

Model checking with SPIN

Software Analysis, Spring 2024

Luca Di Bello

May 15, 2024

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	ProMeLa Model	2
2.1	Sequential Process	3
2.2	Parallel Process	3
2.2.1	Worker Process	4
2.3	Parameters: MAX and LENGTHf	5
3	LTL Properties	6
3.1	Verify completion of both sequential and parallel processes	6
3.2	Additional LTL properties	6
4	Verification with SPIN	7

1 Introduction

In this assignments examines the implementation of model checking using the SPIN tool to verify the correctness of two versions of a frequency counter program: one sequential and the other parallel. Model checking is a technique that allows to verify the correctness certain properties of a system described in a finite-state model. In the following sections will be discussed how the program has been

modeled using ProMeLa language, which Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) properties have been defined to verify the correctness of the program, and how the verification has been performed using SPIN.

2 ProMeLa Model

The ProMeLa model consists of two main processes: the first process handles the sequential computation of frequency counts, storing results in an array `sequential_counts`. The second process on the other hand, initiates parallel computation, spawning worker processes for each possible value in the input array. These workers update an array `parallel_counts` concurrently. Race conditions are avoided as each worker updates a unique position in the array.

As explicitly stated in the assignment, the ProMeLa model presents two constraints:

1. **MAX**: It represents the maximum value that can be assigned to an element in the array. Used while filling the input array with random values.
2. **LENGTH**: the length of the input array.

The model presents an `init` block that initializes the input array with random values between 0 and **MAX** and starts both the sequential and parallel processes. The code is available in listing 1.

```

1 // Define the maximum number of elements in the array
2 #define MAX 2
3 #define LENGTH 2
4
5 // Define the variables
6 int a[LENGTH];
7
8 // Keep track of result of both versions of the program
9 int sequential_counts[MAX + 1];
10 int parallel_counts[MAX + 1];
11
12 // Entry point of the program
13 init {
14     // Initialize the array non-deterministically
15     printf("Random state:\n")
16     int i;
17     for (i : 0 .. LENGTH - 1) {
18         // Select a random value for the array
19         int v;
20         select(v : 0 .. MAX);
21         // Assign the value to the array
22         a[i] = v;
23
24         // Print the value
25         printf("\ta[%d] = %d\n", i, v);
26     }
27
28     // Run the sequential version of the program
29     printf("Running sequential version...\n");
30     run sequentialCounter();
31
32     // Run the parallel version of the program
33     printf("Running parallel version...\n");
34     run parallelCounter();
35 }

```

Listing 1: ProMeLa array initialization and start of sequential and parallel processes

As is possible to see from the code above, both versions of the program have been started using the `run` command inside the same ProMeLa model. This is different from the Java implementation, where the two versions were implemented in separate classes. This design choice was essential to allow the

verification of both versions of the program in the same model as otherwise, it would be impossible to verify by confronting data yielded by two different simulations.

In the abstraction, the sequential and parallel processes are implemented as separate processes. An in depth analysis of each process is provided in the following sections.

2.1 Sequential Process

The sequential version of the frequency counter program is implemented in the `sequentialCounter` process. This process iterates over the input array and increments the corresponding position in the `sequential_counts` array.

The ProMeLa implementation of this version of the program is almost identical to the Java implementation. This was expected, as both languages uses a C-like syntax, and the logic of the program is simple. The code is available in listing 3.

```

1 public int mostFrequent() {
2     int mostFrequent = -1;
3     int maxFrequency = -1;
4     int[] frequencies = new int[max + 1];
5     for (int k = 0; k < a.length; k++)
6     {
7         int value = a[k];
7         frequencies[value] += 1;
8         int frequency = frequencies[
9         value];
9         if (frequency > maxFrequency)
10        {
11            mostFrequent = value;
11            maxFrequency = frequency;
12        }
13    }
14    return mostFrequent;
15 }
16
17

```

Listing 2: Java sequential version of the frequency counter program

```

1 proctype sequentialCounter() {
2     int maxFrequency = -1;
3     int k;
4     for (k : 0 .. LENGTH - 1) {
5         int value = a[k];
6         sequential_counts[value] =
7         sequential_counts[value] + 1;
8         if
9         :: sequential_counts[value] >
10        maxFrequency ->
11            maxFrequency =
12            sequential_counts[value];
12            sequential_result = value;
13            :: else -> skip;
14        fi
15    }
16    // Signal that the sequential
17    version is done
18    sequentialDone = 1;
19 }
20
21

```

Listing 3: ProMeLa sequential version of the frequency counter program

The main difference between the Java and ProMeLa implementation is the way the program yields the result: in the Java implementation, the result is simply returned by the method, while in the ProMeLa implementation, the result is stored in a global variable `sequential_result`. This is necessary as the process cannot return a value.

2.2 Parallel Process

The parallel version of the frequency counter program is implemented in the `parallelCounter` process. This process spawns `MAX + 1` worker processes that concurrently count the frequency of each value in the input array. Each worker process is started with a unique value to count, and by iterating over the input array, increments the corresponding position in the `parallel_counts` array.

After all worker processes have completed, the main parallel counter process iterates through the results and saves the value with the highest frequency inside the `parallel_result` variable.

To be able to detect when all worker processes have completed, I decided to use a *channel* to synchronize the main process with the workers. The channel created in the main process and passed as an argument to each worker process. As soon as a worker process completes, it sends its PID

through passed channel. As we start $MAX + 1$ worker processes, we expect to read $MAX + 1$ values from the channel. By leveraging this, the *parallelCounter* process is able to detect when all worker processes have completed. The code is available in listing 4.

```

1 proctype parallelCounter() {
2   // Create channel to wait for workers to finish
3   chan joinCh = [MAX + 1] of { pid };
4   // Create array of PID's for workers
5   pid workers[MAX + 1];
6   // Create a worker for each possible value
7   int i;
8   for (i : 0 .. MAX) {
9     workers[i] = run parallelWorker(i, joinCh);
10  }
11  // Wait for all workers to finish by reading from the channel
12  for (i : 0 .. MAX) {
13    int done;
14    joinCh ? done;
15  }
16  // If we are here, all workers are done as we read MAX+1 values from the channel
17  printf("\t [!] all workers are done\n");
18  ...
19 }

```

Listing 4: ProMeLa parallel frequency counter - worker synchronization with channel

This implementation differs from the Java implementation, where it does not wait for all threads to complete but instead starts them all together and then, waits for each thread singularly to complete, to save its result. In ProMeLa, we start the worker processes right away and use a channel to wait for all of them to complete before saving the result.

2.2.1 Worker Process

The worker process has been implemented in the *parallelWorker* process. As cited in the previous section, each worker process is started with a unique value to count and increments the corresponding position in the *parallel_counts* array. The code is available in listing 6.

```

1 protected int frequencyOf(int n) {
2     int frequency = 0;
3     for (int value: a) {
4         if (value == n)
5             frequency += 1;
6     }
7     return frequency;
8 }
9
10 class ThreadedCounter extends
    SequentialCounter implements
    Runnable
11 {
12     private int frequency;
13     private int n;
14
15     ThreadedCounter(int[] a, int n, int
        max) {
16         super(a, max);
17         this.n = n;
18     }
19
20     public void run() {
21         frequency = frequencyOf(n);
22     }
23
24     public int frequency() {
25         return frequency;
26     }
27 }
28

```

Listing 5: Java parallel worker thread implementation leveraging Threads

```

1 proctype parallelWorker(int value;
    chan out) {
2     // Look for the value in the array
3     int frequency = 0;
4     int i;
5     for (i : 0 .. LENGTH - 1) {
6         if
7             :: a[i] == value -> frequency =
                frequency + 1;
8             :: else -> skip;
9         fi
10    }
11
12    // Update the value in the parallel
        counts array
13    parallel_counts[value] = frequency;
14    printf("Worker for value %d is done\
        n", value);
15    out ! _pid;
16 }
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

```

Listing 6: ProMeLa parallel worker implementation leveraging processes

As also described in the caption of the listings above, the main difference between the two implementations is how the worker process is started. In the Java implementation, this required the creation of a specific class that implements the `Runnable` interface, while in the ProMeLa implementation, this is simply a process that is started by the main `parallelCounter` process.

A small implementation detail is that the Java worker, leveraging an external function named `frequencyOf`, only computes the frequency of a specific value, while the ProMeLa worker process needs to handle both this logic, but also the saving of the result in the `parallel_counts` and the synchronization with the parent process using the channel (as explained in detail in section 2.2).

2.3 Parameters: MAX and LENGTHf

If MAX and LENGTH are too high, the model checking process can take a long time to complete, or even run out of memory. To avoid this, I decided to set the values of MAX and LENGTH to 2. This way, the model checking process is fast and efficient, and it is possible to verify the correctness of the program in a reasonable amount of time.

3 LTL Properties

3.1 Verify completion of both sequential and parallel processes

To be able to verify the completion of both the sequential and parallel processes, I decided to use two global variables: `sequentialDone` and `parallelDone`. These variables are set to 0 by default, and set to 1 when the respective process has completed. To verify the completion of both processes, I defined the following LTL properties:

```
1  ltl sequential_done { [] (sequentialDone == 1) }  
2  ltl parallel_done { [] (parallelDone == 1) }
```

Listing 7: LTL properties to verify the completion of both sequential and parallel processes

3.2 Additional LTL properties

As requested by the assignment, I defined two additional LTL properties to verify the correctness of the program, one that must hold and one that must not hold. The LTL property that must hold is the following:

1. **Property 1:** The sum of the frequencies of all values in the `sequential_counts` array must be equal to the length of the input array.
2. **Property 2:** The sum of the frequencies of all values in the `parallel_counts` array must be equal to the length of the input array.

4 Verification with SPIN