Forward Analysis of Depth-Bounded Processes

Thomas Wies Damien Zufferey Thomas A. Henzinger

IST Austria (Institute of Science and Technology Austria)

March 25, 2010

From the LIFT web framework (using SCALA actors)

```
class DynamicBlogView extends CometActor {
  //...
  override def localSetup {
    //...
    (BlogCache.cache !? AddBlogWatcher(this, this.blogid)) match {
      case BlogUpdate(entries) => this.blog = entries
    }
  }

  override def lowPriority : PartialFunction[Any, Unit] = {
    case BlogUpdate(entries : List[Entry]) => this.blog = entries; reRender(false)
  }
}

class BlogCache extends LiftActor {
  //...
  protected def messageHandler =
    {
      case AddBlogWatcher(me, id) =>
        val blog = cache.getOrElse(id, getEntries(id)).take(20)
        reply(BlogUpdate(blog))
        //...

      case AddEntry(e, id) =>
        cache += (id -> (e :: cache.getOrElse(id, getEntries(id))))
        sessions.getOrElse(id, Nil).foreach(_ ! BlogUpdate(cache.getOrElse(id, Nil)))

      case DeleteEntry(e, id) => //...
      case EditEntry(e, id) => //..
      case _ =>
    }
}
```

From the LIFT web framework (using SCALA actors)

```
class DynamicBlogView extends CometActor {
  //...
  override def localSetup {
    //...
    (BlogCache.cache !? AddBlogWatcher(this, this.blogid)) match {
      case BlogUpdate(entries) => this.blog = entries
    }
  }

  override def lowPriority : PartialFunction[Any, Unit] = {
    case BlogUpdate(entries : List[Entry]) => this.blog = entries; reRender(false)
```

```
(BlogCache.cache !? AddBlogWatcher(this, this.blogid)) match
{  case BlogUpdate(entries) => this.blog = entries}
```

```
        val blog = cache.getOrElse(id, getEntries(id)).take(20)
        reply(BlogUpdate(blog))
        //...

      case AddEntry(e, id) =>
        cache += (id -> (e :: cache.getOrElse(id, getEntries(id))))
        sessions.getOrElse(id, Nil).foreach(_ ! BlogUpdate(cache.getOrElse(id, Nil)))

      case DeleteEntry(e, id) => //...
      case EditEntry(e, id) => //..
      case _ =>
    }
}
```

Motivation: Client-Server system (# of clients)



Motivation: Client-Server system (# of clients)



Motivation: Client-Server system (# of clients)



Motivation: Client-Server system (# of clients)



Motivation: Client-Server system (# of clients)



Motivation: Client-Server system (# of clients)



Motivation: Client-Server system (# of clients)



Motivation: Client-Server system (# of clients)



Motivation: Client-Server system (# of clients)




*
Client
server
also multiple clients
Server
to
*
server
from
Client

Motivation: Client-Server system (# of clients)



Motivation: Client-Server system (# of clients)



Motivation: Client-Server system (# of clients)



Motivation: Client-Server system (dynamic topology)



Motivation: Client-Server system (dynamic topology)



Motivation: Client-Server system (dynamic topology)



Motivation: Client-Server system (dynamic topology)



Motivation: Client-Server system (dynamic topology)



Covering problem



Covering problem



Covering problem

Covering problem

Covering problem



Covering problem



Covering problem



Covering problem



Outline

- π-calculus, depth-bounded systems
- WSTS
- Forward/Backward analysis
- ADL for depth-bounded systems

The π-calculus [Milner et al., 1992a, Milner et al., 1992b] is a process calculus that describes dynamic distributed computations in a message passing-setting.

$$(\nu x)(Server(x) \mid (\nu y)(Client(y, x) | Messages(x, y)))$$



$$(\nu x)(Server(x) \mid (\nu y)(Client(y, x) | Messages(x, y)))$$

$$\begin{aligned} Server(self) &= self(sender).\ldots \\ Client(self, server) &= self().\ldots \\ Messages(to, from) &= \overline{to}(from) \end{aligned}$$



Depth-bounded systems: [Meyer, 2008] (1)

System with a bound on the longest acyclic path.
(Concretely: it is not possible to encode an infinite memory.)



Depth-bounded systems: [Meyer, 2008] (2)




Client
Server
Client

- Depth-bounded systems are well-structured transition systems [Meyer, 2008].
- Reachability is undecidable.
- Termination is decidable.
- Coverability is decidable for system of known depth.
- Coverability for any depth-bounded system was an open problem.

Our contribution:
Coverability is decidable for any depth-bounded system.

Well-structured transition system

A well-structured transition system (WSTS) is a transition system $\langle S, \rightarrow, \leq \rangle$ such that:

- $\leq$ is a well-quasi-ordering (wqo), i.e. well-founded + no infinite antichain.
- compatibility of $\leq$ w.r.t. $\rightarrow$

$$\forall \quad \begin{array}{ccc} t & \xrightarrow{*} & t' \\ \rotatebox{90}{$\leq$} & & \rotatebox{90}{$\leq$} \\ s & \longrightarrow & s' \end{array} \quad \exists$$

for more detail see:
[Finkel and Schnoebelen, 2001, Abdulla et al., 1996]

A better-quasi-ordering is a wqo closed under the powerset construction.

$\uparrow x = \{x' \in S \mid x \leq x'\}$ is an upward-closed set.
$\downarrow x = \{x' \in S \mid x' \leq x\}$ is an downward-closed set.

Depth bounded systems as WSTS

[Meyer, 2008] showed that depth-bounded processes are WSTS for

- their *reachable* configurations and
- the quasi-ordering $\hookrightarrow$ induced by *subgraph isomorphism*.



[Meyer, 2008] showed that $\hookrightarrow$ is a well-quasi-ordering on the reachable configurations.
We show that it is a better-quasi-ordering.

Tree-Depth of a graph

Tree-Depth

The tree-depth td(G) of a graph G is the minimal height of all trees whose closure contains G.



tree-depth $= 2$

height $= 2$

Tree encoding of depth bounded graph



The labels of tree(G) are graphs.
The number of labels used in the encodings is finite.

Tree encoding of depth bounded graph



The labels of tree(G) are graphs.
The number of labels used in the encodings is finite.

Tree encoding of depth bounded graph



The labels of tree(G) are graphs.
The number of labels used in the encodings is finite.

Tree encoding of depth bounded graph



The labels of tree(G) are graphs.
The number of labels used in the encodings is finite.

Tree encoding of depth bounded graph



The labels of tree(G) are graphs.
The number of labels used in the encodings is finite.

Tree encoding of depth bounded graph



The labels of tree(G) are graphs.
The number of labels used in the encodings is finite.

Homeomorphic tree embedding



We can show for all graphs G_1, G_2:

$$\text{tree}(G_1) \leq \text{tree}(G_2) \text{ implies } G_1 \hookrightarrow G_2$$

Kruskal's tree theorem

Extension of Kruskal's tree theorem [Laver, 1971]

Homeomorphic tree embedding is a better-quasi-ordering on finite trees, where the labels are better-quasi-ordered.

Proposition

Labelled graphs of bounded tree-depth are better-quasi-orderered by the relation induced by subgraph isomorphisms.

$\Rightarrow$ Subgraph isomorphisms induce a better-quasi-ordering on the reachable configurations of a depth-bounded system.

Backward analysis



Backward analysis



Backward analysis




$pre^k(\uparrow bad)$
$pre(\uparrow bad)$
$\uparrow bad$
init
bad
pre
pre^k

- Backward analysis requires *pre* to be computable.
- The WSTS of a depth-bounded system is defined wrt. the *forward-reachable* configurations.
- pre generates unreachable configurations.
- The set of reachable configurations is not computable
- We need to known the depth to preserve the wqo.
- Backward algorithms for coverability works only with processes of *known depth*.

Analysis of depth-bounded systems: computing *pre*



Analysis of depth-bounded systems: computing *pre*



Analysis of depth-bounded systems: computing *pre*



Analysis of depth-bounded systems: computing *pre*




no wqo
k-bounded configurations
wqo
reachable states
not computable
init
$\bigcup_{i=0}^{2} pre(\text{bad})$
$\bigcup_{i=0}^{1} pre(\text{bad})$
bad

Analysis of depth-bounded systems: computing *pre*



Forward analysis



Forward analysis



Forward analysis



Forward analysis



Forward analysis



Problem

How to represents downward-closed sets ?

Analysis of depth-bounded systems: Forward analysis

- Forward algorithms terminate even if the *bound is not known*.
- The algorithm is an instance of the expand enlarge check algorithm [Geeraerts et al., 2006] that uses adequate domain of limits (ADL).
- [Finkel and Goubault-Larrecq, 2009b] provides a theoretical framework for the manipulation of downward-closed sets and the construction of ADL.
- We build such an ADL by extending configurations with '!'.

$\Rightarrow$ coverability is decidable for the entire class of depth-bounded systems.

ADL: [Geeraerts et al., 2006]
let Y an ADL for wqo set X:

For every $z \in \mathsf{X} \cup \mathsf{Y}, \gamma(z)$ is a downward-closed subset of X.



Adequate Domain of Limit (2)

Every downward-closed subset D of X is generated by a finite subset E of Y ∪ X.



Extended configuration

$$(\nu x)(Server(x) \mid !(\nu y)(Client(y,x) | !Messages(x,y)))$$



Limits configuration for depth-bounded systems

We use '!' not as a recursion operator but as a mean to represent infinite sets of configurations.

$\mathcal{C}(PI, k)$ is the set of configurations.
$\mathcal{L}(PI, k)$ in the set of limit configurations.

Theorem

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let PI be a finite set of process identifiers. Then $(\mathcal{L}(PI, k), \sqsubseteq, \gamma)$ is a weak adequate domain of limits for the well-quasi-ordered set $(\mathcal{C}(PI, k), \leq)$.

Corollary

Coverability is decidable for the entire class of depth-bounded systems.

Limits configuration for depth-bounded systems

Theorem [Finkel and Goubault-Larrecq, 2009b]

The downward-closed directed subsets of a wqo set X form an ADL for X.



Proposition

The directed downward-closed sets of depth-bounded configurations are exactly the denotations of limit configurations.

We characterize the tree encodings of downward-closed sets of configurations in terms of the languages of *hedge automata*.

Regular language of unranked trees for Client-Server (1)

$$(\nu x)(Server(x) \mid !(\nu y)(Client(y, x) | !Messages(x, y)))$$



explicit names
$\longrightarrow$



$$(\nu x)(Server(x) \mid !(\nu y)(Client(y,x) | !Messages(x,y)))$$



as tree
$\longrightarrow$



Regular language of unranked trees for Client-Server (3)

$$(\nu x)(Server(x) \mid !(\nu y)(Client(y,x) | !Messages(x,y)))$$



tree language $\longrightarrow$

$$l_1(q_1 q_2^*) \to q_{final}$$
$$l_2(\epsilon) \to q_1$$
$$l_3(q_3) \to q_2$$
$$l_4(q_4^*) \to q_3$$
$$l_5(\epsilon) \to q_4$$

We started an implemention to compute (an over-approximation of) the cover using [Finkel and Goubault-Larrecq, 2009a].

```
Equations:
----------------------------------------
client1(A, B) = (A().(client1(A, B) |
                    request1(B, A)))
answer1(A) = (A<>.0)
new1(A) = (A<>.0)
request1(A, B) = (A<B>.0)
server(A, B) = (A(C).(answer1(C) |
                      server(A, B)) +
                B().(ny D)
                      (client1(D, A) |
                       answer1(D) |
                       new1(B) |
                       server(A, B)))

Initial configuration:
----------------------------------------
(ny A, B)
    (new1(A) |
     server(B, A))
```

```
Computed cover:

(ny A, B)
    (!((ny C)
         (answer1(C) |
         client1(C, B))) |
    !((ny D)
         (client1(D, B) |
         request1(B, D))) |
    new1(A) |
    server(B, A))
```

Recap

Coverability is decidable for depth-bounded processes.

- We provide an ADL for depth-bounded processes;
- prepared the ground for a spectrum of forward algorithms for depth-bounded processes.

Questions ?

Depth-bounded systems [Meyer, 2008]

Nesting of names:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& nest_\nu((\nu x)P) = 1 + nest_\nu(P), \\
& nest_\nu(P_1 \mid P_2) = \max\left\{nest_\nu(P_1), nest_\nu(P_2)\right\}, \\
& \ldots
\end{aligned}
$$

The Depth of a configuration:

$$depth(P) = \min\{\, nest_\nu(Q) \mid Q \equiv P \,\}$$

A process $\mathcal{P}$ is *depth-bounded* if:

$$\exists k \in \mathbb{N},\ \forall P \in Reach(\mathcal{P}),\ depth(P) \leq k$$

(Concretely: it is not possible to make an infinite memory.)

Backward analysis has to guess the exchanged names of each reduction step.
$\rightarrow$ explosion in the nondeterminism.



Closure of a tree



Add edges according to the transitive closure of the parent relation.

Every (undirected) graph is included in the closure of some tree.

Abdulla, P. A., Cerans, K., Jonsson, B. and Tsay, Y.-K. (1996).
General Decidability Theorems for Infinite-State Systems.
In LICS pp. 313–321,.

Finkel, A. and Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2009a).
Forward Analysis for WSTS, Part II: Complete WSTS.
In ICALP (2) pp. 188–199,.

Finkel, A. and Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2009b).
Forward Analysis for WSTS, Part I: Completions.
In STACS vol. 09001, of Dagstuhl Sem. Proc. pp. 433–444,.

Finkel, A. and Schnoebelen, P. (2001).
Well-structured transition systems everywhere!
Theor. Comput. Sci. *256*, 63–92.

Geeraerts, G., Raskin, J.-F. and Van Begin, L. (2006).
Expand, Enlarge and Check: New algorithms for the coverability problem of WSTS.
J. Comput. Syst. Sci. *72*, 180–203.

Laver, R. (1971).
On Fraïssé's Order Type Conjecture.
Ann. of Math. *93*, 89–111.

Meyer, R. (2008).
On Boundedness in Depth in the pi-Calculus.
In IFIP TCS vol. 273, of IFIP pp. 477–489, Springer.

References II

Milner, R., Parrow, J. and Walker, D. (1992a).
A Calculus of Mobile Processes, I.
Inf. Comput. *100*, 1–40.

Milner, R., Parrow, J. and Walker, D. (1992b).
A Calculus of Mobile Processes, II.
Inf. Comput. *100*, 41–77.