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Abstract

High level Petri nets have tokens with values, traditionally called colors, and transitions that produce tokens in a functional way, using the consumed tokens as arguments of the function application. Large nets should be designed in a top-down approach and therefore we introduce a hierarchical net model which combines a data flow diagram technique with a high level Petri net model. We use $\mathcal{Z}$ to specify this net model, which is in fact the metamodel for specific systems. Specific models we specify partly by diagrams and partly in $\mathcal{Z}$. We give some advantages and disadvantages of using $\mathcal{Z}$ in this way. Finally we show how to specify systems by means of an example.
1 Introduction

The last years have shown a growing interest in the formal specification of distributed systems. Such a formal description should take care of the distribution aspects, the interaction between the distributed parts, the transitions between successive states of the system and the state space itself.

Petri nets, see e.g. [Jensen 91], have been used for quite a while to specify concurrent distributed systems. These nets have been augmented recently by a hierarchy to allow a systematic top-down design of a system specification. Such a design method is very similar to the common (informal) use of data flow diagrams [Yourdon 89].

Colored nets make it possible to attach values to tokens. For the specification of these values and the functionality of the transitions one needs a specification language. Usually a functional language is used for the specification of the transition functions. Recently, a few tools have been developed that offer hierarchical colored Petri nets as a specification formalism, cf. [Albrecht 89] and [Hee 89]. Our tool, ExSpect, is based upon a hierarchical timed net model and a functional language. This system has been in use for two years and we have gained a lot of experience in practical applications, e.g. [Aalst 90].

On the other hand, formalisms like Z and VDM are used frequently to specify reactive systems. They do not have mechanisms for treating concurrency and distribution in a straightforward way. However, a formalism like Z seems to be very well suited to specify the transitions in a colored Petri net, thereby replacing the functional language normally used.

There have been more attempts to integrate Z with graphical languages for the description of distributed systems. For instance, for HOOD such an integration is considered. In [Giovanni 90] it is noted that an integration with Petri nets is a point of research.

In the next sections we will use Z in two ways. Firstly for defining what a hierarchical Petri net is (section 2) and secondly for the specification of the state transitions of a Petri net (section 3). We will follow the notation of [Spivey 89]; if not we make a remark.

2 Hierarchical net model

Here we introduce the hierarchical net model that is being used in ExSpect [Hee 89] and that is closely related to hierarchical CP-nets [Jensen 91]. First, we define so called flat nets, which are in fact ordinary colored Petri nets. Then we define hierarchical nets and show how such a net determines a flat net.

We use the Z notation for the above definitions, thereby showing that Z is not only useful for modeling specific systems, but also for defining metamodels or model types. As observed in [Diepen 90], Z schemas can be interpreted as implicitly defined tables. So, if we give a schema for the net model, every flat net corresponds to one and only one element or tuple of the table determined by the schema.

2.1 Flat nets

A flat net has four basic types

[Place, Transition, Connection, Value].
The state of a flat net is determined by objects called tokens. Tokens reside at a place, an element of the type \textit{Place}, and have a value belonging to the type \textit{Value}. State changes are caused by transitions, elements of the type \textit{Transition}. A transition can fire, consuming tokens from a specific set of places and producing tokens for another (not necessarily disjoint) set of places. A transition has a set of input and a set of output connections (elements of the type \textit{Connection}). Connections are used to connect transitions to places.

A \textit{flat net structure} is a directed labeled bipartite graph with places and transitions as nodes and connections as arcs. Traditionally, places are represented by circles and transitions by rectangles (cf. figure 1).

A flat net structure is defined by the following schema

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{FlatNetStructure} \\
\hline
\text{P : IP Place} \\
\text{T : IP Transition} \\
\text{I : Transition \rightarrow IP Connection} \\
\text{O : Transition \rightarrow IP Connection} \\
\text{M : Connection \rightarrow Place} \\
\hline
dom(I) = dom(O) = T \land \\
(\bigcup \text{rng}(I)) \cap (\bigcup \text{rng}(O)) = \text{dom}(M) \land \\
\text{rng}(M) = P \land \\
\forall t_1, t_2 : T \mid t_1 \neq t_2 \bullet I(t_1) \cap I(t_2) = O(t_1) \cap O(t_2) = I(t_1) \cap O(t_2) = I(t_1) \cap O(t_1) = \emptyset \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

A net is determined by a set of places \textit{P}, a set of transitions \textit{T}, two functions \textit{I} and \textit{O} that assign to each transition \textit{t} a set of connections through which it \textit{consumes} tokens (\textit{I}(\textit{t}))) and a set of connections through which it \textit{produces} tokens (\textit{O}(\textit{t}))). Each connection is assigned to a place [Hee 91]. So, when a transition \textit{t} fires, it consumes as many tokens from a place as there are connections of \textit{I}(\textit{t}) assigned to it. Furthermore, it produces for each connection in \textit{O}(\textit{t}) one token or none, so if there are \textit{n} connections in \textit{O}(\textit{t}) assigned to a place, \textit{t} may produce any number of tokens between 0 and \textit{n} for this place. The last condition in the schema states that all connections are unique. In practice, we require only that connections between the same place and transition with the same direction have different labels. In that case we augment the label with a pair \((t, p)\) for output connections and \((p, t)\) for input connections (where \textit{t} and \textit{p} are the transition and the place involved) to obtain a unique label.

It is easy to define an instance of the type FlatNetStructure that describes e.g. the graph of fig. 1.
The flat net structure describes only the static aspects of a net model. The dynamics of such a model are described by an (unlabeled) transition system. Such a transition system has a state space $S$ and a binary relation $Tr$ over $S$. Each pair of $Tr$ corresponds to a possible state transition of the whole system. In fact the transition system of the net model may be considered as an operational semantics of the flat net structure.

We define a derived type called $State$,

$$State == Place \leftrightarrow (Value \leftrightarrow \mathbb{N}).$$

So a state is a mapping that assigns to places a function counting the number of tokens per value. (Note that this function does not represent a bag since we allow numbers to be zero; however it is equivalent to one.)

For each place in a net structure, we define a subset of $Value$ that represents the set of allowed token values for this place. We call this set the value domain of the place. In the next schema we define the state space of a net structure

$$StateSpace$$

| $P : \mathbb{P}Place$ |
| $S : \mathbb{P}State$ |
| $D : Place \leftrightarrow \mathbb{P}Value$ |

$\text{dom}(D) = P \land$

$\forall s : S \cdot \text{dom}(s) = P \land$

$\forall s : S \cdot \forall p : P \cdot \text{dom}(s(p)) \subseteq D(p)$

So component $S$ defines the state space and $D$ the function that assigns domains to places. The last predicate states that tokens at a certain place should have values in the domain of that place.

The next schema combines the state space and flat net structure schemas, adding two components. The first component is a function $L$ that assigns to each transition a local state transition function which formalizes the consumption and production of tokens. The second component is the transition relation $Tr$ over the state space.

$$NetModel$$

| FlatNetStructure |
| StateSpace |
| $L : Transition \leftrightarrow (State \leftrightarrow State)$ |
| $Tr : \mathbb{P}(State \times State)$ |

1. $\text{dom}(L) = T$

2. $\forall t : T \cdot \text{dom}(L(t)) \subseteq S$

3. $\forall t : T \cdot \forall s : \text{dom}(L(t)) \cdot \forall p : \text{dom}(s) \cdot$
   
   $\Sigma(s(p)) = \#\{c : I(t) \mid M(c) = p\}$

4. $\forall t : T \cdot \forall s : \text{dom}(L(t)) \cdot \forall p : \text{dom}(L(t)(s)) \cdot$
   
   $\Sigma(L(t)(s)(p)) \leq \#\{c : O(t) \mid M(c) = p\}$

5. $\forall x : Tr \cdot \text{first}(x) \in S \land \text{second}(x) \in S$

6. $\forall s_1, s_2 : S \mid (s_1, s_2) \in Tr \cdot \exists t : T \cdot \exists s : S \cdot$
   
   $\forall p : P \cdot s(p) \leq s_1(p) \land s \in \text{dom}(L(t)) \land$

   $\forall p : P \cdot s_2(p) = s_1(p) - s(p) + L(t)(s)(p)$
The third rule states that for each input connection one token is consumed; the fourth rule that for each output connection at most one token is produced. Rule six tells us how a (global) state transition is derived from a local state change caused by a transition in the net structure. Note that we add, subtract and compare functions; the generic function $\Sigma$ summarizes the images of a function.

Given an initial state, the net model determines the set of paths of the net according to the transition law. If this law is deterministic, i.e. $Tr$ is in reality of the type $State \leftrightarrow State$, there is only one path. Note that for each state transition precisely one net transition should fire.

### 2.2 Hierarchical nets

Now we can introduce net hierarchy. For large systems it is too complicated to define a flat net structure in one step. One often uses a top-down design method similar to data flow diagram techniques [Yourdon 89] or HOOD [Giovanni 90].

Our hierarchical net structure allows us to decompose nets into places and subnets or agents. (Also compare channel/agency nets [Reisig 87]). At each level of the decomposition process we have to decide which subnets are elementary (i.e. are transitions) and which ones need further decomposition. When all subnets have been decomposed into elementary ones, we can proceed by defining a local state transition function for each elementary subnet.

The above hierarchical net structure is useful not only for the design process but also for documenting the net model, since it provides an overview of the flat net structure.

A subnet usually has connections like a transition. We always assume that the (one) subnet at the top of the hierarchy has no connections anymore. This means that if we want to describe a system that communicates with an environment (by exchanging tokens), we have to model that environment as a subnet and incorporate it at the top level. (Note that this was already the case in the flat net structure.) Figure 2 shows three levels of an example hierarchy.

We see that every connection of a subnet is assigned to a place or connection in its supernet. In figure 2, $y$ is assigned to $x$ and $x$ to $z$. In the next schema we define the hierarchical net structure, generalizing the flat net structure. Each subnet (except the top level one) and each place are mapped to precisely one supernet. These mappings constitute the components $HN$ and $HP$ in the schema. Component $Top$ denotes the top level net. For subnets as well as transitions we use the same type

$$[Net]$$

replacing the earlier type $Transition$. Component $N$ denotes all subnets, including transitions. Components $MP$ and $MC$ denote the assignment of connections. They replace component $M$ of the flat net structure.
Figure 2: Hierarchical decomposition.

HierarchicalNetStructure

\( P : \text{iPPlace} \)
\( T : \text{iPNet} \)
\( N : \text{iPNet} \)
\( I : \text{Net} \rightarrow \text{iPConnection} \)
\( O : \text{Net} \rightarrow \text{iPConnection} \)
\( HN : \text{Net} \rightarrow \text{Net} \)
\( HP : \text{Place} \rightarrow \text{Net} \)
\( MP : \text{Connection} \rightarrow \text{Place} \)
\( MC : \text{Connection} \rightarrow \text{Connection} \)
\( Top : \text{Net} \)

1. \( T \subseteq N \land Top \subseteq N \setminus T \land \text{dom}(I) = \text{dom}(O) = N \setminus \{\text{Top}\} \)
2. \( \text{dom}(MP) \cap \text{dom}(MC) = \emptyset \)
3. \( \text{dom}(MP) \cup \text{dom}(MC) = (\bigcup \text{rng}(I)) \cup (\bigcup \text{rng}(O)) \)
4. \( \forall n_1, n_2 : N \mid n_1 \neq n_2 \cdot I(n_1) \cap I(n_2) = O(n_1) \cap O(n_2) = I(n_1) \cap O(n_2) = \emptyset \)
5. \( \text{dom}(HN) = N \setminus \{\text{Top}\} \land \text{rng}(HN) = N \setminus T \)
6. \( \text{dom}(HP) = P \land \text{rng}(HP) = \text{rng}(HN) \)
7. \( \forall n : \text{dom}(HN) \cdot \exists k : N \cdot HN^k(n) = \text{Top} \)
8. \( \forall n : \text{dom}(HN) \cdot \forall c : I(n) \cup O(n) \cdot \)
\( c \in \text{dom}(MP) \Rightarrow HP(MP(c)) = HN(n) \land \)
\( c \in \text{dom}(MC) \land c \in I(n) \Rightarrow MC(c) \in I(HN(n)) \land \)
\( c \in \text{dom}(MC) \land c \in O(n) \Rightarrow MC(c) \in O(HN(n)) \)

The first four rules of the above schema are straightforward modifications of rules of the
flat net structure. Rules 5, 6 and 7 determine the mappings to the supernets; rule 7 guarantees that in the end everything is mapped to Top, so no cycles are possible. The last rule states that if a connection of a subnet is assigned to a place, then both the subnet and the place should be mapped to a common supernet. If it is assigned to a connection, this should be a connection of the supernet.

It is easy to derive a flat net structure from a hierarchical one, by assigning to each connection of a transition the place it is assigned to by the higher level subnets. The next axiomatic description defines a function \( \text{nettrans} \) that maps a hierarchical net structure onto a flat one.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nettrans} & : \text{HierarchicalNetStructure} \rightarrow \text{FlatNetStructure} \\
\forall h : \text{HierarchicalNetStructure} \bullet \\
\exists MN : \text{Connection} \leftrightarrow \text{Place} \bullet \\
\forall t : h.T \bullet \forall c : (h.I) \cup (h.O) t \bullet \\
& \quad c \in \text{dom}(h.MP) \Rightarrow MN(c) = (h.MP)c \wedge \\
& \quad c \in \text{dom}(h.MC) \Rightarrow MN(c) = MN(h.MC)c \\
& \wedge \\
& (\text{nettrans}(h)).P = h.P \wedge \\
& (\text{nettrans}(h)).T = h.T \wedge \\
& (\text{nettrans}(h)).I = h.T \triangle h.I \wedge \\
& (\text{nettrans}(h)).O = h.T \triangle h.O \wedge \\
& (\text{nettrans}(h)).M = h.MN
\end{align*}
\]

Note that the function \( MN \) is defined recursively; it is however easy to see that this definition is sound.

In the development process, we start with the definition of a hierarchical net structure. This we transform into a flat net structure. Next we define a state space and finally a net model. In this section we have defined all these concepts, but we did not give a language to specify a net model. For the hierarchical net structure we advise a graphical representation such as the one we described and used in the example figures. For the specification of the state space and local state transition functions we advocate Z. This is the topic of the next section.

### 3 Specification of nets in Z

#### 3.1 Places and transitions

In section 2 we have defined what a net model is. It is constructed from a hierarchical net structure which determines a flat net structure, a state space and local transition functions per net transition. In this section we show how the state space and the local transition function can be specified using Z. In fact we do more: we also specify the net model in Z. Using some examples, we present a method for specification of net models.

Consider the example of a flat net structure given in figure 3. To specify the value domains of the places we use type definitions. Let the types of the four places be \( T_A, T_B, T_C \) and \( T_D \). We assume that all types have one common value, denoted by \( \perp \) and called
bottom or nil. The places of a net model are specified in one schema called *Places*. In our example we have the following schema for the places:

\[
\begin{align*}
A &: T_A \rightarrow N_1 \\
B &: T_B \rightarrow N_1 \\
C &: T_C \rightarrow N_1 \\
D &: T_D \rightarrow N_1 \\
\text{true}
\end{align*}
\]

Note that all places are real bags now and not bags which allow frequency zero as in section 2.

Transitions are specified by three schemas called *front-end*, *body* and *back-end* that have to be combined by the pipe operator \(\gg\). This operator has been introduced by [Hayes 87]. Later we will see that we only have to specify the body schema, the other schemas can be derived automatically from the body schema. For transition \(P\) in our example we define three schemas \(P_1, P_2\) and \(P_3\) and then \(P \rightleftarrows P_1 \gg P_2 \gg P_3\).

Schema \(P_1\) describes the selection of tokens: one from place \(A\) and one from place \(B\),

\[
P_1
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta \text{Places} \\
\exists (\text{Places}\setminus (A, B)) \\
X! &: T_A \\
Y! &: T_B \\
A \neq \emptyset \land B \neq \emptyset \land \\
X! \in \text{dom}(A) \land Y! \in \text{dom}(B) \land \\
A' = \text{delete}(X!, A) \land B' = \text{delete}(Y!, B)
\end{align*}
\]

Note that both places should contain at least one token. The function \(\text{delete}\) is a generic function with type variable \(T\). It updates a bag of type \(T \rightarrow N\) by deleting an arbitrary element from it.
The following schema of the specification of $P$ is $P_3$.

\[P_3\]

\[\Delta \text{Places} \]

\[\exists(\text{Places}\setminus\{C,D\}) \]

\[V? : T_C \]

\[W? : T_D \]

\[V? \neq \bot \Rightarrow C' = add(V?, C) \land \]

\[V? = \bot \Rightarrow C' = C \land \]

\[W? \neq \bot \Rightarrow D' = add(W?, D) \land \]

\[W? = \bot \Rightarrow D' = D \]

This schema uses another generic function, called $add$, that adds one element to a bag.

\[\text{add} : (T \times (T \rightarrow N)) \rightarrow (T \rightarrow N) \]

\[\forall t : T \land \forall f : T \rightarrow N \land t \in \text{dom}(f) \Rightarrow \]

\[\{t \mapsto f(t) + 1\} \land \]

\[t \notin \text{dom}(f) \Rightarrow \text{add}(t, f) = f \oplus \{t \mapsto 1\} \]

We take special care of the situation that the input has value $\bot$. This case occurs when a transition does not produce a token for a connection.

The schema $P_2$ specifies the functionality of the transition $P$. Since we are at this moment not interested in any particular functionality we leave it open by assuming a predicate $E$. Note that $V!$ or $W!$ may get the value $\bot$, which means that no token is produced.

\[P_2\]

\[X? : T_A \]

\[Y? : T_B \]

\[V! : T_C \]

\[W! : T_D \]

The final schema $P$, defined by $P \models P_1 \gg P_2 \gg P_3$ joins the three schemas and identifies components with $!$ and $?$ and leaves them out of the signature by introducing existential quantors for each of them, as illustrated in the example given in section 3.2.

Of course we could have given a direct way to specify $P$. However, the schemas $P_1$ and $P_3$ can be derived from $P_2$: they do not require any decision from the designer; the designer only has to specify the schema $P_2$. If we consider $X?$ and $Y?$ as input connections of $P$ and $V!$ and $W!$ as output connections, then we only need to know which places they are
assigned to. This information can be derived from the graphical representation of the net structure. Similarly we derive the types of the places by giving the type of the tokens.

So, a full specification of a net model consists of a graphically represented hierarchical net structure, a schema with places and for each transition one schema (the body schema) with input and output connections as components, decorated with ? and ! respectively.

If we generate the front-end and back-end schemas for each transition then we have a complete Z specification with the following operational semantics: if an initial state is given then one of the transitions that is able to fire will do so. Then in the next state again one of the enabled transitions will fire. Note that a transition is enabled if the input places contain enough tokens. In the example this was checked by the first rule of schema $P_1$. It is possible that like in colored Petri nets there is a precondition based on input values. This can be expressed in the body schema of a transition. In our example the predicate $E$ can have an expression, for instance $X? \neq Y?$.

Note that a specification in this way fits into the metamodel we presented in section 2. The diagram of figure 3 is an instance of the flat net structure schema. The state space is defined by the schema $Places$. To see this recall that in the metamodel a state is of the form $Place \leftrightarrow (Value \rightarrow N)$. In the schema $Places$ an instance is a tuple or a mapping that assigns to the places $A$, $B$, $C$ and $D$ a mapping from respectively $T_A$, $T_B$, $T_C$ and $T_D$ to $N$. Hence $T_A$, $T_B$, $T_C$ and $T_D$ are subsets of $Value$ and they determine the domains of the places. So we have defined in this way component $D$ of schema $StateSpace$. The local transition function $L$ of schema $NetModel$ assigns to each transition a mapping from state to state. The transition schema $P$ for transition $P$ is in fact $L(P)$ since it defines a state transition that obeys the laws of the schema $NetModel$. Hence $L$ is specified by a schema per transition. Finally the operational semantics discussed above and below satisfy the requirements for $Tr$ in the schema $NetModel$.

All (serialized) execution paths of a net model can be obtained by constructing all possible lists containing firable transition schemas connected by the ; schema operator. For example for a net consisting of two transitions $P$ and $Q$, we may get an execution path like

$P$
$P; Q$
$P; Q; P$
$P; Q; P; P$
$P; Q; P; P; Q$
...

### 3.2 A small example

As a simple example we consider the net structure of figure 4. It consists of one transition $P$ that copies its input token to both output places. The schema representing the places is

\[
\text{Places}[T]\\
A : T \leftrightarrow N_1\\
B : T \leftrightarrow N_1\\
\text{true}
\]
We have used an arbitrary type $T$ for these places. The front-end, body an back-end schemas for the transition $P$ are, according to the construction in the previous section

$$P_1[T]$$

$\Delta Places$

$\Xi(Places \setminus (A))$

$X! : T$

$A \neq \emptyset \land$

$X! \in \text{dom}(A) \land$

$A' = \text{delete}(X!, A)$

$$P_2[T]$$

$X? : T$

$Y! : T$

$Z! : T$

$Y! = X? \land Z! = X$

$$P_3[T]$$

$\Delta Places$

$Y? : T$

$Z? : T$

$A' = \text{add}(Y?, A) \land$

$B' = \text{add}(Z?, B)$

Then $P$ becomes, after removing most of the existential quantors

$$P$$

$\Delta Places$

$A' = A \land \exists Y : T \bullet B' = \text{add}(Y, B)$

### 3.3 Stores

In many applications it is useful to have a local state for a net transition. This can be modeled by a special place that always contains one token and that is both an input and an output place for the transition. We call such a place a store. (For stores we use a graphical representation differing from normal places.) Two transitions may have access to the same store; however only one at a time since there is only one token in the place representing the store. This avoids concurrent update problems. Usually a store has a rather complex type. It is not necessary to define the store as a bag since there is always one token; this will simplify the specifications considerably. So we may specify the type of a store just by the type of the token. In data base applications this token usually has
a rather complex type that may be defined by several auxiliary schemas. As an example we construct for a store $A$ a database type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>name : NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address : NODE ADDRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age : IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$age \geq 0$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>license : IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind : KIND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horsepower : IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weight : IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$horsepower \cdot 10 \geq weight$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>driver : NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>license : IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>starttime : IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destination : PLACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$A$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>person : $IP(Person)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>car : $IP(Car)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trip : $IP(Trip)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \forall t : trip \cdot t.driver \in \{x : person \cdot x.name\} \land t.license \in \{x : car \cdot x.license\} \]

Note that the condition in schema $A$ is a referential integrity constraint for the database.

### 3.4 An alternative place construction

We could have considered an alternative for the place construction. Up to here we followed the line of section 2. However, this leaves open how to choose tokens from the places. An alternative could be to replace the bags by queues. In fact this is the way we have implemented it in ExSpect. We have to replace the schema for the places by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A : seqT_A$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B : seqT_B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C : seqT_C$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D : seqT_D$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to account for the change of bag into queue. The front-end and back-end schemas for figure 3 now become equal to
Note that $P_2$ does not have to be changed.

4 A distributed telephone index

To illustrate the concepts of the previous sections we present a simple distributed specification of a reactive system. It is a distributed telephone index: it receives questions for phone numbers and gives answers.

Let $NAME$ be the set of all names and let $NUMBER$ be the set of all valid telephone numbers. At the top level we may specify the index system (as seen from the environment of one node) as a schema $TI$. This is possible since we are dealing with a reactive system: it only produces tokens as a reaction upon an incoming token of the environment.

\[
\begin{align*}
T I_2 & \quad X? : NAME \\
& \quad Y! : NUMBER \\
& \quad index : NAME \rightarrow NUMBER \\
& \quad Y! = index(X?)
\end{align*}
\]

The corresponding net is given in figure 5. In this net we have modeled the environment as a subnet which we do not specify any further.
The next step is to decompose the net $TI$ into several subnets $LTI$, each representing a local node. In a local node questions for numbers arrive from the local environment; if possible such a question is answered directly, if not a message is sent into a network of remote telephone indices. After a cycle through this network, an answer will arrive. The decomposition of the net $TI$ is given in figure 6.

![Diagram of the decomposition of the toplevel $TI$.]

We use the following schema to represent the type of a message

```
mes
  name : NAME
  number : NUMBER
  address : NODE ADDRESS
```

where $NODE ADDRESS$ is the set of all node addresses. The $address$ field denotes the node address from which the message originated and $name$ denotes the name for which a number should be found.

We define the network of figure 7 as the decomposition of a local index system $LTI$. Each local index system $i$ has stores containing its local index of names and numbers and its node address.

```
Stores_i
  address_i : NODE ADDRESS
  index_i : NAME $\rightarrow$ NUMBER
  true
```

The places we need are the following...
Questions enter the local index system at $X$, answers are given at $Y$ and the incoming and outgoing network connections are supplied by $R$ and $Z$. The specifications of the bodies of the two transitions $P$ and $Q$ in the local index system are given below.

In reaction to a question on $X$, transition $P$ searches the local index and gives an answer on $Y$ if the name is present. Otherwise it puts a message for information on $Z!$. The (local) index and address are never changed, so we have used $\Xi Stores_i$. 

Figure 7: A local index system LTI.
Transition $Q$ takes an incoming NAME, NUMBER, NODE ADDRESS triple from $R?$ and sends the number to $Y!$ if the address matches the local address. This happens when a message sent by this node has traversed the whole network. Otherwise it searches the local index for the name and forwards the triple to the next node via $Z!$.

5 Conclusions

In this paper we have shown how Z can be used (a) to specify the metamodel of a hierarchical colored Petri net and (b) to specify the transitions in a specific colored Petri net. We have seen that Z is very well suited for such a specification. However, a few small comments remain. It is not possible to specify constants as parameters to schemas (types are possible). Therefore in our example in section 4 we have used a subscript $i$. Furthermore when one wants an executable specification, one needs to restrict the predicates in the body schemas of the transitions.

A method for constructing specifications of distributed systems starts by building a hierarchical net model in a graphical way and continues by specifying the primitive transitions by means of Z schemas. As a next design step, the Z schemas should be transformed into functions in order to get an executable specification as in ExSpect.
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