Software Engineering using Formal Methods

Modeling Concurrency

Wolfgang Ahrendt

06 September 2016

Concurrent Systems – The Big Picture

Concurrency: different processes trying not to run into each others' way

Concurrent Systems – The Big Picture

Concurrency: different processes trying not to run into each others' way

Main problem of concurrency: sharing computational resources

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JgMB6nEv7K0
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G8eqymwUFi8

Concurrent Systems – The Big Picture

Concurrency: different processes trying not to run into each others' way

Main problem of concurrency: sharing computational resources

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JgMB6nEv7K0
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G8eqymwUFi8

Shared resource = crossing, bikers = processes,

Concurrent Systems – The Big Picture

Concurrency: different processes trying not to run into each others' way

Main problem of concurrency: sharing computational resources

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JgMB6nEv7K0
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G8eqymwUFi8

Shared resource = crossing, bikers = processes,
and a (data) race in progress, approaching a disaster.

Concurrent Systems – The Big Picture

Concurrency: different processes trying not to run into each others' way

Main problem of concurrency: sharing computational resources

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JgMB6nEv7K0
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G8eqymwUFi8

Shared resource = crossing, bikers = processes,
and a (data) race in progress, approaching a disaster.

Solutions to this must be carefully designed and verified, otherwise...

Concurrent Systems – The Big Picture

Focus of this Lecture

Aim of SPIN-style model checking methodology:

exhibit flaws in software systems

Focus of this Lecture

Aim of SPIN-style model checking methodology:

exhibit design flaws in software systems

Focus of this Lecture

Aim of SPIN-style model checking methodology:

exhibit design flaws in concurrent and distributed software systems

Focus of this Lecture

Aim of SPIN-style model checking methodology:

exhibit design flaws in concurrent and distributed software systems

Focus of this lecture:

- Modeling and analyzing concurrent systems

Focus of this Lecture

Aim of SPIN-style model checking methodology:

exhibit design flaws in concurrent and distributed software systems

Focus of this lecture:

- Modeling and analyzing concurrent systems

Focus of next lecture:

- Modeling and analyzing distributed systems

Concurrent/Distributed systems difficult to get right

problems:

- hard to predict, hard to form faithful intuition

Concurrent/Distributed systems difficult to get right

problems:

- hard to predict, hard to form faithful intuition
- enormous combinatorial explosion of possible behavior

Concurrent/Distributed systems difficult to get right

problems:

- hard to predict, hard to form faithful intuition
- enormous combinatorial explosion of possible behavior
- interleaving prone to unsafe operations

Concurrent/Distributed systems difficult to get right

problems:

- hard to predict, hard to form faithful intuition
- enormous combinatorial explosion of possible behavior
- interleaving prone to unsafe operations
- counter measures prone to deadlocks

Concurrent/Distributed systems difficult to get right

problems:

- hard to predict, hard to form faithful intuition
- enormous combinatorial explosion of possible behavior
- interleaving prone to unsafe operations
- counter measures prone to deadlocks
- limited control—from within applications—over ‘external’ factors:

Concurrent/Distributed systems difficult to get right

problems:

- hard to predict, hard to form faithful intuition
- enormous combinatorial explosion of possible behavior
- interleaving prone to unsafe operations
- counter measures prone to deadlocks
- limited control—from within applications—over 'external' factors:
  - scheduling strategies

Concurrent/Distributed systems difficult to get right

problems:

- hard to predict, hard to form faithful intuition
- enormous combinatorial explosion of possible behavior
- interleaving prone to unsafe operations
- counter measures prone to deadlocks
- limited control—from within applications—over 'external' factors:
  - scheduling strategies
  - relative speed of components

Concurrent/Distributed systems difficult to get right

problems:

- hard to predict, hard to form faithful intuition
- enormous combinatorial explosion of possible behavior
- interleaving prone to unsafe operations
- counter measures prone to deadlocks
- limited control—from within applications—over 'external' factors:
  - scheduling strategies
  - relative speed of components
  - performance of communication mediums

Concurrent/Distributed systems difficult to get right

problems:

- hard to predict, hard to form faithful intuition
- enormous combinatorial explosion of possible behavior
- interleaving prone to unsafe operations
- counter measures prone to deadlocks
- limited control—from within applications—over ‘external’ factors:
  - scheduling strategies
  - relative speed of components
  - performance of communication mediums
  - reliability of communication mediums

Testing Concurrent or Distributed System is Hard

We cannot exhaustively test concurrent/distributed systems

- lack of controllability
  $\Rightarrow$ we miss failures in test phase

Testing Concurrent or Distributed System is Hard

We cannot exhaustively test concurrent/distributed systems

- lack of controllability
  $\Rightarrow$ we miss failures in test phase
- lack of reproducability
  $\Rightarrow$ even if failures appear in test phase,
  often impossible to analyze/debug defect

Testing Concurrent or Distributed System is Hard

We cannot exhaustively test concurrent/distributed systems

- lack of controllability
  $\Rightarrow$ we miss failures in test phase
- lack of reproducability
  $\Rightarrow$ even if failures appear in test phase,
  often impossible to analyze/debug defect
- lack of time
  exhaustive testing exhausts the testers long before it exhausts behavior of the system...

Mission of SPIN-style Model Checking

offer an efficient methodology to

- improve the design
- exhibit defects

of concurrent and distributed systems

Activities in Spin-style Model Checking

1. model (critical aspects of) concurrent/distributed system with Promela
2. state crucial properties with assertions, temporal logic, ...
3. use Spin to check all possible runs of the model
4. analyze result, possibly re-work **1.** and **2.**

Activities in SPIN-style Model Checking

1. model (critical aspects of) concurrent/distributed system with PROMELA
2. state crucial properties with assertions, temporal logic, ...
3. use SPIN to check all possible runs of the model
4. analyze result, possibly re-work **1.** and **2.**

Separate concerns of model vs. property! Check the property you want the model to have, not the one it happens to have.

Main Challenges of Modeling

expressiveness

model must be expressive enough to 'embrace' defects the real system could have

simplicity

model must be simple enough to be 'model checkable', theoretically and practically

Modeling Concurrent Systems in Promela

In the SPIN approach,
the cornerstone of modeling concurrent/distributed systems are

PROMELA processes.

Initializing Processes

There is always an initial process prior to all others

often declared *implicitly* using '**active**'.

Initializing Processes

There is always an initial process prior to all others

often declared *implicitly* using '**active**'.

Can be declared *explicitly* with key word '**init**'

```
init {
  printf("Hello␣world\n")
}
```

If *explicit*, **init** is used to start other processes with **run** statement.

Starting Processes

Processes can be started *explicitly* using **run**

```
proctype P() {
  byte local;
  ...
}

init {
  run P();
  run P()
}
```

Each **run** operator starts copy of process (with copy of local variables)

Starting Processes

Processes can be started *explicitly* using **run**

```
proctype P() {
  byte local;
  ...
}

init {
  run P();
  run P()
}
```

Each **run** operator starts copy of process (with copy of local variables)

run `P()` does *not* wait for `P` to finish

Starting Processes

Processes can be started *explicitly* using **run**

```
proctype P() {
  byte local;
  ...
}

init {
  run P();
  run P()
}
```

Each **run** operator starts copy of process (with copy of local variables)

run `P()` does *not* wait for `P` to finish

(PROMELA's **run** corresponds to JAVA's **`start`**, *not* to JAVA's **`run`**)

Atomic Start of Multiple Processes

By convention, **run** operators enclosed in **atomic** block

```
proctype P() {
  byte local;
  ...
}

init {
  atomic {
    run P();
    run P()
  }
}
```

Atomic Start of Multiple Processes

By convention, **run** operators enclosed in **atomic** block

```
proctype P() {
  byte local;
  ...
}

init {
  atomic {
    run P();
    run P()
  }
}
```

Effect: processes only start executing once all are created

Atomic Start of Multiple Processes

By convention, **run** operators enclosed in **atomic** block

```
proctype P() {
  byte local;
  ...
}

init {
  atomic {
    run P();
    run P()
  }
}
```

Effect: processes only start executing once all are created

(More on **atomic** later)

Joining Processes

Following trick allows 'joining': waiting for all processes to finish

```
byte result;

proctype P() {
  ...
}

init {
  atomic {
    run P();
    run P()
  }
  (_nr_pr == 1); /*blocks until join*/
  printf("result␣=%d", result)
}
```

Joining Processes

Following trick allows 'joining': waiting for all processes to finish

```
byte result;

proctype P() {
  ...
}

init {
  atomic {
    run P();
    run P()
  }
  (_nr_pr == 1); /*blocks until join*/
  printf("result␣=%d", result)
}
```

`_nr_pr` built-in variable holding number of running processes

`_nr_pr == 1` only 'this' process (**init**) is (still) running

Process Parameters

Processes may have formal parameters, instantiated by **run**:

```
proctype P(byte id; byte incr) {
  ...
}

init {
  run P(7, 10);
  run P(8, 15)
}
```

Active (Sets of) Processes

init can be made implicit by using the **active** modifier:

```
active proctype P() {
  ...
}
```

Implicit **init** will **run** one copy of P

Active (Sets of) Processes

init can be made implicit by using the **active** modifier:

```
active proctype P() {
  ...
}
```

Implicit **init** will **run** one copy of `P`

```
active [n] proctype P() {
  ...
}
```

Implicit **init** will **run** *n* copies of `P`

Local and Global Data

Variables declared outside of the processes are global to all processes.

Variables declared inside a process are local to that processes.

```
byte n;

proctype P(byte id; byte incr) {
  byte t;
  ...
}
```

`n` is global

`t` is local

Modeling with Global Data

Pragmatics of modeling with global data:

Shared memory of concurrent systems often modeled
by global variables of numeric (or array) type

Status of shared resources (printer, traffic light, ...) often modeled
by global variables of Boolean or enumeration type
(**bool**/**mtype**).

Communication mediums of distributed systems often modeled
by global variables of channel type (**chan**). (next lecture)

Interference on Global Data

```
byte n = 0;

active proctype P() {
  n = 1;
  printf("Process␣P,␣n␣=␣%d\n", n)
}
```

Interference on Global Data

```
byte n = 0;

active proctype P() {
  n = 1;
  printf("Process␣P,␣n␣=␣%d\n", n)
}

active proctype Q() {
  n = 2;
  printf("Process␣Q,␣n␣=␣%d\n", n)
}
```

Interference on Global Data

```
byte n = 0;

active proctype P() {
  n = 1;
  printf("Process␣P,␣n␣=␣%d\n", n)
}

active proctype Q() {
  n = 2;
  printf("Process␣Q,␣n␣=␣%d\n", n)
}
```

How many outputs possible?

Interference on Global Data

```
byte n = 0;

active proctype P() {
  n = 1;
  printf("Process␣P,␣n␣=␣%d\n", n)
}

active proctype Q() {
  n = 2;
  printf("Process␣Q,␣n␣=␣%d\n", n)
}
```

How many outputs possible?

Different processes can interfere on global data

Examples

1. `interleave0.pml`
   SPIN simulation, SPINSPIDER automata + transition system
2. `interleave1.pml`
   SPIN simulation, adding assertion, fine-grained execution model, model checking
3. `interleave5.pml`
   SPIN simulation, SPIN model checking, trail inspection

Synchronization on Global Data

PROMELA has *no synchronization primitives*,
like semaphores, locks, or monitors.

Synchronization on Global Data

PROMELA has *no synchronization primitives*,
like semaphores, locks, or monitors.

Instead, PROMELA inhibits concept of statement executability.

Synchronization on Global Data

PROMELA has *no synchronization primitives*,
like semaphores, locks, or monitors.

Instead, PROMELA inhibits concept of statement executability.

Executability addresses many issues in the interplay of processes.

Synchronization on Global Data

PROMELA has *no synchronization primitives*,
like semaphores, locks, or monitors.

Instead, PROMELA inhibits concept of statement executability.

Executability addresses many issues in the interplay of processes.

Most known synchronization primitives (e.g. test & set, compare & swap, semaphores) can be modeled using executability and atomicity.

Executability

Each statement has the notion of executability.
Executability of basic statements:

statement type	*executable*
assignment	always
assertion	always
print statement	always
expression statement	
send/receive statement	

Executability

Each statement has the notion of executability.
Executability of basic statements:

statement type	*executable*
assignment	always
assertion	always
print statement	always
expression statement	
send/receive statement	

Definition (Expression Statement)

An expression statement is a statement only consisting of an expression.

Executability

Each statement has the notion of executability.
Executability of basic statements:

statement type	*executable*
assignment	always
assertion	always
print statement	always
expression statement	iff value not 0/**false**
send/receive statement	

Definition (Expression Statement)

An expression statement is a statement only consisting of an expression.

Executability

Each statement has the notion of executability.
Executability of basic statements:

statement type	*executable*
assignment	always
assertion	always
print statement	always
expression statement	iff value not `0`/**false**
send/receive statement	(next lecture)

Definition (Expression Statement)

An expression statement is a statement only consisting of an expression.

Executability (Cont'd)

Executability of compound statements:

1

Executability (Cont'd)

Executability of compound statements:

if resp. **do** statement is executable
iff
any of its alternatives[1] is executable

[1] alternative = list of statements

Executability (Cont'd)

Executability of compound statements:

if resp. **do** statement is executable
iff
any of its alternatives[1] is executable

An alternative is executable
iff
its guard (the first statement) is executable

[1] alternative = list of statements

Executability (Cont'd)

Executability of compound statements:

if resp. **do** statement is executable
iff
any of its alternatives[1] is executable

An alternative is executable
iff
its guard (the first statement) is executable
(Recall: in alternatives, "->" syntactic sugar for ";")

[1] alternative = list of statements

Executability (Cont'd)

Executability of compound statements:

if resp. **do** statement is executable
iff
any of its alternatives[1] is executable

An alternative is executable
iff
its guard (the first statement) is executable
(Recall: in alternatives, "->" syntactic sugar for ";")

Revisit `end.pml`

[1] alternative = list of statements

Executability and Blocking

Definition (Blocking)

A statement blocks iff it is *not* executable.
A process blocks iff its location counter points to a blocking statement.

For each step of execution, the scheduler nondeterministically chooses a process to execute

Executability and Blocking

Definition (Blocking)

A statement blocks iff it is *not* executable.
A process blocks iff its location counter points to a blocking statement.

For each step of execution, the scheduler nondeterministically chooses a process to execute among the non-blocking processes.

Executability and Blocking

Definition (Blocking)

A statement blocks iff it is *not* executable.
A process blocks iff its location counter points to a blocking statement.

For each step of execution, the scheduler nondeterministically chooses a process to execute among the non-blocking processes.

Executability, resp. blocking are the key to PROMELA-style modeling of solutions to synchronization problems.

Atomicity

limit the possibility of sequences being interrupted by other processes

weakly atomic sequence

can *only* be interrupted if a statement blocks

strongly atomic sequence

cannot be interrupted at all

Atomicity

limit the possibility of sequences being interrupted by other processes

weakly atomic sequence

can *only* be interrupted if a statement blocks
defined in PROMELA by **atomic**{*list_of_statements*}

strongly atomic sequence

cannot be interrupted at all
defined in PROMELA by **d_step**{*list_of_statements*}

Executability (Cont'd)

atomic resp. **d_step** statement is executable

iff

guard (i.e., the first inner statement) is executable

Deterministic Sequences

d_step:

- strongly atomic
- **d**eterministic (like a single **step**)

Deterministic Sequences

d_step:

- strongly atomic
- **d**eterministic (like a single **step**)
- choices resolved in fixed way (always take the first possible option)
  $\Rightarrow$ avoid choices in **d_step**

Deterministic Sequences

d_step:

- strongly atomic
- **d**eterministic (like a single **step**)
- choices resolved in fixed way (always take the first possible option)
  $\Rightarrow$ avoid choices in **d_step**
- it is an error if any statement within **d_step**,
  other than the first one (called *'guard'*), blocks

```
d_step {
   stmt1; ← guard
   stmt2;
   stmt3
}
```

If `stmt1` blocks, **d_step** is not entered, and blocks as a whole.

It is an error if `stmt2` or `stmt3` block.

(Weakly) Atomic Sequences

atomic:

- weakly atomic
- can be non-deterministic

```
atomic {
    stmt1; ← guard
    stmt2;
    stmt3
}
```

If *guard* blocks, **atomic** is not entered, and blocks as a whole.

Once **atomic** is entered, control is kept until a statement blocks, and only in this case passed to another process.

Prohibit Interference by Atomicity

apply $\mathbf{atomic}$ or $\mathbf{d\_step}$ to interference examples

The Critical Section Problem

Archetypal problem of concurrent systems

Given a number of looping processes, each containing a critical section, design an algorithm such that:

The Critical Section Problem

Archetypal problem of concurrent systems

Given a number of looping processes, each containing a critical section, design an algorithm such that:

Mutual Exclusion At most one process is executing its critical section at any time.

The Critical Section Problem

Archetypal problem of concurrent systems

Given a number of looping processes, each containing a critical section, design an algorithm such that:

Mutual Exclusion At most one process is executing its critical section at any time.

Absence of Deadlock If *some* processes are trying to enter their critical sections, then *one* of them must eventually succeed.

The Critical Section Problem

Archetypal problem of concurrent systems

Given a number of looping processes, each containing a critical section, design an algorithm such that:

Mutual Exclusion At most one process is executing its critical section at any time.

Absence of Deadlock If *some* processes are trying to enter their critical sections, then *one* of them must eventually succeed.

Absence of (individual) Starvation If *any* process tries to enter its critical section, then *that* process must eventually succeed.

Critical Section Pattern

For demonstration and simplicity:
Noncritical and critical sections only **printf** statements

```
active proctype P() {
  do :: printf("P␣non-critical␣actions\n");
        /* begin critical section */
        printf("P␣uses␣shared␣resourses\n")
        /* end critical section */
  od
}

active proctype Q() {
  do :: printf("Q␣non-critical␣actions\n");
        /* begin critical section */
        printf("Q␣uses␣shared␣resourses\n")
        /* end critical section */
  od
}
```

No Mutual Exclusion Yet

More infrastructure to achieve ME.

Adding two Boolean flags:

```
bool P_in_CS = false;
bool Q_in_CS = false;

active proctype P() {
  do :: printf("P non-critical actions\n");
        P_in_CS = true;
        /* begin critical section */
        printf("P uses shared resourses\n");
        /* end critical section */
        P_in_CS = false
  od
}

active proctype Q() {
  ...correspondingly...
}
```

Show Mutual Exclusion VIOLATION with SPIN

adding assertions

```
bool P_in_CS = false;
bool Q_in_CS = false;

active proctype P() {
  do :: printf("P␣non-critical␣actions\n");
        P_in_CS = true;
        /* begin critical section */
        printf("P␣uses␣shared␣resourses\n");
        assert(!Q_in_CS);
        /* end critical section */
        P_in_CS = false
  od
}

active proctype Q() {
    ........assert(!P_in_CS);........
}
```

Mutual Exclusion by Busy Waiting

```
bool P_in_CS = false;
bool Q_in_CS = false;

active proctype P() {
  do :: printf("P␣non-critical␣actions\n");
        P_in_CS = true;
        do :: !Q_in_CS -> break
           :: else -> skip
        od;
        /* begin critical section */
        printf("P␣uses␣shared␣resourses\n");
        assert(!Q_in_CS);
        /* end critical section */
        P_in_CS = false
  od
}

active proctype Q() { ...correspondingly... }
```

Mutual Exclusion by Blocking

Instead of Busy Waiting, process should

1. yield control,
2. continue to run only when exclusion properties becomes true again.

Mutual Exclusion by Blocking

Instead of Busy Waiting, process should

1. yield control,
2. continue to run only when exclusion properties becomes true again.

We can use expression statement `!Q_in_CS`,
to let process `P` block where it should not proceed!

Mutual Exclusion by Blocking

```
active proctype P() {
  do :: printf("P non-critical actions\n");
        P_in_CS = true;
        !Q_in_CS;
        /* begin critical section */
        printf("P uses shared resourses\n");
        assert(!Q_in_CS);
        /* end critical section */
        P_in_CS = false
  od
}

active proctype Q() {
  ...correspondingly...
}
```

Verify Mutual Exclusion of this

Verify with Spin

Verify Mutual Exclusion of this

Verify with SPIN

SPIN error (`invalid end state`)
$\Rightarrow$ deadlock

Verify Mutual Exclusion of this

Verify with SPIN

SPIN error (`invalid end state`)
$\Rightarrow$ deadlock

can make pan ignore the deadlock: `./pan -E`

Verify Mutual Exclusion of this

Verify with Spin

Spin error (`invalid end state`)
$\Rightarrow$ deadlock

can make `pan` ignore the deadlock: `./pan -E`

Spin still reports assertion violation(!)

Proving Mutual Exclusion

In this example:

- mutual exclusion (ME) cannot be shown by SPIN

Proving Mutual Exclusion

In this example:

- mutual exclusion (ME) cannot be shown by SPIN
- `P/Q_in_CS` sufficient for *achieving* ME

Proving Mutual Exclusion

In this example:

- mutual exclusion (ME) cannot be shown by SPIN
- `P/Q_in_CS` sufficient for *achieving* ME
- `P/Q_in_CS` *not* sufficient for *proving* ME

Proving Mutual Exclusion

In this example:

- mutual exclusion (ME) cannot be shown by SPIN
- `P/Q_in_CS` sufficient for *achieving* ME
- `P/Q_in_CS` *not* sufficient for *proving* ME

Need more infrastructure.

Ghost variables: variables for verification, not for modeling

Show Mutual Exclusion with Ghost Variable

```
int critical = 0;

active proctype P() {
  do :: printf("P non-critical actions\n");
        P_in_CS = true;
        !Q_in_CS;
        /* begin critical section */
        critical++;
        printf("P uses shared resourses\n");
        assert(critical < 2);
        critical--;
        /* end critical section */
        P_in_CS = false
  od
}

active proctype Q() {
  ...correspondingly...
}
```

Verify Mutual Exclusion of this

SPIN (`./pan -E`) shows no assertion is violated
$\Rightarrow$ mutual exclusion is verified

Verify Mutual Exclusion of this

SPIN (`./pan -E`) shows no assertion is violated
⇒ mutual exclusion is verified

Still SPIN (without `-E`) reports (`invalid end state`)
⇒ deadlock

Deadlock Hunting

Invalid End State:

- A process does not finish at its end
- OK if it is not crucial to continue – see `end.pml`
- If it is crucial to continue:
  Real deadlock

Deadlock Hunting

Invalid End State:

- A process does not finish at its end
- OK if it is not crucial to continue – see `end.pml`
- If it is crucial to continue:
  Real deadlock

Find Deadlock with SPIN:

- Verify to produce a failing run trail
- Simulate to see how the processes get to the interlock
- Fix the code (not using the end labels nor `-E` option)

Atomicity against Deadlocks

solution:

checking and setting the flag in one atomic step

Atomicity against Deadlocks

solution:

checking and setting the flag in one atomic step

(demonstrate that in `csGhost.pml`)

Atomicity against Deadlocks

solution:

checking and setting the flag in one atomic step

(demonstrate that in `csGhost.pml`)

```
atomic {
  !Q_in_CS;
  P_in_CS = true
}
```

Variations of Critical Section Problem

- Verification artifacts:

Variations of Critical Section Problem

- Verification artifacts:
  - ghost variables ('verification only' variables)

Variations of Critical Section Problem

- Verification artifacts:
  - ghost variables (‘verification only’ variables)
  - temporal logic (later in the course)

Variations of Critical Section Problem

- Verification artifacts:
  - ghost variables ('verification only' variables)
  - temporal logic (later in the course)
- Max n processes allowed in critical section
  modeling possibilities include:

Variations of Critical Section Problem

- Verification artifacts:
  - ghost variables ('verification only' variables)
  - temporal logic (later in the course)
- Max n processes allowed in critical section
  modeling possibilities include:
  - counters instead of booleans

Variations of Critical Section Problem

- Verification artifacts:
  - ghost variables ('verification only' variables)
  - temporal logic (later in the course)
- Max *n* processes allowed in critical section
  modeling possibilities include:
  - counters instead of booleans
  - semaphores (see demo)

Variations of Critical Section Problem

- Verification artifacts:
  - ghost variables ('verification only' variables)
  - temporal logic (later in the course)
- Max *n* processes allowed in critical section
  modeling possibilities include:
  - counters instead of booleans
  - semaphores (see demo)
- More fine grained exclusion conditions, e.g.

Variations of Critical Section Problem

- Verification artifacts:
  - ghost variables ('verification only' variables)
  - temporal logic (later in the course)
- Max n processes allowed in critical section
  modeling possibilities include:
  - counters instead of booleans
  - semaphores (see demo)
- More fine grained exclusion conditions, e.g.
  - several critical sections (Leidestraat in Amsterdam)

Variations of Critical Section Problem

- Verification artifacts:
  - ghost variables ('verification only' variables)
  - temporal logic (later in the course)
- Max n processes allowed in critical section
  modeling possibilities include:
  - counters instead of booleans
  - semaphores (see demo)
- More fine grained exclusion conditions, e.g.
  - several critical sections (Leidestraat in Amsterdam)
  - writers exclude each other and readers
    readers exclude writers, but not other readers

Variations of Critical Section Problem

- Verification artifacts:
  - ghost variables (‘verification only’ variables)
  - temporal logic (later in the course)
- Max *n* processes allowed in critical section
  modeling possibilities include:
  - counters instead of booleans
  - semaphores (see demo)
- More fine grained exclusion conditions, e.g.
  - several critical sections (Leidestraat in Amsterdam)
  - writers exclude each other and readers
    readers exclude writers, but not other readers
  - FIFO queue semaphores, for fairly choosing processes to enter

Variations of Critical Section Problem

- Verification artifacts:
  - ghost variables ('verification only' variables)
  - temporal logic (later in the course)
- Max *n* processes allowed in critical section
  modeling possibilities include:
  - counters instead of booleans
  - semaphores (see demo)
- More fine grained exclusion conditions, e.g.
  - several critical sections (Leidestraat in Amsterdam)
  - writers exclude each other and readers
    readers exclude writers, but not other readers
  - FIFO queue semaphores, for fairly choosing processes to enter
- ... and many more

Why Not Critical Section in Single Atomic Block?

Why Not Critical Section in Single Atomic Block?

- Does not carry over to variations (see previous slide).
- **atomic** only weakly atomic!
- **d_step** excludes any nondeterminism!

Why Not Critical Section in Single Atomic Block?

- Does not carry over to variations (see previous slide).
- **atomic** only weakly atomic!
- **d_step** excludes any nondeterminism!
- Most important: this misses the point.
  We verify effectiveness of **atomic**,
  not of the modeled protection solution!

Why Not Critical Section in Single Atomic Block?

- Does not carry over to variations (see previous slide).
- **atomic** only weakly atomic!
- **d_step** excludes any nondeterminism!
- Most important: this misses the point.
  We verify effectiveness of **atomic**,
  not of the modeled protection solution!

Using **atomic** and **d_step** too heavily, for too large blocks, can result in well-behaved models, while modeling the wrong system.