

# Synthesis of Distributed Agreement-Based Systems with Efficiently-Decidable Verification

Nouraldin Jaber<sup>1</sup>, Christopher Wagner<sup>1</sup>, Swen Jacobs<sup>2</sup>, Milind Kulkarni<sup>1</sup>, and  
Roopsha Samanta<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

{njaber,wagne279,milind,roopsha}@purdue.edu

<sup>2</sup> CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Saarbrücken, Germany  
jacobs@cispa.de

**Abstract.** *Distributed agreement-based* (DAB) systems use common distributed agreement protocols such as leader election and consensus as building blocks for their target functionality. While automated verification for DAB systems is undecidable in general, recent work identifies a large class of DAB systems for which verification is *efficiently-decidable*. Unfortunately, the conditions characterizing such a class can be opaque and non-intuitive, and can pose a significant challenge to system designers trying to model their systems in this class.

In this paper, we present a synthesis-driven tool, CINNABAR, to help system designers building DAB systems ensure that their intended designs belong to an efficiently-decidable class. In particular, starting from an initial *sketch* provided by the designer, CINNABAR generates sketch completions using a counterexample-guided procedure. The core technique relies on compactly encoding root-causes of counterexamples to varied properties such as efficient-decidability and safety. We demonstrate CINNABAR’s effectiveness by successfully and efficiently synthesizing completions for a variety of interesting DAB systems including a distributed key-value store and a distributed consortium system.

## 1 Introduction

Distributed system designers are increasingly embracing the incorporation of formal verification techniques into their development pipelines [8,11,14,32]. The formal methods community has been enthusiastically responding to this trend with a wide array of modeling and verification frameworks for prevalent distributed systems [30,19,17,33]. A desirable workflow for a system designer using one of these frameworks is to (1) provide a framework-specific model and specification of their system, and (2) *automatically* verify if the system model meets its specification.

However, the problem of algorithmically checking if a distributed system is correct for an *arbitrary* number of processes, i.e., the *automated parameterized verification problem*, is undecidable, even for finite-state processes [5,35]. To circumvent undecidability, the system designer must be involved, *one way*

or another, in the verification process. *Either* the designer may choose a semi-automated verification approach and use their expertise to “assist” the verifier by providing inductive invariants [33,26,17,37]. *Or*, the designer may choose a fully-automated verification approach that is only applicable to a restricted class of system models [18,19,25,7] and use their expertise to ensure that the model of their system belongs to the decidable class. This begs the question—for *each workflow*, how can we further simplify the system designer’s task? While effective frameworks have been developed to aid the designer in discovering inductive invariants for the first workflow (e.g., Ivy [30], I4 [27]), there has been little emphasis on aiding the designer to build *decidability-compliant* models of their systems for the second workflow.

In this paper, we present a synthesis-driven approach to help system designers using the second workflow to build models that are *both* decidability-compliant and correct. Thus, our approach helps designers to construct models that belong to a decidable class for automated, parameterized verification, and can be automatically verified to be safe for any number of processes.

In particular, we instantiate this approach in a tool, CINNABAR, that targets an existing framework, QUICKSILVER, for modeling and automated verification of *distributed agreement-based (DAB) systems* [19]. Such systems use *agreement protocols* such as leader election and consensus as building blocks. QUICKSILVER enables modular verification of DAB systems by providing a modeling language, MERCURY, that allows designers to model *verified* agreement protocols using inbuilt language primitives, and identifying a class of MERCURY models for which the parameterized verification problem is *efficiently decidable*.

Unfortunately, this *efficiently-decidable* class of MERCURY models is characterized using conditions that are rather opaque and non-intuitive, and can pose a significant challenge to system designers trying to model their systems in this class. The designer is responsible for understanding the conditions, and manually modifying their system model to ensure it belongs to the efficiently-decidable class of MERCURY. This process can be both tedious and error-prone, even for experienced system designers.

CINNABAR demonstrates that synthesis can be used to automatically build models of DAB systems that belong to the efficiently-decidable fragment of MERCURY and are correct.

**Contributions.** The key contributions of this paper are:

1. A *synthesis-driven method for building efficiently-decidable, correct MERCURY models* (Sec. 3). Starting from an initial *sketch* of the system design provided by the designer, CINNABAR generates a *sketch completion* that (i) belongs to the efficiently-decidable class of MERCURY and (ii) is correct.
2. A *counterexample-guided synthesis procedure that leverages an efficient, extensible, multi-stage architecture* (Sec. 4). We present a procedure that involves a learner that proposes completions of the MERCURY sketch, and a teacher that checks if the completed model belongs to the efficiently-decidable class of MERCURY and is correct. To enable efficient synthesis using this procedure, we propose an architecture that proceeds in stages.

The initial stages focus on checking if a completed model is in the efficiently-decidable class while the latter stages focus on checking if a completed model is also correct. To enable efficiency, when a candidate completion fails at any stage, the architecture helps the learner avoid “similar” completions by *extracting a root-cause* of the failure and *encoding* the root-cause as an additional constraint for the learner. Each stage is equipped with a counterexample extraction strategy tailored to the *property* checked in that stage. The encoding procedure, on the other hand, is property-agnostic—it is able to encode the root-cause of any failure regardless of the stage that extracts it. The separation of the counterexample extractions and the encoding allows the architecture to be extensible—one can add a new stage with a new counterexample extraction strategy, and leverage the existing encoding.

3. *The CINNABAR tool* (Sec. 5). We develop a tool, CINNABAR, to help system designers build MERCURY models of DAB systems. CINNABAR employs QUICKSILVER as its teacher and the Z3 SMT solver as its learner. CINNABAR is able to successfully and efficiently complete MERCURY sketches of various interesting distributed agreement-based systems.

## 2 The MERCURY Parameterized Synthesis Problem

We first briefly review the syntax and semantics of MERCURY [19], a modeling language for distributed systems that build on top of verified agreement protocols such as leader election and consensus. Then, we formalize the synthesis problem.

### 2.1 Review: MERCURY Systems

**MERCURY Process Definition.** A MERCURY system is composed of an arbitrary number of  $n$  identical MERCURY system processes with process identifiers  $1, \dots, n$  and one environment process. The programmer specifies a system process definition  $P$  that consists of (i) a set  $V$  of *local variables* with finite domains, (ii) a set  $E$  of *events* used to communicate between processes, and (iii) a set of *locations* that the processes can move between. Each event  $e$  in  $E$  incarnates an *acting action*  $A(e)$  and a *reacting action*  $R(e)$  (e.g., for a rendezvous event, the acting (resp.

reacting) action is the send (resp. receive) of that event). All processes start in a location denoted **initial**. Each location contains a set of *action handlers* a process in that location can execute. Each handler has an associated action, a Boolean guard over the local variables, and a set of update statements. A partial process definition is depicted on the right.

The language supports five different types of events, namely, broadcast, rendezvous, partition, consensus, and internal. The *synchronous* broadcast (resp.

```

process DistributedStore
variables
  int[1,5] cmd
events
  env rz doCmd : int[1,5]
initial location Candidate
on partition<elect>(All, 1)
  win: goto Leader
  lose: goto Replica
location Leader
on recv(doCmd) do
  cmd := doCmd.payload
  if(cmd = 3) goto Return
  else goto RepCmd
...

```

rendezvous) *communication* event type is denoted **br** (resp. **rz**) and indicates an event where one process synchronously communicates with all other processes (resp. another process). The *agreement* event type partition, denoted **partition**, indicates an event where a set of processes agree to partition themselves into winners and losers. For instance, in the figure, **partition<elect>** (**All,1**) denotes a leader election round with identifier **elect** where **All** processes elect 1 winning process that moves to the **Leader** location, while all other losing processes move to the **Replica** location. The *agreement* event type consensus, denoted **consensus**, indicates an event where a set of processes, each proposing one value, reach consensus on a given set of decided values. For instance, **consensus<vcCmd>** (**All,1,cmd**) denotes a consensus round with identifier **vcCmd** where **All** processes want to agree on 1 decided value from the set of proposed values in the local variable **cmd**. Finally, the internal event indicates an event where a process is performing its own internal computations. For a communication event, the acting action is a send, while the reacting action is a receive. For a partition event, the acting action is a win, while the reacting action is a lose. Finally, for a consensus event, the acting action is proposing a winning value, while the reacting action is proposing a losing value. We denote by  $A(E)$  and  $R(E)$  the set of all acting and reacting actions, respectively.

The updates in an action handler may contain send, assignment, goto, and/or conditional statements. Assignment statements are of the form **lhs** := **rhs** where **lhs** is a local variable and **rhs** is an expression of the appropriate type. The goto statement **goto**  $\ell$  causes the process to switch to location  $\ell$  (i.e., it can be thought of as the assignment statement  $v_{loc} := \ell$ , where  $v_{loc}$  is a special “location variable” that stores the current location of the process). The conditional statements are of the expected form: **if**(**cond**) **then**...**else**... We denote by  $H$  the set of all handlers in the process, and for each handler  $h \in H$  we denote its action, guard, and updates as  $a(h)$ ,  $g(h)$ , and  $u(h)$ , respectively.

**Local Semantics.** The local semantics  $\llbracket P \rrbracket$  of a process  $P$  is expressed as a state-transition system  $(S, s_0, E, T)$ , where  $S$  is the set of local states,  $s_0$  is the initial state,  $E$  is the set of events, and  $T \subseteq S \times \{A(E) \cup R(E)\} \times S$  is the set of transitions of  $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ . A state  $s \in S$  is a valuation of the variables in  $V$ . We let  $s(v)$  denote the value of the variable  $v$  in state  $s$ .

The set of action handlers associated with all acting and reacting actions of all events induces the transitions in  $T$ . In particular, a transition  $t = s \xrightarrow{a} s'$  based on action handler  $h$  over action  $a$  is in  $T$  iff the guard  $g(h)$  evaluates to *true* in  $s$  and  $s'$  is obtained by applying the updates  $u(h)$  to  $s$ .

**Global Semantics.** The global semantics  $\llbracket P, n \rrbracket$  of a MERCURY system  $P_1 \parallel \dots \parallel P_n \parallel P_e$  consisting of  $n$  identical processes  $P_1, \dots, P_n$  and an environment process  $P_e$  (with local state space  $S_e$ ) is expressed as a transition system  $(Q, q_0, E, R)$ , where  $Q = S^n \times S_e$  is the set of global states,  $q_0$  is the initial global state,  $E$  is the set of events, and  $R \subseteq Q \times E \times Q$  is the set of global transitions of  $\llbracket P, n \rrbracket$ .

The set of events  $E$  induce the transitions in  $R$ . As is the case for events, there are five types of global transitions: broadcast, rendezvous, partition, consensus, and internal. In particular, a transition  $r = q \xrightarrow{e} q'$  for some broadcast event  $e$

is in  $R$  iff the send local transition  $q[i] \xrightarrow{A(e)} q[i]'$  is in  $T$  for some process  $P_i$ , and the receive local transition  $q[j] \xrightarrow{R(e)} q[j]'$  is in  $T$  for every other process  $P_j$  with  $j \neq i$ . The remaining global transitions can be formalized similarly.

A trace of a MERCURY system is a sequence  $q_0, q_1, \dots$  of global states such that for every  $i \geq 0$ , the global transition  $q_i \xrightarrow{e} q_{i+1}$  for some event  $e$  is in  $R$ . A global state  $q$  is *reachable* if there is a trace that ends in it.

**Permissible Safety Specifications.** QUICKSILVER targets parameterized verification for a class of properties called *permissible* safety specifications that disallow global states where  $m$  or more processes, for some fixed number  $m$ , are in some subset of the local states. We denote by  $\phi_s(n)$  the permissible safety specifications provided by the designer for a system with  $n$  processes. A MERCURY system is safe if there are no reachable error states in its global semantics. We denote that as  $\llbracket P, n \rrbracket \models \phi_s(n)$ .

**The Efficiently-Decidable Fragment.** QUICKSILVER identifies a fragment of MERCURY for which the parameterized verification problem of a large class of safety properties is *efficiently-decidable*. In particular, a pair  $\langle P, \phi \rangle$  of a MERCURY process  $P$  and a safety specification  $\phi$  is in the efficiently-decidable fragment of MERCURY if it satisfies *phase-compatibility* and *cutoff-amenability* conditions. For such a pair, a *cutoff* number  $c$  of processes can be computed and the parameterized verification problem can be reduced to the verification of the cutoff-sized system (i.e.,  $\forall n : \llbracket P, n \rrbracket \models \phi_s(n) \Leftrightarrow \llbracket P, c \rrbracket \models \phi_s(c)$ ).

During verification, QUICKSILVER computes a set of *phases* that an execution of the system goes through. On a high level, the phase-compatibility conditions ensure that the system moves between phases through “globally-synchronizing” events (i.e., broadcast, partition, or consensus), and that all processes in the same phase can participate in further globally-synchronizing events. This ensures that the system’s ability to move between phases is *independent* of the number of processes in the system. The cutoff-amenability conditions ensure that an error state, where  $m$  processes are in a subset of the local states violating some safety specification, is reachable in a system of any size iff it is reachable in a system with exactly  $m$  processes. If any of these conditions fails, the designer must modify the process definition manually and attempt the verification again. We denote by  $\llbracket P \rrbracket \models \phi_{pc}$  (resp.  $\llbracket P \rrbracket \models \phi_{ca}$ ) that the MERCURY process  $P$  with local semantics  $\llbracket P \rrbracket$  satisfies phase-compatibility (resp. cutoff-amenability) conditions.

## 2.2 MERCURY Process Sketch

Let us extend MERCURY’s syntax to allow process *sketches* that can be completed by a synthesizer. In particular, we allow the process definition to include a set of *uninterpreted functions* that can replace various expressions in MERCURY such as the Boolean expression `cond` in the `if(cond) then ... else ...`, the target locations of `goto` statements, and the `rhs` of assignments.<sup>3</sup> As is standard, each uninterpreted function  $f$  is equipped with a signature determining its

<sup>3</sup> Such uninterpreted functions are sufficient to be a building block for more complex expressions and statements (See, for instance, the SKETCH Language [34]).




Fig. 1: Overview of CINNABAR's architecture.

list of named, typed parameters and its return type. A valid list of arguments **arg** for some function  $f$  is a list of values with types that match the function's parameter list. Applying a function  $f$  to a valid list of arguments **arg** is denoted by  $f(\mathbf{arg})$ . Additionally, we define a *function interpretation*  $I(f)$  of an uninterpreted function  $f$  as a mapping from every valid list of arguments of  $f$  to a valid return value.

A MERCURY process definition  $P$  that contains one or more uninterpreted functions is called a *sketch*, and is denoted  $P_{sk}$ . We denote by  $F_{sk}$  the set of all uninterpreted functions in a sketch  $P_{sk}$ . An interpretation  $I$  of the set  $F_{sk}$  of uninterpreted functions is then a mapping from every uninterpreted function  $f_{sk} \in F_{sk}$  to some function interpretation  $I(f_{sk})$ .

For some process sketch  $P_{sk}$  and some interpretation  $I$  of the set  $F_{sk}$  of uninterpreted functions in  $P_{sk}$ , we denote by  $P_I$  the *interpreted process sketch* obtained by replacing every uninterpreted function  $f_{sk} \in F_{sk}$  in the sketch  $P_{sk}$  with its function interpretation  $I(f_{sk})$  according to the interpretation  $I$ .

### 2.3 Problem Definition

We now define the parameterized synthesis problem for MERCURY systems.

**Definition 1 (MERCURY Parameterized Synthesis Problem (MPSP)).** *Given a process sketch  $P_{sk}$  with a set of uninterpreted functions  $F_{sk}$ , an environment process  $P_e$ , and permissible safety specification  $\phi_s(n)$ , find an interpretation  $I$  of uninterpreted functions in  $F_{sk}$  such that the system  $P_{I,1} || \dots || P_{I,n} || P_e$  is safe for any number of processes, i.e.,  $\forall n : \llbracket P_I, n \rrbracket \models \phi_s(n)$ .*

## 3 Constraint-Based Synthesis for MERCURY Systems

**Architecture.** To solve MPSP, we propose a multi-stage, counterexample-based architecture, shown in Fig. 1, with the following components:

- **LEARNER**: a constraint-solver that accepts a set  $C$  of *constraints* over the uninterpreted functions  $F_{sk}$  and generates interpretations  $I$  satisfying these constraints (i.e.,  $I \models C$ ). Specifically, a constraint  $c \in C$  is a well-typed Boolean formula over uninterpreted function applications.
- **TEACHER**: a component capable of checking phase-compatibility, cutoff-amenability, safety, and *liveness*<sup>4</sup> of MERCURY systems. We refer to these four conditions as *properties*.
- **complete**: a component that builds an interpreted process sketch  $P_I$  from a process sketch  $P_{sk}$  and an interpretation  $I$  provided by the learner.
- **extract<sub>prop</sub>**: a *property-specific* component to extract a counterexample  $ce_x$ , capturing the root cause of a violation, if the TEACHER determines that a property *prop* from the above-mentioned properties is violated.
- **encode**: a novel *property-agnostic* component that encodes counterexamples generated by **extract** components into additional constraints for the learner.

**Synthesis Procedure.** CINNABAR instantiates this architecture as shown in Algo. 1. The algorithm starts with an empty set of constraints,  $C$  (Line 2) over the set  $F_{sk}$  of uninterpreted functions in the process sketch  $P_{sk}$ . In each iteration, it checks if there exists an interpretation  $I$  of the uninterpreted functions that satisfies all the constraints collected so far (Line 4). If such an interpretation is found, it is used to obtain an interpreted process sketch  $P_I$  (Line 6). Then, the algorithm checks if the system described by  $P_I$  is phase-compatible and cutoff-amenable. If so, a cutoff  $c$  is computed (Line 13) and the  $c$ -sized system is checked to be safe. The cutoff-amenability stage is similar to phase-compatibility and is hence omitted from the algorithm. At any stage, if the process fails to satisfy any of these properties (e.g., a counterexample  $ce_x$  to phase-compatibility is found on Line 8), the root-cause of the failure is extracted and encoded into a constraint for the learner to rule out the failure (e.g., Line 10).

---

**Algorithm 1:** Solving MPSP.

---

```

1 procedure Synth( $P_{sk}, \phi_s(n), \phi_l(c)$ )
2    $C = \emptyset$ 
3   while true do
4      $I = \text{interpret}(F_{sk}, C)$ 
5     if  $I \neq \text{null}$  then
6        $P_I = \text{complete}(P_{sk}, I)$ 
7        $\llbracket P_I \rrbracket = \text{buildLS}(P_I)$ 
8        $ce_x = \text{findPhCoCE}(\llbracket P_I \rrbracket)$ 
9       if  $ce_x \neq \text{null}$  then
10         $C = C \cup \neg \text{encode}(ce_x)$ 
11        Continue
12       ...  $\triangleright$  check cutoff-amenability
13        $c = \text{compCutoff}(P_I, \phi_s(n))$ 
14        $\llbracket P_I, c \rrbracket = \text{buildGS}(P_I, c)$ 
15        $ce_s = \text{findSaCE}(\llbracket P_I, c \rrbracket, \phi_s(c))$ 
16       if  $ce_s \neq \text{null}$  then
17         $C = C \cup \neg \text{encode}(ce_s)$ 
18        Continue
19       return  $P_I$ 
20   else
21     return null

```

---

<sup>4</sup> While MPSP targets permissible safety specifications, in order to improve the *quality* of the interpreted process sketch  $P_I$ , we extend MERCURY with *liveness* specifications to help rule out trivial completions that are safe. We emphasize that such specifications are only used as a tool to improve the quality of synthesis, and are only guaranteed for the cutoff-sized system, as opposed to safety properties that are guaranteed for any system size.

Note that these stages are checked sequentially due to the inherent dependency between them: (i) the system can only be cutoff amenable if it is phase compatible, and (ii) one can only check safety after a cutoff has been computed.

**Lemma 1.** *Assuming that the teacher is sound and the learner is complete for finite sets of interpretations, Algo. 1 for solving MPSP is sound and complete.*

*Proof.* Soundness follows directly from the soundness of the teacher. Completeness follows from that the encoding and extraction procedures ensure progress by eliminating at least the current interpretation at each iteration, and the finiteness of the set of interpretations. Finiteness follows from (i) the finite number of uninterpreted functions in a sketch  $P_{sk}$ , (ii) the finiteness of the domain of each local variable, and (iii) the finiteness of the number of local variables in  $P_{sk}$ .

In the remainder of this section, we describe the property-agnostic **encode** component in Algo. 1. In the following section, we describe our implementation of our synthesis procedure specialized to a QUICKSILVER-based teacher and property-specific extraction procedures.

### Property-Agnostic Counterexample Encoding Procedure

We first describe the necessary augmentation of local semantics with *disabled transitions* needed for CINNABAR’s counterexample extraction and encoding. While such transitions are not relevant when reasoning about a “concrete” process definition (i.e., one with no uninterpreted functions), they are quite important when extracting an *explanation* for why some conditions (e.g., phase-compatibility) fail to hold on  $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ .

**Augmented Local Semantics of the MERCURY Process  $P_I$ .** We extend the definition of the local semantics of a MERCURY interpreted process sketch  $P_I$  to be  $\llbracket P_I \rrbracket = (S_I, s_0, E, T_I, T_I^{dis})$  where  $S_I$ ,  $s_0$ ,  $E$ , and  $T_I$  are defined as before and  $T_I^{dis}$  is the set of *disabled transitions* under the current interpretation  $I$ . In particular, a disabled transition  $t = s \xrightarrow{a} \perp$  based on action handler  $h$  over action  $a$  is in  $T_I^{dis}$  iff the guard  $g(h)$  evaluates to *false* in  $s$ . The symbol  $\perp$  here indicates that no local state is reachable, since the guard is disabled.

Additionally, we say a transition  $t = s \xrightarrow{a} s'$  based on action handler  $h$  over action  $a$  is a *sketch transition* if  $h$  contains no uninterpreted functions in its guard or updates. A local state  $s \in S_I$  is *concrete* if (i)  $s$  is the initial state  $s_0$ , or (ii) there exists a sketch transition  $s' \rightarrow s$  where  $s'$  is concrete. In other words, a local state  $s$  is concrete if there exists a path from the initial state  $s_0$  to  $s$  that is composed purely of sketch transitions and hence is always reachable regardless of the interpretation we obtain from the learner.

We now formalize counterexamples for phase-compatibility and cutoff amenability properties then present an encoding procedure for such counterexamples. The encoding is *exact* in the sense that a generated constraint  $c$  corresponding to some counterexample *ce* rules out exactly all interpretations  $I$  where an interpreted process sketch  $P_I$  exhibits *ce* (as opposed to an over-approximation



where  $\mathbf{c}$  would rule out interpreted process sketches that do not exhibit  $cex$ , or an under-approximation where  $\mathbf{c}$  would allow interpreted process sketches that do exhibit  $cex$ ). Additionally, the encoding is *property-agnostic* in the sense that it can handle counterexamples for any property failure.

**Counterexamples.** Recall that a candidate process  $P_I$  based on some process sketch  $P_{sk}$  and interpretation  $I$  has the local semantics  $\llbracket P_I \rrbracket = (S_I, s_0, E, T_I, T_I^{dis})$ . A counterexample  $cex$  to phase-compatibility (resp. cutoff-amenability) is a “subset” of the local semantics  $\llbracket P_I \rrbracket$  such that  $cex \not\models \phi_{pc}$  (resp.  $cex \not\models \phi_{ca}$ ). We say that  $cex$  is a subset of  $\llbracket P_I \rrbracket$ , denoted  $cex \subseteq \llbracket P_I \rrbracket$ , when it has a subset of its enabled and disabled transitions, i.e.,  $cex = (S_I, s_0, E, T'_I \subseteq T_I, T_I'^{dis} \subseteq T_I^{dis})$ .

**Encoding Counterexamples.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the set of all well-typed constraints that the learner accepts. The encoding of counterexample  $cex = (S_I, s_0, E, T_I, T_I^{dis})$  w.r.t. interpretation  $I$  is a formula  $\langle\langle cex \rangle\rangle_I \in \mathcal{C}$  defined as:

$$\langle\langle cex \rangle\rangle_I = \left( \bigwedge_{t_{en} \in T_I} \langle\langle t_{en} \rangle\rangle_I \right) \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{t_{dis} \in T_I^{dis}} \langle\langle t_{dis} \rangle\rangle_I \right),$$

where  $\langle\langle t_{en} \rangle\rangle_I$  (resp.  $\langle\langle t_{dis} \rangle\rangle_I$ ) is an encoding of an enabled (resp. disabled) local transition. Note that  $\langle\langle cex \rangle\rangle_I$  is satisfied under interpretation  $I$  (i.e.,  $I \models \langle\langle cex \rangle\rangle_I$ ) and implies that  $cex \subseteq \llbracket P \rrbracket$ . An encoding of some enabled transition  $t_{en} = s \xrightarrow{a} s'$  based on action handler  $h$  over action  $a$  is defined as:

$$\langle\langle s \xrightarrow{a} s' \rangle\rangle_I = \langle\langle s \rangle\rangle_I \wedge \langle\langle a : s \rangle\rangle_I \wedge \langle\langle s' : s, a \rangle\rangle_I,$$

where:

1. the predicate  $\langle\langle s \rangle\rangle_I$  indicating that the source state  $s$  is reachable from the initial state  $s_0$  under interpretation  $I$ . If  $s$  is concrete,  $\langle\langle s \rangle\rangle_I$  is simply *true* (i.e.,  $s$  is always reachable regardless of  $I$ ). Otherwise,  $\langle\langle s \rangle\rangle_I$  is defined as follows. Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the set of all paths from the initial state  $s_0$  to state  $s$ . Then,  $\langle\langle s \rangle\rangle_I := \bigvee_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \langle\langle p \rangle\rangle_I$ , where  $\langle\langle p \rangle\rangle_I$  for some path  $p$  consisting of local transitions  $t_1, \dots, t_i$  is defined as  $\langle\langle t_1 \rangle\rangle_I \wedge \dots \wedge \langle\langle t_i \rangle\rangle_I$ .
2. the predicate  $\langle\langle a : s \rangle\rangle_I$  indicating that the process can perform action  $a$  from state  $s$ . The predicate  $\langle\langle a : s \rangle\rangle_I$  is defined as follows:  $\langle\langle a : s \rangle\rangle_I := (g(h)[s(V)/V] = \text{true})$ , where  $g(h)[s(V)/V]$  is the guard  $g(h)$  with each local variable  $v \in V$  replaced by its value  $s(v)$  in state  $s$ .

*Example.* Let  $\mathbf{uf}(x, y)$  be an uninterpreted function over local **int** variables  $x$  and  $y$ . Let the local state  $s := \{v_{loc} = \mathbf{F}, x = 1, y = 2\}$ , and let the local guard of action handler  $h$  over action  $a$  in location  $\mathbf{F}$  be  $g := \mathbf{uf}(x, y) > 7 \vee x = 2$ . Then  $\langle\langle a : s \rangle\rangle_I = ((\mathbf{uf}(s(x), s(y)) > 7 \vee s(x) = 2) = \text{true})$  which is  $((\mathbf{uf}(1, 2) > 7 \vee 1 = 2) = \text{true})$  which simplifies to  $\mathbf{uf}(1, 2) > 7$ .

3. the predicate  $\langle\langle s' : s, a \rangle\rangle_I$  indicating that  $s$  goes to  $s'$  on action  $a$ . The predicate  $\langle\langle s' : s, a \rangle\rangle_I$  is defined as follows. Let  $u(h)$  denote the set of updates of the form  $\mathbf{lhs} := \mathbf{rhs}$  of handler  $h$  over action  $a$ . Then,  $\langle\langle s' : s, a \rangle\rangle_I := \bigwedge_{\mathbf{lhs} := \mathbf{rhs} \in u(h)} s'(\mathbf{lhs}) = \mathbf{rhs}[s(V)/V]$ .

*Example.* Let the set of updates have the single update  $x := \mathbf{uf}(y, z)$  and  $s, s'$  be  $\{v_{loc} = \mathbf{F}, x = 1, y = 2, z = 3\}$  and  $\{v_{loc} = \mathbf{D}, x = 5, y = 2, z = 3\}$ . Then  $\langle\langle s' : s, a \rangle\rangle_I$  is:  $s'(x) = \mathbf{uf}(s(y), s(z))$  which is  $\mathbf{uf}(2, 3) = 5$ .

An encoding of some disabled transition  $t_{dis} = s \xrightarrow{a} \perp$  in  $cex$  is defined as  $\langle\langle t_{dis} \rangle\rangle_I = \langle\langle s \rangle\rangle_I \wedge \langle\langle \neg a : s \rangle\rangle_I$  where  $\langle\langle s \rangle\rangle_I$  is as before and the predicate  $\langle\langle \neg a : s \rangle\rangle_I$ , indicating that the process cannot perform action  $a$  from state  $s$ , is defined as follows:  $\langle\langle \neg a : s \rangle\rangle_I := (g(h)[s(V)/V] = false)$ .

The intuition behind breaking a transition's encoding to various predicates is that some phase-compatibility conditions leave parts of a transition unspecified. For instance, the predicate “the local state  $s$  can react to event  $e$ ” corresponds to a local transition  $s \xrightarrow{R(e)} * \in T_I$  with encoding  $\langle\langle s \rangle\rangle_I \wedge \langle\langle R(e) : s \rangle\rangle_I$ .

Finally, to rule out any interpretation  $I$  that exhibits  $cex$ , we add the constraint  $c = \neg \langle\langle cex \rangle\rangle_I$  to the learner.

**Encoding Counterexamples to Safety Properties.** Similar to the local semantics, we extend the definition of the global semantics  $\llbracket P_I, n \rrbracket$  of a MERCURY system  $P_{I,1} || \dots || P_{I,n} || P_e$  to be  $\llbracket P_I, n \rrbracket = (Q_I, q_0, E, R_I, R_I^{dis})$ , where  $Q_I, q_0, E$ , and  $R_I$  are defined as before and  $R_I^{dis}$  is the set of *disabled global transitions* under the current interpretation  $I$ . Then, a counterexample  $cex$  to safety is a “subset” of the *global semantics*  $\llbracket P_I, c \rrbracket$  such that  $cex \not\models \phi_s(c)$ . Encoding of such a counterexample  $cex$  is formalized as before, with the encoding of an enabled global transition  $r$  in  $cex$  being a formula  $\langle\langle r \rangle\rangle_I \in \mathcal{C}$  computed as follows. For some global transition  $r = q \xrightarrow{e} q'$ , we denote by  $active(r)$  the local transitions that processes in  $q$  locally use to end in  $q'$ . That is,  $active(r) = \{t \in T_I \mid \exists P_{I,i} : t = q[i] \xrightarrow{A(e)} q'[i] \vee t = q[i] \xrightarrow{R(e)} q'[i]\}$ . We then define the encoding  $\langle\langle r \rangle\rangle_I$  as:  $\langle\langle r \rangle\rangle_I = \bigwedge_{t \in active(r)} \langle\langle t \rangle\rangle_I$ .

Note that the predicates  $\langle\langle q \rangle\rangle_I$ ,  $\langle\langle e : q \rangle\rangle_I$ ,  $\langle\langle q' : q, e \rangle\rangle_I$ , and  $\langle\langle \neg e : q \rangle\rangle_I$  as well as the encoding for the global disabled transitions can be defined similar to their counterparts discussed earlier.

## 4 Counterexample Extraction

Our tool specializes the synthesis procedure in Algo. 1 by using QUICKSILVER as the teacher to check phase-compatibility, cutoff-amenability, and safety. For the remainder of this section, we will refer to phase-compatibility and cutoff-amenability conditions as *local* properties and safety (and liveness) specifications as *global* properties.

**Local Properties.** Given a local property  $\phi$  expressed as first-order logic formulas over the local semantics of a MERCURY process, CINNABAR extracts a counterexample  $cex$  according to Algo. 2.

First, we negate the property and express in disjunctive normal form (DNF):

---

### Algorithm 2: Counterexample Extraction.

---

```

1 procedure Extract( $P_I, \phi$ )
2    $\phi' = makeDNF(\neg \phi)$ 
3    $W = \emptyset$ 
4   foreach  $c \in cubes(\phi')$  do
5     if  $\llbracket P_I \rrbracket \models c$  then
6        $cw = \emptyset$ 
7       foreach  $l \in literals(c)$  do
8          $lw = witness(l)$ 
9          $cw = cw \cup \{lw\}$ 
10       $W = W \cup \{cw\}$ 
11    $cex = pickMinimal(W)$ 
12   return  $cex$ 

```

---

$\phi' = \neg\phi = c_1 \vee c_2 \vee \dots$ , where each cube  $c_i = l_1 \wedge l_2 \wedge \dots$  is a conjunction of literals (Line 2). Then, for each cube  $c$  satisfied under  $\llbracket P_I \rrbracket$  (Line 5), extract a cube *witness*  $cw$  that is a subset of the local semantics  $\llbracket P_I \rrbracket$  such that  $\llbracket P_I \rrbracket \models cw$  (Lines 7 - 9). This is done by extracting, for each literal  $l$  in  $c$ , a minimal subset  $lw$  of  $\llbracket P_I \rrbracket$  such that  $lw \models l$  (Line 8). We say  $lw$  is a *minimal witness* of  $l$  if any strict subset of  $lw$  cannot be a witness for  $l$  (i.e.,  $\forall lw' \subset lw : lw' \not\models l$ ). Finally pick a minimal (in terms of size) cube witness of some cube  $c$  as a *ce*x (Line 11). Since  $ce$ x  $\models c$  and  $c \Rightarrow \neg\phi$ , we know that  $ce$ x  $\models \neg\phi$  (or equivalently,  $ce$ x  $\not\models \phi$ ).

In this work, we carefully analyzed the phase-compatibility and cutoff amenability conditions and incorporated procedures to compute witnesses for their literals (i.e., the **witness** calls on Line 8). We refer the interested reader to App. A for complete details and illustrate one such counterexample extraction procedure using an example.

*Example.* We present a simplified phase-compatibility condition and demonstrate the above procedure on it. Let the set of broadcast, partition, and consensus events be called the *globally-synchronizing* events, denoted  $E_{\text{global}}$ . Let  $ph(s)$  be the set of all “phases” containing local state  $s$ . The condition states that: for each internal transition  $s \rightarrow s'$  that is accompanied by a reacting transition  $s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} s''$  for some globally-synchronizing event  $\mathbf{f}$ , and for each state  $t$  in the same phase as  $s$ , state  $t$  must have a reacting transition of event  $\mathbf{f}$ . Formally:

$$\forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s' \in S : \\ (s \rightarrow s' \in T \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \in T) \Rightarrow (\forall X \in ph(s), t \in X : \exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \in T).$$

This condition is an example of a local property  $\phi$  we want to extract counterexamples for when it fails. The procedure is applied as follows:

Step (1): We first simplify  $\phi$  to the following:

$$\forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S, X \in ph(s) : \\ (s \rightarrow s' \in T \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \in T \wedge inPhase(X, s, t)) \Rightarrow (\exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \in T),$$

where  $inPhase(X, s, t)$  indicates that states  $s$  and  $t$  are in phase  $X$  together. We then obtain the negation  $\neg\phi$ :

$$\exists \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S, X \in ph(s) : \\ s \rightarrow s' \in T \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \in T \wedge inPhase(X, s, t) \wedge \neg \exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \in T.$$

Step (2): The formula  $\neg\phi$  is in DNF, and there is a cube for each instantiation of event  $\mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}$ , states  $s, s', t \in S$ , and phase  $X$  that satisfies the formula  $\neg\phi$ . There are 4 literals. The literals “ $s \rightarrow s' \in T$ ” and “ $s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \in T$ ” can be witnessed by the corresponding transitions  $s \rightarrow s'$  and  $s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *$ , respectively. The literal “ $\neg \exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \in T$ ” can be witnessed by the *disabled* transition  $t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} \perp$ . The witness for the literal  $inPhase(X, s_a, s_b)$  for some phase  $X$  and

local states  $s_a$  and  $s_b$  is more involved. It depends on the *nature* of that phase. We analyzed the phase construction procedure given in [19] and distilled it as follows. For each event  $e \in E_{\text{global}}$ , we define its source (resp. destination) set to be the set of states in  $S$  from (resp. to) which there exists a transition in  $T$  labeled with an acting or reacting action of event  $e$ . Let *corePhases* be the set of all source and destination sets of all globally-synchronizing actions. Then, two states  $s_a$  and  $s_b$  are in the same phase if:

- (a) they are part of some core phase, i.e.,  $\exists X \in \text{corePhases} : s_a, s_b \in X$ , or,
- (b) they are in different core phases that are connected by an internal path, i.e.,  $\exists A, B \in \text{corePhases} : s_a, s'_a \in A \wedge s_b, s'_b \in B \wedge s'_a \rightsquigarrow s'_b$ , where  $s'_a \rightsquigarrow s'_b$  is an internal path from  $s'_a$  to  $s'_b$ .

If  $X$  is a core phase (i.e., case (A) holds), the counterexample extraction procedure returns the phase itself. Otherwise, case (B) holds and the two core phases are recursively extracted as well as the internal path connecting them. Step (3) The final step is to build a subset of the local semantics that include the extracted witnesses for all 4 literals.

**Global Properties.** If a candidate process  $P_I$  meets its phase-compatibility and cutoff-amenability conditions, then it belongs to the efficiently-decidable fragment of MERCURY, and a cutoff  $c$  exists. It then remains to check if the system  $P_{I,1} \parallel \dots \parallel P_{I,n} \parallel P_e$  is safe (i.e.,  $\llbracket P_I, c \rrbracket \models \phi_s(c)$ ).

Safety properties  $\phi_s(n)$  are specified by the system designer as (Boolean combinations of) permissible safety specifications. Such properties are invariants that must hold in every reachable state in  $\llbracket P_I, c \rrbracket$ .

A counterexample  $cex \subseteq \llbracket P_I, c \rrbracket$  to a safety property  $\phi_s(c)$  is a finite trace from the initial state  $q_0$  to an error state  $q_e$ . Such traces are extracted while constructing  $\llbracket P_I, c \rrbracket$ .

## 5 Implementation and Evaluation

### 5.1 Implementation

Our tool<sup>5</sup> implements the architecture illustrated in Fig. 1. Additionally, it incorporates a liveness checker into the teacher. Liveness properties  $\phi_l(c)$  ensure that the system makes progress and eventually reacts to various events. We refer the interested reader to App. B for details on specifying liveness properties as well as extracting and encoding counterexamples to such properties.

### 5.2 Evaluation

In this section, we investigate CINNABAR's performance. We study the impact of CINNABAR's counterexample extraction and encoding, as well as the choice of uninterpreted functions, on performance. Finally, we examine how CINNABAR's iterations are distributed across the different types of counterexamples.

<sup>5</sup> CINNABAR is publicly available on Zenodo [20].




Fig. 2: CINNABAR’s performance compared to enumeration-based synthesis. The systems studied are: Distributed Store (DS), Consortium (CTM), Distributed Lock Service (DLS), Distributed Register (DR), Two-Object Tracker (TOT), Distributed Robot Flocking (DRF), variants Small Aircraft Transportation System Landing Protocol (SATS, SATS2), variants of Distributed Sensor Network (DSN, DSNR), and variants of Robotics Motion Planner (RMP, RMPR). For each benchmark, the  $i$ -th point denotes the average runtime for all variants with  $i$  uninterpreted functions.

**Benchmarks.** The benchmarks we use are process sketches based on the benchmarks presented in [19]. We refer the reader App. C for a description of each benchmark’s functionality, its safety and liveness specifications, and the unspecified functionality in the sketch. An example MERCURY sketch and its completion is also included in App. C.

**Experimental Setup.** To ensure that our reported results are not dependent on a particular choice of uninterpreted functions, we create a set of *variants* for each benchmark as follows. For each benchmark, we first pick a set  $ue$  of “candidate uninterpreted functions”, corresponding to expressions that a designer might reasonably leave unspecified. Then, for each subset  $e$  in the set  $\mathcal{P}(ue)$  of all non-empty subsets of  $ue$ , we create a variant of the benchmark where the uninterpreted functions in  $e$  are included in the sketch. We set a timeout of 15 minutes when running any variant and conduct our experiments on a MacBook Pro with 2 GHz Quad-Core Intel Core i5 and 16 GB of RAM.

**Effect of Counterexample Extraction and Encoding.** As our baseline, we consider a synthesis loop where the learner enumerates interpretations until a correct interpretation is found. If some interpreted process sketch  $P_I$  fails a property at any stage, we add the constraint  $c = \neg I$  to the learner. This effectively eliminates one interpretation at a time, as opposed to all interpretations that exhibit the given counterexample at a time (as done by our encoder). In Fig. 2, we present a comparison of CINNABAR’s runtime compared to this enumeration-based baseline. We make the following observations. While the runtimes of both enumeration-based synthesis and CINNABAR grow exponentially when increasing the number of uninterpreted functions, CINNABAR outperforms




Fig. 3: Effect of the choice of uninterpreted functions on synthesis time. For some benchmark and some number  $m$  of uninterpreted functions, the  $m$ -th box-and-whiskers plot presents, from bottom to top, the minimum, first quartile, median, third quartile, and maximum synthesis run time across the run times of all variants of that benchmark with  $m$  uninterpreted functions.

enumeration-based synthesis in almost all scenarios. Only for variants with a single uninterpreted function we observed cases where enumeration-based synthesis found a correct solution faster than CINNABAR (e.g., as in DSNR with one uninterpreted function). This is due to the additional time spent extracting and encoding counterexamples. However, the value of the counterexample extraction and encoding becomes clearly apparent with larger number of unspecified expressions as the number of interpretations grows much larger and it becomes infeasible to just enumerate them. Furthermore, CINNABAR is able to perform synthesis for any variant of our benchmarks in under 9 minutes.

**Effect of the Choice of Uninterpreted Functions.** In Fig. 3, for each benchmark, we examine the variation of synthesis runtime across variants with the same number of uninterpreted functions. As shown in the figure, in some cases (e.g., CTM and DS), the variation is more noticeable. The main factor contributing to this is that uninterpreted functions present different overhead on synthesis based on their nature. For instance, an uninterpreted function corresponding to a `lhs` of some assignment expression is more expensive to synthesize compared to an uninterpreted function corresponding to a target of some `goto` statement, as the latter has a smaller search space.

**Counterexample Distribution on Iterations.** In Fig. 4, we illustrate the different types of counterexamples encountered throughout CINNABAR’s iterations. We make the following observations. First, CINNABAR spends most of its iterations ruling out phase-compatibility violations. This is expected as checking phase-compatibility is the first stage in our synthesis loop. Since a phase-compatible system moves in a structured way between its phases, this stage rules out all arbitrary completions that prohibit processes from advancing through the phases. Furthermore, there are fewer safety violations than any other type of violations. Once an interpreted process sketch is in the efficiently-decidable fragment




Fig. 4: A property-based visualization of CINNABAR’s iterations for a representative subset of the variants. Each line corresponds a CINNABAR’s execution of a synthesis variant of a benchmark. From left to right, each line starts with iteration 1, ends with the iteration where a correct interpretation was found, and is colored to indicate nature of violations encountered throughout the execution. For instance, the line ■■■■ would indicate that CINNABAR encountered a phase-compatibility violation in iteration 1, then a cutoff-amenability in iteration 2, ..., and finally was able to find a correct interpretation in iteration 6.

of MERCURY, it is more likely to be safe. There are two factors that contribute to this: (i) phase-compatible systems move in a structured way and are more likely to be “closer” to a correct version of the system, and (ii) because cutoff-amenability depends on the safety specification, satisfying cutoff-amenability means the interpreted process sketch is more likely to be correct with respect to the safety property already. Finally, eliminating liveness violations ensures that CINNABAR is able to synthesize higher-quality completions. As shown in the figure, liveness violations are often encountered in the very first iteration, as the SMT-based learner tends to favor interpretations with disabled guards that trivially satisfy phase-compatibility, cutoff-amenability, and safety properties.

**Usability.** If CINNABAR fails to synthesize a correct completion, the designer can *replace* existing expressions in the sketch with uninterpreted functions, allowing CINNABAR to explore a larger set of possible candidate completions.

Finally, while the supported uninterpreted functions may not correspond to large segments of the code or complex control-flow constructs, they are the main “knobs” that the designer needs to turn to ensure that their systems belong to the efficiently-decidable fragment of MERCURY.

## 6 Related Work

**Aiding System Designers via Decidable Verification.** Ivy [30] adopts an interactive approach to aid the designer in searching for inductive invariants for their systems. Ivy translates the system model and its invariant to EPR [31], and looks for a *counterexample-to-induction* (CTI). The designer adjusts the invariant to eliminate that CTI and Ivy starts over. I4 [27] builds on Ivy by first

considering a fixed system size, automatically generating a potential inductive invariant, and using Ivy to check if that invariant is also valid for any system size. The approach in [12] identifies a class of asynchronous systems that can be reduced to an equivalent synchronized system modeled in the Heard-Of Model [10]. The designer manually annotates the asynchronous system to facilitate the reduction, and encodes the resulting Heard-Of model in the  $\text{CL}$  [15] logic which has a semi-decision procedure. These approaches differ from ours in two ways. First, the designer needs to manually provide/manipulate inductive invariants and/or annotations to eventually enable decidable verification. Second, these approaches are “verification only”: they require a *fully-specified* model that either meets or violates its correctness properties and the designer is responsible for adjusting the model if verification fails. CINNABAR, on the other hand, accepts a sketch that is then completed to meet its properties.

**Parameterized Synthesis.** Jacobs and Bloem [21] introduced a general approach for parameterized synthesis based on cutoffs, where they use an underlying fixed-size synthesis procedure that is required to guarantee that the conditions for cutoffs are met by the synthesized implementation. Our approach can be seen as an instantiation of this approach, as one of the stages in our multi-stage counterexample-based loop ensures that cutoff-amenability conditions hold on any candidate process. Other approaches that tackle the parameterized synthesis problem without cutoff results are more specialized. For instance, the approach in [25] adopts a CEGIS-based synthesis strategy where the designer provides a threshold automaton with some parameters unspecified. Synthesis completes the model and uses the parameterized model checker in [24] to check the system. A similar idea, but based on the notion of well-structured transition systems, is used for the automatic *repair* of parameterized systems in [22]. The approach in [23] targets parameterized synthesis for self-stabilizing rings, and shows that the problem is decidable even when the corresponding parameterized verification problem is not. The designer provides a set of legitimate states and the size of the template process, and the procedure yields a completed self-stabilizing template. A similar approach for more general topologies is presented in [29]. Bertrand et al. [6] target systems composed of an unbounded number of agents that are fully specified and one underspecified controller process. The synthesis goal is to synthesize a controller that controls all agents uniformly and guides them to a specific desired state. Markgraf et al. [28] also target synthesis of controllers by posing the problem as an infinite-duration 2-player game and utilize regular model checking and the  $L^*$  algorithm [4] to learn correct-by-design controllers. These approaches are not applicable to our setup as they do not admit distributed agreement-based systems (modeled in MERCURY).

**Synthesis of Distributed Systems with a Fixed Number of Processes.** Various approaches focus on automated synthesis of distributed systems with a *fixed* number of processes [3,2,1,13,36]. While such approaches deploy a similar counterexample-guided strategy to complete a user-provided sketch, they do not provide parameterized correctness guarantees nor the necessary agreement primitives needed to model distributed agreement-based systems.



## References

1. Alur, R., Martin, M., Raghothaman, M., Stergiou, C., Tripakis, S., Udupa, A.: Synthesizing finite-state protocols from scenarios and requirements. In: Yahav, E. (ed.) *Hardware and Software: Verification and Testing*. pp. 75–91. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2014)
2. Alur, R., Raghothaman, M., Stergiou, C., Tripakis, S., Udupa, A.: Automatic completion of distributed protocols with symmetry. In: Kroening, D., Păsăreanu, C.S. (eds.) *Computer Aided Verification*. pp. 395–412. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2015)
3. Alur, R., Tripakis, S.: Automatic synthesis of distributed protocols. *SIGACT News* **48**(1), 55–90 (Mar 2017). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3061640.3061652>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3061640.3061652>
4. Angluin, D.: Learning regular sets from queries and counterexamples. *Inf. Comput.* **75**(2), 87–106 (nov 1987). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(87\)90052-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(87)90052-6), [https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(87\)90052-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(87)90052-6)
5. Apt, K.R., Kozen, D.C.: Limits for automatic verification of finite-state concurrent systems. *Information Processing Letters* **22**(6), 307–309 (1986). [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190\(86\)90071-2](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(86)90071-2), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0020019086900712>
6. Bertrand, N., Dewaskar, M., Genest, B., Gimbert, H., Godbole, A.A.: Controlling a population. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.00893* (2018)
7. Bloem, R., Jacobs, S., Khalimov, A., Konnov, I., Rubin, S., Veith, H., Widder, J.: *Decidability of Parameterized Verification*. Synthesis Lectures on Distributed Computing Theory, Morgan & Claypool Publishers (2015)
8. Bornholt, J., Joshi, R., Astrauskas, V., Cully, B., Kragl, B., Markle, S., Sauri, K., Schleit, D., Slatton, G., Tasiran, S., Van Geffen, J., Warfield, A.: Using lightweight formal methods to validate a key-value storage node in amazon s3. In: *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 28th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. p. 836–850. SOSP ’21, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477132.3483540>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477132.3483540>
9. Büchi, J.R.: On a Decision Method in Restricted Second Order Arithmetic, pp. 425–435. Springer New York, New York, NY (1990). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-8928-6\\_23](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-8928-6_23), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-8928-6\\_23](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-8928-6_23)
10. Charron-Bost, B., Schiper, A.: The Heard-of Model: Computing in Distributed Systems with Benign Faults. *Distributed Computing* **22**(1), 49–71 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00446-009-0084-6>
11. Cook, B.: Formal reasoning about the security of amazon web services. In: Chockler, H., Weissenbacher, G. (eds.) *Computer Aided Verification*. pp. 38–47. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2018)
12. Damian, A., Dragoi, C., Militaru, A., Widder, J.: Communication-closed Asynchronous Protocols. In: *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification* (2019)
13. Damm, W., Finkbeiner, B.: Automatic Compositional Synthesis of Distributed Systems. In: *International Symposium on Formal Methods*. pp. 179–193. Springer (2014)
14. Dill, D., Grieskamp, W., Park, J., Qadeer, S., Xu, M., Zhong, E.: Fast and reliable formal verification of smart contracts with the move prover. In: Fisman, D., Rosu,

- G. (eds.) Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems. pp. 183–200. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2022)
15. Drăgoi, C., Henzinger, T.A., Veith, H., Widder, J., Zufferey, D.: A Logic-based Framework for Verifying Consensus Algorithms. In: International Conference on Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation. pp. 161–181. Springer (2014)
  16. Emerson, E.A., Sistla, A.P.: Utilizing symmetry when model-checking under fairness assumptions: An automata-theoretic approach. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* **19**(4), 617–638 (jul 1997). <https://doi.org/10.1145/262004.262008>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/262004.262008>
  17. Hawblitzel, C., Howell, J., Kapritsos, M., Lorch, J.R., Parno, B., Roberts, M.L., Setty, S., Zill, B.: Ironfleet: Proving practical distributed systems correct. In: Proceedings of the 25th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles. p. 1–17. SOSP ’15, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2815400.2815428>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/2815400.2815428>
  18. Jaber, N., Jacobs, S., Wagner, C., Kulkarni, M., Samanta, R.: Parameterized verification of systems with global synchronization and guards. In: Lahiri, S.K., Wang, C. (eds.) Computer Aided Verification. pp. 299–323. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2020)
  19. Jaber, N., Wagner, C., Jacobs, S., Kulkarni, M., Samanta, R.: Quicksilver: Modeling and parameterized verification for distributed agreement-based systems. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **5**(OOPSLA) (oct 2021). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3485534>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3485534>
  20. Jaber, N., Wagner, C., Jacobs, S., Kulkarni, M., Samanta, R.: Synthesis of Distributed Agreement-Based Systems with Efficiently-Decidable Verification (Artifact) (Apr 2023). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7497463>, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7497463>
  21. Jacobs, S., Bloem, R.: Parameterized Synthesis. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* **10**(1) (2014)
  22. Jacobs, S., Sakr, M., Völz, M.: Automatic repair and deadlock detection for parameterized systems. In: FMCAD 2022. pp. 225–234
  23. Klinkhamer, A.P., Ebnenasir, A.: Synthesizing parameterized self-stabilizing rings with constant-space processes. In: Dastani, M., Sirjani, M. (eds.) Fundamentals of Software Engineering. pp. 100–115. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2017)
  24. Konnov, I., Lazić, M., Veith, H., Widder, J.: A Short Counterexample Property for Safety and Liveness Verification of Fault-tolerant Distributed Algorithms. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* **52**(1), 719–734 (2017)
  25. Lazic, M., Konnov, I., Widder, J., Bloem, R.: Synthesis of Distributed Algorithms with Parameterized Threshold Guards. In: Aspnes, J., Bessani, A., Felber, P., Leitão, J. (eds.) OPODIS. LIPIcs, vol. 95, pp. 32:1–32:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik (2017)
  26. Leino, K.R.M.: Dafny: An automatic program verifier for functional correctness. In: Clarke, E.M., Voronkov, A. (eds.) Logic for Programming, Artificial Intelligence, and Reasoning. pp. 348–370. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2010)
  27. Ma, H., Goel, A., Jeannin, J.B., Kapritsos, M., Kasikci, B., Sakallah, K.A.: I4: Incremental inference of inductive invariants for verification of distributed protocols. In: Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles. p. 370–384. SOSP ’19, Association for Computing Machinery

- ery, New York, NY, USA (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3341301.3359651>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3341301.3359651>
28. Markgraf, O., Hong, C.D., Lin, A.W., Najib, M., Neider, D.: Parameterized synthesis with safety properties. In: Oliveira, B.C.d.S. (ed.) *Programming Languages and Systems*. pp. 273–292. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2020)
  29. Mirzaie, N., Faghih, F., Jacobs, S., Bonakdarpour, B.: Parameterized synthesis of self-stabilizing protocols in symmetric networks. *Acta Informatica* **57**(1-2), 271–304 (2020)
  30. Padon, O., McMillan, K.L., Panda, A., Sagiv, M., Shoham, S.: Ivy: Safety verification by interactive generalization. In: *Proceedings of the 37th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. p. 614–630. PLDI '16, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2908080.2908118>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/2908080.2908118>
  31. Piskac, R., de Moura, L., Bjørner, N.: Deciding Effectively Propositional Logic Using DPLL and Substitution Sets. *Journal of Automated Reasoning* **44**(4), 401–424 (2010)
  32. Reid, A., Flur, S., Church, L., de Haas, S., Johnson, M., Laurie, B.: Towards making formal methods normal: meeting developers where they are. In: *HATRA 2020: Human Aspects of Types and Reasoning Assistants* (2020), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.16345>
  33. Sergey, I., Wilcox, J.R., Tatlock, Z.: Programming and proving with distributed protocols. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **2**(POPL) (Dec 2017). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3158116>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3158116>
  34. Solar-Lezama, A., Tancau, L., Bodik, R., Seshia, S., Saraswat, V.: Combinatorial Sketching for Finite Programs. In: *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*. pp. 404–415. ASPLOS XII, ACM (2006)
  35. Suzuki, I.: Proving properties of a ring of finite-state machines. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **28**(4), 213–214 (Jul 1988). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190\(88\)90211-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(88)90211-6), [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190\(88\)90211-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(88)90211-6)
  36. Udupa, A., Raghavan, A., Deshmukh, J.V., Mador-Haim, S., Martin, M.M., Alur, R.: TRANSIT: Specifying Protocols with Concolic Snippets. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* **48**(6), 287–296 (2013)
  37. Wilcox, J.R., Woos, D., Panchekha, P., Tatlock, Z., Wang, X., Ernst, M.D., Anderson, T.: Verdi: A framework for implementing and formally verifying distributed systems. In: *Proceedings of the 36th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. p. 357–368. PLDI '15, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2737924.2737958>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/2737924.2737958>

## A Extracting Counterexamples to Phase-Compatibility and Cutoff-Amenability Conditions

In this section, we first recap the phase-compatibility, and discuss their counterexample extraction and encoding functions. We then give a similar statement to the cutoff-amenability conditions.

### A.1 Phase-Compatibility Conditions

Let the set of broadcast, partition, and consensus events be called the *globally-synchronizing* events, denoted  $E_{\text{global}}$ . For each event  $e \in E_{\text{global}}$ , we define its source set  $\text{src}_e = \{s \mid s \xrightarrow{A(e)} s' \in T \vee s \xrightarrow{R(e)} s' \in T\}$  be the set of states in  $S$  from which there exists a transition in  $T$  labeled with  $e$ . Similarly, we define the destination set  $\text{dst}_e = \{s \mid s' \xrightarrow{A(e)} s \in T \vee s' \xrightarrow{R(e)} s \in T\}$  as the set of states in  $S$  to which a transition in  $T$  labeled with  $e$  exists. Furthermore, for some event  $e$  and some subset  $X$  of the local state space  $S$ , we say that  $e$  is *initiable* in  $X$  if some state in  $X$  has an acting transition of  $e$ . We will denote this as  $\text{initiable}(X, e)$ . Finally, let  $s \rightsquigarrow^{R(e)} s'$  denote a path  $s \rightarrow^* s' \xrightarrow{R(e)} s''$  such that  $s \rightarrow^* s'$  is a path of internal transitions and  $s' \xrightarrow{R(e)} s''$ .

**Definition 2 (Phase-Compatibility Conditions [19]).**

- (1) Every state  $s \in S$  which has an acting transition  $s \xrightarrow{A(e)} s'$  must also have a corresponding reacting transition  $s \xrightarrow{R(e)} s''$ :

$$\forall e \in E_{\text{global}} : s \xrightarrow{A(e)} s' \implies s \xrightarrow{R(e)} s''$$

- (2) For each acting transition  $s \xrightarrow{A(e)} s'$  that is accompanied by a reacting transition  $s' \xrightarrow{R(f)} s''$  such that  $f$  is initiable in the set  $\text{dst}_e$  of destination states of event  $e$ , (i) if there are other acting transitions  $t \xrightarrow{A(e)} t'$  for event  $e$ , all of them must transition to a state  $t'$  with a reacting transition  $t' \xrightarrow{R(f)} t''$  of event  $f$  and (ii) for every reacting transition  $u \xrightarrow{R(e)} u'$  of  $e$ , there must be a path from  $u'$  to a state with a reacting transition of event  $f$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall e, f \in E_{\text{global}}. \left( s \xrightarrow{A(e)} s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(f)} s'' \right) \implies \\ & \text{initiable}(\text{dst}_e, f) \implies \left( \forall t \xrightarrow{A(e)} t'. \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(f)} t'' \right) \wedge \left( \forall u \xrightarrow{R(e)} u'. \exists u' \rightsquigarrow^{R(f)} u'' \right) \end{aligned}$$

- (3) For each internal transition  $s \rightarrow s'$  that is accompanied by a reacting transition  $s' \xrightarrow{R(f)} s''$  and for each state  $t$  in the same phase as  $s$ , if event  $f$  is

initiable in that phase, then  $t$  must have a path to a state with a reacting transition of event  $f$ . Let  $ph(s)$  be the set of all phases containing  $s$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \forall f \in E_{\text{global}} : \left( s \rightarrow s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(f)} s'' \right) \implies \\ \forall X \in ph(s). \text{initiable}(X, f) \implies \left( \forall t \in X. \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(f)} t' \right) \end{aligned}$$

## A.2 Extracting Witnesses in the Negation of Phase-Compatibility Conditions

We obtain the negation of the conditions in order to define the literals used.

**Witnessing a Violation of Condition (1)** The negation of this condition is simply:

$$\exists e \in E_{\text{global}} : s \xrightarrow{A(e)} s' \in T \wedge s \xrightarrow{R(e)} s'' \notin T$$

Since this formula is essentially in DNF, the witness is simply a state  $s$  which has the acting transition on some event  $e$  but not the reacting one.

**Witnessing a Violation of Condition (2)** We first obtain the equivalent condition (ref. Lemma 2):

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t, z, z' \in S : \\ (s \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{e})} s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge z \xrightarrow{A/R(\mathbf{e})} z' \wedge z' \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{e})} t') \implies \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \end{aligned}$$

We focus in the “reacting” part of the condition. The other part is straightforward. The negation of the condition is:

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t, z, z' \in S : \\ s \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{e})} s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge z \xrightarrow{A/R(\mathbf{e})} z' \wedge z' \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{e})} t' \wedge \neg \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \end{aligned}$$

And, as before, the witness is any two events  $\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}$  and states  $s, s', t, z, z' \in S$  that satisfy the formula. Note that the witness for  $\neg \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *$  is extracted

as follows. Let  $P_{\text{int}}$  be all the internal paths originating from  $t'$  and  $S_{\text{int}}$  be the set of all states in these paths. Then, the witness is all paths in  $P_{\text{int}}$ , all *disabled* internal transitions originating from  $S_{\text{int}}$ , and all *disabled* reacting transitions on event  $\mathbf{f}$ . Intuitively, this is the subset of the local semantics for which  $\neg \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *$  holds.

**Witnessing a Violation of Condition (3)** We again first obtain a simpler, equivalent formula (ref. Lemma 3):

$$\forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t, z \in S, X \in \text{ph}(s) : \\ (s \rightarrow s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge z \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge \text{inPhase}(X, s, t) \wedge \text{inPhase}(X, s, z)) \Rightarrow (\exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *)$$

where  $\text{inPhase}(X, s, t)$  indicates that states  $s$  and  $t$  are in some phase  $X$  together. The negation of the condition is as before, and the interesting part is extracting a witness for  $\text{inPhase}(X, s_a, s_b)$  for some phase  $X$  and local states  $s_a$  and  $s_b$ . This is done as follows. Let  $\text{corePhases}$  be the set of all source and destination sets of all globally-synchronizing actions. Two states  $s_a$  and  $s_b$  are in the same phase if:

1. they are part of some core phase:  $\exists X \in \text{corePhases} : s_a, s_b \in X$ , or,
2. they are in different core phases that are connected by an internal path:  
 $\exists A, B \in \text{corePhases} : s_a, s'_a \in A \wedge s_b, s'_b \in B \wedge s'_a \rightsquigarrow s'_b$ .

In case (A), the counterexample extraction procedure simply returns the core phase itself and in case (B) the two core phases are returned as well as the internal path between them.

### A.3 Cutoff-Amenability Conditions

Jaber et. al [19] define a notion of *independence* of local transitions. Informally, independent transitions are ones a process can take without requiring the *existence* of other processes in certain states (e.g., sending a broadcast). A path is independent if it consists of independent transitions.

**Definition 3 (Cutoff-Amenability Conditions [19]).** Let  $P$  be a phase-compatible process,  $\phi_s(n)$  a permissible specification, and  $\mathcal{F}$  the set of independent simple paths from  $s_0$  to a state  $s \in \text{st}(f)$ . We require either of the following to hold.

1. All paths from  $s_0$  to  $\text{st}(f)$  are independent, or,
2. For every transition  $s_s \rightarrow s_d$  such that  $s_s \neq s_d$  and  $s_s$  is a state in some path  $p \in \mathcal{F}$ , either
  - (a) the state  $s_d$  is in  $p$  and the transition  $s_s \rightarrow s_d$  is independent, or,
  - (b) the state  $s_d$  is not in  $p$  and all paths out of  $s_d$  lead back to  $s_s$  via independent transitions.

### A.4 Extracting Witnesses in the Negation of Cutoff-amenability Conditions

The negation of the above condition is:

- (x) some path from  $s_0$  to  $\text{st}(f)$  is not independent, and,
- (y) some transition  $s_s \rightarrow s_d$  such that  $s_s \neq s_d$  and  $s_s$  is a state in some path  $p \in \mathcal{F}$  and
  - (a) the state  $s_d$  is in  $p$  and the transition  $s_s \rightarrow s_d$  is not independent, or ,

- (b) the state  $s_d$  is not in  $p$  and some path out of  $s_d$  does not lead back to  $s_s$ , or leads back to  $s_s$  but has a non-independent transition.

Interestingly, the condition can fail in two ways: either  $x \wedge y \wedge a$  or  $x \wedge y \wedge b$ . The counterexample extraction procedures for these literals are defined similar to these of phase-compatibility.

## B Extracting Liveness Counterexamples

In this section, we give details on how CINNABAR handles liveness properties and their corresponding counterexamples.

A liveness property is specified as a Büchi automaton [9] or an LTL formula that accepts infinite traces in  $\llbracket P_I, c \rrbracket$  violating the property.

As is the case with safety properties, if the system is not live (i.e.,  $\llbracket P_I, c \rrbracket \not\models \phi_l(c)$ ), a counterexample  $cex \subseteq \llbracket P_I, c \rrbracket$  is extracted and encoded. Such  $cex$  is a “lasso-shaped” subset of the global semantics that represents an infinite, fair, accepting trace violating  $\phi_l(c)$ . An infinite trace is fair if it represents a realistic infinite execution of the system as opposed to one that is merely an artifact of the non-determinism when picking which system event should be executed next. Such  $cex$  consists of two parts: a fair, accepting *cycle* in  $\llbracket P_I, c \rrbracket$ , and a finite *stem* from the initial state  $q_0$  to a state in that cycle. Note that  $cex$  *additionally* contains all disabled global transitions from every state in the cycle. Intuitively, enabling any such disabled transition renders the infinite trace unfair, and hence rules out the liveness violation.

We now discuss how liveness properties are checked in CINNABAR. We first define our notion of Büchi automata, the *product structure* of a Büchi automaton and the global semantics  $\llbracket P, c \rrbracket$ , and the overall procedure of extracting witnesses of liveness violations.

### B.1 Büchi Automata and the Product Structure

**Büchi Automata.** A Büchi automaton is defined as  $B = (S_B, s_{b0}, T_B)$  where:

1.  $S_B$  is the set of states which can optionally be accepting.  $s_{b0}$  is the initial state.
2.  $T_B$  is the transition relation. Each transition  $t_b \in T_B$  is of the form  $(s_b, e, \varphi_q, s'_b)$  where:
  - (a)  $s_b$  and  $s'_b$  are the source and destination states, respectively,
  - (b)  $e \in E$  is an event, and,
  - (c)  $\varphi_q$  is a global state predicate.

Note that this is slightly different than Büchi automata with an event-only or state-only based labels on the transitions but one can think of any label on the edges as a “signal” the automaton needs to move from one state to the next.

**Product Structure.** The product structure based on the global semantics  $\llbracket P, c \rrbracket = (Q, R)$  and Büchi automaton  $B = (S_B, T_B)$  is defined as  $PS = (S_{PS} \times T_{PS})$  where:

1.  $S_{PS} = Q \times S_B$  is the set of product states.

2.  $T_{PS} \subseteq S_{PS} \times S_{PS}$  is the transition relation. A transition  $t_{PS} = (q, s_B) \rightarrow (q', s'_B)$  is in  $T_{PS}$  iff:
  - (a) there exists a transition  $(q, e, q')$  in  $R$ ,
  - (b) there exists a transition  $(s_B, e, \varphi_q, s'_B)$  in  $T_B$ , and,
  - (c) the state predicate holds in the destination state:  $\varphi_q(q') = \text{true}$ .

## B.2 Fair Infinite Traces

**Fairness.** We assume a notion of non-determinism that ensures the following: *if an event is ready infinitely often, it is taken infinitely often*. We say an event is *ready* when processes are in local states where they can be acting/reacting to that event, and *taken* if the event was chosen to be executed next. Intuitively, we want to ensure that infinite traces we report as liveness violations are not due to the fact that the nondeterministic choice of which system event to execute next is biased.

Then, infinite fair accepting traces are identified using the following procedure:

1. Build the product structure  $PS$ .
2. Find fair accepting cycles (as detailed in [16]).
3. Build a stem from the initial state to a state in the cycle.
4. extract the stem, the cycle, and all disabled transitions in every state on the cycle as a counter example to liveness.

## B.3 Specifying Liveness Properties in MERCURY

To ease the designer’s burden when specifying liveness properties, we extend MERCURY with two basic Linear-Time Logic (LTL) property templates that are automatically translated to Büchi automata. The first property is  $\mathbf{F}p$ , requiring that proposition  $p$  eventually holds in every execution in the system. The liveness property “a leader is eventually elected” is an example of this property. The second property is  $\mathbf{G}(p \Rightarrow \mathbf{F}q)$ , ensuring that every time proposition  $p$  holds, then proposition  $q$  eventually holds. The liveness property “every command is eventually acknowledged” is an example of this property.

Finally, we point out that we also check for *deadlock-freedom*, i.e., that  $\llbracket P_I, c \rrbracket$  does not contain any deadlock state where no event is enabled. A counterexample to deadlock freedom is a trace to some deadlock state  $q_d$  as well as all disabled global transitions out  $q_d$ . After all, a deadlock state can be avoided if the system does not reach it, or can step out of it.

# C Additional Evaluation Information

## C.1 Benchmarks Details

In this section, for each benchmark, we provide a brief description of its functionality and its safety and liveness specifications. We also outline the unspecified functionality in each sketch.



1. Distributed Store (DS) system: a distributed system where a set of processes maintain a consistent view of some stored data and manipulate the data according to client requests. A leader election protocol can be used to elect one process as a leader that is responsible for serving client requests while all other processes act as replicas.
  - Safety properties: For all states in all behaviors, (i) there is at most one leader, and (ii) the leader and the replicas agree on the stored data.
  - Liveness properties: For all system behaviors, (i) a leader is eventually elected, and (ii) all client requests are eventually handled and acknowledged.
  - Unspecified functionality: the uninterpreted functions in the system's sketch correspond to various interesting questions including: (i) how many candidates should win, and what should the winning and losing processes do after the partition?, (ii) how does a leader handle different types of client requests?, and (iii) how are the agreed-upon updates performed consistently across the leaders and replicas?
2. Consortium (CTM): a distributed system where a set of processes try to make a decision by delegating decision making to an elected, trusted subset of deliberating processes. Once deliberating processes reach consensus on a decision, one of them is elected to broadcast the decision to the rest of the processes.
  - Safety properties: (i) at most two processes can participate in the deliberation stage and (ii) all the processes agree on the decision made.
  - Liveness properties: (i) eventually, a set of deliberating processes is elected, and (ii) eventually, all processes in the system are informed about the decision made.
  - Unspecified functionality: the uninterpreted functions in the system's sketch correspond to various interesting questions including: (i) how should the processes partition themselves into deliberating processes and processes waiting for a decision to be made? (ii) once the decision is made, how should it be shared with the rest of the system? (iii) upon obtaining the decided values, how should the waiting processes behave?
3. Distributed Lock Service (DLS): a system that allows its clients to view a distributed file system as a centralized one through coarse-grain locking. The system elects a leader server that handles and acknowledges the clients requests, and ensures that the files remain consistent across all the replica servers. The leader can decide to step down, allowing other replica servers to take its place through a new election round.
  - Safety property: there is at most one leader at any time.
  - Liveness properties: (i) a leader is eventually elected, and (ii) every client request is eventually served and acknowledged.
  - Unspecified functionality: how should the candidate servers elect a leader? how should they behave when the leader steps down?
4. Distributed Register (DR): a distributed system that replicates a piece of data and allows concurrent updates to such data without an elected leader.

Processes in the system can directly serve clients' read requests. If any process in the system receives an update request from its clients, and the value is different from the already-stored one, it invokes a round of consensus to update the data on all other processes.

- Safety property: upon serving client read requests, all processes agree on the stored data.
  - Liveness property: all client requests are eventually acknowledged.
  - Unspecified functionality: the logic for deciding when an update request should be propagated to the rest of the processes, and how a process serves a read request.
5. Two-Object Tracker (TOT): a surveillance system where a set of processes are constantly monitoring objects near them in the environment. If one object is observed, a leader process is elected to monitor the object along with some followers. If a second object is observed, another leader is elected to track that starts tracking that object and the followers are split between the two leaders.
    - Safety property: at most one leader monitoring each object.
    - Liveness property: if an object is observed by the system, then eventually a leader and some of the followers are tracking it.
    - Unspecified functionality: the logic of electing leaders and determining followers when objects are observed.
  6. Distributed Robot Flocking (DRF): a system where processes simulate moving in a flock by periodically electing a leader that decides the direction that the flock goes towards.
    - Safety property: at any given time, all processes are going in the same direction.
    - Liveness property: a leader is eventually elected.
    - Unspecified functionality: the logic followers use to respond to a leader's change-of-direction messages.
  7. Small Aircraft Transportation System Landing Protocol (SATS): a protocol developed by NASA to enhance access to small airports that do not have a control tower. The aircraft coordinate with each other to access the airport and gradually descend to their final approach and landing. The airport's vicinity has two "holding zones" for aircraft to wait in before attempting to land. During landing, if the pilot observes any obstacles, they abort the landing and return to their appropriate holding zone.
    - Safety properties: (i) at most four aircraft are allowed at a time in the airport's vicinity, (ii) there are at most two aircraft in each holding zone at a time, and (iii) at most one aircraft is allowed to attempt final approach at a time.
    - Liveness property: eventually some aircraft lands.
    - Unspecified functionality: how the successive subsets of the aircraft are chosen to transition from entering the airport all the way until landing, and how aircraft behave if obstacles are noticed during landing.

We also study a variant of SATS, denoted SATS2, where the aircraft that misses its final approach is given a higher priority to attempt landing again.

8. Distributed Sensor Network (DSN): a system where a set of distributed sensors monitors the environment for signals (e.g., a smoke) and those that detect the signal coordinate to report it to a centralized authority.
  - Safety property: at most two sensors send a report.
  - Liveness property: if a signal is detected, then it is eventually reported.
  - Unspecified functionality: various transitions the sensors must take to send a report.

We additionally study a variant of DSN, denoted DSNR, where the sensors can be reset back to their monitoring states.

9. Robotics Motion Planner (RMP): a system where a set of robots carries out tasks submitted by the environment. The robots need to coordinate to determine a motion plan that avoids collisions when executing their assigned tasks.
  - Safety property: at most one robot can plan at a time, allowing it to account for the routes taken by previous robots.
  - Liveness property: if a task is submitted, then it eventually is executed.
  - Unspecified functionality: how the robots invoke consecutive rounds of agreement to pick a robot that can plan while others await.

Similar to DSN, we study a variant of RMP, denoted RMPR, where robots can be reset back to their initial states by the environment.

## C.2 Complete Example

We now illustrate MERCURY sketches and their completions using the Distributed Store benchmark.

**Modeling Distributed Store in MERCURY.** The MERCURY model for Distributed Store is presented in Fig. 5. For now, assume that every symbol  $??_{id}$  is replaced with the corresponding comment on the same line.

In the MERCURY model in Fig. 5, a process starts in the **Candidate** location (Line 9) and coordinates with other processes to elect a leader. Leader election is modeled using MERCURY’s **partition** agreement primitive (Line 10) that partitions a set of participants into “winners” and “losers”. Here, **partition**  $\langle \text{elect} \rangle (\text{All}, 1)$  denotes a leader election round with identifier **elect** where **All** processes elect 1 “winning” process that moves to the **Leader** location, while all other “losing” processes move to the **Replica** location. The leader awaits for client requests (Line 14) and if it receives a read request (**cmd** = 3), it moves to the **Return** location and serves the request, and otherwise, it moves to the **RepCmd** location to coordinate with the replicas on performing the requested data update. Agreement on the update to be performed on the data is modeled using MERCURY’s **consensus** primitive (Lines 26 and 38) that allows a set of participants, each proposing one value, to agree on a set of decided values. Here, **consensus**  $\langle \text{vcCmd} \rangle (\text{All}, 1, \text{cmd})$  denotes a consensus round with identifier **vcCmd** where **All** processes want to agree on 1 decided value from the set

```

1  machine DistributedStore
2  variables
3    int[1,5] cmd
4    int[1,2] stored
5  actions
6    env rz doCmd : int[1,5]
7    env rz ackCmd : int[1,5]
8    env rz ret : int[1,2]
9  initial location Candidate
10 on partition<elect>(All, ??1) // 1
11   win: goto ??2 // Leader
12   lose: goto ??3 // Replica
13 location Leader
14 on recv(doCmd) do
15   cmd := doCmd.payload
16   if(??4) // cmd = 3
17     goto ??5 // Return
18   else
19     goto ??6 // RepCmd
20 location Return
21 on _ do
22   rend(ret[stored], doCmd.sID)
23   goto Leader
25 location RepCmd
26 on consensus<vcCmd>(All,1,cmd) do
27   cmd := vcCmd.decVar[1]
28   if(cmd <= 2)
29     stored := cmd
30   else if(??7) // cmd = 4
31     stored := stored + 1
32   else if(??8) // cmd = 5
33     stored := stored - 1
34   rend(ackCmd[cmd], doCmd.sID)
35   cmd := default(cmd)
36   goto Leader
37 location Replica
38 on consensus<vcCmd>(All,1,_) do
39   cmd := vcCmd.decVar[1]
40   if(cmd <= 2)
41     stored := cmd
42   else if(cmd = 4)
43     stored := ??9 // stored + 1
44   else if(cmd = 5)
45     stored := ??10 // stored - 1

```

Fig. 5: MERCURY sketch of a Distributed Store process.

of proposed values in the local variable `cmd`. Upon termination of agreement, all processes retrieve the agreed-upon update to execute on the stored data using the `vcCmd.decVar[1]` expression (Lines 27 and 39), and execute the update on the stored data (Lines 28-33 and 40-45). The updates can be: set data to 1 (`cmd = 1`), set data to 2 (`cmd = 2`), increment the data (`cmd = 4`), or decrement the data (`cmd = 5`). Once the update is performed on the stored data, the leader sends an acknowledgment back to the client (Line 34).

**Distributed Store Sketch in MERCURY.** Consider the Distributed Store process sketch in Fig. 5 where the system designer leaves parts of their model unspecified (denoted by the unspecified expressions  $??_{id}$  for some  $id$  in  $\mathbb{N}$ ). These unspecified parts correspond to various interesting questions the system designer may have when designing their system. For instance, unspecified expressions  $??_1$ ,  $??_2$ , and  $??_3$  determine how many candidates should win, and what should the winning and losing processes do after the partition. Unspecified expressions  $??_4$ ,  $??_5$ , and  $??_6$  dictate how a process acting as a leader handles different types of client requests. And finally, unspecified expressions  $??_7$ ,  $??_8$ ,  $??_9$ , and  $??_{10}$  control how the agreed-upon updates should be performed consistently across the leaders and replicas. While such unspecified expressions may not correspond to large segments of the code or complex control-flow constructs, they are the main “knobs” that the designer needs to turn to ensure that their systems belong to the efficiently-decidable fragment of MERCURY. The specified parts of this sketch capture a general intuition that an experienced system designer may have about this Distributed Store system. For instance, that there are leaders and replicas, and that different client requests may need to be handled differently.

**CINNABAR.** From the set of 163,840,000 possible completions of the Distributed Store sketch in Fig. 5, CINNABAR is able to find a correct one in 2.2 minutes and 203 iterations. In contrast, a naive exploration of all possible completions times out after 15 minutes. This demonstrates the impact of counterexample extraction and encoding on effectively pruning the search space. During the execution of the synthesis loop, CINNABAR encountered 36 phase-compatibility violations, 31 cutoff-amenability violations, 21 safety violations, and 114 liveness violations. Interestingly, out of the 67 phase-compatibility and cutoff-amenability violations, 63 were encountered in the first 100 iterations, showing that, for this system, CINNABAR was able to converge faster on candidates in the efficiently-decidable fragment, and used liveness properties to pick a higher-quality candidate to return to the designer.

## D Equivalent forms for the Phase-Compatibility Conditions

**Lemma 2.**

$$\begin{aligned}
& \forall e, f \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S : \\
& \left( s \xrightarrow{A(e)} s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(f)} * \right) \Rightarrow \left( \text{initiable}(dst_e, f) \Rightarrow \left( t \xrightarrow{R(e)} t' \Rightarrow \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(f)} * \right) \right) \\
& \equiv \\
& \forall e, f \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t, z, z' \in S : \\
& \left( s \xrightarrow{A(e)} s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(f)} * \wedge z \xrightarrow{A/R(e)} z' \wedge z' \xrightarrow{A(f)} * \wedge t \xrightarrow{R(e)} t' \right) \Rightarrow \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(f)} *
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We show this in one direction, the other can be obtained using the same steps in the reverse order. We start with:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \forall e, f \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S : \\
& \left( s \xrightarrow{A(e)} s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(f)} * \right) \Rightarrow \left( \text{initiable}(dst_e, f) \Rightarrow \left( t \xrightarrow{R(e)} t' \Rightarrow \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(f)} * \right) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Unrolling all the implications, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \forall e, f \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S : \\
& \neg \left( s \xrightarrow{A(e)} s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(f)} * \right) \vee \left( \neg \text{initiable}(dst_e, f) \vee \neg \left( t \xrightarrow{R(e)} t' \vee \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(f)} * \right) \right) \\
& = \forall e, f \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S : \\
& \neg s \xrightarrow{A(e)} s' \vee \neg s' \xrightarrow{R(f)} * \vee \neg \text{initiable}(dst_e, f) \vee \neg t \xrightarrow{R(e)} t' \vee \neg \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(f)} *
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \forall \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S : \\
&\quad \neg \left( s \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{e})} s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge \text{initiable}(\text{dst}_{\mathbf{e}}, \mathbf{f}) \wedge t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{e})} t' \right) \vee \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \\
&= \forall \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S : \\
&\quad \left( s \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{e})} s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge \text{initiable}(\text{dst}_{\mathbf{e}}, \mathbf{f}) \wedge t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{e})} t' \right) \Rightarrow \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that

$$\text{initiable}(\text{dst}_{\mathbf{e}}, \mathbf{f}) \equiv \exists z, z' \in S : z \xrightarrow{A/R(\mathbf{e})} z' \wedge z' \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{f})} *$$

Hence our formula becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \forall \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S : \\
&\quad \left( s \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{e})} s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge (\exists z, z' \in S : z \xrightarrow{A/R(\mathbf{e})} z' \wedge z' \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{f})} *) \wedge t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{e})} t' \right) \Rightarrow \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *
\end{aligned}$$

Since all the variables in  $\left( s \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{e})} s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{e})} t' \right)$  are free<sup>6</sup> in  $(\exists z, z' \in S : z \xrightarrow{A/R(\mathbf{e})} z' \wedge z' \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{f})} *)$ , we can apply the following rewrite rule:  $(\exists x : f(x)) \wedge g(y) \equiv \exists x : (f(x) \wedge g(y))$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
&\forall \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S : \\
&\quad \left( \exists z, z' \in S : (s \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{e})} s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge z \xrightarrow{A/R(\mathbf{e})} z' \wedge z' \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{f})} *) \wedge t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{e})} t' \right) \Rightarrow \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *
\end{aligned}$$

Following a similar variable freeness argument as before, we can apply the following rewrite rule:  $(\exists x : f(x)) \Rightarrow g(y) \equiv \forall x : (f(x) \Rightarrow g(y))$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
&\forall \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S : \\
&\quad \forall z, z' \in S : \left( (s \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{e})} s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge z \xrightarrow{A/R(\mathbf{e})} z' \wedge z' \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{f})} *) \wedge t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{e})} t' \right) \Rightarrow \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\forall \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t, z, z' \in S : \\
&\quad (s \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{e})} s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge z \xrightarrow{A/R(\mathbf{e})} z' \wedge z' \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{f})} *) \wedge t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{e})} t' \Rightarrow \exists t' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.**

$$\begin{aligned}
&\forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s' \in S : \left( s \rightarrow s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \right) \Rightarrow \\
&\quad \left( \forall X \in \text{ph}(s) : \left( \text{initiable}(X, \mathbf{f}) \Rightarrow (\forall t \in X. \exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *) \right) \right) \\
&\equiv \\
&= \forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t, z \in S, X \in \text{ph}(s) : \\
&\quad (\text{inPhase}(X, s, t) \wedge \text{inPhase}(X, s, z) \wedge s \rightarrow s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge z \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{f})} *) \Rightarrow (\exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *)
\end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>6</sup> Modulo some renaming for event names if need be.

*Proof.* We show this in one direction, the other can be obtained using the same steps in the reverse order. We start with:

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s' \in S : \\ & \left( s \rightarrow s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \right) \Rightarrow \left( \forall X \in ph(s) : \left( \text{initiable}(X, \mathbf{f}) \Rightarrow (\forall t \in X. \exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *) \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Unrolling the implications, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s' \in S : \\ & \neg \left( s \rightarrow s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \right) \vee \left( \forall X \in ph(s) : \left( \neg \text{initiable}(X, \mathbf{f}) \vee (\forall t \in X. \exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *) \right) \right) \\ & = \forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s' \in S : \\ & \neg s \rightarrow s' \vee \neg s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \vee \left( \forall X \in ph(s) : \left( \neg \text{initiable}(X, \mathbf{f}) \vee (\forall t \in X. \exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *) \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Using the rewrite rule:  $(\forall x : f(x)) \vee g(y) \equiv \forall x : (f(x) \vee g(y))$  we obtain the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s' \in S : \\ & \forall X \in ph(s) : \left( \neg s \rightarrow s' \vee \neg s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \vee \neg \text{initiable}(X, \mathbf{f}) \vee (\forall t \in X. \exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Using the same rewrite rule we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s' \in S : \\ & \forall X \in ph(s), t \in X : \left( \neg s \rightarrow s' \vee \neg s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \vee \neg \text{initiable}(X, \mathbf{f}) \vee (\exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s' \in S, X \in ph(s), t \in X : \\ & \left( \neg s \rightarrow s' \vee \neg s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \vee \neg \text{initiable}(X, \mathbf{f}) \vee (\exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $\text{inPhase}(P, u, v)$  indicates that states  $u$  and  $v$  are in some phase  $P$  together. Hence, we can rewrite  $t \in X$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S, X \in ph(s) : \\ & \text{inPhase}(X, s, t) \Rightarrow \left( \neg s \rightarrow s' \vee \neg s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \vee \neg \text{initiable}(X, \mathbf{f}) \vee (\exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *) \right) \\ & = \forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S, X \in ph(s) : \\ & \left( \neg \text{inPhase}(X, s, t) \vee \neg s \rightarrow s' \vee \neg s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \vee \neg \text{initiable}(X, \mathbf{f}) \vee (\exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *) \right) \\ & = \forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S, X \in ph(s) : \\ & \left( \neg (\text{inPhase}(X, s, t) \wedge s \rightarrow s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *) \vee \neg \text{initiable}(X, \mathbf{f}) \vee (\exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S, X \in ph(s) : \\ \left( (inPhase(X, s, t) \wedge s \rightarrow s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge initiable(X, \mathbf{f})) \Rightarrow (\exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *) \right)$$

Finally, we can rewrite *initiable*(*X*, *f*) using the following:

$$initiable(X, \mathbf{f}) \equiv \exists z \in X : z \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{f})} * \equiv \exists z \in S : inPhase(X, s, z) \wedge z \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{f})} *$$

Hence, we obtain:

$$= \forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t \in S, X \in ph(s) : \\ \left( (inPhase(X, s, t) \wedge s \rightarrow s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \right. \\ \left. \wedge (\exists z \in S : inPhase(X, s, z) \wedge z \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{f})} *)) \Rightarrow (\exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *) \right)$$

Following similar steps from Lemma 2 we extract *z* to the top level and obtain:

$$= \forall \mathbf{f} \in E_{\text{global}}, s, s', t, z \in S, X \in ph(s) : \\ (inPhase(X, s, t) \wedge inPhase(X, s, z) \wedge s \rightarrow s' \wedge s' \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} * \wedge z \xrightarrow{A(\mathbf{f})} *) \Rightarrow (\exists t \xrightarrow{R(\mathbf{f})} *)$$



This figure "sampleLine.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2208.12400v2>