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Why?

- From requirements to design specification (at least for the **behavioral aspect**): ensure consistency by construction
- Incremental design of SDL specifications (Add traces in a stepwise manner)

```
MSC_0  →  SDL_0  →  SDL_1  →  SDL_2  ...
+       +       +       
MSC_1   MSC_2
```

- Enrich existing SDL specification without modifying the architecture → adding services ("service creation")
Basic Approach: Introduction

Process P1

Process P2
Basic Approach: issues

- MSC specifies required order of sending and consumption of messages

Translation seems straightforward!

However …
Basic Approach: issues

- DOES NOT specify how process instances communicate
- The actual arrival depends on the communication architecture
- The given SDL architecture defines the communication architecture
- Even with a defined communication architecture the actual arrival of messages (signals) into SDL process instance queue may be different from the consumption order
- Straightforward translation may lead to deadlocks because of SDL implicit transitions...
Basic Approach: issues

Two different architectures
Basic Approach: Key Concepts

- For each process, generate an SDL skeleton with the sending and receiving transitions as specified in the bMSC, BUT keep in mind all the possible arrival orders to the input queue **according to the given architecture**
- Avoid implicit transition for signals that will be consumed later
- **APPROPRIATE USE of “SAVE”:** If process instance is expecting signal \(y\), then “any” other signal that MAY BE in the queue and ahead of \(y\) is saved
- 3 Main steps in the translation algorithm
Basic Approach: Step 1

• First step: Ordering of events *
  – define a transitive earlier relation \( e_i \ll e_j \) means \( e_i \) occurs earlier in time than \( e_j \)
  – two rules:
    • for each MSC instance, events are totally ordered
    • the sending event of a message occurs earlier than its reception
  – Transitive closure of the order relation is independent from the architecture

* Similar to Holzman and Alur et al. in their work on race conditions
Example: Step 1

\[ (e_i, e_j) = T \text{ means } e_i << e_j \]
Basic Approach: Step 2

- Build “receive queues”
  - For each process, in order to view the possible arrival orders of incoming signals, we view its input queue as a set of parallel FIFO queues. Each queue correspond to one incoming channel
  - Algorithm creates a table for each process:
    • 1 column for each “receive queue” (for each incoming channel)
    • a row for each input event (and only input events)
    • for each instance $P_i$ in the MSC
      - for each output event $e_s$ sending signal $m$ to $P_j$
        » find the related input event $e_r$ in $P_j$
        » for each input event $e_k$ in instance $P_j$
          if not($e_k << e_s$) and not($e_r << e_k$),
          add signal $m$ to the appropriate “receive queue”
Example: Step 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Input Signal</th>
<th>$Q_{1,2,1}$</th>
<th>$Q_{3,2,1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$e_3$</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x,y</td>
<td>z,w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e_4$</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>z,w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e_5$</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e_6$</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Receive queues” table for process $P_2$
Basic Approach: Step 3

- Generate SDL code (use of SAVE)
- for each instance $P_i$ in the MSC diagram
  - for each event $e_j$
    - if $e_j$ is an output event generate an SDL output
    - else if $e_j$ is an input event of signal $m$
      - generate an SDL input for message $m$
      - for each “receive queue” of $P_i$ (except the queue to which $m$ belongs), generate an SDL SAVE for all the messages in the queue

[THESE MESSAGES MAY ARRIVE INTO $P_i$ INPUT QUEUE BEFORE $m$]
Example: Step 3

SDL specification of process $P_2$
Extensions

• Inline constructs:
  – alt
  – opt
  – seq,
  – loop, etc.
Extensions: Alt construct

Example 1
Extensions: Alt Construct

Generated SDL processes for Example 1

- **process Sender**
  - any
  - b
  - a
  - d
  - c

- **process Receiver**
  - b
  - d
  - a
  - c
Extensions: Alt Construct

Example 2: Problems!
Extensions: A Second alt Example

Example 3:
Problems!
Extension: Overtaking

Example 4: Problems!

![Diagram showing interactions between senders and receivers with blocks B1 and B2.]}
Communication hierarchy

Every message ⟷ one channel

Non-Implementable

Implementable

Non-Implementable

No-buf: synchronous

Communication Hierarchy from Engels et al. [PSTV/FORTE’ 97]
Example 5

Cannot be implemented with full synchronization or msg-models.
Compatibility between MSCs

• Related to implementability

• Two MSCs are compatible, if they can be implemented in the same architecture.

• MSC Composition Operators?
Compatibility between MSCs (cont.)

These two MSCs are incompatible.
Compatibility between MSCs (cont.)

These two MSCs are incompatible.
Discussion

• Different issues simultaneously: translation, Implementability, compatibility

• Data part?

• Environment for enriching SDL specifications: use ObjectGeode Internal Representation

• A basis for maintaining code ...

• Work is still in progress ...