## Semantics and Verification 2006

#### Lecture 2

- informal introduction to CCS
- syntax of CCS
- semantics of CCS

# CCS Basics (Sequential Fragment)

- Nil (or 0) process (the only atomic process)
- action prefixing (a.P)
- ullet names and recursive definitions  $(\stackrel{
  m def}{=})$
- nondeterministic choice (+)

#### This is Enough to Describe Sequential Processes

Any finite LTS can be (up to isomorphism) described by using the operations above.

# CCS Basics (Parallelism and Renaming)

- parallel composition (|)
   (synchronous communication between two components = handshake synchronization)
- restriction  $(P \setminus L)$
- relabelling (P[f])

## Definition of CCS (channels, actions, process names)

#### Let

- A be a set of channel names (e.g. tea, coffee are channel names)
- ullet  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{A} \cup \overline{\mathcal{A}}$  be a set of labels where
  - $\overline{A} = {\overline{a} \mid a \in A}$ (A are called names and  $\overline{A}$  are called co-names)
  - by convention  $\overline{\overline{a}} = a$
- $Act = \mathcal{L} \cup \{\tau\}$  is the set of actions where
  - $\tau$  is the internal or silent action (e.g.  $\tau$ , tea, coffee are actions)
- K is a set of process names (constants) (e.g. CM).

# Definition of CCS (expressions)

The set of all terms generated by the abstract syntax is called CCS process expressions (and denoted by  $\mathcal{P}$ ).

#### Notation

$$P_1 + P_2 = \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} P_i$$
 Nil = 0 =  $\sum_{i \in \emptyset} P_i$ 

### Precedence

#### Precedence

- restriction and relabelling (tightest binding)
- action prefixing
- parallel composition
- summation

Example: 
$$R + a.P|b.Q \setminus L$$
 means  $R + ((a.P)|(b.(Q \setminus L)))$ .

# Definition of CCS (defining equations)

### CCS program

A collection of defining equations of the form

$$K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P$$

where  $K \in \mathcal{K}$  is a process constant and  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  is a CCS process expression.

- Only one defining equation per process constant.
- Recursion is allowed: e.g.  $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overline{a}.A \mid A$ .

## Semantics of CCS

### Syntax

#### CCS

(collection of defining equations)



### Semantics

#### LTS

(labelled transition systems)

HOW?

## Structural Operational Semantics for CCS

### Structural Operational Semantics (SOS) - G. Plotkin 1981

Small-step operational semantics where the behaviour of a system is inferred using syntax driven rules.

Given a collection of CCS defining equations, we define the following LTS ( $Proc, Act, \{\stackrel{a}{\longrightarrow} | a \in Act\}$ ):

- $Proc = \mathcal{P}$  (the set of all CCS process expressions)
- $Act = \mathcal{L} \cup \{\tau\}$  (the set of all CCS actions including  $\tau$ )
- transition relation is given by SOS rules of the form:

RULE 
$$\frac{premises}{conclusion}$$
 conditions

# SOS rules for CCS ( $\alpha \in Act$ , $a \in \mathcal{L}$ )

$$\mathsf{RES} \ \ \frac{P \overset{\alpha}{\longrightarrow} P'}{P \smallsetminus L \overset{\alpha}{\longrightarrow} P' \smallsetminus L} \ \ \alpha, \overline{\alpha} \not\in L \qquad \qquad \mathsf{REL} \ \ \frac{P \overset{\alpha}{\longrightarrow} P'}{P[f] \overset{f(\alpha)}{\longrightarrow} P'[f]}$$

CON 
$$\xrightarrow{P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'} K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P$$

# Deriving Transitions in CCS

Let 
$$A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a.A$$
. Then 
$$((A \mid \overline{a}.Nil) \mid b.Nil)[c/a] \stackrel{c}{\longrightarrow} ((A \mid \overline{a}.Nil) \mid b.Nil)[c/a].$$

$$\mathsf{REL} \ \frac{\mathsf{COM1}}{\mathsf{COM1}} \frac{\overline{a.A} \xrightarrow{a} A}{A \xrightarrow{a} A} A \overset{\text{def}}{=} a.A \\ \mathsf{COM1}} \frac{\mathsf{COM1}}{A \mid \overline{a}.Nil \stackrel{a}{\longrightarrow} A \mid \overline{a}.Nil} \\ \frac{\mathsf{COM1}}{(A \mid \overline{a}.Nil) \mid b.Nil \xrightarrow{a} (A \mid \overline{a}.Nil) \mid b.Nil}}{((A \mid \overline{a}.Nil) \mid b.Nil) [c/a]} \xrightarrow{c} ((A \mid \overline{a}.Nil) \mid b.Nil) [c/a]}$$

## LTS of the Process a.Nil | a.Nil

