I. INTRODUCTION

Abstract—This paper extends the authors' previous work on a formal approach to the specification of reconfigurable systems, introduced in [7], in which configurations are taken as local states in a suitable transition structure. The novelty is the explicit consideration that not only the realisation of a service may change from a configuration to another, but also the set of services provided and even their functionality, may themselves vary. In other words, interfaces may evolve, as well.

Context: configurations-as-local-states

The qualifier reconfigurable is used for systems whose execution modes, and not only the values stored in their internal memory, may change in response to the continuous interaction with the environment. In [7] the authors' introduced a formal, two level approach to their specification. The rationale sought to combine two basic dimensions in systems specification: one which emphasizes behaviour and its evolution, another focused on data and their transformations.

Behaviour is typically specified through (some variant of) state-machines. Such models capture evolution in terms of event occurrences and their impact in the system's internal state configuration (see e.g. [6]). Data types and services upon them, on the other hand, are often presented as theories in suitable logics, over a signature which offers a syntactic interface to the system. Semantics is, then, given by a class of concrete algebras acting as models for the specified theory (see e.g. [9]). The starting point for our approach, is that these dimensions are interconnected: the functionality offered by a reconfigurable system, at each moment, may depend on the stage of its evolution. In [7] the reconfiguration dynamics is modelled as a transition system, whose nodes are interpreted as the different configurations it may assume. Therefore, each of such nodes is endowed with an algebra, or even a first-order structure, to formally characterise the semantics of the services offered in the corresponding configuration. Technically, models of reconfigurable systems are given as structured state-machines whose states denote algebras, rather than sets.

The approach assumed, however, that the signature, i.e., the interface provided at any local state is fixed. Or, to put this in an equivalent way, that the system's interface is invariant with respect to the reconfiguration process. This paper, as explained below, aims at relaxing this condition.

Before that, however, a word is due on the specification logic adopted. Modal languages are, quite obviously, the natural choice to talk about transition systems. We resort, however, to their hybrid extension [1] because a crucial point in the whole approach is to be able to express and verify properties which may only hold in a specific state, or a group thereof. Hybrid logic introduces a special set of symbols to name states and a suitable family of reference operators. Additionally, at each state, a whole algebra has to be specified. This entails the combination of hybrid and modal features with equational logic, leading to adoption of a variant of hybrid equational logic. This combination, in a highly general setting, is discussed in a complementary line of research, documented in [8], [4], but is not essential for what follows. The overall approach, summed up in the slogan configurations-as-local-states, is sketched in Fig I.

It should be stressed this approach differs from the one proposed by Y. Gurevich in the early nineties under the designation of evolving algebras and, later, as abstract state machines [5], [2]. A state there encapsulates a specific configuration of variables in an algebra: as configurations change, so the algebra evolves. In our own approach, however, each node corresponds to a different, independent algebra.

Contribution: reconfigurable interfaces

As mentioned above, we intend to go a step further and allow not only a possibly different algebra in each state, but also different algebras over a different signature. Actually, in a number of cases the services a system may offer, and their functionalities, may depend on the particular configuration or mode of operation the system is currently assuming. Therefore, in the place of a unique (static) interface \((S,F)\), we consider in the sequel a family of signatures \((S^i,F^i)_{i \in \text{Nom}}\) indexed by the set \text{Nom} of state identifiers, i.e., the nominals of our hybrid specification language. The approach introduced in [7] is extended accordingly. Technically, this is achieved through the introduction of (hybrid) partial algebra Specifications to “simulate” the intended, independent (hybrid) equational ones. Note, however, that, even resorting to partial specifications, models will always be (total) algebras with respect to the corresponding local interface. The following example will be used to illustrate the method.

Example. Suppose that, in the context of a client-server architecture, a buffering component is required to store and manage incoming messages from different clients. Depending on the server’s execution mode, i.e., its current configuration, issues like the order in which calls have arrived or the number of repeated messages may, or may not, be relevant. Therefore, the shape of the buffering component may vary, typically being determined by an external manager.
A model for this component comprises four endowed, respectively with \( i \) an algebra of sequences (for configurations where both order and multiplicities are relevant issues), \( ii \) an algebra of multi sets (when the order may be left out), \( iii \) an algebra of sets (when the application may abstract over order and repetitions), and finally \( iv \) an algebra of repetition free sequences (to cater only the messages’ order). Going from one configuration to another involves not only a change in the way a service is realised (e.g., insertion clearly differs from one state to the other), but also a change at the interface level. For example, an operation to count the number of replicated messages does not make sense if sets are used as a local model.

Outline. The remaining of the paper is organized as follows: Section II recalls the definitions of equational and partial algebra logics as well as the notions of hybridization and presentation of logics. The main contribution appears in Section III. Finally, Section IV briefly discusses tool support for the extended specification method.

II. BACKGROUND

The Equational Logic \( EQ \)

Services and system operations are specified in equational logic. A signature is a pair \((S, F)\) where \( S \) is a set of sort symbols and \( F = \{ F_{ar\rightarrow s} \mid ar \in S^*, s \in S \} \) is a family of sets of operation symbols indexed by arities \( ar \) (for the arguments) and sorts \( s \) (for the results). A model \( M \) for \((S, F)\) is an \((S, F)\)-algebra which interprets each sort symbol \( s \) as a set \( M_s \), its carrier, and each operation symbol \( t : F_{ar\rightarrow s} \) as a function \( M_{ar} : M_{ar} \rightarrow M_s \), where \( M_{ar} \) is the product of the carriers of sorts in \( ar \). The sentences are the universal quantified \((S, F)\)-equations \((\forall X)t = t'\). The satisfaction relation is defined recursively on the structure of the sentences:

- \( M \models_{(S,F)} t = t' \) iff \( M_{t} = M_{t'} \), where \( M_{t} \) denotes the interpretation of term \( t \) in \( M \) defined recursively by \( M_{\sigma(t_1,\ldots,t_n)} = M_{\sigma}(M_{t_1},\ldots,M_{t_n}) \).
- \( M \models_{(S,F)} (\forall X)\rho \) iff \( M' \models_{(S,F+X)} \rho \), for any \((S, F + X)\)-expansion \( M' \) of \( M \).

The Partial Algebras Logic \( PA \)

In this case, signatures are tuples \((S, TF, PF)\), where \( TF \) and \( PF \) are families of sorts of, respectively, total and partial function symbols such that \( TF_{ar\rightarrow s} \cap PF_{ar\rightarrow s} = \emptyset \) for each arity \( ar \) and each sort \( s \). Models of \( PA \) are partial algebras, i.e., function symbols are interpreted as partial, rather than total, functions. The sentences are defined by the following grammar

\[ \rho, \rho' \models t \neq t' \mid t \neq t' \mid t \leq t' \mid df(t) \mid \neg \rho \mid \rho \circ \rho' \]

where \( \circ \in \{ \wedge, \vee, \Rightarrow \} \). Finally, the satisfaction relation is

- \( A \models_{(S,TF,PT)} df(t) \) iff \( A_t \) is defined;
- \( A \models_{(S,TF,PT)} t \neq t' \) iff \( A_t = A_{t'} \) when both are defined;
- \( A \models_{(S,TF,PT)} t \leq t' \) iff \( A_t \preceq A_{t'} \) and \( A_t \) and \( A_{t'} \) are defined and \( A_t = A_{t'} \),

with the usual interpretation of the boolean connectives.

Hybridization

The combination of both equational and partial algebras logics with a hybrid language plays a crucial role in the specification method discussed in this paper. Both are briefly presented below. Following this description it is not hard to notice the emergence of a common pattern in the way a hybrid logic is built on top of another logic. Such a construction was made systematic as part of this research effort, in [8], [4]. The so-called hybridization process is formulated in the general setting of the theory of institutions [3].

Hybrid equational logic \( HEQ \) is presented as follows: signatures are triples \( \Delta = (\Sigma, Nom, \Lambda) \), where \( \Sigma \) is an equational signature \((S, F)\), \( Nom \) and \( \Lambda \) are sets of symbols for nominals and modalities, respectively. The sentences are defined by the following grammar

\[ \rho, \rho' \models i \mid \rho_0 \mid \ominus_s \rho \mid \rho \circ \rho' \mid \neg \rho \mid \lambda \rho \]

where \( \rho_0 \) is an equational sentence over \( \Sigma \), \( i \in Nom \) and \( \ominus \in \{ \wedge, \vee, \Rightarrow \} \). As usual \( \lambda \rho \) denotes \( \neg \lambda \neg \rho \). Models are \((Nom, \Lambda)\)-transition structures with a \( \Sigma \)-algebra associated to each state. Formally, models of \( \Delta \) are pairs \((M, W)\) where
• $|W|$ is a set, for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $W_{\lambda} \subseteq |W| \times |W|$ is a
binary relation and for each $i \in I$, $W_i$ is a constant in $|W|$;

• $M : W \rightarrow \text{Mod}^{EQ}(S,F)$ is a function associating
algebras to states. $M(w)$ is denoted by $M_w$.

Finally, the satisfaction relation is defined as follows:

• $(M,W) \models_{w \leftarrow i} i$ iff $W_i = w$

• $(M,W) \models_{w \leftarrow i} \rho_0$ iff $M_w \models_{EQ} \rho_0$

• $(M,W) \models_{w \leftarrow i} \rho \vartriangleleft \rho$ iff $(M,W) \models_{w \leftarrow i} \rho$ and $(M,W) \models_{w \leftarrow i} \rho'$; and
analogously for the remaining boolean connectives.

The Hybrid Partial Algebra logic $\mathcal{H}PA$ is defined as $\mathcal{H}EQ$
but taking, a partial algebra signature $(S,TF,PF)$ in place of $\Sigma$; a $(S,TF,PF)$-sentence of $PA$ in place of $\rho_0$; a function
$M : |W| \rightarrow \text{Mod}^{PA}(S,TP,PF)$ in place of $M : |W| \rightarrow$
$\text{Mod}^{EQ}(S,F)$; and $(M,W) \models_{w \leftarrow i} \rho_0$ iff $M_w \models_{\Sigma} \rho_0$ in place
of $M_w \models_{EQ} \rho_0$.

Presentations

A common way to define a new logic is to take another
logic, plus some additional data suitably expressed through
new axioms. One way to proceed is through presentations.
Formally, given a logic $\mathcal{L}$, a presentation of $\mathcal{L}$, say $\mathcal{L}^{pres}$, takes
as signatures pairs $(\Sigma, \Gamma)$ where $\Sigma$ is a $\mathcal{L}$-signature and $\Gamma$ a
set of $\mathcal{L}$-sentences. The $(\Sigma, \Gamma)$-models of $\mathcal{L}^{pres}$, are $\mathcal{L}$-models
such that $M \models_{\Sigma} \Gamma$. The satisfaction relation of $\mathcal{L}^{pres}$ is the
restriction of $\mathcal{L}$ to $\mathcal{L}^{pres}$-models.

III. RECONFIGURATION OF INTERFACES

The hybridization process mentioned above assumes that
all configurations have models over the same signature. Suppose,
however, that this is not the case and one has instead a family
of different equational signatures $(S^i,F^i)_{i \in \text{Nom}}$, one for each (named by nominal $i$) state. A global signature can be
obtained in $\mathcal{H}PA$ as follows. The first step is to define a signature
$(S,TF,PF)$ in $PA$ able to capture the all possible possible interfaces in $(S^i,F^i)$, for $i \in \text{Nom})$ and on those which concern only
a specific state named, say, by $i \in \text{Nom}$. These two set of
operations define a (global) $\mathcal{H}PA$-signature:

$S = \bigcup_{i \in \text{Nom}} S_i$

$TF_{\Delta \leftarrow w} = \{ \sigma | \sigma \in \bigcap_{i \in \text{Nom}} F^i \}$

$PF_{\Delta \leftarrow w} = \{ \sigma | \sigma \in \langle F^i \rangle_{\Delta \leftarrow w} \wedge TF_{\Delta \leftarrow w}, i \in \text{Nom} \}$

On this way, we have again an unique base signature to proceed with the specification. However, the information about which of those operations are defined in each configuration has to be considered. This is done by the following axioms:

$\Gamma = \{ \@_i(\forall X)\delta\sigma(\sigma(X)) | \sigma \in \langle F^i \rangle_{\Delta \leftarrow w} \wedge PF_{\Delta \leftarrow w}, i \in \text{Nom} \} \cup$

$\{ \neg \@_i(\exists X)\delta\sigma(\sigma(X)) | \sigma \in PF_{\Delta \leftarrow w} \wedge \langle F^i \rangle_{\Delta \leftarrow w}, i \in \text{Nom} \}$

Therefore, one ends up with a unique signature
$((S,TF,PF), \Gamma)$ to proceed, which also includes a set $\text{Nom}$ for naming the relevant configurations, the corresponding family of signatures, and the set of reconfiguration events $\Lambda$ which trigger reconfigurations and give rise to the relevant modalities. With this signature the method in [7] can be safely applied from this point on. In broad terms, we are going to simulate local, total functions with global, partial
ones. This entails the need for adopting strong equality to specify "global properties" of operations defined in a specific configuration. For instance, any existential equation $t \equiv t'$ involving operations in $PF$ is inconsistent because it fails on the configurations where these operations are not defined. Of course, this is not the case of existencial equations prefixed by satisfaction operators, i.e., of sentences of form $@_i(t \equiv t')$.

But, in general, this is not enough: all operations must be "locally"-total or "completely"-undefined.

In this context, specifications are built according to the following steps:

1) Enumerate the set of relevant configurations and define the set of their names $\text{Nom}$ accordingly;

2) Enumerate the set of reconfiguration-events and define for each of them a modality in $\Lambda$;

3) Collect the family of local, Nom-indexed interfaces and define $(S_i,F_i)_{i \in \text{Nom}}$

4) Take the global signature $((S,TF,PF), \Gamma)$ in $\mathcal{H}EQ^{pres}$ through the suggested construction;

5) Develop the specification along the lines proposed in [7]:

a) Specify the global properties, i.e., properties holding in all the system configurations (using strong equations);

b) Specify the local properties using the satisfaction operators $@_i$ tagged $(S_i,F_i)$-equations;

c) Specify the reconfiguration structure, i.e., the underlying transition system using the available modalities.

The method can be illustrated with the example introduced in Section I. First of all define a set $\text{Nom} = \{OM, Om, oM, om\}$ of nominals, where the capitalized letters correspond to the relevance of order and multiplicity
issues (for instance, $Om$ refers to a configuration where order, but not multiplicity, is the relevant issue). Then, for the reconfigurations events, take a set of modal symbols $\Lambda = \{goto\_OM, goto\_Om, goto\_oM, goto\_om\}$. Consider now the local interfaces. For $(S^0m, F^{om})$ choose the usual signature for Sets comprising the set of sorts $S^{om} = \{\text{Elem},\text{Store},\text{Bool}\}$ and operation symbols $F^{om}_{\text{Store}} = \{\text{empty}\}$, $F^{om}_{\text{Elem}x\text{Store} \rightarrow \text{Bool}} = \{\text{ins}_i\}$; $F^{om}_{\text{Elem}x\text{Store} \rightarrow \text{Store}} = \{\text{insert}\}$; and $F^{om}_{\text{ar} \rightarrow s} = \emptyset$ for the other arities. Clearly, $(S^{om}, F^{om}) = (S^{om}, F^{om})$. The remaining cases need to deal with multiplicities; therefore signatures have to be enriched with new operations. Hence, $(S^{om}, F^{om})$ can be defined as $S^{om} = S^{om} \cup \{\text{Nat}\}$ and $F^{om}_{\text{Elem}x\text{Store} \rightarrow \text{Nat}} = \{\text{mult}\}$ and $F^{om}_{\text{ar} \rightarrow s} = \emptyset$ for the other arities. Again, $(S^{om}, F^{om}) = (S^{om}, F^{om})$. Therefore, the following "global" partial signature gets defined:

$((S,TF,PF), \Gamma)$ taking $S = \bigcup_{i \in \text{Nom}} S_i = S^{om}$, $TF = F^{om}$ and $PF_{\text{Elem}x\text{Store} \rightarrow \text{Nat}} = \{\text{mult}\}$ and $PF_{\text{ar} \rightarrow s} = \emptyset$ for the other arities. On its turn, $\Gamma$ is defined by the sentences
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IV. Tool Support

In order to have effective practical application, a formal
method should have some form of tool support. The specifi-
cation method discussed in the previous section is no exception.
First of all a first-order encoding for \( HEQ \) into \( FOL \) was
developed. Moreover, through an instantiation of the general
method of [8], [4], a first-order encoding for \( HPA \) (or more
rigorously, for a version of \( HPA \) with additional constraints
regarding the rigidification of operations and sorts [4]) is also
available. Both results are instrumental to provide access to
effective tool support because \( FOL \) enjoys of a very stable set
of proof tools.

In particular, integration with the Hets [10] platform
seems promising. Using a metaphor of [10], Hets may be
seen as a “motherboard" where different “expansion cards”
can be plugged in. These pieces are individual logics (with
their particular analyzers and proof tools) as well as logic
translations, suitably encoded at an institutional level. Details
are given in [7], [8].

Notice that Hets already integrates parsers, static analy-
zers and provers for a wide set of individual logics. Moreover it
offers a powerful manager for heterogeneous proofs resorting
to the so-called graphs of logics, i.e., graphs whose nodes are
logics and, whose edges, are isomorphisms between them.

Recently an hybrid version of CASL, called HCASL, as
well as the suitable encoding into CASL, were integrated
directly in Hets [11]. This provides effective tool support
to specifications in the logics discussed in this paper since
both are subsumed in HCASL and Hets offers a very stable
and mature tool support for the specification in CASL. Other
features of Hets can also be explore in this context. For ex-
ample, the model finder of Darwin, which is already integrated
in Hets, may be used as an effective consistency check for
our specifications. Moreover, available encodings of FOL into
HasCASL, a specification language for functional programs,
opens further perspectives for prototyping specifications (see
[10]).

V. Conclusions

The paper extends a specification method for reconfig-
urable systems in order to accommodate the presence of
different interfaces (i.e., algebraic signatures) in different con-
figuration states. The extension proposed was smooth and
compatible with Hets-based tool support.

Whether similar results can be obtained if other hybrid
languages are used, e.g., replacing hybrid equational logic by
hybrid first-order logic, remains object of current research.
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