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Abstract: Model decomposition is a powerful tool to scale the design of large and complex systems. It enables developers to separate components development from the concerns of their integration and orchestration. Event-B is a refinement-based formal method, equipped with three decomposition styles that come with solid semantic foundations and strong tool supports. This paper intends to give some useful insights and modelling guidelines for using these decomposition styles, illustrated by an actual development of a master data updating system.
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1 Introduction

Modern software systems are becoming more complex everyday. This trend is going to continue as industry witnesses unprecedented explosive demands for social and business connectivity. This poses a huge challenge to system modelling for rigorous quality assurance, while scalability becomes a great issue. Hence model structuring is paramount in mastering complexity of large systems. Although there has never been a lack of theoretical research in this area, few modelling platforms provide a sufficiently good level of tool support to evaluate structuring techniques and their impact on industrial application of formal modelling. There are no clear guidelines either for model designers. This impedes the application of formal verification to large-scale designs.

Event-B \([3]\) has established itself as a popular formal system development with broad industrial adoptions. Event-B was designed as a minimalistic formalism to form the core of the Rodin platform \([4]\). A great range of features have been provided as extensions to the modelling platform, covering almost all aspects of model-driven engineering such as requirement, simulation, visualization, testing, formal verification, and code generation. The extension architecture allows a modeller to enable only those features that are relevant for the domain of modelled
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problem. This keeps the core features of the platform as simple as possible while not sacrificing any functionalities.

The basic Event-B language supports model structuring by nothing more than the uses of events and refinement inside one model. However, it is highly impractical to construct a large scale formal design as one monolithic model, which results in numerous problems with legibility, maintainability, team work, reuse, and so on. Notably, it also affects proof structuring: autonomous provers are suffocated by a large number of hypothesis and thus anything that makes the context of a proof smaller is extremely beneficial.

Model decomposition comes as a great potential to solve the above problem. Three different decomposition styles exist for Event-B, all providing a guarantee of refinement monotonicity: the model after decomposition is a correct refinement of the one before decomposition, provided all obligated proofs are given. This allows a decomposed part of the model to be treated as an independent artefact so that the modeller can concentrate on this part and does not have to worry about the other parts. The tool supports for these techniques, realized as Rodin plugins, not only provide assistance on how to decompose a model, but also generate explicit constraints and relations between the decomposed model and the resulting sub-components.

Technically, decomposition is a special form of refinement by which a single abstract model is refined by several concrete models and their aggregation. Like refinement, a properly planned decomposition step results in very low proof cost. It requires, however, a good degree of foresight. First, a model is difficult to decompose if the model does not possess a structure that can be easily divided and mapped to independent components to be produced by decomposition. Second, any careless design decision before decomposition may be difficult to correct afterward, which often leads to complete rework on the development of each individual local component. Therefore, a modeller can serve a better job when some guidelines are available so that the modeller knows which decomposition style to choose from, and which design decisions need to be taken care of at each stage.

In this paper we provide some insights and propose modelling guidelines for applying model decomposition, drawn from our personal experiences and illustrated by a case study by an industrial user of Event-B. These guidelines are not supposed to give a one-for-all solution for all decomposition attempts. We introduce stages in decomposition and point out which design problems (that can be easily overlooked) need to be addressed in each step.

Outline. Sec. 2 briefly introduces Event-B and decomposition in general. Sec. 3 gives our modelling guidelines. Different decomposition styles are detailed in Sec. 4 – Sec. 6 by showing their applications on the modelling of a master data updating system. We compare the different approaches in Sec. 7. Finally, we draw some conclusions in Sec. 8.

2 Background

2.1 Event-B

Event-B is a formal modelling method for developing correct-by-construction hardware and software systems. An Event-B model is a state transition system where the state corresponds to a set of variables $v$ and transitions are represented by a collection of events $evt$. The most general form of an event is: $evt \triangleq \text{any } t \text{ where } G(t, v) \text{ then } A(t, v) \text{ end}$, where $t$ is a set of parameters, $G(t, v)$
is the enabling condition (called guard) and $A(t,v)$ is an action changing the value of $v$. An action comprises several assignments executing in parallel. Each assignment can have one of the following forms: $x := E(t,v)$, $x \in S(t,v)$ or $x \mid P(t,v,x')$, where $x$ are some variables in $v$. The first form assigns value of expression $E(t,v)$ to $x$. The second assignment form non-deterministically assigns to $x$ some element of set $S(t,v)$. The third assignment form non-deterministically assign to $x$ some after value $x'$ satisfying the before-after predicate $P(t,v,x')$. The last assignment form is also the most general one: other assignment forms can be equivalently represented using before-after predicates. Essential to Event-B is the formulation of invariants $I(v)$: safety conditions to be preserved at all times.

To facilitate the construction of large-scale models, Event-B advocates the use of refinement: the process of gradually adding details to a model. An Event-B development is a sequence of models linked by refinement relations. It is said that a concrete model refines an abstract one. Abstract variables $v$ are linked to concrete variables $w$ by a gluing invariant $J(v,w)$. Any behaviour of the concrete model must be simulated by some behaviour of the abstract model, with respect to the gluing invariant $J(v,w)$.

Rodin [4] is an industrial-strength toolset supporting Event-B. Rodin provides an integrated modelling environment with a range of editors, modelling assistants, automatic generator of verification conditions and a set of automated provers tasked to discharge verification conditions.

Example – A Master Data Updating System  
Fig. 1 shows a master data updating system that we use as the case study of this paper. The system consists of a User process and a Server process keeping some master data in sync. When User proposes a data change, it first updates its local copy, and then sends a request message to Server and waits for the answer. Upon receiving the request, Server checks the validity of the proposed change, and updates the master copy only when the change is deemed valid. Then, Server sends to User a response containing either...
an approval or a rejection. User has to roll back the change if a rejection is received. We are interested in the global property that the local and master databases are always identical before and after each data update procedure.

The Event-B model in Fig. 2 serves as the most abstract view of the above system. The initial model is designed to have as few variables and events as sufficient to express the above mentioned property (see Invariant inv0.3). The model contains variables udb and sdb denoting User and Server’s database respectively. The Boolean variable is denotes if the global system is in synch. There are three events, namely u_update, s_update and u_final. When the system is in synch, u_update changes the local database, which invalidates the insynch status. While the system is out of synch, s_update may occur to update the server database (either to be the same as udb or unchanged). Finally, u_final occurs to put the system back in synch by making the local database to be identical as the server database. Note that s_update may be skipped when the system is out of synch. Although this cannot happen in the real system, we permit it in the abstract model to simplify proofs, which does not affect the satisfaction of the global property in consideration. This spurious behavior will be removed by refinement in our further development using decompositions.

Figure 2: The top abstract model of Update Master Data

### 2.2 Decomposition

The top-down style of development used in Event-B allows the introduction of new events and data-refinement of variables during refinement steps. A consequence of this development style is an increasing complexity of the refinement process when dealing with many events and state variables. Decomposition addresses such difficulty by providing a mechanism for splitting a large model into several sub-models (that can be further developed independently). Several decomposition techniques have been proposed by extending the existing Event-B notation. This paper is concerned with three existing approaches: shared-variable [2], shared-event [7] and modularisation [11], all of which are supported by Rodin plug-ins [13, 1]. These decomposition techniques differ in that different model elements are shared among sub-components. For shared-variable decomposition, a part of state information (variables) is shared among sub-components. Further refinements then concentrate on how each component processes shared state information. For shared-event decomposition, a set of events are synchronised and shared by sub-components. Hence, it is important to take care of the inputs/outputs of these synchronised events. Modulari-
sation defines a set of *interfaces* that are shared and accessed by different components. Interfaces provide callable operations and promises that these operations can deliver. The implementation of an operation should guarantee that the promises are fulfilled for any given circumstance.

Shared-variable decomposition is similar to rely/guarantee approach from Jones [12]: internal/external events is essentially an encoding of rely/guarantee conditions. It also corresponds to *concurrent action systems* [5] where a solution for the interleaving semantics is proposed.

Shared-event decomposition allows separation of aspects by using synchronisation and communication based on Butler's work [6] combining Action System and CSP [10]. CSP value passing channels correspond to events that communicate via shared parameters.

The separation of procedure declaration from implementation have a long history both in computer programming and modelling. Modularisation closely relates to the treatment of procedures in Hoare logic [9, 8]: procedure calls are used as a metaphor to benefit from refinement monotonicity. Consequently independent model aspects can be considered separately although this should not be confused with modelling a procedure call as a construct of a programming language.

### 3 Guidelines

The primary challenge of applying decomposition is to ensure that the structure of the original model fits the requirements of the chosen decomposition style, leading to helpful sub-models that can be developed separately with a tangible advantage in terms of proof efforts and overall model scale. As with any *top-down* approach for system development using refinement, the more abstract models are initially, the more useful the decomposition step will be. Here we do not focus on directly justifying the use of a particular decomposition style. Instead we focus on *how to proceed* when decomposing using one of the suggested decomposition styles.

We define a general top-down guideline for the three decomposition techniques based on the following common template.

**Stage 1** To model the system abstractly, expressing all the relevant global system properties.

**Stage 2** To refine the abstract model to fit the structure expected by a given decomposition technique.

**Stage 3** To apply decomposition.

**Stage 4** To develop the resulting sub-models independently.

Following this guideline, global properties are captured early in the model and guaranteed to hold in the final models by combining refinement and decomposition. The development of each decomposed part is done independently of the others. Consequently, we can have different implementations for a decomposed model that is guaranteed to work with any implementation of other decomposed models.

In the subsequent sections, we elaborate on the application of different decomposition techniques using our proposed modelling guideline.
4 Shared-Variable Decomposition

Consider Fig. 3 where machine $M$ has four events, $e_1$ to $e_4$, and three variables, $v1$ to $v3$. The solid lines connect variables used by events. In Fig. 3, $M$ is shared-variable decomposed and events are partitioned into sub-components: $e_1$ and $e_2$ are allocated to machine M1; $e_3$ and $e_4$ are allocated to machine M2. Consequently, $v1$ belongs to M1 and $v3$ belongs to M2 (private variables). Variable $v2$ is shared between M1 and M2. Furthermore, additional external events are required to simulate how shared variables are handled in the other sub-component ($e_3.e$ is added to M1 and $e_2.e$ to M2). Assuming that $e_2$ has the general form

$$ e_2 \equiv \text{any } t \text{ where } G(t,v_1,v_2) \text{ then } v_1,v_2 :| P(t,v_1,v_2,v_1',v_2') \text{ end} $$

the corresponding external event $e_2.e$ can be generated as follows.

$$ e_{2.e} \equiv \text{any } t, v_1 \text{ where } G(t,v_1,v_2) \text{ then } v_2 :| \exists v_1'.P(t,v_1,v_2,v_1',v_2') \text{ end} $$

Intuitively, $e_{2.e}$ is a projection of $e_2$ onto the state without variable $v_1$.

There exist certain constraints about shared-variable decomposition during the development of the resulting sub-components: they can be refined independently but shared variables and external events must be present and cannot be refined. More information on shared-variable decomposition in Event-B can be found in [2].

4.1 Master Data Updating System

We describe in detail how to develop the example of update master data using shared-variable decomposition. The model described in Section 2 represents our abstract model of Stage 1. We continue with the subsequent stages of our modelling guideline.

Stage 2. Shared Channels Between Components. In this preparation stage, we introduce the channels (the shared elements) acting in between User and Server. The channels are modelled by two variables $creq$ and $cres$, corresponding to the set of messages going through the request and response channels respectively.

Memo SV1 In this preparation stage, variables going to be shared are introduced.
Moreover, since in Stage 4 the shared variables and external events can be neither removed nor refined, the shared elements introduced in this preparation stage must be concrete.

**Memo SV2** The shared variables must be concrete.

Furthermore, we are going to split the variables and events into two groups, corresponding to each site, preparing for the later decomposition step. An important design constraint here is that User’s events can only reference the variables belonging to User and the shared channels, but not the variables of Server. The same for Server’s events.

**Memo SV3** Events belonging to each sub-component can only reference its own variables and shared variables.

As a result, variable *is* must be refined away. We replace *is* by *uis*, the local in-synch flag, with a gluing invariant *uis* = *is*, i.e. the global in synch is consistent with User’s view. A separate in-synch flag *sis* is introduced for Server. Moreover, in order to separate User and Server completely, we introduce new variables for keeping some information belong to each site. For User, variable *udb old* is added in order to keep the old value of User’s database for undoing later if necessary. For Server, variable *sc* keeps the user’s change to the database on the server site for updating Server’s database if the change is valid.

Despite of the details that we have to introduce in order to clearly separate the future sub-components, we aim to keep the model at this stage fairly abstract. It should contain only necessary information for maintaining the global properties and specifying the shared elements between future sub-components. Other information, e.g. control/data flows within each sub-component can/should be abstracted away.

**Memo SV4** Unnecessary details irrelevant to decomposition should be abstracted from the model in Stage 2.

For example, we assume for the moment that the update of the database and sending the request message from User happens simultaneously. This is represented by event *u_update_and_req*, a refinement of the abstract event *u_update*.

```
   u_update_and_req refines u_update
   any ch where
   uis = T \land ch \in CH
   then
   uis, udb, udb old, creq := F, upd(udb \mapsto ch), udb, \{ch\}
   end
```

In *u_update_and_req*, the local database *udb* is updated to be *upd(udb \mapsto ch)*, the new value obtained by applying changes *ch*; the old local database is saved in *udb old*; and the actual change is send as a request to the server via channel *creq*. Note that *u_update_and_req* satisfies our Memo SV3, i.e. reference only variables belonging to User and the shared channel *creq*.

Other events in this model include: *s_receive_req* for Server to receive some request; *s_accept_res* for Server to update its database and send a positive response; *s_reject_res* for Server to send a negative response without updating its database; *u_receive_res_acc* and *u_receive_res_rej* for User to receive some (positive/negative) response and act accordingly.
An important advantage during the model design in this stage is the use of the abstract model from **Stage 1**. Consistency enforced by refinement guides our design in **Stage 2**, i.e. constraints on the shared variables will be *derived* from the need to maintain the global properties introduced in **Stage 1** (typically in terms of invariants).

In our example, the following invariants are *discovered* during the process of discharging proof obligations such as guard strengthening and invariant preservation of the model. They relate the content of the channels and the internal status of *User* and *Server*. Invariants **inv1_7** and **inv1_8** relate Server’s database *sdb* with the User’s database (current *udb* or old *udb_old*) depending on the content of the channel *cres*. Invariants **inv1_9** and **inv1_10** state that User is out of synch if there are some request or response messages.

- **inv1_7**: \( \text{cres} = \{T\} \Rightarrow \text{sdb} = \text{udb} \)
- **inv1_8**: \( \text{cres} = \{F\} \Rightarrow \text{sdb} = \text{udb}_\text{old} \)
- **inv1_9**: \( \text{creq} \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \text{uis} = F \)
- **inv1_10**: \( \text{cres} \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \text{uis} = F \)

**Stage 3. Decomposition Summary.** This stage is semi-automatic: we provide the tool with input on how the events are partitioned into different future sub-models. Intuitively, we separate our events into two groups, corresponding to *User* and *Server* accordingly. The variables distribution amongst these model are calculated according to the information about events distribution. The summary of our decomposed models is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Server</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal events</td>
<td>u_update_and_req</td>
<td>s_receive_req</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u_receive_res_acc</td>
<td>s_accept_res</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u_receive_res_rej</td>
<td>s_reject_res</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private variables</td>
<td><em>udb</em>, <em>udb_old</em>, <em>uis</em></td>
<td>sdb, <em>sc</em>, <em>sis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared variables</td>
<td><em>creq</em>, <em>cres</em></td>
<td><em>creq</em>, <em>cres</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stage 4. Developments of Sub-models.** We present a summary of the additional refinement steps for each model. Most invariants in the sub-models are technical and related to the sequentialisation of the actions, reflecting the process flows in Figure 1.

User The control flow is introduced via means of a program counter *upc* to capture the actual sequential steps inside the User process. Other internal variables of User are introduced accordingly, i.e. User’s change *uch* and User’s stored response type *ures*.

Server Similarly, the control flow of Server is introduced via means of a program counter *spc*. Internal variables of Server, such as the check result *scr*, are introduced.

**5 Shared-Event Decomposition**

In Fig. 4, M is *shared-event* decomposed into two parts: M1 and M2. Variables are partitioned into the sub-components: v1 is placed in M1 and v2, v3 are placed in M2. Unlike the shared variable approach, no variable sharing is allowed. Events using variables allocated to different sub-components (e2 shares v1 and v2) must be *split*. 
Assuming that event $e_2$ has the following form

\[
e_2\quad \text{any } t \quad \text{where} \quad G_1(t,v_1) \quad G_2(t,v_2) \quad \text{then} \quad v_1 : \mid P_1(t,v_1,v_1') \quad v_2 : \mid P_2(t,v_2,v_2') \quad \text{end}
\]

Event $e_{2,1}$ is defined as a partial version of $e_2$ only referring to variable $v_1$, i.e.

\[
e_{2,1} \equiv \text{any } t,v_1 \quad \text{where} \quad G(t,v_1) \quad \text{then} \quad v_1 : \mid P_1(t,v_1,v_1') \quad \text{end}
\]

Event $e_{2,2}$ is defined similarly but only refers to $v_2$.

Memo SE1 The abstract model of shared-event decomposition is such that each event updating non-private variables may be syntactically split into two events.

5.1 Master Data Updating System

Using the same initial model in Fig. 2, we describe the following stages in the application of a shared event decomposition. The system is designed to be decomposed into components User and Server synchronously communicating by value passing messages.

Stage 2. The Value Passing Protocol. The goal of this stage is to have a model where the state variables are partitioned amongst the future sub-models. Typically, this stage involves refinement of events to introduce the shared elements in the form of events’ parameters. Similar to the shared-variable style, a good abstract model is pursued where only necessary information related to the global properties and the shared elements are specified.

Memo SE2 Irrelevant details should be abstracted away from the model before decomposition.
In this refinement, we prepare the decomposition by introducing synchronous channels and respective value passing protocol. The content of the protocol is represented by shared parameters (in the resulting sub-events). At this stage, the communication is abstract and occurs in a single event.

**Memo SE3** Shared elements are introduced by means of event parameters.

The global flag is replaced by uis and sis for User and Server sync respectively. The gluing invariants between uis, sis and is are given by inv1.1, inv1.2 and inv1.3: uis always matches is; while a request is being processed, sis matches is; otherwise, the server is synchronised (sis = T).

```plaintext
variables: udb, sdb, uis, 
           u_ch, u_rq 
inv1.1  uis = is

inv1.2  u_rq = PRC ⇒ sis = is

inv1.3  u_rq ≠ PRC ⇒ sis = T
```

Some control variables are added: u_ch corresponds to the User change; u_rq holds the request state on the User side where PRC is the set of all possible control states; s_st corresponds to the server state and s_ch holds the change from the Server’s viewpoint. Refined event u_update models a modification that is stored in u_ch before being sent to the server by the new event rq. Event rq simultaneously sends and receives the request in the server, storing it in s_ch and updates the User’s (u_rq := PRC) and Server’s (s_st := VAL_RQ) state. The server is considered out of sync once receives a request (sis := F).

```plaintext
u_update refines u_update

any ch where
   ch ∈ CH
   uis = T
   u_rq = IDLE
then
   uis, u_ch := F, ch
end

rq

any msg where
   uis = F ∧ msg = u_ch ∧ u_rq = IDLE
   s_st = S_IDLE 
then
   u_rq := PRC
   s_ch, s_st, sis := msg, VAL_RQ, F
end
```

Note that event rq has been designed so that it can be syntactically split into parts concerning only with variables of the User or Server (Memo SE1). The request validation can be deferred until the decomposition because it is irrelevant to the considered global property. The server is updated in the refined event s_update for a valid request. Even when the request is deemed invalid, a response is sent back by the new event rsp. This event syncs in the Server and updates the User’s request. If the request is valid, u_ch is applied locally; if the request is invalid, udb remains the same. In either case, udb is back in sync with the server.

Several gluing invariants are discovered as a result of the generated proof obligations. **inv1.4** state that while u_rq is processed, User/Server changes match; if u_rq is deemed invalid, sdb/udb are identical (inv1.5); a valid request results in sdb matching with udb updated with u_ch (inv1.6).

```plaintext
inv1.4:  uis = F ∧ u_rq = PRC ⇒ s_ch = u_ch
inv1.5:  u_rq = INVLD ⇒ udb = sdb
inv1.6:  u_rq = VAL ⇒ upd(udb → u_ch) = sdb
```

Our model is synchronous since the messages exchanged by User and Server are sent and received simultaneously. Alternatively, we could also model asynchronous communication by introducing a buffer between udb and sdb suggesting a three way decomposition.
Stage 3. Decomposition Summary. Sub-models User and Server result from the allocation of the original variables according to their use. The decomposition is summarised in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Server</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>udb, u,ch, uis, u_rq</td>
<td>sdb, s,st, sis, s,ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>u_update, u_final, rq, rsp</td>
<td>s_update, rq, rsp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 4. Developments of Sub-models. The decomposition allows the separation of sending/receiving a request by defining the request as parameter msg shared by User and Server (similarly applied to the server’s response). The resulting sub-models can be refined independently:

User A program counter is added defining the local states (update udb, send request, receive response, commit/discard change). Two events refined the two possible outcomes: l_commit for valid modifications updating udb and l_discard to discard the modification. An additional refinement could add a request queue removing the waiting between the server reply and the next modification.

Server The server is refined by modelling the request validation with a new event s_val.

6 Modularisation

In modularisation, interfaces are defined for sub-components such as the interface I in Fig. 5, which contains interface variable iv and operations o1 and o2. Operations are specified by pairs of pre/post-conditions. An interface is separated from its implementation IM that provides concrete behavior for each of the interface operations. An abstract machine of the integrated system is modeled in M, which is refined by M1 where sub-component behavior is replaced with respective operation calls.

![Figure 5: Decomposition via modularisation](image)

In M, logical subunits must be identified so that they can be easily mapped to operation calls. Respective variables in M are mapped to interface variables, and actions can be replaced by interface operations. An interface must be carefully designed such that a minimal level of details of the sub-component behavior is exposed in the interface.
Memo M1 A module interface should be as general (weak) as possible because of re-usability.

Following the above principle, we should expect that sometimes an interface is too weak in that the post-conditions of its operations are not strong enough to establish the soundness of the caller machine.

Memo M2 In case of a too weak interface, we should strengthen operation post-conditions using the undischarged proof obligations as guidance.

Machine M1 can be further refined. However, operation calls to o1 and o2 must stay intact.

Memo M3 Operation calls must be preserved in the chain of refinements except for parameter refinement.

Unlike two other decomposition approaches, modularisation offers a greater degree of flexibility on how to construct a decomposed specification because of lower coherence among sub-components. One consequence is that the modularisation approach applies to both top-down and bottom-up designs, and even blurs the boundary. For top-down development, the guideline in Sec. 3 can be used in modularisation approaches as well. In bottom-up development, sub-component interface may already exist before a global integration scenario is designed. This is useful for many industrial use cases in which service integrations and customizations are formally analyzed.

6.1 Master Data Updating System

We take a different approach here that does not follow the guideline in Sec. 3. Even though we will explain the approach in a top-down fashion, it resembles certain aspects of a bottom-up development in that the design of sub-component interfaces is relatively independent of the global integration, because the interfaces are standard communication interfaces that produce and consume messages.

We start with an abstract machine but only specifies message flows and does not state the global property. Interfaces are defined for the two processes and implemented by separate machines by adding local control and data flow information. A sufficient amount of implementation details, such as local variables and properties, is carefully chosen and exposed in their interfaces to enable the verification of the global property. Finally, the top abstract machine is refined by adding details of operation calls and message buffers. The global property is then verified on a final refinement.

Stage 1. Specifying Abstract Message Flows. The top abstract machine uses flags to indicate whether a certain message has been sent or received. For example, if the flag req_snt is T then a request message has been sent. Several invariants describing the order of message events are added for property verification later. As an example, inv6 specifies that a response message has to be sent before it can be received. Message events are abstract at this level and simply set the flags accordingly.
variables: \(\text{req}_s\text{nt}, \text{req}_r\text{cv}, \text{res}_s\text{nt}, \text{res}_r\text{cv}\)

\[\text{inv6} : \quad \text{res}_s\text{nt} = \text{F} \Rightarrow \text{res}_r\text{cv} = \text{F}\]

\(\text{send}_r\text{eq} \equiv \text{when} \quad \text{req}_s\text{nt} = \text{F} \land \text{res}_r\text{cv} = \text{F} \quad \text{then} \quad \text{req}_s\text{nt} = \text{T} \quad \text{end}\)

**Stage 2. Process Interfaces.** The interface of each process defines a set of message operations. These operations do not consider how messages are transported, but merely specify the types of messages that they provide or expect. For example, interface User provides messages to be sent \((\text{get}_\text{request})\), and take incoming messages fed to them for local consumption \((\text{put}_\text{response})\). In particular, \text{get}_\text{request} produces a message equivalent to the local change \((ch)\) proposed by the user.

\begin{align*}
\text{get}_\text{request} & \quad \text{pre} \quad \text{req}_s\text{nt} = \text{F} \land \text{res}_r\text{cv} = \text{F} \\
& \quad \text{return} \quad \text{msg} \\
& \quad \text{post} \quad \text{msg} = ch \\
& \quad \text{req}_s\text{nt}' = \text{T}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{put}_\text{response} & \quad \text{any} \quad \text{msg} \\
& \quad \text{pre} \quad \text{msg} \in \text{BOOL} \land \text{req}_s\text{nt} = \text{T} \\
& \quad \text{return} \quad \text{res}_r\text{cv} = \text{F} \\
& \quad \text{post} \quad \text{ures} = \text{msg} \\
& \quad \text{res}_r\text{cv}' = \text{T}
\end{align*}

**Stage 3. Process Implementations.** Concrete details of sub-components are added in implementations, such as events that describe how control states and local variables are updated. Message-related flags are no longer present, thus we provide a link between those flags and local control states \((u_{cs})\) as gluing invariants like the one below among others.

\[\text{inv18} \quad \text{req}_s\text{nt} = \text{F} \Leftrightarrow u_{cs} \in \{\text{start}, \text{upd}, \text{req}\}\]

An interface implementation is essentially an Event-B refinement step. We need to prove that the postcondition of any interface operation must be fulfilled by the corresponding events that implement the operation. We also need to prove relative deadlock freedom that, whenever an interface operation is enabled, some of its implementing events must be executable.

**Stage 4. Final Global Machine.** The top-level machine is refined at this level to contain operation calls and actual message exchanging behavior. Each process has a buffer to store incoming messages. When a message needs to be sent, the corresponding interface operation of the sender process is called to retrieve the outgoing message, which is then added to the corresponding buffer. When a message is to be received, the message is taken out of the buffer and passed to the receiver process by calling the respective interface operation. In the following code, the prefix \text{user} is used in interface variables and operations of the \text{user} module.

\(\text{send}_r\text{eq} \equiv \text{when} \quad \text{user}_r\text{eq}_s\text{nt} = \text{F} \land \text{user}_r\text{eq}_r\text{cv} = \text{F} \quad \text{then} \quad \text{buf}_s = \text{buf}_s \cup \{\text{user}_r\text{eq}_\text{get}_\text{request}\} \quad \text{end}\)

**Stage 5. Property Verification.** Unlike the other approaches, the global property is encoded and proved at the final global machine. The proof is based on the symbolic values of the local and master databases delivered as operation post-conditions in the process interfaces.
7 Discussions

All approaches decompose global machines into two components, one per process\(^1\). Shared-variable and shared-event approaches start with similar abstractions, specifying a minimal set of events reflecting how the local and remote databases are updated while preserving the global property of interest. A series of refinements are introduced with appropriated chosen gluing invariants and proofs of deadlock freedom and convergence. The two approaches are different in that the shared-event version implements a synchronous message passing model. The choice is mostly motivated by the fact that synchronised message passing events can be shared by two processes. However, the system could be modelled in an asynchronous communication by introducing a buffer sub-component. These two approaches ensure that the global properties are preserved before decomposition. Afterwards each individual sub-component focus on their specific properties. A system involving a shared object is favoured by a shared variable decomposition where the shared object can be accessed by all the sub-components. On the other hand, communicating system parts can be shared event decomposed possibly introducing a middleware to allow an asynchronous approach.

In contrast to the other approaches, the modularisation version formulates and proves the global property at the final stage, after the module interfaces are designed. This is possible because the global machines and modules are loosely coupled, only linked by interfaces. An advantage that immediately comes to mind is flexibility: changes to existing components and inclusion of new components do not necessarily affect unchanged modules nor their proofs. However, the largest challenge of modularisation is the design of appropriate interfaces as they play a crucial role in linking multiple worlds while preserving the global property. During the design of our model, we go through iterations of “trial and error” to find the appropriate amount of information to be exposed in interfaces. As we learned from our experiences, a good practice is to start with an initial interface containing a minimal amount of information and weak possible post-conditions for operations. When these are insufficient to prove the global property, we can gradually bring more information to the interface and strengthen post-conditions.

8 Conclusion

We have presented modelling guidelines for three decomposition techniques of Event-B, illustrated by a case study. Due to limited space, it was impossible to tell the complete story of the case study development. We emphasise on the several design decisions that were taken during the development of the examples, in order to successfully apply decomposition, resulting in helpful sub-models for further independent elaboration. Together, the guidelines and these design decisions act as a document of our experience in applying decomposition techniques.

Decomposition is a powerful technique to cope with the complexity of system development but applying decomposition comes at a price: the cost of planning a development strategy that fits a certain decomposition style. It turns out that mastering the technicalities related to establishing decomposition correctness and even an extensive tool support are still not enough to systematically apply decomposition. Decomposition is rarely successful without prior planning.

\(^1\) The models are available online at http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/22164/
and such development planning is not yet supported by an established methodology.

One fascinating topic for future research is to see how different decomposition techniques complement each other in the same development. The diversity in decomposition approaches may be exploited to make decomposition more flexible and simpler for an end user. We are also planning to formalise the criteria of model decomposability and, if successful, mechanise them in a tool. Such a tool, in principle, could give an immediate answer on which decomposition technique, if any, would succeed for a given model.
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