

DCR Execution Equivalence

Søren Debois & Axel Christfort

May 26, 2024

Abstract

We present an Isabelle formalization of the basics of DCR-graphs [1] before defining *Execution Equivalent* markings. We then prove that execution equivalent markings are perfectly interchangeable during process execution, yielding significant state-space reduction for execution-based model-checking of DCR graphs.

Contents

1 DCR processes	1
1.1 Execution semantics	2
1.2 Execution Equivalence	3

```
theory DCRExecutionEquivalence
  imports Main
begin
```

1 DCR processes

Although we use the term "process", the present theory formalises DCR graphs as defined in the original places and other papers.

type-synonym *event* = *nat*

The static structure. This encompasses the relations, the set of event *dom* of the process, and the labelling function *lab*. We do not explicitly enforce that relations and marking are confined to this set, except in definitions of enabledness and execution below.

record *rels* =

```
  cond :: event rel
  pend :: event rel
  incl :: event rel
  excl :: event rel
```

mist :: event rel

dom :: event set

The dynamic structure, called the marking

record *marking* =

Ex :: event set

In :: event set

Re :: event set

It will be convenient to have notation for the events required, excluded, etc. by a given event.

abbreviation *conds* :: rels \Rightarrow event \Rightarrow event set

where

$conds\ T\ e \equiv \{ f . (f,e) \in cond\ T \}$

abbreviation *excls* :: rels \Rightarrow event \Rightarrow event set

where

$excls\ T\ e \equiv \{ x . (e,x) \in excl\ T \wedge (e,x) \notin incl\ T \}$

abbreviation *incls* :: rels \Rightarrow event \Rightarrow event set

where

$incls\ T\ e \equiv \{ x . (e,x) \in incl\ T \}$

abbreviation *resps* :: rels \Rightarrow event \Rightarrow event set

where

$resps\ T\ e \equiv \{ f . (e,f) \in pend\ T \}$

abbreviation *mists* :: rels \Rightarrow event \Rightarrow event set

where

$mists\ T\ e \equiv \{ f . (f,e) \in mist\ T \}$

Similarly, it is convenient to be able to identify directly the currently excluded events.

1.1 Execution semantics

definition *enabled* :: rels \Rightarrow marking \Rightarrow event \Rightarrow bool

where

$enabled\ T\ M\ e \equiv$

$e \in In\ M \wedge$

$(conds\ T\ e \cap In\ M) - Ex\ M = \{\}$ \wedge

$(mists\ T\ e \cap In\ M) - (dom\ T - Re\ M) = \{\}$

definition *execute* :: rels \Rightarrow marking \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow marking

where

```

execute T M e ≡ (|
  Ex = Ex M ∪ { e },
  In = (In M - excls T e) ∪ incl T e,
  Re = (Re M - { e }) ∪ resps T e
|)

```

1.2 Execution Equivalence

definition *accepting* :: marking ⇒ bool **where**
accepting M = (Re M ∩ In M = {})

fun *acceptingrun* :: rels ⇒ marking ⇒ event list ⇒ bool **where**
acceptingrun T M [] = *accepting* M
| *acceptingrun* T M (e#t) = (enabled T M e ∧ *acceptingrun* T (execute T M e) t)

definition *all-conds* :: rels ⇒ nat set **where**
all-conds T = { fst rel | rel . rel ∈ cond T }

definition *execution-equivalent* :: rels ⇒ marking ⇒ marking ⇒ bool **where**
execution-equivalent T M1 M2 = (
 (In M1 = In M2) ∧
 (Re M1 = Re M2) ∧
 ((Ex M1 ∩ *all-conds* T) = (Ex M2 ∩ *all-conds* T))
)

lemma *conds-subset-eq-all-conds*: conds T e ⊆ *all-conds* T
using *all-conds-def* **by** *auto*

lemma *ex-equiv-over-cond*: (Ex M1 ∩ *all-conds* T) = (Ex M2 ∩ *all-conds* T) ⇒
(Ex M1 ∩ conds T e) = (Ex M2 ∩ conds T e)
using *conds-subset-eq-all-conds* **by** *blast*

lemma *enabled-ex-equiv*:
assumes *execution-equivalent* T M1 M2 *enabled* T M1 e
shows *enabled* T M2 e

proof –

from *assms*(1) **have**
(Ex M1 ∩ *all-conds* T) = (Ex M2 ∩ *all-conds* T)
by (*simp add: execution-equivalent-def*)

hence *ex-eq*:
(Ex M1 ∩ conds T e) = (Ex M2 ∩ conds T e)
using *ex-equiv-over-cond* **by** *metis*

from *assms*(1) **have** *in-eq*:
In M1 = In M2
by (*simp add: execution-equivalent-def*)

from *assms*(2) **have**
(conds T e ∩ In M1) ⊆ Ex M1
by(*simp-all add: enabled-def*)

hence

$(conds\ T\ e \cap In\ M1) \cap (conds\ T\ e) \subseteq Ex\ M1 \cap (conds\ T\ e)$
by auto
hence
 $(conds\ T\ e \cap In\ M1) \subseteq Ex\ M1 \cap (conds\ T\ e)$
by auto
hence
 $(conds\ T\ e \cap In\ M2) \subseteq Ex\ M2 \cap (conds\ T\ e)$
using ex-eq in-eq by auto
hence
 $(conds\ T\ e \cap In\ M2) \subseteq Ex\ M2$
by simp
then show ?thesis
using enabled-def assms in-eq execution-equivalent-def by auto
qed

lemma execute-ex-equiv:

assumes *execution-equivalent* $T\ M1\ M2$ *execute* $T\ M1\ e = M3$ *execute* $T\ M2\ e = M4$

shows *execution-equivalent* $T\ M3\ M4$

proof –

from assms have

$In\ M3 = In\ M4$

using execute-def execution-equivalent-def by fastforce

moreover from assms have

$Re\ M3 = Re\ M4$

using execute-def execution-equivalent-def by force

ultimately show ?thesis using assms execute-def execution-equivalent-def by fastforce

qed

lemma accepting-ex-equiv: *execution-equivalent* $T\ M1\ M2 \implies$ *accepting* $M1 \implies$ *accepting* $M2$

by (simp add: accepting-def execution-equivalent-def)

theorem acceptingrun-ex-equiv:

assumes *acceptingrun* $T\ M1$ *seq execution-equivalent* $T\ M1\ M2$

shows *acceptingrun* $T\ M2$ *seq*

using assms

proof(*induction seq arbitrary: M1 M2 rule: acceptingrun.induct*)

case (1 $T\ M$)

then show ?case

by (simp add: accepting-ex-equiv)

next

case (2 $T\ M\ e\ t$)

then show ?case proof –

from 2(2) obtain $M1e$ where $m1e$:

$M1e = execute\ T\ M1\ e$

by blast

hence $m1e$ -accept:

```

    acceptingrun T M1e t
  using 2(2) acceptingrun.simps(2) by blast
obtain M2e where
  M2e = execute T M2 e
  by blast
moreover from this m1e have
  execution-equivalent T M1e M2e
  using 2(3) execute-ex-equiv by blast
moreover from this have
  acceptingrun T M2e t
  using 2(1) m1e-accept by blast
ultimately show ?thesis using 2(2) enabled-ex-equiv 2(3) acceptingrun.simps(2)
by blast
qed
qed

end

```

References

- [1] C. O. Back, T. Slaats, T. T. Hildebrandt, and M. Marquard. Discover: accurate and efficient discovery of declarative process models. *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer*, pages 1–25, 2021.