This form is a summary description of the model entitled "UtahNoC" proposed for the Model Checking Contest @ Petri Nets. Models can be given in several instances parameterized by scaling parameters. Colored nets can be accompanied by one or many equivalent, unfolded P/T nets. Models are given together with property files (possibly, one per model instance) giving a set of properties to be checked on the model.

 $\stackrel{\mathrm{since}}{\mathrm{MCC}}$  2014

# Description

This Petri net model describes one routing node of a fault-tolerant wormhole routing algorithm for an asynchronous on-chip network communication. Data transmission between two arbitrary nodes is achieved by packets flowing from the their sources to destinations in the network.

The network considered is a two-by-two two-dimensional mesh which has four corner routing nodes, so that each routing node has two neighboring nodes and its own IP. Each IP is responsible for injecting and absorbing packets to and from its routing node. A routing node accepts a packet from its neighbors and/or its IP, computes the forwarding routing direction based on the packet's source and destination, and then transmits it accordingly. Each routing node consists of three routers and three arbiters. A router is responsible for accepting packets from its neighbor or its own IP. An arbiter is responsible for outputting a packet to its neighbor or its own IP.

Links can fail transmitting packets. To make the routing algorithm fault-tolerant, each packet is in general issued with two routing choices, providing an alternative if the first choice fails. Therefore, a router is connected to all three arbiters that are in the same node, and if one arbiter is not available, the router still has chances to communicate with the rest arbiters.

The model specification is written in LNT (*LOTOS New Technology*), which combines functional languages (to describe data types and user-defined functions operating on typed values) and process calculi (to describe concurrent components that synchronize using rendezvous and communicate via message passing). The LNT specification used was the version dated on November 28, 2013, which is 660-line long. The LNT specification was translated to LOTOS, and then to an interpreted Petri net using the CADP toolbox. Finally, the present P/T net was obtained by stripping out all dataflow-related information (variables, types, assignments, guards, etc.) from the interpreted Petri net, leading to a NUPN (*Nested-Unit Petri Net*) model translated to PNML using the CÆSAR.BDD tool.

# References

Jian Wu, Zhen Zhang, and Chris Myers. A Fault-Tolerant Routing Algorithm for a Network-on-Chip using a Link Fault Model. Proceedings of the Virtual Worldwide Forum for PhD Researchers in Electronic Design Automation, 2011. http: //www.async.ece.utah.edu/publications/VW-FEDA2.pdf

# Scaling parameter

This model is not parameterized.

# Size of the model

number of places:	216
number of transitions:	977
number of arcs:	2905
number of units:	9
HWB code ( <i>height-width-bits</i> ):	2 - 8 - 37

# Structural properties

ordinary -	all arcs have multiplicity one	/
simple free	$choice$ — all transitions sharing a common input place have no other input place $\ldots \ldots \ldots \checkmark \checkmark (\epsilon$	ı)

<sup>(a)</sup> 944 arcs are not simple free choice, e.g., the arc from place 1 (which has 40 outgoing transitions) to transition 808 (which has 2 input places).

#### 

 $\stackrel{\mathrm{since}}{\mathrm{MCC}}$  2014

# Behavioural properties

safe — in every reachable marking, there is no more than one token on a place	<mark>/ (</mark>	э)
dead place(s) — one or more places have no token in any reachable marking	<mark>Х (</mark> 1	9)
dead transition(s) — one or more transitions cannot fire from any reachable marking	X (0	q)
deadlock — there exists a reachable marking from which no transition can be fired	. ? (	r)
reversible — from every reachable marking, there is a transition path going back to the initial marking		?
live — for every transition t, from every reachable marking, one can reach a marking in which t can fire		?

#### Size of the marking graph

number of reachable markings:	$4.7599 \times 10^9$ (s)
number of transition firings:	$7.7248 \times 10^{10}$ (t)
max. number of tokens per place:	1 <sup>(u)</sup>
max. number of tokens per marking:	$8^{(v)}$

 $^{\rm (r)}$  found to be false at MCC'2014 by GreatSPN.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>(b)</sup> transitions 808 and 814 share a common input place 1, but only the former transition has input place 192.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>(c)</sup> 473 transitions are not of a state machine, e.g., transition 78.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>(d)</sup> 204 places are not of a marked graph, e.g., place 0.

<sup>(</sup>e) stated by CÆSAR.BDD version 1.5.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm (f)}$  from place 1 one cannot reach place 0.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>(g)</sup> place 0 is a source place.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>(h)</sup> stated by CÆSAR.BDD version 1.5.

<sup>(</sup>i) stated by CÆSAR.BDD version 1.5.

<sup>(</sup>j) stated by CÆSAR.BDD version 1.5.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm (k)}$  551 transitions are not loop free, e.g., transition 165.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>(1)</sup> transition 78 is not conservative.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>(m)</sup> transition 78 is not subconservative.

 $<sup>^{(</sup>n)}$  the definition of Nested-Unit Petri Nets (NUPN) is available from http://mcc.lip6.fr/nupn.php

<sup>(</sup>o) safe by construction – stated by the  $C \not\equiv SAR$  compiler.

 $<sup>^{(</sup>p)}$  stated by CÆSAR.BDD version 3.3.

 $<sup>^{(</sup>q)}$  stated by CÆSAR.BDD version 2.0.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>(s)</sup> computed at MCC'2014 by GreatSPN, Marcie, PNMC, and PNXDD; exact value: 4,759,924,249.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm (t)}$  computed at MCC'2014 by Marcie; exact value: 77,248,039,202.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm (u)}$  stated by the CÆSAR compiler; confirmed at MCC'2014 by GreatSPN and Marcie.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm (v)}$  confirmed at MCC'2014 by GreatSPN and Marcie.