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Petri Nets (PNs)

- Model introduced by **C.A. Petri** in 1962
  - Ph.D. Thesis: “Communication with Automata”
- Applications: distributed computing, manufacturing, control, communication networks, transportation…
- PNs describe explicitly and graphically:
  - sequencing/causality
  - conflict/non-deterministic choice
  - concurrency
- Basic PN model
  - Asynchronous model (partial ordering)
  - Main drawback: no hierarchy
Example:
Synchronization at single track rail segment

• "Preconditions"
Playing the “token game”
Conflict for resource “track”
Petri Net Graph

- Bipartite weighted directed graph:
  - Places: circles
  - Transitions: bars or boxes
  - Arcs: arrows labeled with weights

- Tokens: black dots
Petri Net

• A PN \((N,M_0)\) is a Petri Net Graph \(N\)
  
  – **places**: represent distributed state by holding tokens
    
    – marking (state) \(M\) is an \(n\)-vector \((m_1,m_2,m_3,...)\), where \(m_i\) is the non-negative number of tokens in place \(p_i\).
    
    – initial marking \((M_0)\) is initial state
  
  – **transitions**: represent actions/events
    
    – enabled transition: enough tokens in predecessors
    
    – firing transition: modifies marking

• …and an initial marking \(M_0\).

Places/Transitions: conditions/events
Transition firing rule

- A marking is changed according to the following rules:
  - A transition is **enabled** if there are enough tokens in each input place
  - An enabled transition **may or may not** fire
  - The **firing** of a transition modifies marking by **consuming** tokens from the input places and **producing** tokens in the output places
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Producer-Consumer with priority

Consumer B can consume only if buffer A is empty

Inhibitor arcs
PN properties

• Behavioral: depend on the initial marking (most interesting)
  – Reachability
  – Boundedness
  – Schedulability
  – Liveness
  – Conservation

• Structural: do not depend on the initial marking (often too restrictive)
  – Consistency
  – Structural boundedness
Reachability

- Marking $M$ is **reachable** from marking $M_0$ if there exists a sequence of firings $\sigma = M_0 \ t_1 \ M_1 \ t_2 \ M_2 \ldots \ M$ that transforms $M_0$ to $M$.
- The reachability problem is decidable.

**Example Diagram**

- $M_0 = (1,0,1,0)$
- After $t_3$, $M_1 = (1,0,0,1)$
- After $t_2$, $M = (1,1,0,0)$
Liveness

- **Liveness**: from any marking any transition can become fireable
  - Liveness implies deadlock freedom, not viceversa
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- **Conservation**: the total number of tokens in the net is constant
Analysis techniques

• Structural analysis techniques
  – Incidence matrix
  – T- and S- Invariants

• State Space Analysis techniques
  – Coverability Tree
  – Reachability Graph
Incidence Matrix

- Necessary condition for marking $M$ to be reachable from initial marking $M_0$: 
  
  there exists **firing vector** $v$ s.t.:

  $$M = M_0 + A \cdot v$$

\[A = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\]
State equations

- E.g. reachability of $M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T$ from $M_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T$

\[ A = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{array} \]

- but also $v_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}^T$ or any $v_k = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & (k) & (k+1) \end{bmatrix}^T$
Necessary Condition only
State equations and invariants

- Solutions of $Ax = 0$ (in $M = M_0 + Ax$, $M = M_0$)

**T-invariants**
- sequences of transitions that (if fireable) bring back to original marking
- periodic schedule in SDF
- e.g. $x = |0 1 1|^T$

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
-1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & -1 \\
0 & -1 & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\]
Application of T-invariants

- **Scheduling**
  - *Cyclic schedules*: need to return to the initial state
State equations and invariants

- Solutions of $yA = 0$

**S-invariants**
- sets of places whose weighted total token count does not change after the firing of any transition ($yM = yM'$)
- e.g. $y = |1 1 1 |^T$

\[
A^T = \begin{bmatrix}
-1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & -1 & 1 
\end{bmatrix}
\]
Application of S-invariants

- **Structural Boundedness**: bounded for any finite initial marking $M_0$
- **Existence of a positive S-invariant** is sufficient condition for structural boundedness
  - initial marking is finite
  - weighted token count does not change
Summary of algebraic methods

- Extremely efficient
  (polynomial in the size of the net)
- Generally provide only necessary or sufficient information
- Excellent for ruling out some deadlocks or otherwise dangerous conditions
- Can be used to infer structural boundedness
Coverability Tree

- Build a (finite) tree representation of the markings

**Karp-Miller algorithm**

- Label initial marking $M_0$ as the root of the tree and tag it as *new*
- While new markings exist do:
  - select a new marking $M$
  - if $M$ is identical to a marking on the path from the root to $M$, then tag $M$ as *old* and go to another new marking
  - if no transitions are enabled at $M$, tag $M$ *dead-end*
  - while there exist enabled transitions at $M$ do:
    - obtain the marking $M'$ that results from firing $t$ at $M$
    - on the path from the root to $M$ if there exists a marking $M''$ such that $M'(p) \geq M''(p)$ for each place $p$ and $M'$ is different from $M''$, then replace $M'(p)$ by $\emptyset$ for each $p$ such that $M'(p) > M''(p)$
    - introduce $M'$ as a node, draw an arc with label $t$ from $M$ to $M'$ and tag $M'$ as *new*. 
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- Boundedness is decidable with *coverability tree*

```
1000
↓
t1
0100
↓
t3
0011
↓
t2
0101
```
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- Boundedness is decidable with *coverability tree*

```
1000
↓ t1
0100
↓ t3
0011
↓ t2
010∞
```
Coverability Tree

- Is (1) reachable from (0)?
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• Is (1) reachable from (0)?
Coverability Tree

• Is (1) reachable from (0)?

• Cannot solve the reachability problem
For bounded nets the Coverability Tree is called Reachability Tree since it contains all possible reachable markings.
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Subclasses of Petri nets

- Reachability analysis is too expensive
- State equations give only partial information
- Some properties are preserved by *reduction rules*
  e.g. for liveness and safeness

Even reduction rules only work in some cases
- Must restrict class in order to prove stronger results
Marked Graphs

- Every place has at most 1 predecessor and 1 successor transition
- Models only *causality* and *concurrency* (no conflict)
State Machines

- Every transition has at most 1 predecessor and 1 successor place
- Models only **causality** and **conflict**
  - (no concurrency, no synchronization of parallel activities)
Free-Choice Petri Nets (FCPN)

Free-Choice (FC): the outcome of a choice depends on the value of a token (abstracted non-deterministically) rather than on its arrival time.

Confusion (not-Free-Choice)

Extended Free-Choice

every transition after choice has exactly 1 predecessor place
Free-Choice nets

- Introduced by Hack (‘72)
- Extensively studied by Best (‘86) and Desel and Esparza (‘95)
- Can express concurrency, causality and choice **without confusion**
- Very strong structural theory
  - necessary and sufficient conditions for liveness and safeness, based on **decomposition**
  - exploits **duality** between MG and SM
MG (& SM) decomposition

- **Allocation** is a control function that chooses which transition fires among several conflicting ones (A: P → T).
- Eliminate the subnet that would be inactive if we were to use the allocation...
- **Reduction Algorithm**
  - Delete all unallocated transitions
  - Delete all places that have all input transitions already deleted
  - Delete all transitions that have at least one input place already deleted
- Obtain a **Reduction** (one for each allocation) that is a conflict free subnet
MG reduction and cover

- Choose one successor for each conflicting place:
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MG reductions

- The set of all reductions yields a **cover of MG components** (T-invariants)
Hack’s theorem (‘72)

- Let $N$ be a Free-Choice PN:
  - $N$ has a live and safe initial marking (well-formed)

**if and only if**
- every MG reduction is strongly connected and not empty, and the set of all reductions covers the net
- every SM reduction is strongly connected and not empty, and the set of all reductions covers the net
Hack’s theorem
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Summary of LSFC nets

- Largest class for which structural theory really helps
- Structural component analysis may be expensive
  (exponential number of MG and SM components in the worst case)
- But...
  - number of MG components is generally small
  - FC restriction simplifies characterization of behavior
Petri Net extensions

• Add interpretation to tokens and transitions
  – Colored nets (tokens have value)

• Add time
  – Time/timed Petri Nets (deterministic delay)
    – type (duration, delay)
    – where (place, transition)
  – Stochastic PNs (probabilistic delay)
  – Generalized Stochastic PNs (timed and immediate transitions)

• Add hierarchy
  – Place Charts Nets
PNs Summary

- PN Graph: places (buffers), transitions (actions), tokens (data)
- Firing rule: transition enabled if there are enough tokens in each input place

Properties
- Structural (consistency, structural boundedness…)
- Behavioral (reachability, boundedness, liveness…)

Analysis techniques
- Structural (only CN or CS): State equations, Invariants
- Behavioral: coverability tree

Reachability

Subclasses: Marked Graphs, State Machines, Free-Choice PNs
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