

(Place/Transition) Petri Nets

Hans.VangheLuwe@uantwerpen.be

Finite State Automaton


$$(E, X, f, x_0, F)$$

- E is a finite alphabet
- X is a finite state set
- f is a state transition function,
 $f : X \times E \rightarrow X$
- x_0 is an initial state, $x_0 \in X$
- F is the set of final states

Dynamics (x' is next state):

$$x' = f(x, e)$$

FSA graphical/visual notation: State Transition Diagram



State Automaton


$$(E, X, \Gamma, f, x_0)$$

- E is a countable event set
- X is a countable state space
- $\Gamma(x)$ is the set of feasible or enabled events
 $x \in X, \Gamma(x) \subseteq E$
- f is a state transition function,
 $f : X \times E \rightarrow X$, only defined for $e \in \Gamma(x)$
- x_0 is an initial state, $x_0 \in X$


$$(E, X, \Gamma, f)$$

omits x_0 and describes a class of State Automata.

State Automata for Queueing Systems




Physical View



Abstract View

State Automata for Queueing Systems: customer centered



$$E = \{a, d\}$$


$$X = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$$

$$\Gamma(x) = \{a, d\}, \forall x > 0; \Gamma(0) = \{a\}$$

$$f(x, a) = x + 1, \forall x \geq 0$$

$$f(x, d) = x - 1, \forall x > 0$$

State Automata for Queueing Systems: server centered (with breakdown)




Limitations/extensions of State Automata

- Adding time ?
- Hierarchical modelling ?
- Concurrency by means of $\times$
- States are represented explicitly
- Specifying control logic, synchronisation ?

Petri nets

- Formalism similar to FSA
- Graphical/Visual notation
- C.A. Petri 1960s

Notation invented at age of 13
to describe chemical reaction
networks



Petri nets

- Formalism similar to FSA
- Graphical/Visual notation
- C.A. Petri 1960s
- Additions to FSA:
 - Explicitly (graphically/visually) represent when event is enabled
→ describe control logic
 - Elegant notation of concurrency
 - Express non-determinism

Petri net notation and definition (no dynamics)

$$(P, T, A, w)$$


- $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots\}$ is a finite set of *places*
- $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots\}$ is a finite set of *transitions*
- $A \subseteq (P \times T) \cup (T \times P)$ is a set of *arcs*
- $w : A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a *weight function*

Note: no need for *countable* P and T .

Derived Entities

- $I(t_j) = \{p_i : (p_i, t_j) \in A\}$ set of *input places* to transition t_j
($\equiv$ conditions for transition)
- $O(t_j) = \{p_i : (t_j, p_i) \in A\}$ set of *output places* from transition t_j
($\equiv$ affected by transition)
- Transitions $\equiv$ events
- similarly: input- and output-transitions for p_i
- graphical/visual representation: *Petri net graph* (multigraph)

Example Petri Net



Introducing State: Petri net Markings

- Conditions met ? Use *tokens* in places
- Token assignment $\equiv$ *marking* x

$$x : P \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

- A marked Petri net

$$(P, T, A, w, x_0)$$


x_0 is the *initial marking*

- The *state* $\mathbf{x}$ of a marked Petri net

$$\mathbf{x} = [x(p_1), x(p_2), \dots, x(p_n)]$$

Number of tokens need not be bounded (cfr. State Automata states).

Example Marked Petri Net



$P = \{H, O2, H2O, P3, P4\}$

$T = \{t, T1, T2\}$

$A = \{(H2,t), (O2,t), (O2, T1), (t, H2O), (t, P3), (H2O, T2), (T2, P4)\}$

$w((H2,t)) = 2, w((t, P3)) = 3, w((O2,t)) = w((O2, T1)) = w((t, H2O)) = w((H2O, T2)) = w((T2, P4)) = 1$

$I(t) = \{H, O2\}, I(T1) = \{O2\}, I(T2) = \{H2O\}$

$O(t) = \{P3, H2O\}, O(T1) = \{\}, O(T2) = \{P4\}$

$x = [9, 1, 1, 0, 0]$ corresponding to places $[H, O2, H2O, P3, P4]$

State Space of Marked Petri net

- All n -dimensional vectors of nonnegative integer markings


$$X = \mathbb{N}^n$$

- Transition $t_j \in T$ is *enabled* if

$$x(p_i) \geq w(p_i, t_j), \forall p_i \in I(t_j)$$

Example Marked Petri Net

Enabled transitions in red



Petri Net Dynamics

State Transition Function f of marked Petri net (P, T, A, w, x_0)

$$f : \mathbb{N}^n \times T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^n$$

is defined for transition $t_j \in T$ if and only if

$$x(p_i) \geq w(p_i, t_j), \forall p_i \in I(t_j)$$

If $f(\mathbf{x}, t_j)$ is defined, set $\mathbf{x}' = f(\mathbf{x}, t_j)$ where

$$x'(p_i) = x(p_i) - w(p_i, t_j) + w(t_j, p_i)$$

- State transition function f based on *structure* of Petri net
- Number of tokens *need not be conserved* (but can)

Algebraic Description of Dynamics

- Firing vector $\mathbf{u}$: transition j firing

$$\mathbf{u} = [0, 0, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$$

- Incidence matrix $\mathbf{A}$:


$$a_{ji} = w(t_j, p_i) - w(p_i, t_j)$$

- State Equation

$$\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{uA}$$

Example Marked Petri Net


Enabled transitions in red



Semantics

- *sequential vs. parallel*
- Handle nondeterminism:
 1. User choice
 2. Priorities
 3. Probabilities (Monte Carlo)
 4. Reachability Graph (enumerate all choices)


Example Marked Petri Net



$S0 = [9, 1, 1, 0, 0]$
 $S1 = [9, 1, 0, 0, 1]$
 $S2 = [9, 0, 1, 0, 0]$
 $S3 = [7, 0, 2, 3, 0]$
 $S4 = [9, 0, 0, 0, 1]$
 $S5 = [7, 0, 1, 3, 1]$
 $S6 = [7, 0, 0, 3, 2]$

Marking corresponds to [H, O₂, H₂O, P₃, P₄]

Example Marked Petri Net




$S0 = [9, 1, 1, 0, 0]$
 $S1 = [9, 1, 0, 0, 1]$
 $S2 = [9, 0, 1, 0, 0]$
 $S3 = [7, 0, 2, 3, 0]$
 $S4 = [9, 0, 0, 0, 1]$
 $S5 = [7, 0, 1, 3, 1]$
 $S6 = [7, 0, 0, 3, 2]$


Reachability graph =
 compact notation of all possible “sample paths” (behaviour traces) =

$\{ S0 \text{ -}T1\text{ -}> S2 \text{ -}T2\text{ -}> S4, S0 \text{ -}T2\text{ -}> S1 \text{ -}T1\text{ -}> S4,$
 $S0 \text{ -}T2\text{ -}> S1 \text{ -}t\text{ -}> S5 \text{ -}T2\text{ -}> S6, S0 \text{ -}t\text{ -}> S3 \text{ -}T2\text{ -}> S5 \text{ -}T2\text{ -}> S6 \}$


Pattern: sequence



Pattern: sequence





Pattern: sequence




Semantics

- *sequential vs. parallel*
- Handle nondeterminism:
 1. User choice
 2. Priorities
 3. Probabilities (Monte Carlo)
 4. Reachability Graph (enumerate all choices)


Pattern: sequence




Pattern: sequence



Pattern: sequence



Pattern: sequence



$S0 = [2, 0, 0]$

$S1 = [1, 1, 0]$


$S2 = [1, 0, 1]$

$S3 = [0, 2, 0]$


$S4 = [0, 1, 1]$

$S5 = [0, 0, 2]$


Pattern: split



Pattern: split



Pattern: split




Pattern: split




$S0 = [1, 0, 0]$

$S1 = [0, 1, 1]$


Pattern: join



Pattern: join



Pattern: join




Pattern: join




$S0 = [1, 1, 0]$

$S1 = [0, 0, 1]$



Pattern: conflict, choice, decision



Pattern: conflict, choice, decision



Pattern: conflict, choice, decision



Pattern: conflict, choice, decision




$S0 = [1, 0, 0]$


$S1 = [0, 0, 1]$

$S2 = [0, 1, 0]$


parallel independence, confluence




parallel independence, confluence



parallel independence, confluence




parallel independence, confluence



“parallel independence”

“confluence”

“diamond” pattern




$S0 = [1, 0, 1, 0]$

$S1 = [0, 1, 1, 0]$


$S2 = [1, 0, 0, 1]$

$S3 = [0, 1, 0, 1]$



critical section, semaphore, mutex




critical section, semaphore, mutex




critical section, semaphore, mutex



critical section, semaphore, mutex




critical section, semaphore, mutex



$S0 = [1, 0, 1, 0, 1]$
 $S1 = [1, 0, 0, 1, 0]$
 $S2 = [0, 1, 0, 0, 1]$

critical section, semaphore, mutex



$S0 = [1, 0, 1, 0, 1]$


$S1 = [1, 0, 0, 1, 0]$

$S2 = [0, 1, 0, 0, 1]$


$[*, 1, *, 1, *]$

reachable in some path?


Infinite Capacity Petri net




Infinite Capacity Petri net




Finite Capacity Petri net (FC P/T PN)




Finite Capacity Petri net (FC P/T PN)



Finite Capacity Petri net
as augmented Infinite Capacity Petri net?




Finite Capacity Petri net as augmented Infinite Capacity Petri net




Finite Capacity Petri net as augmented Infinite Capacity Petri net

1. Add complimentary place p' with initial marking $x_0(p') = K(p) - x_0(p)$
 2. Between each transition t and complimentary places p'
 - add arcs (t, p') or (p', t) where
 - $w(t, p') = w(p, t)$
 - $w(p', t) = w(t, p)$
- same “expressiveness”
- Finite Capacity is “syntactic sugar”

P/T PN with **Inhibitor Arc** (makes Turing equiv.)



P/T PN with Inhibitor Arc (makes Turing equiv.)




$$S_0 = [2, 0, 0]$$



$$S_1 = [1, 0, 1]$$

$$S_2 = [0, 0, 2]$$

P/T PN with Inhibitor Arc (finite capacity)



P/T PN with Inhibitor Arc (finite capacity)





Representing a Petri net as a State Machine

Construct Reachability Graph

- Reachability Graph is State Machine
- States are tuples $(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$
- Events correspond to t_i firing
- May be infinite (both in size and in marking ω)

Finite State Automaton represented as a Petri Net



[0c, 10c, 20c, 30c, 40c, 50c]

S0 = [1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]

S1 = [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]

S2 = [0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0]

S3 = [0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0]

S4 = [0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0]

S5 = [0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0]

modelling the “current state” of an FSA → single token


Representing a State Machine as a Petri net

1. no output
2. with output



⇒ automatic (though inefficient) transformation

FSA without output


$c \rightarrow f \rightarrow e$





FSA without output




FSA without output





FSA without output




FSA with output (and communication)



FSA with output (and communication)





Fairness, Time ... TPPN, TTPN



Time slice
DT-cnd

Colour




ALG

CPN


SYNTHESIS

<http://cpntools.org/>

Petri net models for Queueing Systems




Physical View





Abstract View

Capacity Constraints for Resource Conservation

Simple Server/Queue



Simple Server/Queue




$S0 = [0, 1, 0]$

$S1 = [\omega, 1, 0]$


$S2 = [\omega, 0, 1]$

[queue, idle, busy]



Simple Server/Queue departure modelled explicitly



Simple Server/Queue with server breakdown (and repair)



Simple Server/Queue with server breakdown (and repair)



Modular Composition: Communication Protocol


Build incrementally:

1. Single transmitter: FSA vs. Petri net
2. Two transmitters competing for channel


Pros/Cons of Petri net models (depends on goals !):

- Petri net is more complex than FSA for single transmitter
- More insight
- Incremental modelling
- Modular modelling
- Intuitive modelling of concurrency


Single Transmitter FSA




Single transmitter




Single transmitter





Single transmitter





Single transmitter




Single transmitter



Two independent transmitters



Two transmitters competing for a single communication channel



Analysis of Petri nets

of **properties** of interest

Analysis of *logical* or *qualitative* behaviour.


Resource sharing $\Rightarrow$ *fair* usage of resources:

- Boundedness
- Conservation
- Liveness and Deadlock
- State Reachability
- State Coverability
- Persistence
- Language Recognition


Boundedness

- Example: upper bound on number of customers in queue.
- Definition: A place $p_i \in P$ in a Petri net with initial state $\mathbf{x}_0$ is *k-bounded* or *k-safe* if $x(p_i) \leq k$ for all states in all possible sample paths.
- A 1-bounded place is called *safe*.
- If a place is *k-bounded* for some *k*, the place is *bounded*.
- If all places are bounded, the Petri net is *bounded*.

Bounded vs. Unbounded




Conservation (invariants)



Sum of **busy** and **idle** marking is *constant* across *all* sample paths

Conservation (invariants): weighted sum



Conservation

A Petri net with initial state x_0 is
conservative with respect to $\gamma = [\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n]$ if


$$\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x(p_i) = \text{constant}$$

for all states in all possible sample paths.

Liveness and Deadlock


- Cyclic dependency $\Rightarrow$ wait indefinitely
- Deadlock
- Deadlock avoidance: avoid certain states in sample paths

Deadlock in queueing system with rework




$[\text{queueFree}, \text{queue}, \text{rework}] = [0, 1, 1] \rightarrow \text{deadlock}$

Deadlock in queueing system with rework




$[\text{queueFree}, \text{queue}, \text{rework}] = [0, 1, 1] \rightarrow \text{deadlock}$

Deadlock in queueing system with rework




$[\text{queueFree}, \text{queue}, \text{rework}] = [0, 1, 1] \rightarrow \text{deadlock}$

Deadlock resolved (avoided)



Deadlock resolved (avoided)




Liveness


Given initial state $\mathbf{x}_0$, a transition in a Petri net is:

- L0-live (dead): if the transition can never fire.
- L1-live: if there is some firing sequence from $\mathbf{x}_0$ such that the transition can fire at least once.
- L2-live: if the transition can fire at least k times for some given positive integer k .
- L3-live: if there exists some infinite firing sequence in which the transition appears infinitely often.
- L4-live: if the transition is L1-live for every possible state reached from $\mathbf{x}_0$.

Liveness example



Liveness example





T0 is L1-live

T1 is dead

T2 is L3-live, not L4-live

Liveness example



$S_0 = [1, 0]$

$S_1 = [0, 1]$

T_0 is L1-live

T_1 is dead

T_2 is L3-live, not L4-live

State Reachability

- A state $\mathbf{x}$ in a Petri net is *reachable* from a state $\mathbf{x}_0$ if there exists a sequence of transitions starting at $\mathbf{x}_0$ such that the state eventually becomes $\mathbf{x}$.
- Build/use reachability graph.
- Deadlock avoidance is a special case of reachability.

State Coverability

- In a Petri net with initial state $\mathbf{x}_0$, a state $\mathbf{y}$ is *coverable* if there exists a sequence of transitions starting at $\mathbf{x}_0$ such that the state eventually becomes $\mathbf{x}$ and $x(p_i) \geq y(p_i)$.
- Related to L1-liveness: *minimum number of tokens required* to enable a transition.

Coverability Notation

- Root node
- Terminal node
- Duplicate node

Coverability Notation

- Node *dominance*

$$\mathbf{x} = [x(p_1), x(p_2), \dots, x(p_n)]$$

$$\mathbf{y} = [y(p_1), y(p_2), \dots, y(p_n)]$$

$\mathbf{x} >_d \mathbf{y}$ ($\mathbf{x}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}$) if

1. $x(p_i) \geq y(p_i), \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$
2. $x(p_i) > y(p_i)$ for at least some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$

- The symbol ω represents *infinity*

$$\mathbf{x} >_d \mathbf{y}$$


For all i such that $x(p_i) > y(p_i)$, replace $x(p_i)$ by ω

$$\omega + k = \omega = \omega - k$$



Coverability Tree Construction

1. Initialize $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_0$ (initial state)
2. For each new node $\mathbf{x}$,
evaluate the transition function $f(\mathbf{x}, t_i)$ for all $t_j \in T$:
 - (a) if $f(\mathbf{x}, t_j)$ is undefined for all $t_j \in T$, then $\mathbf{x}$ is a terminal node.
 - (b) if $f(\mathbf{x}, t_j)$ is defined for some $t_j \in T$,
create a new node $\mathbf{x}' = f(\mathbf{x}, t_j)$.
 - i. if $x(p_i) = \omega$ for some p_i , set $x'(p_i) = \omega$.
 - ii. If there exists a node $\mathbf{y}$ in the path from root node $\mathbf{x}_0$ (included) to $\mathbf{x}$ such that $\mathbf{x}' >_d \mathbf{y}$, set $x'(p_i) = \omega$ for all p_i such that $x'(p_i) > y(p_i)$
 - iii. Otherwise, set $\mathbf{x}' = f(\mathbf{x}, t_j)$.
3. Stop if all new nodes are either *terminal* or *duplicate*



Example





Reachability Tree (Graph)





Reachability Tree (Graph)






Coverability Tree





Coverability Tree






Coverability Tree (Graph)



Reachability Tree/Graph vs. Coverability Tree (Graph)



Reachability Tree/Graph vs. Coverability Tree (Graph)



analysis property: reachable $[1, 0, 3, 0]$




can this question be answered?

Applications of the Coverability Tree

- Boundedness: ω does not appear in coverability tree
- Bounded Petri net $\Rightarrow$ reachability graph
- Conservation: $\gamma_i = 0$ for ω positions
- Inverse problem: what are γ and C ?
- Coverability: inspect coverability tree
- Limitations: deadlock detection

specifying and checking properties over **all** traces


2001WETFSP “specification and verification”



Principles of Model Checking,
Christel Baier and Joost-Pieter Katoen.
MIT Press, 2008.

Chapter 5

Marked Petri Net



$P = \{H, O2, H2O, P3, P4\}$

$T = \{t, T1, T2\}$

$A = \{(H2,t), (O2,t), (O2, T1), (t, H2O), (t, P3), (H2O, T2), (T2, P4)\}$


$w((H2,t)) = 2, w((t, P3)) = 3, w((O2,t)) = w((O2, T1)) = w((t, H2O)) = w((H2O, T2)) = w((T2, P4)) = 1$

$I(t) = \{H, O2\}, I(T1) = \{O2\}, I(T2) = \{H2O\}$

$O(t) = \{P3, H2O\}, O(T1) = \{\}, O(T2) = \{P4\}$

$x = [9, 1, 1, 0, 0]$ corresponding to places $[H, O2, H2O, P3, P4]$

Marked Petri Net semantics: behaviour traces



$S0 = [9, 1, 1, 0, 0]$
 $S1 = [9, 1, 0, 0, 1]$
 $S2 = [9, 0, 1, 0, 0]$
 $S3 = [7, 0, 2, 3, 0]$
 $S4 = [9, 0, 0, 0, 1]$
 $S5 = [7, 0, 1, 3, 1]$
 $S6 = [7, 0, 0, 3, 2]$

Reachability graph =
compact notation of **all possible** “sample paths” (**behaviour traces**) =

$\{ S0 \xrightarrow{T1} S2 \xrightarrow{T2} S4, S0 \xrightarrow{T2} S1 \xrightarrow{T1} S4,$
 $S0 \xrightarrow{T2} S1 \xrightarrow{t} S5 \xrightarrow{T2} S6, S0 \xrightarrow{t} S3 \xrightarrow{T2} S5 \xrightarrow{T2} S6 \}$

Linear Temporal Logic (LTL, Amir Pnueli in 1977): specifying properties over (behaviour) **traces**

LTL formulas:

$$\varphi ::= \text{true} \mid a \mid \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \mid \neg \varphi \mid \bigcirc \varphi \mid \varphi_1 \mathbf{U} \varphi_2$$


- a = atomic proposition
- $\bigcirc$ = “next”: φ is true at next step
- $\mathbf{U}$ = “until”: φ_2 is true at some point, φ_1 is true until that time

Operator precedence

- Unary bind stronger than binary
- $\mathbf{U}$ takes precedence over $\wedge$, $\vee$ and $\rightarrow$

(behaviour) **trace**

Formula evaluation: evaluate LTL propositions over a sequence of states (path):




- Same notation as linear time properties: $\sigma \models \varphi$ (path “satisfies” specification)

“Primary” temporal logic operators

F Eventually $\Diamond\phi := \text{true} \cup \phi$ ϕ will become true at some point in the future

G Always $\Box\phi := \neg\Diamond\neg\phi$ ϕ is always true; “(never (eventually ($\neg\phi$)))”



Some common composite operators


- $p \rightarrow \Diamond q$ p implies eventually q (response)
- $p \rightarrow q \cup r$ p implies q until r (precedence)
- $\Box\Diamond p$ always eventually p (progress)
- $\Diamond\Box p$ eventually always p (stability)
- $\Diamond p \rightarrow \Diamond q$ eventually p implies eventually q (correlation)

Operator precedence

- Unary binds stronger than binary
- Bind from right to left:
 $\Box\Diamond p = (\Box(\Diamond p))$
 $p \cup q \cup r = p \cup (q \cup r)$
- $\cup$ takes precedence over $\wedge$, $\vee$ and $\rightarrow$

System description

- Focus on lights in on particular direction
- Light can be any of three colors: green, yellow, red
- Atomic propositions = light color



Ordering specifications

- Liveness: “traffic light is green infinitely often”

$$\Box \Diamond \text{green}$$

- Chronological ordering: “once red, the light cannot become green immediately”

$$\Box (\text{red} \rightarrow \neg \bigcirc \text{green})$$

- More detailed: “once red, the light always becomes green eventually after being yellow for some time”

$$\Box (\text{red} \rightarrow (\Diamond \text{green} \wedge (\neg \text{green} \cup \text{yellow})))$$


$$\Box (\text{red} \rightarrow \bigcirc (\text{red} \cup (\text{yellow} \wedge \bigcirc (\text{yellow} \cup \text{green}))))$$

Progress property


- Every request will eventually lead to a response

$$\Box (\text{request} \rightarrow \Diamond \text{response})$$

process 1



process 2




Property: Process 1 and process 1 are never both in their critical sections at the same time (mutual exclusion)


$$\square \neg (x(\text{critical}_1) == 1 \wedge x(\text{critical}_2) == 1)$$

$$\square (\neg(x(\text{critical}_1) == 1) \vee \neg(x(\text{critical}_2) == 1))$$

process 1



process 2



Property: Process 1 and process 1 are never both in their critical sections at the same time (mutual exclusion)


$$\square \neg ((x(\text{critical}_1) == 1) \wedge (x(\text{critical}_2) == 1))$$

$$\square (\neg (x(\text{critical}_1) == 1) \vee \neg (x(\text{critical}_2) == 1))$$


forall paths (CTL)

$$\forall \square \neg ((x(\text{critical}_1) == 1) \wedge (x(\text{critical}_2) == 1))$$

process 1



process 2



semaphore

Property: Neither process monopolizes the critical section (fairness)


$$\square ((x(\text{critical}_1) == 1) \longrightarrow \Diamond (x(\text{critical}_2) == 1))$$

$$\square ((x(\text{critical}_1) == 1) \longrightarrow \Diamond \neg (x(\text{critical}_1) == 1))$$

$$\square ((x(\text{critical}_2) == 1) \longrightarrow \Diamond (x(\text{critical}_1) == 1))$$

Computation(al) Tree Logic (CTL)

non-deterministic behaviour
leads to branches
in the behaviour trace



for all paths
(universal quantification)

$\forall$ PATHS $A F [0, 2, 0]$

there exists a path
(existential quantification)

$\exists$ A PATH $E F [0, 1, 0]$




TAPAAL: Tool for Verification of Timed-Arc Petri Nets

TAPAAL is a tool for

- modelling, simulation and verification of
- **Timed-Arc Petri nets**
- developed at Department of Computer Science at **AAL**borg University in Denmark
- and available for Linux, Windows and Mac OS X platforms.

Timed-Arc Petri Net (TAPN) is a time extension of the classical [Petri net model](#) (a commonly used graphical model of distributed computations introduced by [Carl Adam Petri](#) in his dissertation in 1962). The time extension we consider allows for explicit modelling of real-time, which is associated with the tokens in the net (each token has its own age) and arcs from places to transitions are labelled by time intervals that restrict the age of tokens that can be used in order to fire the respective transition. In TAPAAL tool a further extension of this model with age invariants, urgent transitions, transport arcs (which are more expressive than for example previously considered read-arcs) and with inhibitor arcs is implemented.

The TAPAAL tool offers a graphical editor for drawing TAPN models, simulator for experimenting with the designed nets and a verification environment that automatically answers logical queries formulated in a subset of [CTL logic](#) (essentially EF, EG, AF, AG formulae without nesting). It also allows the user to check whether a given net is k-bounded for a given number k. The newest version of TAPAAL is now equipped with three open source verification engines distributed together with TAPAAL (for continuous time semantics, discrete time semantics and a new efficient engine for the verification of untimed nets supporting both CTL and LTL logics.). It is also possible to model two-player games, both with and without time features. Optionally, the user can automatically translate TAPAAL models into [UPPAAL](#) and rely on the UPPAAL verification engine.




<https://www.tapaaal.net/>


Signal Temporal Logic (STL)

Always $|x| > 0.5 \Rightarrow$ after 1 s, $|x|$ settles under 0.5 for 1.5 s

$$\varphi := G(x[t] > .5 \rightarrow F_{[0,1]} (G_{[0,1.5]} x[t] < 0.5))$$



Signal Temporal Logic (STL) for **run-time monitoring** of Hybrid Systems



From "On Signal Temporal Logic" lecture by Alexandre Donzé. EECS114@UCB. 2013

Tools:

- breach (Matlab toolbox)
<https://github.com/decyphir/breach>
- RTAMT
<https://github.com/nickovic/rtamt>


automated and Simulation based functional safety Engineering meThodology (aSET)

System Contract

```
Contract TR57{  
  longname "Logic vehicle dynamics EDL state"  
  [...]  
  scope Globally  
  pattern ResponsePattern:  
    if receiveDataCAN has-occurred,  
      then-in-response vehicle_EDL_State  
        eventually-occurs within 50ms  
  generate-STL  
}
```

+


System Architecture



=

Simulation and verification of contract

(DWS[t]==1) and (vehicleEDLState[t]==EDL_OPEN)



Indicates whether (and when) contract is satisfied by the trace

DSL for contract specification

```
Contract FR07{  
    longname "Response to driver locking command"  
    description "The system must close the EDL after  
                receiving a locking command from the driver."  
  
    statements{  
        Event driver_lock :=  
            Port driverCommands_closingRequest == True,  
        Property close_EDL :=  
            EDL_STATE in Set{State EDLphysicalSyst_CloseEDL}  
    }  
    scope Globally  
    pattern ResponsePattern:  
        if driver_lock has-occurred, then-in-response  
            close_EDL eventually-occurs  
    generate-STL  
}
```