Linear State Machines Formal Model

Legalese.com

October 17, 2017

Click most terms (in this color) to jump to their first underlined usage.

Contents

1	Basics: events, time, and traces	1
	1.1 Execution for simple contracts	4
2	Infinite state: Global Variables and Event Parameters 2.1 Execution	5 7
3	Event Schema	7
4	May-Later and Must-Later	7

1 Basics: events, time, and traces

This section defines a complete-but-limited model of contracts, called <u>simple contracts</u>, and also gives definitions that will be used for the full definition of contracts in Section 2.

Every contract specifies a <u>time unit</u>; it is the smallest unit of time that one writes constraints about or does arithmetic with. We expect it will most often be days. A <u>time stamp</u> is a natural number that we think of as being in units time unit.

An <u>event</u> is composed of an <u>action</u>, a <u>role</u>, a time stamp, and optionally some parameters (but parameters will not be introduced until Section 2). The <u>actions</u> and <u>roles</u> are fixed finite sets. In this first version of the L4

mathematical model, there is exactly one participant of each role. All events are modelled as actions, and a special role <u>Env</u> is used to model events that have no agent (i.e. role).

A <u>trace</u> is a sequence of events. The time stamps of the events must be nondecreasing. Thus, within the smallest unit of time, any number of events can happen; however, they are always strictly ordered. The idea here is that we want events to be strictly ordered for simplicity and to minimize the size of the space of execution traces, but if we made the time stamps strictly increasing, we would need to be working at a level of granularity for time that is at least one level smaller than the smallest unit of time that would appear in an informal version of the contract (at least when time unit = days, since contracts that use days as their minimum unit generally do not require that all events happen on different days).

A contract has a fixed finite number of <u>states</u>, one of which is designated the <u>start state</u>, and which includes at least the following:

- fulfilled
- $\underline{\mathsf{breached}(X)}$ for each nonempty subset X of the roles. There is also an $\underline{\mathsf{action}}\ \underline{\mathsf{breaches}(X)}$ for each such X, and $\underline{\mathsf{breachEvent}(X,t)}$ is defined as the $\underline{\mathsf{event}}\ \langle \mathsf{breaches}(X), \mathsf{Env}, t \rangle$

Between any two events in a trace, the contract is in some global state which consists of at least a time stamp for the current time and a state (in Section 2, global variables will be added).

A contract has a finite directed edge-labeled multigraph¹ which we might call its <u>skeleton</u>; the nodes are the <u>states</u>, and each directed edge, which we will call a <u>transition</u>, is labeled with an <u>action</u>. The <u>skeleton</u> is the part of the <u>contract</u> that is easy to visualize. Some notation:

- For r a role, an r-transition is a transition whose role is r.
- For a an action, an \underline{a} -event (\underline{a} -transition) is an event (transition) whose action is a.
- For s a state, the <u>incoming s-transitions</u> (<u>outgoing s-transitions</u>) are the edges coming into (going out of) s.

Every transition is one of the following three types. They will be explained in more detail in the next section.

¹By this I mean there may be multiple edges from one node to another, but they must have different labels.

- A may next transition defines permitted events.
- A <u>relievable must next transition</u> defines the most-used kind of obligated <u>events</u>. These are obligations that are relieved by the performance of a permitted <u>event</u> by some other agent.
- A <u>must next transition</u> defines the strongest kind of obligated events.

Note that the events defined by relievable must next transitions and must next transitions are also considered permitted events.

We say that a transition τ and an event $E = \langle a, r, t \rangle$ are <u>compatible</u> iff they have the same action a and the same role r. This definition will be modified in Section 2 when we add event parameters.

Since the environment Env cannot breach a contract or be *obligated* to do anything, no Env-transition can be a must next transition or a relievable must next transition. That completes the definition of the finite directed graph skeleton of a contract.

Each transition τ is also associated with a transition guard transGuard $_{\tau}(\cdot)$ relation. For simple contracts, it is just a relation on time stamps, and a transition τ is enabled upon entering a global state with time stamp t iff transGuard $_{\tau}(t)$ is true.

Each transition τ is also associated with a <u>deadline function</u> deadline_{τ}(·), which yields a <u>deadline</u>. deadline_{τ}(t) is either a time stamp after t, or the special element $\underline{\infty}$. The deadline for a transition is when:

- an enabled may next transition (a kind of permission) expires³.
- an enabled must next transition (the strong form of obligation) causes a breach by role_{τ}^4 if a compatible event has not been performed by the deadline.
- an enabled relievable must next transition (the weak form of obligation) causes a possibly-joint breach by role_{τ} if a compatible event has not been performed by the deadline and no other permitted event is performed by the deadline.

²Currently, LSM examples are written assuming the transition guards of a state s's transitions get evaluated only once upon entering the state. It would also be reasonable to guess that they get evaluated once per time unit while the contract is in that state. This is not ideal.

³Todo: expires should probably be a defined term.

⁴Which recall, in this formal model means a transition to the state breached($\{role_{\tau}\}$)

For simple contracts, a deadline function is just a function from time stamps to timeunit \cup timestamps. If d is such a function, and a state is entered at time stamp t, then:

- If $d(t) \in \text{timestamps}$, the deadline is d(t).
- If $d(t) \in \text{timeunit}$, the deadline is t + d(t).

The transition guards must satisfy the following conditions, which would be statically verified in a language for contracts. We give the simple contracts definitions here, but these conditions will be used in Section 2 as well.

unambiguous absolute obligation condition: For every time stamp t, if some transition guard of a must next transition evaluates to true (at t) then every other transition guard evaluates to false (at t).

choiceless relievable obligations condition: For every role r and time stamp t, if one of r's relievable must next transitions's transition guards evaluates to true (at t) then any other relievable must next transitions for r evaluate to false (at t).

breach or somewhere to go condition: If it is possible for all the enabled non-Env transitions to expire simultaneously, without causing a breach (which entails that there are no enabled must next transitions or relievable must next transitions) then there must be an Env-transition with deadline ∞ .

1.1 Execution for simple contracts

A simple contract of course starts in its start state. Let E_1, E_2, \ldots be a finite or infinite trace (recall: a sequence of events), as defined in Section 1. Let G_i be the global state that follows E_i for each i.

 G_0 is $\langle \text{startstate}, 0 \rangle$.

Let $i \geq 0$, and assume execution is defined up to entering G_i . To reduce notational clutter, let us use the aliases:

$$G = \langle s, t \rangle = G_i$$
 $E = E_i$ $G' = \langle s', t'^5 \rangle = G_{i+1}$

Case 1: There is some enabled must next transition τ in G. If there is any other enabled transition, then this contract (not just this trace) violates the unambiguous absolute obligation condition, and so is invalid.⁶

⁵Note that t' is E's time stamp

 $^{^6}$ Recall that a language (tool) for simple contracts will verify that such a thing can't happen.

- If E is compatible with τ and E happens within τ 's deadline, then the next state must be target_{τ} .⁷ This means E fulfilled the obligation created by τ .
- Otherwise, E must be breachEvent(role_{τ}, deadline_{τ}(t) + 1).

Case 2: There is no enabled must next transition in G. From the set of enabled may next transitions of s and the set of enabled relievable must next transitions in G, compute the deadline for each, and discard the transitions whose deadline has passed by the time E happens;⁸ let T_p be the resulting set of transitions. From the set of enabled relievable must next transitions in G, compute the deadline for each, and discard the transitions whose deadline is not the unique minimal time stamp t^* within that set; let T_o be the resulting set, and let R be $\{\text{role}_{\tau} \mid \tau \in T_o\}$. Then E is either:

- An event compatible with T_p .
- breachEvent (R, t^*) . This means that all of the roles whose enabled relievable must next transition expire earliest (at t^*) are jointly responsible for the breach.

The breach or somewhere to go condition ensures that one of those two cases will apply. In particular, it implies that at least one of T_p or R is nonempty.

2 Infinite state: Global Variables and Event Parameters

Todo?: Move Event Parameters to its own section. A lot can be done with infinite state systems without them.

We introduce a set of basic datatypes \mathbb{T} , which includes at least \mathbb{B} , \mathbb{N} , and \mathbb{Z} . Add to the definition of contract:

A fixed finite set of typed global vars. The global vars are ordered, so we
may describe their collective types as a single tuple GVarTypes ∈ T*

Add to the definition of global state an assignment of values to the global
vars. We'll call such an assignment a global vars assignment.

⁷i.e. if $t' \leq \mathsf{deadline}_{\tau}(t)$ then $s' = \mathsf{target}_{\tau}$.

⁸i.e. discard τ if deadline_{τ}(t) > t'.

 $^{^{9}}$ Obviously not possible if R is empty

• An assignment of types (\mathbb{T} -tuples) to the actions. This allows events to have parameters. We refer to such a type as an action-parameters domain, and the specific action-parameters domain for action a is paramtypes_a.

The event definition receives the following generalizations:

- Each action a additionally has a global vars transform, denoted transform_a, which is a function from gvartypes \times paramtypes_a \times timestamps to gvartypes.
- The definition of the transition guard of a a-transition is generalized: it may now depend on the values of the global vars; i.e. it is now a relation on timestamps × gvartypes.

The conditions on transition guards are updated in unsurprising ways. For every state s:

unique absolute obligation condition: For every global state G whose (local) state is s, if one of s's must next transitions evaluates to true (on G) then every other transition guard of s evaluates to false.

role-unique relievable obligations condition: For every role r and global state G whose (local) state is s, if one of s's relievable must next transitions with role r evaluates to true (on G) then every other of s's relievable must next transitions with role r evaluates to false.

breach or somewhere to go condition: If it is possible for all the enabled non-Env transitions to expire simultaneously, without causing a breach (which entails that there are no enabled must next transitions or relievable must next transitions) then there must be an Env-transition with deadline ∞ .

Note (probably to move to some other section or document): it will often be the case in a language for contracts that we simultaneously define an action a and a state JH_a (for "a Just Happened", to fit its literal meaning). In this case, the incoming JH_a -transitions are exactly the set of a-transitions. As a convenience, a language for contracts will allow the outgoing JH_a -transitions to depend directly on a's parameters (that is, for the transition guard and event-schema constructor to depend on a's parameters). This is merely a convenience because, as we will see when we define execution, one can achieve the same effect by introducing new global vars that are only used by a and JH_a ; a uses transform $_a$ (recall, its global vars transform) to save its parameter values to those new global vars, so that the outgoing JH_a -transitions can then refer to them.

2.1 Execution

3 Event Schema

4 May-Later and Must-Later

This section does not actually change the definition of contract. Instead, it defines an often-useful contract structure that is likely to be supported with custom syntax in a language for contracts.

We have so far been noncommittal about what types are available for global vars and action-parameters domains. We will see later that the types strongly affect expressivity. As a special case, the reader should convince themselves that any contract that uses only boolean (or other finite domain) types can be simulated by a simple contract (using a much larger number of states).