the} \) \( \text{projection onto the second component (respectively} \ \text{second and third components} \) \( \text{of the} \ \text{function} \ \text{EVERY} \) \( \forall \)

IF \( \text{UNLOCK}(t \ \text{mes}) \ \text{AND} \ \text{LOCK}(\text{EVERY}_{2, \text{tg}}) = 0 \)

\( \text{THEN} \ \gamma_1 : \text{ACK}(\text{mes}); \)

IF \( \text{RG}(g) \ \text{AND} \ \text{UNLOCK}(t \ \text{mes}) \ \text{AND} \ \text{LOCK}(\text{tg}) \)

\( \text{THEN} \ \gamma_2 : \text{LG}(g) \ \text{AND} \ \text{UNLOCK}(t \ \text{mes}); \)

IF \( \text{WOUND}(ts) \ \text{AND} \ \text{ACK}(\text{mes}) \)

\( \text{THEN} \ \gamma_3 : \text{ACK}(\text{mes}); \)

IF \( \text{PT}(\text{ts}^*) \ \text{AND} \ \text{ACK}(\text{mes}) \)

\( \text{THEN} \ \gamma_4 : \text{ACK}(\text{mes}); \)

IF \( \text{ACK}(\text{die}) \ \text{AND} \ \text{TW}(\text{EVERY}_{2, ts}) \ \text{AND} \ \text{NW}(\text{EVERY}_{2, ts}) \ \text{AND} \ \text{EW}(\text{EVERY}_{2, ts}) \)

\( \text{AND} \) \( \text{PT}(\text{EVERY}_{2,3} \text{ts}^*) \)

\( \text{THEN} \ \gamma_5 : \text{TR}(\text{INIT}(t)); \)

IF \( \text{LG}(g) \ \text{AND} \ \text{FWAIT}(\text{tg}) \)

\( \text{THEN} \ \delta_1 : \text{RG}(g) \ \text{AND} \ \text{NEXT}(tg) \ \text{AND} \ \text{LOCK}(tg); \)

IF \( \text{LG}(g) \)

\( \text{THEN} \ \delta_2 : \text{RG}(g); \)

END

IV - CONCLUSION

The CS-PN software, like the RDPS and GSPN software, is especially suited to the qualitative and quantitative analysis of systems. Unlike the RDPS and GSPN software, however, and with its C-DEOL specification language, coupled with advantages in conciseness, simplicity, and simplification, the CS-PN software is better adapted to site distribution and to protocol specification, verification, validation, and performance evaluation.

Furthermore, its specification, verification, validation, and evaluation procedures are more fully structured and modular, while the exploitation of results remains in the traditional mold.
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