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Abstract

The model checker SPIN is applied to the analysis of feature interactions in the design of telecommunications services. The application area is a challenging one for model-checking because formulating the right temporal properties in a distributed system is difficult and the state spaces quickly become intractable. We demonstrate how to express the properties in LTL and give minimal abstraction techniques that can greatly reduce the cost of model-checking. We also show how analysis can be performed automatically using scripts.
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1 Introduction

In software development a feature is a component of additional functionality – additional to the main body of code. Typically, features are added incrementally, at various stages in the life-cycle, usually by different developers. A consequence of adding features in this way is feature interaction, when one feature affects, or modifies, the behaviour of another feature. Although in many cases feature interaction is quite acceptable, even desirable, in other cases interactions lead to unpredictable and undesirable results. The problem is well known within the telecommunications services domain (for example, see [3]),
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though it exhibits in many other well-known domains such as email and elec-
tronic point of sales. We expect interactions to be an issue in next generation
systems as well, for example in Grid technologies [21]. It is therefore important
to have a range of techniques for dealing with them.

Techniques to deal with feature interactions can be characterised as design
time or run time, interaction detection and/or resolution. Here, we concentrate
on the detection of interactions at design time, with resolution through re-
design.

When there is a proliferation of features, as in telecommunications services,
then automated detection techniques are essential. In this paper, we investi-
gate the feasibility of our specification and modelling approach, and the use
of model-checking techniques, for feature interaction detection in POTS (plain
old telephony) services. Much is known about the POTS domain, we therefore
believe it to be an ideal domain to test the feasibility of our approach. We
choose the model-checker SPIN [27], because of the suitability of the associ-
ated high level description language, Promela, for specifying software systems.
Preliminary results for a system involving no features were reported in [6].

Model-checking involves constructing a finite model of a system and checking
that a desired property holds in that model by exploring the state-space of
the model. Theorem proving, on the other hand, involves deriving theorems
from a given set of axioms. The former is ideally suited to our domain be-
cause telecommunications services are inherently concurrent and each model
(essentially a labelled transition system) can be generated automatically from
a high level description of a service. Consequently, the high level Promela
descriptions can be modified with very little cost, seldom the case in a theo-
rem proving approach where theorems have to be reproved, as the underlying
theory changes.

Our approach involves considering a given service (and features) at two differ-
ent levels of abstraction: communicating finite state automata and temporal
logic formulae, represented by Promela specifications, labelled transition sys-
tems and Büchi automata. We make contributions in several ways, including

- a low level call service model in Promela that permits truly independent
call control processes with asynchronous communication, asymmetric call
control and a facility for adding features in a structured way,
- state-space reduction techniques for Promela which result in tractable state-
spaces, thus overcoming classic state-explosion problems,
- a technique for implementing a relativised temporal operator, that is one
which depends on constituent processes, in the linear temporal logic of
SPIN,
- interaction analysis of a basic call service with six features, involving four
users with full functionality. There are two types of analysis, static and
dynamic, the latter is completely automated, making extensive use of Perl
scripts to generate the model-checking runs.

Additionally, our results may serve to provide useful guidance for model-
checking in this, and other, application domains.

The paper is organised as follows. Our overall approach to interaction detec-
tion, and the role of SPIN, is given in section 2. Following this, we give a short
overview of telecommunications services, the language Promela, and then in
some detail, how SPIN’s search and verification algorithms work.

Sections 4 and 5 give an overview of the finite state automata and temporal
properties for the basic service. In section 6 we give the Promela implemen-
tation of the basic call service, and optimisations to reduce the state space;
in Section 7 we validate the basic service. Sections 8, 9 and 10 give similar
descriptions and implementation of the features. Static and dynamic interac-
tion analysis, respectively, are introduced in Sections 11 and 12. In Section 13
we automate the (dynamic) analysis and model generation and give results.
In Section 14 we discuss the role of static and dynamic analysis. Conclusions
and directions for further work are given in section 15.

Some of the results contained in this paper have been presented in [5]. However
here we include greater implementation detail and provide more background
material relating to SPIN. In addition, our analysis concerns 8 features whereas
in [5] only 6 were considered.

1.1 Related Work

Model-checking for feature interaction analysis has been investigated by oth-
ers, for example, using SMV [39], Caesar [41], COSPAN [17] and SPIN in [29].
In the last, the Promela model is extracted mechanically from call processing
software code; no details of the model are given and so it is difficult to
compare results. In [39], the authors are restricted to two subscribers of the
service with full functionality (plus two users with half functionality), due to
state-space explosion problems. For similar reasons, call control is not inde-
dependent. Nevertheless, we regard this as a benchmark paper and aim at least
to demonstrate a similar set of properties within our context. In [17], features
and the basic service are described at only one level of abstraction, by tem-
poral descriptions. State-space explosion is avoided, but interactions arising
from implementation detail, such as race conditions, cannot be detected. Our
layered approach permits detection of interactions arising from implementa-
tion detail, building upon earlier work by the first author (of this paper) in
[41], where process algebra was employed. This too suffered from limitations
imposed by state-explosion and the lack of (explicit) asynchronous communication; indeed these limitations motivated the current investigation of Promela and SPIN.

2 Approach

Our approach has two phases; in the first phase we consider only the basic call service, as depicted in Figure 1. The aim of the first phase is to develop the right level of abstraction of the basic service and to ensure that we have effective reasoning techniques, before proceeding to add features.

Our starting point is the top and left hand side of figure 1: the automata and properties. Neither need be complete specifications; this is a virtue of the approach and, for example, allows us to avoid the frame problem. The Promela description in the middle of Figure 1 is regarded as the implementation; a crucial step is therefore validation of the implementation. This is done by checking satisfaction of the properties, using SPIN. Initial attempts fail, due to state-space explosion, however, an examination of the underlying state-
space (far right of Figure 1) leads us to discover simple, but very effective optimisations.

The second phase, when we add features, is depicted in Figure 2. Again, the starting point is finite state automata and properties. The Promela implementation is augmented with the new feature behaviour, primarily through the use of “in-line” functions (see Section 10.1); again, the Promela has to be validated, this time against the feature properties. This leads us to our ultimate goal, interaction analysis, which takes two forms: static analysis, involving (syntactic) inspection of the Promela “code”, and dynamic analysis, involving reasoning over combinations of sets of logical formulae and configurations of the feature subscribers, using SPIN. Both of these forms of analysis are indicated in Figure 2. The results of (either) analysis is interaction detection, often with a clear indication of possible resolution(s). The relationship between the two types of analysis is discussed in Section 14.
3 Background

3.1 Telecommunications Services

Control of the progress of calls is provided by a service at an exchange (a stored program control exchange). The service responds to events such as handset on or off hook, as well as sending control signals to devices and lines such as ringing tone or line engaged. A service is a collection of functionality that is usually self-sustaining. A feature is additional functionality, for example, a call forwarding capability, or ring back when free; a user is said to subscribe to a feature. When features are added to a basic service, there may be interactions (i.e. behavioural modifications) between both the features offered within that service, as well as with features offered in another service.

For example, if a user who subscribes to call waiting (CW) and call forward when busy (CFB) is engaged in a call, then what will happen when there is a further incoming call? (Full details of all features mentioned here are given in section 8.) If the call is forwarded, then the CW feature is clearly compromised, and vice versa. In either case, the subscriber will not have his/her expectations met. This is an example of a single user, single component (SUSC) [7] interaction – the conflicting features are subscribed to by a single user. More subtle interactions can occur when more than one user/subscriber are involved, these are referred to as multiple user, multiple component (MUMC) interactions. For example, consider the scenario where user A subscribes to originating call screening (OCS), with user C on the screening list, and user B subscribes to CFB to user C. If A calls B, and the call is forwarded to C, as prescribed by B’s feature CFB, then A’s feature OCS is compromised. Clearly, if the call is not forwarded, then the CFB feature is compromised. These kinds of interactions can be very difficult to detect (and resolve), particularly since different features may be activated at different stages of a the call cycle.

Ideally, interactions are detected and resolved at service creation time, though this may not always be possible when third-party or legacy services are involved (for example, see [4]).

As with all distributed systems, there are many perspectives of a telecomms network, with varying levels of abstraction. Here, we have chosen to examine the user perspective of the basic call service, following the IN (Intelligent Networks) model, distributed functional plane [30].
This section is intended to give an overview of Promela and SPIN. A more
detailed description of the search algorithms and parameters used by the latter
is included for the interest of the non SPIN expert, and as such can be omitted
by those readers already familiar with Promela and SPIN.

Promela, *Process meta language* [26,27], is a high-level, state based, language
for modelling communicating, concurrent processes. It is an imperative, C-
like language with additional constructs for non-determinism, asynchronous
and synchronous communication, dynamic process creation, and mobile con-
nections, i.e. communication channels can contain other communication chan-
nels. Thus, the language is very powerful and expressive. SPIN is a bespoke
model-checker for Promela and provides several reasoning mechanisms: asser-
tion checking, acceptance/progress states and cycle detection and satisfaction
of linear temporal logic (LTL) formulae.

Other high-quality model-checkers include SMV, Murphi and FDR [34,12,40].
We choose to work with SPIN primarily because of the rich expressive power
of Promela, and its suitability for modelling software processes. We do not
choose SMV, for example, because the modelling languages: extended SMV
and synchronous Verilog, were designed with hardware in mind. These lan-
guages do not allow one to model software as naturally and do not include
asynchronous communication or explicit concurrency as primitives.

### 3.2.1 *On-the-fly Depth-first Search*

In order to perform verification on a model, SPIN converts a Promela speci-
fication into a labelled transition system (LTS). An LTS is defined as a triple
\( F = (S, f_0, T) \) where \( S \) is a finite set of states, \( f_0 \) is a distinguished initial
state in \( S \), and \( T \) a finite set of transitions, that is a set of pairs \( (s_1, s_2) \), where
\( s_1, s_2 \in S \). Each transition of the LTS corresponds to the execution of a spe-
cific atomic statement within one of the (concurrent) processes. An LTS can
be represented by a graph (a *state-graph*) in which the nodes correspond to
the states in \( S \) and directed edges correspond to the transitions in \( T \).

A basic depth-first search (to check for deadlock, assertion violations etc.)
explores the state-graph associated with \( F \), starting from the initial state \( f_0 \),
successively progressing along the edges of the graph and back-tracking when
a previously visited state is reached, until an error is found – or until the entire
search space has been explored.
3.2.2 Partial Order Reduction

Partial order reduction (POR) (see [36] and [35]) is a technique that is used to diminish the time and memory requirements when model-checking concurrent processes. It is based on the observation that execution sequences (or “traces”) of a concurrent program can be divided into equivalence classes whose members are indistinguishable with respect to a property that is to be checked. By ensuring that at least one trace from each equivalence class is executed during a reduced search, the use of POR ensures that redundant work is not performed and that the truth (or otherwise) of a property is preserved.

A traditional, exhaustive, depth-first search of the state-space of a concurrent system involves the exploration of all of the transitions enabled at any state encountered during the search. The crux of the POR algorithm (described in [35]) is the fact that, in some cases, it is sufficient to explore a subset of the enabled transitions of a state (and hence reduce the total number of execution paths to be explored). Such a subset is called an ample set, and only exists for some states — when certain conditions are satisfied.

The implementation of POR used in SPIN (see [28]), involves the identification of various categories of Promela statement that can be statically marked as “safe” (or “conditionally safe”) transitions. A subset of transitions enabled from a given state can only be ample if it consists entirely of safe transitions (and no successor of the state arising from any of these transitions has already been encountered during the current execution). The statements (transitions) that are marked as safe are essentially assignments to local variables or exclusive channel read/send operation. A channel is said to be exclusive read-access within a process, annotated $xr$, if no other process can read from the channel. Similarly, a channel is said to be exclusive send-access and annotated $xs$.

3.2.3 Parameters and Further Options used in SPIN Verification

One important parameter that needs to be set for any verification run is the maximum search depth $M$. This value determines the maximum distance along any path (starting from the initial state) that the depth-first search will explore. If $M$ is set to a value that is less than the length of the greatest path from the initial state in a full search, the search will be truncated. In this case, whenever the search reaches depth $M$, the error message “maximum search depth too small” is reported, and the search will back-track until it reaches a previously unvisited state as before. This means that any state that is not reachable from the initial state along a path of length at most $M$, will not be explored.

For debugging purposes, a truncated search is suitable. Once an error has been reported, successive runs should be performed to determine the smallest value
of $M$ for which the error will be "caught". If the search is truncated, the error will occur at or near the maximum search-depth. Following a verification with this maximum search-depth with a guided simulation will provide a description of the shortest path to the error.

If, on the other hand, after strenuous debugging, there are no errors believed to be present in the model, a full search-space search must be performed to show that there are no errors at any depth. In this case a truncated search is not suitable and $M$ must be set to a value greater than the length of the greatest execution sequence. However (especially when conservation of memory is crucial), it is important that care is taken to set the maximum depth to as small a size as possible - to avoid the provision of an unnecessarily large (current search state storage) search stack.

For every reachable state, the corresponding state-vector is a unique characterisation of the state consisting of a sequence of bits in memory. During a depth-first search these states are usually stored in a hash-table. The size of the hash-table is determined via the Estimated State-Space Size parameter. If this is set too high, the memory required for the hash-table will be too great and verification will not be possible. If however this value is set too low the hash-table will not be large enough to accommodate all of the reached states. In general, it is advisable to leave this parameter set to the default value unless the Minimised Automaton Encoding (combined with Compression) or Supertrace options are selected. Compression is a method by which each individual state is encoded in a more efficient way. The memory required for each individual stored state is thus reduced, although the memory required for the hash-table itself remains unchanged. If MA-encoding is used without COM a hash-table is not used, and so the value of the Estimated State-Space Size parameter is irrelevant. However, if MA-encoding and COM are combined, a (small) hash-table is still required for the compression of the individual states. It is therefore prudent to set the Estimated State-Space Size parameter to a low value. Since we did not employ Supertrace, we omit its description here.

Finally, the Weak Fairness option [19,35,1] ensures that any process that has a transition that remains enabled will eventually execute it. The algorithm is based on a variant of Choeka's flag algorithm [8] and involves the construction of an extended state-space consisting of $N$ copies of the original state-space (where $N$ is the number of processes). Clearly the additional memory and time requirements of such an algorithm are great and therefore its use should be avoided where possible (see section 5.3).
As well as enabling a search of the state-space to check for deadlock, assertion violations etc., SPIN allows the checking of the satisfaction of an LTL formula over all execution paths. The mechanism for doing this is via never claims – processes which describe undesirable behaviour, and Büchi automata – automata that accept a system execution if and only if that execution forces it to pass through one or more of its accepting states infinitely often. Full details of never claims and Büchi automata are given in [27,18,33]. Here, we give a brief overview of the mechanisms involved and a description of how they have been employed.

Standard LTL formulae are constructed from a set of atomic propositions, the standard Boolean operators (¬, ∧ and ∨), and the temporal operators [] (always), <> (eventually), o (next) and U (strong) until). Propositions include process control such as @p@label meaning process p is at label label.

When SPIN is used to verify an LTL property one must first use SPIN’s LTL converter (or an alternative—see section 6.1) which translates LTL formulae into Promela syntax. This translation is a never-claim and encodes the Büchi acceptance condition. During a SPIN verification, this never-claim is converted to a Büchi automaton. Another Büchi automaton, consisting of the the synchronous product of the LTS corresponding to the concurrent system (model) and the Büchi automaton corresponding to the never-claim, is constructed. A depth-first search explores the state-graph associated with this (new) Büchi automaton.

If the original LTL formula f does not hold, the depth-first search will “catch” at least one execution sequence for which ¬f is true. If f has the form []p, (that is f is a safety property), this sequence will contain an acceptance state at which ¬p is true. In this case the never-claim is said to complete. Alternatively, If f has the form <>p, (that is f is a liveness property), the sequence will contain a cycle which can be repeated infinitely often, throughout which ¬p is true. In this case the never-claim is said to contain an acceptance cycle. In either case the never claim is said to be matched.

When using SPIN’s LTL converter it is possible to check whether a given property holds for All Executions or for No Executions. A universal quantifier is implicit in the beginning of all LTL formulas and so, to check an LTL property it is natural, therefore, to choose the All Executions option. However, we sometimes wish to check that a given property (p say) holds for some state along some execution path. This is not possible using LTL alone. However, SPIN can be used to show that “p holds for No Executions” is not true (via a never-claim violation), which is equivalent. Therefore, when listing our
properties (section 5.3), we use the shorthand $E(\emptyset)p$ (meaning for some path $p$) to mean “$(\emptyset)p$ for No Executions is not true”.

This concludes the background material, we are now ready to begin the first phase of the approach: a description of the basic call service.

4 Basic Call Service

Figure 3 gives a diagrammatic representation of the automaton for the basic call service. States to the left of the idle state represent terminating behaviour, states to the right represent originating behaviour. Events observable by service subscribers label transitions: user-initiated events at the terminal device, such as (handset) on and (handset) off, are given in plain font, network-initiated events such as unobt and engaged are given in italics. Note that there are two “ring” events, oring and tring, for originating and terminating ring tone, respectively. This reflects the fact that the ringing tone is indeed generated at each terminal device. Not all transitions are labelled. For example, there is an unlabelled transition from the (originating) state calling to dial, simply because there is no observable event associated with this transition.

The automata must communicate with each other; namely, the behaviour of one call process, as originating party, affects the behaviour of another call process, as terminating party. We do not adopt a formal notation to describe the communication mechanism (e.g. extended finite state automata) but describe it informally, as follows.

A communication channel is associated with each call process (or automata). Each channel has capacity for at most one message: a pair consisting of a channel name (the other party in the call) and a status bit (the status of
The contents of Channel A and their interpretations are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents of Channel A</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>empty</td>
<td>A is free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A,0)</td>
<td>A is engaged, but not connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B,0)</td>
<td>B is terminating party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B is attempting connection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A,0)</td>
<td>A is engaged, but not connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B,0)</td>
<td>B is terminating party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B,1)</td>
<td>If channel B contains (A,1) then A and B are connected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. States of a Communications Channel in the Protocol

The communication channels are used to coordinate call set up and clear down. The basic protocol for call set up from A to B is as follows, assuming neither are engaged in a call. When A goes off hook, the message (A,0) is placed on channel A. After dialling B, the message (A,0) is sent to channel B. When B receives this message, the message (B,1) is sent to channel A and the status bit in the message on channel B is changed to 1; the connection is then established. To clear down, A can close down one side of the connection by going on hook: the message is removed from its communication channel and the status bit of the message in channel B becomes 0. Then, neither A nor B are in a connected state, and A is free to close down the connection. On the other hand, channel B cannot close down the connection (reflecting the real-life situation). So, if B goes on hook, while A and B are connected, then the connection status remains unchanged for both A and B.

5 Basic Call Service Properties

In this section we give a set of temporal properties for the basic call service. Before doing so, we explain the form of the propositions and the addition of a new temporal operator.
5.1 Propositions

Propositions in SPIN’s version of LTL may refer to values of (global) variables or to process “counters”. Examples of the former are \( x == 0 \) and \( x >= y \). An example of the latter is \( \text{user}[\text{proc}_i]@idle \), meaning the incarnation of the process \( \text{user} \) with process identifier \( \text{proc}_i \) is at label \( \text{idle} \). Process identifiers are simply global variables, initialised when a process is instantiated (and captured by assignment within the Promela \( \text{run} \) command).

In our propositions we will assume that the variables include the arrays \( \text{connect.to} \), recording the presence of a connection between two users, \( \text{dialled} \), recording the most recent number dialled (since leaving the \( \text{idle} \) state), and \( \text{event} \) and \( \text{network\_event} \), for user-initiated and network-initiated events, respectively. \( \text{proc}_i \) and \( \text{chan\_name}[i] \) are the process identifier and the channel name associated with user process \( i \), respectively.

5.2 Relativised Next Operator

When model-checking, the temporal operator \( \circ \) (next) in LTL must be used with caution, due to problems of stuttering equivalence – properties involving \( \circ \) can not be guaranteed to be closed under stuttering (see, for example, [37]). Consequently a valuable state reduction strategy, partial order reduction (see section 3.2.2) is not applicable in the presence of \( \circ \). However, this is not a great hardship since it is in fact very rare that a property holds in every next global state in a distributed system.

The \( \circ \) operator is of little use in a distributed system, what is required is a relativised \( \circ \). That is, we would like to refer a next state relative to a particular constituent process. Such an operator would allow us to formalise properties such as “after a process \( p \) reads from a channel, its next action is to increment a given variable”. (Note that the next global state might be one in which another process updates a different variable.)

We propose that in SPIN, relativised operators can be implemented by judicious use of the built-in global variable \( \text{last} \) and the (LTL) next operator. This variable holds the value of the (internal) process number of the process that last made a transition. Although some formulae that involve the next operator \( \circ \) can be shown to be stutter-closed (and so partial order reduction can be used for the verification of such properties), in general, the use of the \( \text{last} \) variable precludes the use of partial order reduction.

We introduce the operator \( \circ_{\text{proc}_i} \) as a shorthand meaning the next global state in which process \( \text{proc}_i \) has made a (local) transition (i.e. the first global state
in which \( \text{proc} \) has made a move). In general, \( \circ \) and \( \circ_{\text{proc}} \) will refer to different states, the former occurring before (or at the same time as) the latter. Thus a property of the form “if \( p \) is true, then the next time process \( i \) makes a transition, \( q \) will be true”, which is expressed in LTL as follows: \( \Box (p \rightarrow \circ((\Box(\neg r)) \circ (\neg r) U (r \land q))) \) (where \( r \) is defined as \( \text{last} = \text{proc} \)), can be expressed more simply as \( \Box (p \rightarrow \circ_{\text{proc}} q) \).

5.3 Basic Call Service Temporal Properties

As described in sections 3.3 and 5.2 respectively, we use the following shorthand notation: \( E \) (for some path) and \( \circ_{\text{proc}} \) (next, with respect to process \( i \)). In order to allow a further compact representation of properties, we introduce the operators \( W \) (weak until) and \( P \) (precedes), defined as follows:

\[
fWg = \Box f \lor (f U g)
\]

and

\[
fPg = \neg (\neg f U g).
\]

The LTL is given here alongside each property. This involves referring to variables (eg. dialled and connect) contained within the Promela code (an extract of which is given in section 6). We use symbols to denote predicates, for example “\( \Box p \) where \( p \) is \( \text{dialled}[i] == i \)” This provides a neater representation, and the LTL converter requires properties to be given in this way.

**Property 1** A connection between two users is possible.

That is: \( E \Box p \), where \( p \) is \( \text{connect}[i].to[j] == 1 \), for \( i \neq j \).

**Property 2** If you dial yourself, then you receive the engaged tone before returning to the idle state.

That is: \( \Box (p \rightarrow (\neg r) W g) \) where \( p \) is \( \text{dialled}[i] == \text{channelname}[i] \), \( q \) is \( \text{network.event}[i] == \text{engaged} \) and \( r \) is \( \text{user[proc]} @ \text{idle} \).

**Property 3** Busy tone or ringing tone will directly (that is, the next time that the process is active) follow calling.

That is: \( \Box (p \rightarrow \circ_{\text{proc}} q) \) where \( p \) is \( \text{event}[i] == \text{call} \) and \( q \) is \( (\text{network.event}[i] == \text{engaged}) \lor (\text{network.event}[i] == \text{oring}) \).

**Property 4** The dialled number is the same as the number of the connection attempt.
That is: $[(p \rightarrow q)$ where $p$ is $\text{dialled}[i] \equiv j$ and $q$ is $\text{partner}[i] \equiv \text{chan\_name}[j]$.]

**Property 5** If you dial a busy number then either the busy line clears before a call is attempted, or you will hear the engaged tone before returning to the idle state.

That is: $[(p \land v \land t) \rightarrow (((\neg s)W(w)) \mid (\neg r)Wq))$ where $p$ is $\text{dialled}[i] \equiv j$, $v$ is $\text{event}[i] \equiv \text{dial}$, $t$ is $\text{full}(\text{chan\_name}[j])$, $s$ is $\text{event}[i] \equiv \text{call}$, $w$ is $\text{len}(\text{chan\_name}[i]) \equiv 0$, $r$ is $\text{user} [\text{proc}_i] \equiv \text{idle}$ and $q$ is $\text{network\_event}[i] \equiv \text{engaged}$, for $i \neq j$.

Note that the operator $\text{len}$ is used to define $w$ in preference to the function $\text{empty}$ (or $\text{nfull}$). This is because SPIN disallows the use of the negation of these functions (and $\neg w$ arises within the never-claim).

**Property 6** You cannot make a call without having just (that is, the last time that the process was active) dialled a number.

That is: $[(p \rightarrow q)$ where $p$ is $\text{user}[\text{proc}_i] \equiv \text{calling}$ and $q$ is $\text{event}[i] \equiv \text{dial}$.

Note that property 1 would not hold for all sequences because a connection may not always be possible, for example, because the other line is out of service, or constantly engaged, or the originator goes on-hook before a connection is made.

Great care has been taken to ensure that each temporal formula not only expresses precisely a property, but that the form will enable us to reason about them in the most efficient way. For example, it would be tempting to express Property 2 as $[(p \rightarrow q)$, where $p$ is $(\text{dialled}[i] \equiv \text{chan\_name}[i])$ and $q$ is $(\text{network\_event}[i] \equiv \text{engaged})$ (see [6]). This formula would be problematic in two ways. On the one hand it could be satisfied in a situation where a caller dialled his/her own number but failed to hear the engaged tone as a result (but heard the engaged tone ultimately, albeit during a different call). This would result in a longer search time to find an error. On the other hand, this formula would cause an error to be reported if a caller dialled his/her number and then simply failed to progress infinitely often. To avoid this unwanted scenario, the weak-fairness option would be required (see section 3.2.3), so causing a huge increase in the search-depth/time. The use of the $W$ operator in this situation is therefore crucial.
Each call process (see figure 3) is described in Promela as an instantiation of the (parameterised) proctype User declared thus:

```plaintext
proctype User (byte selfid; chan self)
```

Promela is a state-based formalism, rather than event-based. Therefore, we represent events by (their effect on) variables, and states (e.g. calling, dialling, etc.) by labels. Since each transition is implemented by several compound statements, we group these together as an *atomic* statement, concluding with a *goto*.

An example of the Promela code associated with the *idle*, *dialing*, *calling* and *oconnected* states and their outgoing transitions is given below. The global/local variables and parameters include the self-explanatory `selfid` and `partnerid`, the communication channels `self` and `partner`, and the variables `dev`, `dialled`, `event` and `network_event`. In addition `messchan` and `messbit` are local variables used for reading messages, the channel `null` allows a default value for the `partner` variable when that call process is not engaged in a call. This value is not strictly necessary for modelling purposes, but can be valuable for reasoning.

Any variable about which we may intend to reason should not be updated more than once within any atomic statement, other variables may of course be updated as required. In addition `d_steps` (deterministic sequences of code that are executed indivisibly), while more efficient than atomic steps, are not suitable here because they do not allow a process to jump to a label out of scope. Finally, we note that there are numerous in-line assertions within the code, particularly at points when entering a new (call) state, and when reading and writing to communication channels.

```plaintext
idle:
  atomic
    assert(dev == on);
    assert(partner[selfid] == null);
    /* either attempt a call, or receive one */
    if
      :: empty(self) -> event[selfid] = off;
      dev[selfid] = off;
      self!self,0; goto dialing
    /* no connection is being attempted, go offhook */
    /* and become originating party */
      :: full(self) -> self ? partner[selfid], messbit >;
      /* an incoming call */
    if
      :: full(partner[selfid]) ->
        partner[selfid] ? <messchan, messbit >;
      if
        :: messchan = self /* call attempt still there */
        -> messchan = null; messbit = 0; goto alert
      else
        self ! messchan, messbit;
    /* call attempt cancelled */
```
partner[seflid]=null; partnerid=6;
messchan=null; messbit=0; goto idle
fi :: empty(partner[seflid]) ->
  self? messchan, messbit;
/* call attempt cancelled */
  partner[seflid]=null; partnerid=6;
  messchan=null; messbit=0;
  goto idle
fi
fi;

dialing:
  atomic{
    assert(dev == off);
    assert(full(seflid));
    assert(partner[seflid]=null);
    /* dial or go onhook */
    if
      :: event[seflid]=dial;
      /* dial and then nondeterministic choice of called party */
      if
        :: partner[seflid] = zero;
        dialled[seflid] = 0;
        partnerid=0
        :: partner[seflid] = one;
        dialled[seflid] = 1;
        partnerid=1
        :: partner[seflid] = two;
        dialled[seflid] = 2;
        partnerid=2
        :: partner[seflid] = three;
        dialled[seflid] = 3;
        partnerid=3
        :: partnerid= 7;
        fi
        :: event[seflid]=on;
        dev[seflid]=on;
        self? messchan, messbit; assert(messchan=seflid);
        messchan=null; messbit=0;
        goto idle
      /*go onhook, without dialling */
      fi;
    calling: /* check number called and process */
      atomic{
        event[seflid]=call;
        assert(dev == off);
        assert(full(seflid));
        if
          :: partnerid=7 -> goto unobtainable
          :: partner[seflid] = self -> goto busy
        /* invalid partner */
          :: (!partner[seflid]!self)&&!(partnerid=7)) ->
            if
              :: empty(partner[seflid]) -> partner[seflid]=self,0;
              self? messchan, messbit;
              self? partner[seflid]=0;
              goto alert
            /* valid partner, write token to partner's channel */
              :: full(partner[seflid]) -> goto busy
            /* valid partner but engaged */
              fi
            fi;
          connected:
atomic{
    assert(full(meld));
    assert(full(partner[meld]));
    /* connection established */
    connect[meld].to[partnerid] = 1;
    goto oclose);
}

Any number of call processes can be run concurrently. For example, assuming the global communication channels zero, one, etc. a network of four call processes is given by:

atomic{
    run User(0,zero);run User(1,one);
    run User(2,two);run User(3,three)}

6.1 Options and State-space Reduction

Initial attempts to validate the properties against a network of four call processes fail because of state-space explosion. In this section we examine the causes of state-space explosion, the applicability of standard solutions involving configuring SPIN and how the the Promela code itself can be transformed to optimise the state-space. The fully optimised code (including features) is given in the appendix.

SPIN Options

The most obvious, standard optimisation to apply is POR (see section 3.2.2); however, it has only limited effect on our model. Closer examination shows that this is hardly surprising. The only statements statically defined as “safe” by SPIN are assignments to local variables or exclusive channel read/send operations. The former are not only rare, but they are embedded in atomic statements that are themselves only safe if all component statements are safe. The latter do not appear at all: there are a few channel instances which could be declared to be £s, but none the former. Moreover, while we could declare further dedicated channels between pairs of processes, and annotate them appropriately, we are still left with the problem that even a non-destructive read or test of the length of a channel violates the $r property. Such a test is crucial: often behaviour depends on the exact contents of a channel. Thus, while some small gains can be made, they are minimal. Moreover, many such statements are embedded in unsafe atomic statements; it would clearly be a retrograde step to reduce the atomicity.

States can be compressed using minimised automaton encoding (MA) or compression (COM) (see section 3.2.3). When using the former, it is necessary to define the maximum size of the state-vector, which of course implies that
one has searched the entire space. However one can often find a reasonable value by choosing the (uncompressed) value reported from a preliminary verification with a deliberate assertion violation. While MA and COM together give a significant memory reduction, the trade-off in terms of time was simply unacceptable, for example, after 65 hours, the depth reached was only of the order of $10^6$.

*State-space Reductions*

A simple but stunningly effective way to reduce the state-space is to ensure that each visit to a *call state* is indeed a visit to the same underlying Promela state. This means that as many variables as possible should be initialised and then reset to their initial value (reinitialised) within Promela loops. For example, in virtually every call state it is possible to return to *idle*. An admirable reduction is made if variables such as `messchan` and `messbit` are initialised before the first visit to this label (*call state*), and then reinitialised before subsequent visits. This is so that global states that were previously distinguished (due to different values of these variables at different visits to the *idle call state*) are now identified. The largest reduction is to be found when such variables are routinely reset before progressing to the next *call state*. Unfortunately, this is not always possible, as it would result in a variable (about which we wish to reason) being updated more than once within an atomic statement (as discussed in 6). However, there is a solution: add a further state where variables are reinitialised. For example, we have added a new state *preidle*, where the variables `network_event` and `event` are reinitialised, before progression to *idle*. Therefore every occurrence of *goto idle* becomes *goto preidle*.

We note that although the (default) data-flow optimisation option available with SPIN attempts to reinitialise variables automatically, we have found that this option actually increases the size of the state-space of our model. This is due to the initial values of our variables often being non-zero (when they are of type mtype for example). SPIN's data-flow optimisation always resets variables to zero. Therefore we *must* switch this option off, and reinitialise our variables manually.

By merely commenting in/out any reference to (update of) all of the *event* variables when any such variable is needed for verification (see for example Property 3), the size of the state-space can be increased by an unnecessarily large amount. For example, to prove that Property 3 holds for *user[i]*, we are only interested in the value of *event[i]*, not of *event[j]* where $i \neq j$. The latter do not need to be updated. Thus an “inline” function, `event_action(eventq)` has been introduced to enable the update of specific variables. That is, it allows us to update the value of *event[i]* to the value *eventq*, and leave the other event variables set to their default value. So, for example, if $i = 0$, the `event_action` inline becomes:
inline event_action (eventq)
{
    if
        :selfid+O->event[selfid]=eventq
        :selfid|O->skip
    fi
}

Any reference to this inline definition is merely commented out when no event variables are needed for verification. (Another inline function is included to handle the network_event variables in the same way.)

We note that this reduction is not implemented in SPIN, though SPIN does, however, issue a warning “variable never used” in situations where such a reduction would be beneficial.

These transformations not only lead to a dramatic reduction of the underlying state-space, the search depth required was reduced to 10 percent of the initial value, but they do not involve abstraction away from the original model. On the contrary, if anything, they could be said to reduce the level of abstraction.

Unlike other abstraction methods (see for example [9], [20] and [23]) our techniques are simple, and merely involve making simple checks that unnecessary states have not been unintentionally introduced. We believe that these kinds of state-space explosions are not uncommon. All SPIN users should be aware that they may be introducing spurious states when coding their problem in Promela.

Finally, we note that the structure of never claims (Büchi automata) can affect efficiency and consistency of results. We use the conversion tool of Etessami, [16], which will shortly be implemented in SPIN. The Büchi automata in this case tend to be smaller (that is they contain fewer states) and have led to the faster detection of “bad” paths for some properties.

7 Basic Call Service Validation

It was possible to verify all six properties fairly quickly and well within our 1.5 Gbyte memory limit. State compression was used throughout.

In property 1 the No Executions option was selected and for all other properties, the All Executions option was selected.

For the verification of property 1, a path containing the expected never-claim violation was found within a search-depth of 10,000 in each case.

For each of the properties 2, 4, 5 and 6 a search of the entire search-space
showed there to be no errors. When partial-order reduction was applied each search was completed within a maximum search-depth of 2.5 million and there are at most 1 million stored states in each case. Each search completed within 10 minutes. Failure to apply partial-order reduction resulted in an increase in the maximum search depth reached of between 19% and 24% and a corresponding increase in the number of stored states of about 23%.

The verification of property 3 took longer (21 minutes), required a greater search-depth to be reached (4.2 million) and more states to be explored (3.7 × 10^6). This is partially due to the fact that both the event and network-event variables for the process under consideration had to be included for this property. In addition, the use of the Jast operator precludes the use of partial order reduction, which could have helped to reduce the complexity in this case.

8 Features

Now that the state-space is tractable, we can commence the second phase: adding a number of features to the basic service.

8.1 Features

The set of features that we have added include:

- **CFU – call forward unconditional** All calls to the subscriber’s phone are diverted to another phone.
- **CFB – call forward when busy** All calls to the subscriber’s phone are diverted to another phone, if and when the subscriber is busy.
- **OCS – originating call screening** All calls by the subscriber to numbers on a predefined list are inhibited. Assume that the list for user x does not contain x.
- **ODS – originating dial screening** The dialling of numbers on a predefined list by the subscriber is inhibited. Assume that the list for user x does not contain x.
- **TCS – terminating call screening** Calls to the subscriber from any number on a predefined list are inhibited. Assume that the list for user x does not contain x.
- **RBWF – ring back when free** The subscriber has the option to call the last recorded caller to his/her phone.
- **OCO – originating calls only** The subscriber is only able to be the originating party of a call.
• **TCO – terminating calls only** The subscriber is only able to be the terminating party of a call.

Note that examples of services that offer the features OCO or TCO are a pay phone and a teen line respectively.

We do not give automata for all the features, but give only one example. Figure 5 illustrates the change in user-perceived behaviour when the user subscribes to the ring back when free feature.

### 9 Temporal Properties for Features

The properties for features are more difficult to express than those for the basic service. In order to accurately reflect the behaviour of each feature, great attention must be paid to the *scope* of each property within the corresponding LTL formula (see for example [14]). For example, in property 8, it is essential that (for the CFB feature to be invoked) the forwarding party has a full communication channel *whilst the dialling party is in the dialling state*. This can only be expressed by stating that the forwarding party must have a full channel continuously between two states, the first of which must occur *before* the dialling party enters the dialling state, and the second *after* the dialling party emerges from the dialling state.

The values of the variables $i, j$ and $k$ depend on the *particular pair of features* and the corresponding *property* that is being analysed. These variables are therefore updated prior to each verification either manually (by editing
the Promela code directly), or automatically during the running of a model-
generating script (see section 13).

**Property 7 – CFU** Assume that user j forwards to k.

If user i rings user j then a connection between i and k will be attempted before user i hangs up.

That is: \[ [(p \rightarrow (rPq)), \text{where } p \text{ is } \text{dialled}[i] == j, r \text{ is } \text{partner}[i] == \text{chan\_name}[k], \text{and } q \text{ is } \text{dev}[i] == \text{on}.] \]

**Property 8 – CFB** Assume that user j forwards to k.

If user i rings user j when j is busy then a connection between i and k will be attempted before user i hangs up.

That is: \[ \left[ \left( (u \land t) \land ((u \land t) \cup (\neg u \land t \land p)) \right) \rightarrow (rPq) \right], \text{where } p \text{ is } \text{dialled}[i] == j, t \text{ is } \text{full}(\text{chan\_name}[j]), r \text{ is } \text{partner}[i] == \text{chan\_name}[k], u \text{ is } \text{User[proci}@dialling} \text{ and } q \text{ is } \text{dev}[i] == \text{on}.] \]

**Property 9 – OCS** Assume that user i has user j on its screening list.

No connection from user i to user j is possible.

That is: \[ [(\neg p), \text{where } p \text{ is } \text{connect}[i].to[j] == 1.] \]

**Property 10 – ODS** Assume that user i has user j on its screening list.

User i may not dial user j.

That is: \[ [(\neg p), \text{where } p \text{ is } \text{dialled}[i] == j.] \]

**Property 11 – TCS** Assume that user i has user j on its screening list.

No connection from user j to user i is possible.

That is: \[ [(\neg p), \text{where } p \text{ is } \text{connect}[j].to[i] == 1.] \]

**Property 12 – RBWF** Assume that user j has RBWF.

It is possible for an attempted call from i to j to eventually result in a successful call from j to i (without j ever dialling i).

That is: \[ E(\diamond ((p \land t \land q) \land (rPq))), \text{where } p \text{ is } \text{dialled}[i] = j, q \text{ is } \text{dialled}[j] = i, r \text{ is } \text{connect}[j].to[i] == 1 \text{ and } t \text{ is } \text{event}[i] == \text{call}.] \]
Property 13 – OCO Assume that user $j$ has OCO.

No connection from user $i$ to user $j$ is possible.

That is: $\| (-p)$, where $p$ is connect$[i].to[j] == 1$.

Property 14 – TCO Assume that user $j$ has TCO.

No connection from user $j$ to user $i$ is possible.

That is: $\| (-p)$, where $p$ is connect$[j].to[i] == 1$.

10 The Features in Promela

We do not give all the details of the implementation of features in Promela, but draw attention to some of the more important aspects:

- To implement the features we have included a “feature lookup” function (see below) that implements the features and computes the transitive closure of the forwarding relations (when such features apply to the same call state).
- We distinguish between call and dial screening; the former means a call between user A and B is prohibited, regardless of whether or not A actually dialed B, the latter means that if A dials B, then the call cannot proceed, but they might become connected by some other means. The latter case might be desirable if screening is motivated by billing. For example, if user A dials C (a local leg) and C forwards calls to B (a trunk leg) then A would only pay for the local leg.
- Currently we restrict the size of the lists of screened callers (relating to the OCS, ODS and TCS features) to one. That is, we assume that it is impossible for a single user to subscribe to two of the same screening feature. This is sufficient to demonstrate some feature interactions, and limits the size of the state-space.
- The addition of RBWF, while straightforward, increases the complexity of the underlying state-space greatly. This is because it involves recording (in a structure indexed by call processes) the last connection attempt. The issue is not just that there is a new global variable, but that call states that were previously identified are now distinguished by the contents of that record (c.f. discussion above about variable reinitialisation).
- To ensure that all variables are initialised, we use 6 as a default value. This is particularly useful when a user does not subscribe to a particular feature. The value 7 is used to denote both an unobtainable number (e.g. an incorrect number) and to denote the “button press” in RBWF. We do not use an additional value for the latter, so as not to increase the state
10.1 Implementation of features: the feature_lookup inline

In order to enable us to add features easily, all of the code relating to feature behaviour is now included within an inline definition. In SPIN, an inline definition is defined at the same level as a proctype declaration. An inline invocation (an inline call) is performed with the same syntax as a procedure call in an imperative language, such as C, and the parameters to an inline definition are typically names of variables. The body of an inline is expanded within the body of the User proctype at each point of invocation.

feature_lookup is defined as follows:

```c
inline feature_lookup(part_chan, part_id, st)
{
    do
        :((st==st_idle)&& (term_call_only[selfid]==1)) -> st=st_blocked
        :((st==st_diag1)&& (DNS[selfid]==part_id)) -> st=st_unobt
        :((st==st_diag1)&& (RMWF[selfid]==1)&& (part_id==7))
            -> st=st_back
        :((part_id!=7)&& (st==st_diag1)|| (CFB[part_id]!-6))
            -> part_id=CFB[part_id];
            part_chan=chan_name[part_id]
        :((part_id!=7)&& (st==st_diag1)|| (CFB[part_id]!-6)|| (len(part-chan)>0))
            -> part_id=CFB[part_id];
            part_chan=chan_name[part_id]
        :((st==st_call)&& (DCS[part_id]==1)) -> st=st_unobt
        :((st==st_call)&& (DCS[selfid]==part_id)) -> st=st_unobt
        :((st==st_call)&& (TCS[part_id]==selfid)) -> st=st_unobt
    else -> break
    od
}
```

The parameters part_chan, part_id, and st take the values of the current partner, partnerid and state of a user when a call to the feature_lookup inline is made. Statements within feature_lookup pertaining to features that are not currently active are automatically commented out (see section 13).

We note that one may regard feature_lookup as encapsulating centralised intelligence in the switch, as it has “knowledge” of the status of processes and data concerning feature configuration. While on the one hand one might argue that this is against the spirit of an IN switch, on the other hand we maintain that MUMC feature interactions simply cannot be detected in a completely distributed architecture.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>property</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>CFU</th>
<th>CFB</th>
<th>OCS</th>
<th>ODS</th>
<th>TCS</th>
<th>RBWF</th>
<th>OCO</th>
<th>TCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>property 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property 3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property 4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property 5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property 6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property 7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property 8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property 9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property 10</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property 11</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property 12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property 13</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property 14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6. Results of Property validation

10.2 Feature Validation

Each feature was validated (via SPIN verification) against the appropriate set of properties (1–12). We consider the property associated with a feature, the basic call properties, and the other feature properties, as appropriate. In figure 6 a dash (—) denotes that the property is not appropriate — for example a property might depend upon data that is not relevant to that feature. A × indicates that for some suitable set of parameters, the property is not satisfied. For ease of presentation and for comparison, BC is considered (again) as a feature.

11 Static Analysis

Static analysis is an analysis of the structure of the feature descriptions, i.e. an examination of the Promela descriptions. In this analysis, interaction is defined as follows.

**Definition** An *interaction* is when overlapping guards: two or more guards which evaluate to true, under an assignment to variables, lead to diverging consequences.

In other words, if there is an overlap, and the consequences diverge, then there
is non-determinism and hence a potential interaction. A more operational explanation is that we are trying to detect of shared triggers of features. Shared trigger is a well known concept, though seldom expressed in the above way. Because we have collected additional feature behaviour together within the inline feature lookup, we need only consider overlapping guards within this function.

As an example, consider the following overlap between CFU and CFB:

```plaintext
::(part_id!-7)&(st=st_dial)&(CFU[part_id]=6)
    ->part_id=CFU[part_id]
::(part_id!-7)&(st=st_dial)&(CFB[part_id]=6)&(len(partchan)>0)
    ->part_id=CFB[part_id]
```

The overlap occurs under the assignment st = st_dial, CFU[part_id] = x, len(partchan) > 0, and CFB[part_id] = y where x, y ≠ 6 and x ≠ y. The first choice consequently assigns x to part_id, but the second assigns y to part_id. These are clearly divergent, and so we have found an interaction.

SUSC and MUMC interactions are distinguished by considering the roles of part_id and selfid as indices. If the same index is used for the feature subscription, e.g. CFU[part_id] and CFB[part_id], then the interaction is SUSC, if different indices are used, it is MUMC. In this example, the interaction is clearly SUSC.

Interactions found from static analysis are relatively rare, because the shared triggers indeed lead (for different reasons) to the same action, or because there are few overlaps. Overlaps (found through the process of superposition) are sometimes subtle. For example, consider the following choices:

```plaintext
::(st=st_dial)&(DES[selfid]=part_id)
    ->st=st_unbst
::(st=st_dial)&(BBWF[selfid]=1)&(part_id=7)
    ->st=st_rback
```

There is no overlap here because 7 is not a valid number to be in a screening list, hence no interaction.

In all, there are 9 pairs to consider (4 clauses for st_dial, leading to 6 pairs, and 3 clauses for st_call, leading to 3 pairs). The results of the static analysis are given in the tables of figure 7 and 8. A √ indicates an interaction whereas a × indicates none. The tables are symmetric.

Static analysis is a very simple yet very effective mechanism for finding some interactions – those which arise from new non-determinism. It depends very much on the structure of the specification, unlike our dynamic form of analysis.
12 Dynamic Analysis

Dynamic analysis is an analysis of the logical properties that are satisfied (or not) by pairs of users subscribing to combinations of features. In this analysis, an interaction is defined as follows.

**Definition** Let $x$ and $y$ be user processes, and $x_{f_i} \cup y_{f_j}$ the configuration, or scenario, in which $x$ subscribes to feature $f_i$ and $y$ subscribes to feature $f_j$. Features $f_i$ and $f_j$ interact if a property that holds for $f_i$ alone, no longer holds in the presence of another feature $f_j$. More formally, for a property $\phi$, we have $x_{f_i} \models \phi$ but $x_{f_i} \cup y_{f_j} \not\models \phi$.

When $x == y$, then the interaction is SUSB, otherwise it is MUMC. Note that there are no constraints on $i$ and $j$, ie, $i = j$ or $\neq j$. An SUSC (MUMC) interaction between $f_i$ and $f_j$, resulting from a violation of property $\phi$, is
written \((f_i, f_j)_S \ ((f_i, f_j)_M)\).

The analysis is pairwise, known as 2-way interactions. While at first sight this may be limiting, empirical evidence suggests there is little motivation to generalise: 3-way interactions that are not detectable as a 2-way interaction are exceedingly rare [32]. A similar approach to dynamic analysis is taken, for example, by [39].

A naive approach would be to consider any property above as a candidate for \(\phi\). However, it is easy to see that this would lead to all features interacting. A more selective approach is required: we consider only the properties associated with the features under examination, i.e. for features \(f_i\) and \(f_j\), consider only properties \(\phi_i\) and \(\phi_j\).

13 Automatic Model Generation and Feature Interaction

Originally, before features were added to the basic call model, global variables were manually "turned off" (i.e. commented out) or replaced by local variables when they are not needed for verification. The addition of features has led to even more variables requiring to be selectively turned on and off, and set to different values. For example if an originating call screening feature is selected the \(\text{orig}_\text{call}_\text{screen}\) array has to be included and its elements set to the appropriate values. In addition the \(\text{feature}_\text{lookup}\) inline must be amended to include those lines pertaining to the originating call screening feature. If no \(\text{ring back when free}\) feature is chosen, the entire \(\text{ringback}\) call state must be commented out.

Making all of the necessary changes before every SPIN run was extremely time-consuming and error prone. Therefore, we now use a Perl script to enable us to perform these changes automatically. Specifically this enables us to generate, for any combination of features and properties, a model from a template file. Each generated model also includes a header containing information about which features and properties have been chosen in that particular case, which makes it easier to monitor model-checking runs.

Dynamic feature interaction analysis is combinatorially explosive: we must consider all pairs of features and combinations of suitable instantiations of the free variables \(i, j\) and \(k\) occurring in the properties. For example, for the SUSC case alone this gives 36 different scenarios (though not all are valid). To ease this burden and to speed up the process, a further Perl script is used to enable

- systematic selection of pairs of features and parameters \(i, j\) and \(k\), and generation of corresponding model,
automated SPIN verification of model and recording of feature interaction results.

Note that scenarios leading to feature interactions are recorded. Depending on the property concerned, a report of 1 error (properties 7–11) or 0 errors (property 12) from the SPIN verification indicates an interaction. Once (if) an SUC interaction is found the search for MUMC interactions commences. If an MUMC interaction is found the next pair of features is considered. The following example of output demonstrates the complete results for CFU and CFB with property 7.

/*The features are 1 and 2 */
/*New combination of features:CFU[0]=1 and CFB[0]=0 */
feature 2 is meaningless

/*New combination of features:CFU[0]=1 and CFB[0]=1 */
with property 7
with parameters 0,0 and 1 errors: 0
with parameters 1,0 and 1 errors: 0
with parameters 2,0 and 1 errors: 0
with parameters 3,0 and 1 errors: 0

/*New combination of features:CFU[0]=1 and CFB[0]=2 */
with property 7
with parameters 0,0 and 1 errors: 1 FEATURE INTERACTION: SUC

/*New combination of features:CFU[0]=1 and CFB[1]=0 */
potential loop, test separately

/*New combination of features:CFU[0]=1 and CFB[1]=1 */
feature 2 is meaningless

/*New combination of features:CFU[0]=1 and CFB[1]=2 */
with property 7
with parameters 0,0 and 1 errors: 1 FEATURE INTERACTION: MUMC

13.1 Dynamic Analysis – Feature Interaction results

The tables in figure 9 and 10 give the interactions found (using automated model generation and analysis) for pairs of features in both the SUC case and the MUMC case. A ✓ in the row labelled by feature $f_i$ means that the property $\phi_i$ is violated whereas a ✗ indicates that no such violation has occurred. Two features $f_i$ and $f_j$ interact if and only if there is a ✓ in position $(f_i, f_j)$ and/or a ✓ in position $(f_j, f_i)$. BC is excluded as every feature interacts with it in some way.

New SUC interactions are detected by the dynamic analysis, namely those associated with the RBWF feature. For example, there is an $(RBWF, CFU)_S$
interaction because the CFU feature prevents the record variable pertaining to the subscriber being set to a non-default value. Therefore the subscriber is unable to perform a ring-back.

The tables are not symmetric. For example, there is an \((ODS, CFU)_M\) interaction, but not a \((CFU, ODS)_M\) interaction. To understand why, observe that static analysis detects a MUMC interaction under the assignment \(ODS[0] = 1\), and \(CFU[1] = 2\). Dynamic analysis also detects an interaction violation – indeed our analysis script (see section 13) generates exactly this scenario: an \((ODS, CFU)_M\) interaction with \(i = 0\) and \(j = 1\) (i.e. user 0 rings user 1). Consider those computations where \(featureLookup\) takes the \(ODS\) branch. One could understand this as ODS having precedence. There is no interaction in this case: both property 7 and property 10 are satisfied. However, there is a computation sequence where the \(CFU\) branch is taken; in this case CFU has precedence and property 10 is violated because user 0 has \(dialed\) user 1 – before the call is forwarded to user 2 (although clearly property 7 is satisfied). Often, understanding why and how a property is violated will give the
designer strong hints as to how to resolve an interaction.

14 Role of Static and Dynamic Analysis

The interactions found through dynamic analysis depend very much on the properties and how the features are modelled. When the properties are adequate, we would expect every statically detected interaction to be detected dynamically, but not vice versa. This is borne out by our analysis.

We may regard the static analysis step as an inexpensive method of uncovering some interactions, as well as providing an indication of whether or not we have a good set of behavioural properties. But, note that the properties are not complete descriptions, in particular they do not state what should not happen (i.e. the frame problem). For example, one might expect a \((CFU, TCS)_M\) interaction but this is not the case because although TCS will block the forwarded call, the partner variable will be set appropriately, thus satisfying property 7. Perhaps one should strengthen the property for CFU, to insist that the connection is made (rather than just setting partner appropriately). But, it is not that simple, the forwarded party may be engaged, or have a forwarded feature (or any other kind of feature); the possibilities are endless. Therefore, we consider the CFU property to be quite adequate.

In order to illustrate the contributions of the two analyses better, consider two examples: when an interaction is detected and when it is not.

14.0.1 ODS and CFU

Static analysis detects an interaction when \(ODS[0] = 1\), and \(CFU[1] = 2\). Dynamic analysis also detects an interaction, with \(i = 0\) and \(j = 1\). In any trace where \(feature\_lookup\) takes the ODS branch, there is no interaction (the CFU property is not violated because we do not even get the stage of user 0 attempting to ring user 1). One could understand this as ODS having precedence. However, there is a trace where the CFU branch is taken; in this case CFU has precedence and the ODS property is violated because user 0 has dialled user 1 – before the call is forwarded to user 2.

14.0.2 OCS and CFU

Neither static nor dynamic analysis detects an interaction. In the static case, this is obvious because the OCS case refers to the call state and the CFU case refers to the dial state. These are disjoint states, hence no overlap. However,
one might expect to detect an interaction dynamically, thinking of the scenario described above \((OCS)[0] = 1, CFU[1] = 2,\) and user 0 rings user 1). It seems that one property must be violated. But, there is no violation and the clue as to why comes from the static analysis: CFU is triggered properly whilst in the dial state, but later on, in the call state, OCS stops the call progressing. The property for CFU is fulfilled, we do attempt to make the appropriate call, and then that call is blocked. So, both properties are satisfied and we do not have an interaction.

This example highlights again the fact that the properties are not complete descriptions, we do not insist that a connection is made for CFU. As before, it also illustrates why complete descriptions at this level are not appropriate.

It is also important to note that the particular specification detail of a feature can affect the interaction results associated with that feature. For example, had we chosen to implement the OCO feature from within the dialing state (rather than in the calling state), far more interactions would have exhibited. There would, for example, have been a static (MUMC) interaction between ODS and OCO and a dynamic (MUMC) interaction between CFA and OCO.

14.1 Comparison with Other Feature Interaction Results

Unfortunately, it is very difficult to compare interaction analysis results – even when researchers model the (apparently) same features, actual specification detail can profoundly affect the result (as seen above). Nevertheless, we have compared our results with those from [39] and the contest run in conjunction with FIW 2000 (Feature Interaction Workshop 2000) [3]. Our results are, broadly speaking, similar, though we note that our interpretation of RBWF is rather different from that in the contest.

15 Conclusions and Future Directions

Our approach to feature interaction detection involves modelling a service at two different levels of abstraction: communicating finite state automata and temporal logic formulae, represented by Promela specifications, labelled transition systems and Büchi automata. In this paper, we have considered modelling and analysing a basic call service with eight features, involving four users with full functionality. There are two types of analysis, static and dynamic; the latter involves model-checking with SPIN and is completely automated, making extensive use of Perl scripts to generate the SPIN runs.
The application area is a challenging one for model-checking for two reasons: formulating the right temporal properties for distributed systems is difficult, and the state spaces for any realistic model quickly become intractable. We have demonstrated why relativised properties are important in distributed systems and how they can be implemented in the LTL of SPIN, and how a Promela model can be optimised, without losing operational detail. For the latter, we have outlined a simple but effective state-space reduction technique for Promela that does not abstract away from the system being modelled. On the contrary, it may be understood as reducing the gap between the Promela representation and the system under investigation. The technique involves reinitialising variables and results in a reduction of 90 per cent of the state-space. Thus, we overcome classic state-explosion problems and our interaction analysis results are considerably more extensive than those in [39]. We believe that both our reduction technique and the use of Perl scripts could be useful to the SPIN community in general.

Since our analysis technique is based on property violation, and reasoning by model-checking always provides a counter-example, we can gain a good understanding of why an interaction occurs. Since our service model is low-level, we can quickly see which operational aspects (eg, local, global variables) are causing an interaction, this can help the redesign process. For example, static analysis indicates shared triggers and dynamic analysis indicates in-built precedences between features, when the results of the analysis are not symmetric. Both can indicate how to alter precedences between features, in order to resolve interactions.

Finally, we observe that we have only proved our results for four user processes, we would like to be able to generalise these results for any number of user processes. This is currently under investigation.
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Appendix: The Basic Service with features

We give here the optimised code for the basic service plus features. All code pertaining to feature behaviour is commented out.

```c
stype =
{on,off,dial,call,orig,ring,unobt,engaged,connected,disconnect,
 callback,st_idle,st_blocked,st_unobt,st_rback,st_diall,st_call};
chan null = [1] of {chan.bit};
chan zero = [1] of {chan.bit};
chan one = [1] of {chan.bit};
chan two = [1] of {chan.bit};
chan three = [1] of {chan.bit};
chan chan_name[4]; typedef array { byte to[4] }
array connect[4]; /*
/* 16 bytes in total */
/*short p0=-1;*/
/*p3= -1;*/
/*pl= -1,p2= -1*/
/* The simple basic call protocol: A rings B */
/* A goes offhook, put A,0 on channel A */
/* A dials B and B is free, */
/* then A puts A,0 on channel B: B,0 on channel A. */
/* B goes offhook and then put B,1 on channel A */
/* A and B are now connected */
/* To disconnect: A removes token from own channel, */
/* B removes token from own channel */
/*inline feature_lookup (q1,id1,st)
{
do :
  ((st==st_idle)&(term_call_only[selfid]==1)) -> st=st_blocked
  ((st==st_diall)&(orig_dial_screen[selfid]==id1)) -> st=st_unobt
  ((st==st_diall)&(ring_back_when_free[selfid]==1)&(id1==7)) -> st=st_rback
  ((id1==7)&(st==st_dial1)&(call_forward_always[id1]!=0))
    -> id1=call_forward_always[id1]
    q1=chan_name[id1]
  ((id1==7)&(st==st_dial1)&(call_forward_busy[id1]!=0)&(len(q1)>0))
    -> id1=call_forward_busy[id1]; q1=chan_name[id1]
```
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::(st->st_call)&((orig_call_screen[melfid]==id)) st->st_unobt
::(st->st_call)&((term_call_screen[id]==melf)) st->st_unobt
::(st->st_call)&((orig_call_only[id]==1)) st->st_unobt
else->break
}

/*inline event action (eventq)
{
  if
  :melfid->0>event[melfid]=eventq
  :melfid!0>skip
  fi
}*/

/*inline network_ev_action (neteventq)
{
  if
  :melfid->0>network_event[melfid]=neteventq
  :melfid!0>skip
  fi
}*/

proctype User (byte melfid; chan self)
{ /* start User */
  chan messchan=null;
  bit messbit=0;
  stype state=on;
  stype dev=on;
  byte partnerid=6;

  idle:
  atomic{
    assert(dev == on);
    assert(partner[melfid]==null);
    /* either attempt a call, or receive one */
    if
      :: empty(self)->state=st_idle; feature_lookup(partner[melfid],partnerid,state);
      if
        :: state==st_blocked->state=on; goto idle
        else->state=on
      fi;
    /*event_action(off):*/
    dev=off;
    self!self,0>goint dialing
      /* no connection is being attempted, go offhook */
      /* and become originating party */
      :: full(self)-> messchan=partner[melfid].messbit;
      /* an incoming call */
    if
      ::full(partner[melfid])
        partner[melfid]!meschan,messbit;
      if
        :: messchan == self /* call attempt still there */
        ~meschan!=null:messbit=0; goto talert
        :: messchan!meschan,messbit; /* call attempt cancelled */
        partner[melfid]=null;partnerid=6;meschan=null;messbit=0;
        goto preidle
      fi
      ::empty(partner[melfid])
        self?meschan,messbit; /* call attempt cancelled */
        partner[melfid]=null;partnerid=6;meschan=null;messbit=0;
        goto preidle
      fi
}
dialing:  atomic{
    assert(dev == off);
    assert(full(self));
    assert(partner[selfid]==null);
    /* dialing or go on hook */
    if
      /event_action(dial):
        /* dial and then nondeterministic choice of called party */
        if
          partner[selfid] = zero;
          /*dalled[selfid] = 0;*/
          partnerid=0
          partner[selfid] = one;
          /*dalled[selfid] = 1;*/
          partnerid=1
          partner[selfid] = two;
          /*dalled[selfid] = 2;*/
          partnerid=2
          partner[selfid] = three;
          /*dalled[selfid] = 3;*/
          partnerid=3
          partnerid= 7;
        fi;
        state=st_dial0;
        /* feature_lookup(partner[selfid],partnerid,state);*/
      fi
    /event_action(on):
      dev=on;
      messchan,messbit;assert(messchan==self);
      messchar=null;messbit=0;
      goto preidle
      /*go on hook, without dialling */
    fi;
}

calling:  /* check number called and process */
  atomic(/event_action(call);*/
  assert(dev == off);
  assert(full(self));
  /* record[partnerid]=self;*/
  state=st_call;
  /*feature_lookup(partner[selfid],partnerid,state);*/
  if
    state=st_unobt->state=on;partner[selfid]=null;partnerid=6; /*dalled[selfid]=6;*/
    goto unobtainable
    /:state=st_redo->state=on;goto redo*/
    /*(state=st_redo&&partnerid=7)->state=on;goto calling
    /:(state=st_dial&&partnerid=7)->state=on;partner[selfid]=null;partnerid=6;*/
      /*dalled[selfid]=6;*/
    goto unobtainable
  fi
  /event_action(on):
    dev=on;
    messchan,messbit;assert(messchan==self);
    messchar=null;messbit=0;
    goto preidle
    /*go on hook, without dialling */
    fi;
:: full(partner[seldid]) -> goto busy
    /* valid partner but engaged */
    fi;
    fi;

busy: /* number called is engaged, go onhook or trivial dial */
    atomic{
        assert(full(self));
        /* =network_ev_action(engaged); */
        if
            :: /*event_action(on); */
            dev = on;
            self?messchan,mesnbit;assert(messchan==self);
            partner[seldid]=null:partnerid=6;
            messchan=null;
            /*dialled[seldid]=6; */
            messbit=0; goto preidle
            /*go onhook, cancel connection attempt */
/*:: event_action(dial); */
        goto busy*/
        /* trivial dial */
    fi;
/* comment out entire ringback state when no ACB switched on */
/* otherwise just comment out events when not needed */
/* Can't nest comments remember */
/* ringback: */
atomic(printf("MSC: Last Caller was user %d\n",record[seldid]);
    self?messchan,messbit;:
    assert(messchan==self);
    if
        :: self?messchan,messbit;dev=on;
        dialled[seldid]=6;
        partner[seldid]=null;partnerid=6;
        messchan=null;messbit=0;
        event_action(on);
        goto preidle
        :: record[seldid] !=6) ->
        messchan=null;messbit=0;
        partner[seldid]=chan_name[record[seldid]];
        partnerid=record[seldid];
        event_action(callback);
        goto calling
    fi; /*

unobtainable: /* number called is unobtainable, go onhook or trivial dial */
    atomic(assert(full(self));
        assert(partner[seldid]=null);
        assert(partnerid=6);
        /* assert(\dialled[seldid]=6); */
        /* network_ev_action(unobt); */
    if
        :: /*event_action(on); */
        dev = on;
        self?messchan,messbit; assert(messchan==self);
        messchan=null;
        messbit=0;goto preidle
        /*go onhook, cancel connection attempt */
/*:: event_action(dial); goto busy*/
/* trivial dial */
    fi;
}
calrt;
/* called party is ringing */
atomic{
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assert(full(partner[selfid]));
assert(full(self));
assert(dev == off);
/*\*method\**
self?mnc,msn:assert(mnc==partner[selfid];
mnc=null;
/* check channel */
if
  mnc== 1-mnc=0:goto oconnected
/* correct token */
  mnc=0-goto oalert
/* wrong token, not connected yet, try again */
  mnc=0-goto oringout
/* give up */
/* :: event_action(dial):mnc=0-goto oalert*/
  /* trivial dial */
);:
oringout: /*abandon call attempt*/
  atomic(
    assert(full(partner[selfid]));
    assert(full(self));
    assert(dev == off);
    /*\*method\*/
    dev=on;
    self?mnc,msn;
    partner[selfid] ?mnc,msn;
    partner[selfid] !mnc,msn;
    partner[selfid] =null:partnerid=6;
    /*dalled[selfid]=6;*/
    mnc=msn=0:mnc=0;
    goto preidle;
    /* give up, go onhook */
  );:
occonnected: atomic(
    assert(full(self));
    assert(full(partner[selfid]));
    /* connection established */
    /*connect[partnerid] =1;*/
    goto oclose);
oclose: /* disconnect call */
  atomic(
    assert(full(self));
    assert(full(partner[selfid]));
    /*\*method\*/
    dev = on;
    self?mnc,msn;
    /* empty own channel */
    assert(mnc==partner[selfid]);
    assert(mnc=1);
    partner[selfid]?mnc,msn;
    /* empty partner’s channel */
    assert(mnc=1);
    assert(mnc=0);
    /* and disconnect partner */
    partner[selfid] !mnc,msn;
    /* connect[partnerid] =0;*/
    partner[partnerid] =null;
    /*dalled[selfid]=6;*/
    partnerid=6:mnc=msn=0;
    goto preidle);
talert: atomic(
    assert((dev == on)&(full(self)));
    /* either device rings or*/
    /* connection attempt is cancelled and then empty channel */
42
partner[selfid]?<messchan,messbit>;
if :: messchan==self->
/*network_ev_action(tring);*/
messchan=null;messbit=0;
goto tpickup
:: else->skip /* attempt has been cancelled */
fi;
/*network_ev_action(disconnect);*/
self?messchan,messbit;
partner[selfid]=null;partnerid=6;
/*dalled[selfid]=6;*/
messchan=null;messbit=0;
goto preidle
}

	pickup: /* proceed with connection or connect attempt cancelled */
atomic(assert(full(self));
if :: full(partner[selfid]) ->
partner[selfid]?<messchan,messbit>;
if :: messchan==self /*connection proceeding */
assert(messbit == 0);
self?messchan,messbit;
assert(messchan==partner[selfid]);
assert(messbit==0);
/*event_action(off);*/
dev = off;
partner[selfid]?messchan,messbit;
partner[selfid]!self,; /* establish connection */
self!partner[selfid].i;
messchan=null;messbit=0;
goto tclose
:: else -> /* wrong message, connection cancelled */
/*network_ev_action(disconnect);*/
/*self?messchan,messbit;*/
/*event_action(on);*/
dev=on;
partner[selfid]=null;
/*dalled[selfid]=6;*/
partnerid=6;messchan=null;messbit=0;
goto preidle
fi

:: empty(partner[selfid]) -> /* connection cancelled */
/*network_ev_action(disconnect);*/
/*self?messchan,messbit;*/
/*event_action(on);*/
dev=on;
partner[selfid]=null;partnerid=6;
/*dalled[selfid]=6;*/
messchan=null;messbit=0;
goto preidle
fi);

tclose: /* check if originator has terminated call */
atomic(self?<messchan,messbit>;
if :: (messbit = 1 & dev = off) -> /* trivial handset down */
/*event_action(on);*/
dev = on; messchan= null; messbit=0;goto tclose
:: (messbit = 1 & dev = on) -> /* trivial handset up */
/*event_action(off):*/
dev = off; messchan=null;messbit=0;goto tclose
   :: (messbit == 0 && dev == on) -> /* connection is terminated
   */
   self?messchan,messbit;
   partner[nullptr]=null;partnerid=6;
   /*dialed[nullptr]=6;*/
   messchan=null;messbit=0;
goto preidle
   :: (messbit == 0 && dev == off) ->
   */network_ev_action(disconnect);*/
    /* disconnect tone */
   */event_action(on);*/
   dev=on; /* connection is terminated
   */
   self?messchan,messbit;
   partner[nullptr]=null;
   /*dialed[nullptr]=6;*/
   partnerid=6;messchan=null;messbit=0;
goto preidle
}

preidle:
atomic{
   /*network_ev_action(on);*/
   /*event_action(on);*/
   goto idle
}
} /* end User */

init{
   atomic{partner[0]=null;
   partner[1]=null;
   partner[2]=null;
   partner[3]=null;
   chan_name[0]=zero;
   chan_name[1]=one;
   chan_name[2]=two;
   chan_name[3]=three;

   /*switch on features here*/
   /*default value 6, */
   /*if user i has feature, set to id of user to be forwarded to, or screened */
   /*call_forward_buys[0]=6;
   call_forward_buys[1]=6;
   call_forward_buys[2]=6;
   call_forward_buys[3]=6;*/
   /*call_forward_always[0]=1;
   call_forward_always[1]=6;
   call_forward_always[2]=6;
   call_forward_always[3]=6;*/
   /*orig_dial_screen[0]=6;
   orig_dial_screen[1]=6;
   orig_dial_screen[2]=6;
   orig_dial_screen[3]=6;*/
   /*orig_call_screen[0]=6;
   orig_call_screen[1]=6;
   orig_call_screen[2]=6;
   orig_call_screen[3]=6;*/
   /*term_call_screen[0]=6;*/
}
term_call_screen[1]=6;
term_call_screen[2]=6;
term_call_screen[3]=6; /*

/*ring_back_when_free[0]=0;
ring_back_when_free[1]=0;
ring_back_when_free[2]=0;
ring_back_when_free[3]=0; */

/*orig_call_only[0]=0;
orig_call_only[1]=0;
orig_call_only[2]=0;
orig_call_only[3]=0; */

/*term_call_only[0]=0;
term_call_only[1]=0;
term_call_only[2]=0;
term_call_only[3]=0; */

/\p0==/run User(0,zero);
/\p1==/run User(1,one);
/\p2==/run Orig_User(2,two);
/\p3==/run Term_User(3,three);
}