



1. Context

Real-time systems are difficult to test and their failure leads to dramatic consequences



Model checking is an automatic verification technique to verify the correctness of the system model w.r.t. a property:

- **Verification** procedure: exhaustive search of the state space of the model
 (State: ○; Transition: →)




A model of the system



● is unreachable

A property to be satisfied


- **Checking question:** Does the model of the system satisfy the property?
 Yes No



Counterexample

2. Goal


- Verify real-time systems, modelled by parametric timed automata. Take advantage of high-performance distributed computing for faster verification



→ Design algorithms distributed on a cluster to perform faster
 (Note: Most algorithms use a Master-Worker scheme)

3. System model: Parametric timed automata

- A formalism to model and verify concurrent real-time systems [Alur et al., 1993].
- 1 Parametric timed automaton (parameter) ↔ n. Timed automata (concrete value)




System Behaviour and its Trace Set depend on the values of parameters!


- x:** Clock
- p:** Parameters allow to represent unknown values (e.g. a transmission delay or a timeout)
- Trace set:** set of all sequences of (untimed) actions

4. Checking algorithm: Behavioural cartography

- Exhibit all subparts of the parameter space (system behaviours) (i.e. dense sets of parameter values of the parametric timed automata) [André and Fribourg, 2010]



- Easily check a certain value or a certain trace set for a certain behaviour




Method: Enumerate integer points and generate a tile (use the Inverse Method [André et al., 2009]). All points in a same tile have the same possible behaviours

5. Distribution: High performance distributed algorithms

Solution 1: Point-based distribution


Master sends all the individual points to the Workers [André et al., 2015a, André et al., 2014]. 3 algorithms:



1. **Sequential:** Each point is sent to a worker sequentially
2. **Random:** Points are selected randomly, then switch to Sequential
3. **Shuffle:** Similar to Sequential, but the master must statically compute the array of all points, then shuffle all points, then store them back in the array (new!)

Solution 2: Region-based distribution

Each process is in charge of a set of points (subdomain) [André et al., 2015a]




Static:

- One of the processes splits the domain, then sends to other processes and gathers the results of all processes
- **Drawback:** No load balancing although the workload is irregular


Dynamic:

- A Master is solely responsible for gathering tiles and splitting domain/subdomains
- The master monitors the progress of all workers: it can balance workload (by splitting) between workers

6. Implementation and experiments



- **IMITATOR** [André, Fribourg, Kühne, Soulat, 2012]: Parameter synthesis tool for real-time systems
- **OCaml:** All algorithms implemented in the OCaml language
- **MPI:** Using the OcamlMPI library bindings on top of Open MPI for message-passing between processes
- **Grid'5000:** homogeneous cluster featuring various technologies. Experiments conducted on 2 real clusters: **Pastel** (Toulouse, FR) 140 4-core nodes and **Griffon** (Nancy, FR) 92 8-core nodes



The case studies are a flip-flop circuit, a root contention protocol, some tasks scheduling problems and a networked automation system:

Case study	Flip-flop4	RCP	Sched3-2	Sched3B-2	Sched3B-3	Sched5	SiMoP
Execution time							
Static	33.0	2108.0	4.0	26.6	181.0	213.0	21.4
Seq	2059.0	653.0	4.6	11.0	810.0	219.0	36.1
Random	652.0	635.0	3.6	8.4	524.0	148.0	23.6
Shuffle	670.0	624.0	3.1	7.6	243.0	140.0	18.7
Subdomain	48.0	1286.0	7.2	15.8	217.0	273.0	32.4
Subdomain + H	24.0	622.0	4.0	11.0	81.0	199.0	23.2
Hybrid	24.0	624.0	3.1	7.6	81.0	140.0	18.7

Hybrid: switch between Subdomain + H (≥ 100.000 points) and Shuffle (< 100.000 points)

7. Conclusion and future works

- Proposed a new efficient distributed algorithm + Heuristic for Behavioural Cartography
- Implemented the new algorithms in IMITATOR
- Design an fully distributed scheme for BC (No Master!)
- Try BC in GPU's or CPU+GPU's environments
- Formally prove the deadlock-freeness of our master-worker communication scheme

References

- [Alur et al., 1993] Alur, R., Henzinger, T. A., and Vardi, M. Y. (1993). Parametric real-time reasoning. In *STOC*, pages 592–601. ACM.
- [André et al., 2009] André, É., Chatain, Th., Encrenaz, E., and Fribourg, L. (2009). An inverse method for parametric timed automata. *IJFCS*, 20(5):819–836.
- [André et al., 2014] André, É., Coti, C., and Evangelista, S. (2014). Distributed behavioral cartography of timed automata. In Dongarra, J., Ishikawa, Y., and Aisushi, H., editors, *21st European MPI Users' Group Meeting (EuroMPI/ASIA'14)*, pages 109–114. ACM.
- [André and Fribourg, 2010] André, É. and Fribourg, L. (2010). Behavioral cartography of timed automata. In *RP*, volume 6227 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 76–90. Springer.
- [André et al., 2012] André, É., Fribourg, L., Kühne, U., and Soulat, R. (2012). IMITATOR 2.5: A tool for analyzing robustness in scheduling problems. In *FM*, volume 7436 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 33–36. Springer.
- [André et al., 2015a] André, É., Lipari, C., and Nguyen, H. G. (2015a). Enhanced distributed behavioral cartography of parametric timed automata. In Butler, M. and Conchon, S., editors, *Proceedings of the 7 ICFEM'15, Springer LNCS 9407, November 2015*. Springer.
- [André et al., 2015b] André, É., Lipari, G., Nguyen, H. G., and Sun, Y. (2015b). Reachability preservation based parameter synthesis for timed automata. In Havelund, K., Holzmann, G., and Joshi, R., editors, *Proceedings of the 7th NASA Formal Methods Symposium (NFM'15)*, volume 9058 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 50–65. Springer.