

Measuring Masking Fault-Tolerance

Pablo F. Castro^{1,3}, Pedro R. D'Argenio^{2,3,4}, Ramiro Demasi^{2,3}, and Luciano Putruele^{1,3}

¹ Departamento de Computación, FCEFQyN, Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto, Río Cuarto, Córdoba, Argentina, {pcastro,lputruele}@dc.exa.unc.edu.ar

² Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, FaMAF, Córdoba, Argentina, {dargenio,rdemasi}@famaf.unc.edu.ar

³ Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Argentina

⁴ Saarland University, Saarbrücken, Germany

Abstract. In this paper we introduce a notion of fault-tolerance distance between labeled transition systems. Intuitively, this notion of distance measures the degree of fault-tolerance exhibited by a candidate system. In practice, there are different kinds of fault-tolerance, here we restrict ourselves to the analysis of masking fault-tolerance because it is often a highly desirable goal for critical systems. Roughly speaking, a system is masking fault-tolerant when it is able to completely mask the faults, not allowing these faults to have any observable consequences for the users. We capture masking fault-tolerance via a simulation relation, which is accompanied by a corresponding game characterization. We enrich the resulting games with quantitative objectives to define the notion of masking fault-tolerance distance.

Furthermore, we investigate the basic properties of this notion of masking distance, and we prove that it is a directed pseudo metric. We have implemented our approach in a prototype tool that automatically compute the masking distance between a nominal system and a fault-tolerant version of it. We have used this tool to measure the masking tolerance of multiple instances of several case studies.

Keywords: Simulation Relations, Fault-tolerance, Pay-Off Games, Quantitative Analysis

1 Introduction

Fault-tolerance allows for the construction of systems that are able to overcome the occurrence of faults during their execution. Examples of fault-tolerant systems can be found everywhere: communication protocols, hardware circuits, avionic systems, cryptographic currencies, etc. So, the increasing relevance of critical software in everyday life has led to a renewed interest in the automatic verification of fault-tolerant properties. However, one of the main difficulties when reasoning about these kinds of properties is given by their quantitative nature, which is true even for non-probabilistic systems. A simple example is given by the introduction of redundancy in critical systems. This is one by far

of the main techniques used to achieve fault-tolerance. It is well-known that adding more redundancy to a system increases the system reliability. Most importantly, measuring this increment is a central issue when evaluating different fault-tolerant protocols or implementations. On the other hand, the formal characterization of fault-tolerant properties could be an involving task, usually these properties are encoded using *ad-hoc* mechanisms as part of a general design.

The usual flow for the design and verification of fault-tolerant systems consists in defining a nominal model (i.e., the “fault-free” or “ideal” program) and afterwards extending it with faulty behaviors that deviate from the normal behavior prescribed by the nominal model. This extended model represents the way in which the system operates under the occurrence of faults. There are different ways of extending the nominal model, the typical approach is *fault injection* [18,19], that is, the automatic introduction of faults into the model. An important property that any extended model has to satisfy is the preservation of the normal behavior under the absence of faults. In [10], we proposed an alternative formal approach for dealing with the analysis of fault-tolerance. This approach allows for a fully automated analysis and appropriately distinguishes faulty behaviors from normal ones. Moreover, this framework is amenable to fault-injection. In that work, three notions of simulation relations are defined to characterize *masking*, *nonmasking*, and *failsafe* fault-tolerance, as originally defined in [13].

During the last decade, significant progress has been made towards defining suitable metrics or distances for diverse types of quantitative models including real-time systems [17], probabilistic models [11], and metrics for linear and branching systems [5,7,16,21,27]. Some authors have already pointed out that these metrics can be useful to reason about the robustness of a system, a notion related to fault-tolerance. Particularly, in [5] the traditional notion of simulation relation is generalized and three different simulation distances between systems are introduced, namely *correctness*, *coverage*, and *robustness*. These are defined using quantitative games with *discounted-sum* and *mean-payoff* objectives.

In this paper we introduce a notion of fault-tolerance distance between labelled transition systems. Intuitively, this distance measures the degree of fault-tolerance exhibited by a candidate system. As it was mentioned above, there exist different levels of fault-tolerance, we restrict ourselves to the analysis of *masking fault-tolerance* because it is often thought of as the most benign kind of fault-tolerance and it is a highly desirable property for critical systems. Roughly speaking, a system is masking fault-tolerant when it is able to completely mask the faults, not allowing these faults to have any observable consequences for the users. Formally, the system must preserve both the safety and liveness properties of the nominal model [13]. In contrast to the robustness distance defined in [5], which measures how many unexpected errors are tolerated by the implementation, we consider a specific collection of faults given in the implementation and measure how many faults are tolerated by the implementation in such a way that they can be masked by the states. We also require that the normal behavior of the specification has to be preserved by the implementation when no faults are

present. In this case, we have a bisimulation between the specification and the non-faulty behavior of the implementation. Otherwise, the distance is 1. Thus, we effectively distinguish between the nominal model and its fault-tolerant version and the set of faults taken into account. In Section 5, we compare in more details the robustness distance and our notion of fault-tolerance distance.

In order to measure the degree of masking fault-tolerance of a given system, we start characterizing masking fault-tolerance via simulation relations between two systems as defined in [10]. The first one acting as a specification of the intended behavior (i.e., nominal model) and the second one as the fault-tolerant implementation (i.e., the extended model with faulty behavior). The existence of a masking relation implies that the implementation masks the faults. Afterwards, we introduce a game characterization of masking simulation and we enrich the resulting games with quantitative objectives to define the notion of *masking fault-tolerance distance*, where the possible values of the game belong to the interval $[0, 1]$. The fault-tolerant implementation is masking fault-tolerant if the value of the game is 0. Furthermore, the bigger the number, the farther the masking distance between the fault-tolerant implementation and the specification. Accordingly, a bigger distance remarkably decreases fault-tolerance. In addition, we prove that it is a directed pseudo metric. Specifically, we prove that our definition of masking distance satisfies two basic properties of any distance, reflexivity and the triangle inequality.

Finally, we have implemented our approach in a tool that takes a nominal model and its fault-tolerant implementation and automatically compute the masking distance among them. We have used this tool to measure the masking tolerance of multiple instances of several case studies such as a redundant cell memory, the bounded retransmission protocol, and the byzantine generals introduced by Lamport et al. [20].

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we introduce preliminaries notions used throughout this paper. We present in Section 3 the formal definition of masking distance build on quantitative simulation games and we also prove its basic properties. We describe in Section 4 the experimental evaluation on some well-known case studies. In Section 5 we discuss the related work. Finally, we discuss in Section 6 some conclusions and directions for further work.

2 Preliminaries

Let us introduce some basic definitions and results on game theory that will be necessary across the paper, the interested reader is referred to [1].

A *Transition System* (TS) is a tuple $A = \langle S, \Sigma, E, s_0 \rangle$, where S is a finite set of states, Σ is a finite alphabet, $E \subseteq S \times \Sigma \times S$ is a set of labelled transitions, and s_0 is the initial state. In the following we use $s \xrightarrow{e} s' \in E$ as a syntactic sugar for $(s, e, s') \in E$. Let $|S|$ and $|E|$ denote the number of states and edges, respectively. We define $post(s) = \{s' \in S \mid s \xrightarrow{e} s' \in E\}$ as the set of successors of s . Similarly, $pre(s') = \{s \in S \mid s \xrightarrow{e} s' \in E\}$ as the set of predecessors of s' . Moreover, $post^*(s)$

denotes the states which are reachable from s . Without loss of generality, we require that every state s has a successor, i.e., $\forall s \in S : \text{post}(s) \neq \emptyset$. A run in a transition system A is an infinite path $\rho = \rho_0\sigma_0\rho_1\sigma_1\rho_2\sigma_2\cdots \in (S \cdot \Sigma)^w$ where $\rho_0 = s_0$ and for all i , $\rho_i \xrightarrow{\sigma_i} \rho_{i+1} \in E$. From now on, given a tuple (x_0, \dots, x_n) , we denote by $\text{pr}_i((x_0, \dots, x_n))$ its i -th projection.

A *game graph* G is a tuple $G = \langle S, S_1, S_2, \Sigma, E, s_0 \rangle$ where S, Σ, E and s_0 are as in transition systems and (S_1, S_2) is a partition of S . The choice of the next state is made by Player 1 (Player 2) when the current state is in S_1 (respectively, S_2). A weighted game graph is a game graph along with a weight function v^G from E to \mathbb{Q} . A run in the game graph G is called a *play*. The set of all plays is denoted by Ω .

Given a game graph G , a *strategy* for Player 1 is a function $\pi : (S \cdot \Sigma)^* S_1 \rightarrow S \times \Sigma$ such that $\forall \rho_0\sigma_0\rho_1\sigma_1 \dots \rho_i \in (S \cdot \Sigma)^* S_1$, we have that if $\pi(\rho_0\sigma_0\rho_1\sigma_1 \dots \rho_i) = (\sigma, \rho)$, then $\rho_i \xrightarrow{\sigma} \rho \in E$. A strategy for Player 2 is defined in a similar way. The set of all strategies for Player p is denoted by Π_p . A strategy for player p is said to be memoryless (or positional) if it can be defined by a mapping $f : S_p \rightarrow E$ such that for all $s \in S_p$ we have that $s \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_0(f(s))} \text{pr}_1(f(s)) \in E$, that is, these strategies do not need memory of the past history. Furthermore, a play $\rho_0\sigma_0\rho_1\sigma_1\rho_2\sigma_2 \dots$ conforms to a player p strategy π if $\forall i \geq 0 : (\rho_i \in S_p) \Rightarrow (\sigma_i, \rho_{i+1}) = \pi(\rho_0\sigma_0\rho_1\sigma_1 \dots \rho_i)$. The *outcome* of a Player 1 strategy π_1 and a Player 2 strategy π_2 is the unique play, named $\text{out}(\pi_1, \pi_2)$, that conforms to both π_1 and π_2 .

A *game* is made of a game graph and a boolean or quantitative objective. A *boolean objective* is a function $\Phi : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and the goal of Player 1 in a game with objective Φ is to select a strategy so that the outcome maps to 1, independently what Player 2 does. On the contrary, the goal of Player 2 is to ensure that the outcome maps to 0. Given a boolean objective Φ , a play ρ is *winning* for Player 1 (resp. Player 2) if $\Phi(\rho) = 1$ (resp. $\Phi(\rho) = 0$). A strategy π is a *winning strategy* for Player p if every play conforming to π is winning for Player p . We say that a game with boolean objective is *determined* if some player has a winning strategy, and we say that it is memoryless determined if that winning strategy is memoryless. Reachability games are those games whose objective functions are defined as $\Phi(\rho_0\sigma_0\rho_1\sigma_1\rho_2\sigma_2 \dots) = (\exists i : \rho_i \in V)$ for some set $V \subseteq S$, a standard result is that reachability games are memoryless determined.

A *quantitative objective* is given by a *payoff* function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the goal of Player 1 is to maximize the value f of the play, whereas the goal of Player 2 is to minimize it. For a quantitative objective f , the value of the game for a Player 1 strategy π_1 , denoted by $v_1(\pi_1)$, is defined as the infimum over all the values resulting from Player 2 strategies, i.e., $v_1(\pi_1) = \inf_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} f(\text{out}(\pi_1, \pi_2))$. The value of the game for Player 1 is defined as the supremum of the values of all Player 1 strategies, i.e., $\sup_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} v_1(\pi_1)$. Analogously, the value of the game for a Player 2 strategy π_2 and the value of the game for Player 2 are defined as $v_2(\pi_2) = \sup_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} f(\text{out}(\pi_1, \pi_2))$ and $\inf_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} v_2(\pi_2)$, respectively. We say that a game is determined if both values are equal, that is: $\sup_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} v_1(\pi_1) =$

$\inf_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} v_2(\pi_2)$. In this case we denote by $val(\mathcal{G})$ the value of game \mathcal{G} . The following result from [22] characterizes a large set of determined games.

Theorem 1. *Any game with a quantitative function f that is bounded and Borel measurable is determined.*

3 Masking Distance

We start by defining masking simulation. In [10], we have defined a state-based simulation for masking fault-tolerance, here we recast this definition using labelled transition systems. First, let us introduce some concepts needed for defining masking fault-tolerance. For any vocabulary Σ , and set of labels $\mathcal{F} = \{F_0, \dots, F_n\}$ not belonging to Σ , we consider $\Sigma_{\mathcal{F}} = \Sigma \cup \mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{F} \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$. Intuitively, the elements of \mathcal{F} indicate the occurrence of a fault in a faulty implementation. Furthermore, sometimes it will be useful to consider the set $\Sigma^i = \{e^i \mid e \in \Sigma\}$, containing the elements of Σ indexed with superscript i . Moreover, for any vocabulary Σ we consider $\Sigma_{\mathcal{M}} = \Sigma \cup \{M\}$, where $M \notin \Sigma$, intuitively, this label is used to identify masking transitions.

Given a transition system $A = \langle S, \Sigma, E, s_0 \rangle$ over a vocabulary Σ , we denote $A^M = \langle S, \Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}, E^M, s_0 \rangle$ where $E^M = E \cup \{s \xrightarrow{M} s \mid s \in S\}$.

3.1 Strong Masking Simulation

Definition 1. *Given two transition systems $A = \langle S, \Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}, E, s_0 \rangle$ and $A' = \langle S', \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}, E', s'_0 \rangle$, we say that A' is strong masking fault-tolerant with respect to A if there exists a relation $\mathbf{M} \subseteq S \times S'$ (considering A^M instead of A) such that:*

- (A) $s_0 \mathbf{M} s'_0$
- (B) for all $s \in S, s' \in S'$ with $s \mathbf{M} s'$ then for each $e \in \Sigma$ the following holds:
 - (1) if $(s \xrightarrow{e} t) \in E$ then $\exists t' \in S' : (s' \xrightarrow{e} t' \wedge t \mathbf{M} t')$;
 - (2) if $(s' \xrightarrow{e} t') \in E'$ then $\exists t \in S : (s \xrightarrow{e} t \wedge t \mathbf{M} t')$;
 - (3) if $(s' \xrightarrow{F} t')$ for some $F \in \mathcal{F}$ then $\exists t \in S : (s \xrightarrow{M} t \wedge t \mathbf{M} t')$.

We say that state s' is masking fault-tolerant for s when $s \mathbf{M} s'$. Intuitively, the intention in the definition is that, starting in s' , faults can be masked in such a way that the behavior exhibited is the same as that observed when starting from s and executing transitions without faults. In other words, a masking relation ensures that every faulty behavior in the implementation can be simulated by the specification. Let us explain in more detail the above definition. First, note that conditions A, B.1, and B.2 imply that we have a bisimulation when A and A' do not exhibit faulty behavior. Particularly, condition B.1 says that the normal execution of A can be masked by an execution of A' . On the other hand, condition B.2 says that the implementation does not add normal (non-faulty) behavior. Finally, condition B.3 states that every outgoing faulty transition (F) from s' must be matched to an outgoing masking transition (M) from s .

Definition 2. Given two transition systems $A = \langle S, \Sigma, E, s_0 \rangle$ and $A' = \langle S', \Sigma', E', s'_0 \rangle$: $A \prec_{Mask} A' \Leftrightarrow$ there exists a strong masking simulation $\mathbf{M} \subseteq S \times S'$.

If $A \prec_{Mask} A'$ we say that A' is a strong masking fault-tolerant implementation of A .

3.2 Weak Masking Simulation

For analysing nontrivial systems, a weak version of masking simulation relation is needed, it could abstract away from internal transitions, which are inherent in any fault-tolerant system.

The main idea is that weak masking simulation abstracts away from internal behaviour of the systems, which is modelled by a special action τ . We define a set of *weak transition relations* $\Rightarrow \subseteq S \times (\Sigma \cup \{\tau\} \cup \{M\} \cup \mathcal{F}) \times S$, also denoted as E_W , which is formally defined as follow:

$$\Rightarrow = \begin{cases} (\overset{\tau}{\rightarrow})^* \circ \overset{e}{\rightarrow} \circ (\overset{\tau}{\rightarrow})^* & \text{if } e \in \Sigma, \\ (\overset{e}{\rightarrow})^* & \text{if } e = \tau, \\ \overset{e}{\rightarrow} & \text{if } e \in \{M\} \cup \mathcal{F}. \end{cases}$$

The symbol \circ stands for composition of binary relations and $(\overset{\tau}{\rightarrow})^*$ is the reflexive and transitive closure of the binary relation $\overset{\tau}{\rightarrow}$.

Intuitively, if $e \neq \tau$ then $s \Rightarrow s' \in E_W$ means that from s there is a sequence of zero or more transitions labelled by τ , followed by one transition labelled by e , followed again by zero or more transitions labelled by τ such that we reach the state s' . By writing $s \overset{\tau}{\Rightarrow} s'$ we state that we can go from s to s' via zero or more τ transitions labelled by τ . In particular, for every state s we have $s \overset{\tau}{\Rightarrow} s$.

Definition 3. Given two transition systems $A = \langle S, \Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}, E_W, s_0 \rangle$ and $A' = \langle S', \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}, E'_W, s'_0 \rangle$ (where $\Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}$ possible contains the distinguished silent action τ), we say that A' is weak masking fault-tolerant with respect to A if there exists a relation $\mathbf{M} \subseteq S \times S'$ (considering A^M instead of A) such that:

- (A) $s_0 \mathbf{M} s'_0$
 (B) for all $s \in S, s' \in S'$ with $s \mathbf{M} s'$ then for each $e \in \Sigma \cup \{\tau\}$ the following holds:

- (1) if $(s \overset{e}{\rightarrow} t) \in E$ then $\exists t' \in S' : (s' \overset{e}{\rightarrow} t' \in E'_W \wedge t \mathbf{M} t')$;
- (2) if $(s' \overset{e}{\rightarrow} t') \in E'$ then $\exists t \in S : (s \overset{e}{\rightarrow} t \in E_W \wedge t \mathbf{M} t')$;
- (3) if $(s' \overset{F}{\rightarrow} t') \in E'$ for some $F \in \mathcal{F}$ then $\exists t \in S : (s \overset{M}{\rightarrow} t \in E \wedge t \mathbf{M} t')$.

Theorem 2. Given two transition systems $A = \langle S, \Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}, E_W, s_0 \rangle$ and $A' = \langle S', \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}, E'_W, s'_0 \rangle$ (where $\Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}$ possible contains the distinguished silent action τ), $\mathbf{M} \subseteq S \times S'$ (considering A^M instead of A) is a weak masking simulation iff:

- (A) $s_0 \mathbf{M} s'_0$

(B) for all $s \in S, s' \in S'$ with $s \mathbf{M} s'$ then for each $e \in \Sigma \cup \{\tau\}$ the following holds:

- (1) if $(s \xrightarrow{e} t) \in E_W$ then $\exists t' \in S' : (s' \xrightarrow{e} t' \in E'_W \wedge t \mathbf{M} t')$;
- (2) if $(s' \xrightarrow{e} t') \in E'_W$ then $\exists t \in S : (s \xrightarrow{e} t \in E_W \wedge t \mathbf{M} t')$;
- (3) if $(s' \xrightarrow{F} t') \in E'_W$ for some $F \in \mathcal{F}$ then $\exists t \in S : (s \xrightarrow{M} t \in E_W \wedge t \mathbf{M} t')$

The proof of this theorem is straightforward following the same ideas of Milner in [24]. We remark that we do not include the proofs for each theorem and lemma stated in this section due to space restriction, the interesting readers can access them in [4].

A natural way to check weak bisimilarity is to *saturate* [12,24] the transition system and then check strong bisimilarity on the saturated transition system. Following the same idea, we can compute weak masking simulation by reducing it to strong masking simulation. Notice that \xrightarrow{e} can be alternatively defined by:

$$\frac{p \xrightarrow{e} q}{p \xrightarrow{e} q} \qquad \frac{}{p \xrightarrow{\tau} p} \qquad \frac{p \xrightarrow{\tau} p_1 \xrightarrow{e} q_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} q}{p \xrightarrow{e} q} \quad (e \notin \{M\} \cup \mathcal{F})$$

Note that weak masking simulation on \xrightarrow{e} coincides with strong masking simulation on \xrightarrow{e} , thus we can check weak masking simulation by applying the algorithms for strong masking simulation to the saturated transition system.

Definition 4. Given two transition systems $A = \langle S, \Sigma, E, s_0 \rangle$ and $A' = \langle S', \Sigma', E', s'_0 \rangle$: $A \preceq_{Mask} A' \Leftrightarrow$ there exists a weak masking simulation $\mathbf{M} \subseteq S \times S'$.

If $A \preceq_{Mask} A'$ we say that A' is a weak masking fault-tolerant implementation of A .

Running example. Let us consider a memory cell that stores a bit of information and supports reading and writing operations, presented in a state-based form in [10]. A state in this system maintains the current value of the memory cell ($m = i$, for $i = 0, 1$), writing allows one to change this value, and reading returns the stored value. Obviously, in this system the result of a reading depends on the value stored in the cell. Thus, a property that one might associate with this model is that the value read from the cell coincides with that of the last writing performed in the system.

A potential fault in this scenario occurs when a cell unexpectedly loses its charge, and its stored value turns into another one (e.g., it changes from 1 to 0 due to charge loss). A typical technique to deal with this situation is *redundancy*: use three memory bits instead of one. Writing operations are performed simultaneously on the three bits. Reading, on the other hand, returns the value that is repeated at least twice in the memory bits; this is known as *voting*.

We take the following approach to model this system. We have labels $W_0, W_1, R_0,$ and R_1 for representing writing and reading operations. Specifically, W_0 (resp. W_1): writes a zero (resp. one) in the memory. R_0 (resp. R_1): reads a zero (resp. one) from the memory. Figure 1 depicts four transition systems. The leftmost

one represents the nominal system for this example (denoted as A). The second one from the left characterizes the nominal transition system augmented with masking transitions, i.e., A^M . The third and fourth ones from the left to the right are fault-tolerant implementations of A , named A' and A'' , respectively. Note that A' contains one fault, while A'' considers two faults. Both implementations use triple redundancy; intuitively, state t_0 contains the three bits with value zero and t_1 contains the three bits with value one. Moreover, state t_2 is reached when one of the bits was flipped (either 001, 010 or 100). In A'' , state t_3 is reached when two of three bits were flipped (either 011 or 101 or 110) starting from state t_0 . It is simple to see that there exists a relation of masking fault-tolerance between




Fig. 1. Transition systems for the memory cell.

A^M and A' , as it is witnessed by the relation $\mathbf{M} = \{(s_0, t_0), (s_1, t_1), (s_0, t_2)\}$. It is a routine to check that \mathbf{M} satisfies the conditions of Definition 1. On the other hand, there does not exist a masking relation between A^M and A'' because state t_3 must be related to state s_0 in any masking relation. This state can only be reached by executing faults, which are necessarily masked with M-transitions. However, note that, in state t_3 , we can read a 1 (transition $t_3 \xrightarrow{R_1} t_3$) whereas, in state s_0 , we can only read a 0.

3.3 Masking Simulation Game

Let us now define a masking simulation game for two transition systems (the specification of the nominal system and its fault-tolerant implementation) capturing masking fault-tolerance. We first define the masking game graph where we have two players named by convenience *the refuter* (R) and *the verifier* (V).

Definition 5. Given two transition systems $A = \langle S, \Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}, E_W, s_0 \rangle$ and $A' = \langle S', \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}, E'_W, s'_0 \rangle$ (considering A^M instead of A), we define the strong masking game graph $\mathcal{G}_{A^M, A'} = \langle S^G, S_R, S_V, \Sigma^G, E^G, s_0^G \rangle$ for two players as follows:

- $\Sigma^G = \Sigma_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}$
- $S^G = (S \times (\Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}^1 \cup \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \cup \{\#\})) \times S' \times \{R, V\} \cup \{s_{err}\}$

- The initial state is $s_0^G = \langle s_0, \#, s'_0, R \rangle$, where the refuter starts playing
- Refuter's states of the graph are $S_R = \{(s, \#, s', R) \mid s \in S \wedge s' \in S'\} \cup \{s_{err}\}$
- Verifier's states of the graph are $S_V = \{(s, \sigma, s', V) \mid s \in S \wedge s' \in S' \wedge \sigma \in \Sigma^G \setminus \{M\}\}$

and E^G is the minimal set satisfying:

- $\{(s, \#, s', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (t, \sigma^1, s', V) \mid \exists \sigma \in \Sigma : s \xrightarrow{\sigma} t \in E\} \subseteq E^G$,
- $\{(s, \#, s', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (s, \sigma^2, t', V) \mid \exists \sigma \in \Sigma'_{\mathcal{F}} : s' \xrightarrow{\sigma} t' \in E'\} \subseteq E^G$,
- $\{(s, \sigma^2, s', V) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (t, \#, s', R) \mid \exists \sigma \in \Sigma : s \xrightarrow{\sigma} t \in E\} \subseteq E^G$,
- $\{(s, \sigma^1, s', V) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (s, \#, t', R) \mid \exists \sigma \in \Sigma' : s' \xrightarrow{\sigma} t' \in E'\} \subseteq E^G$,
- $\{(s, F_i^2, s', V) \xrightarrow{M} (t, \#, s', R) \mid \exists s \xrightarrow{M} t \in E^M\} \subseteq E^G$, for any $F_i \in \mathcal{F}$
- If there is no outgoing transition from some state s then transitions $s \xrightarrow{\sigma} s_{err}$ and $s_{err} \xrightarrow{\sigma} s_{err}$ for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, are added.

The intuition of this game is as follows. The refuter chooses transitions of either the specification or the implementation to play, and the verifier tries to match her choice, this is similar to the bisimulation game [26]. However, when the refuter chooses a fault, the verifier must match it with a masking transition (M), the intuitive reading of this is that the fault-tolerant implementation masked the fault in such a way that the occurrence of this fault cannot be noticed from the users' side. R wins if the game reaches the error state, i.e., s_{err} . On the other hand, V wins when that state is not reached during the game (i.e., this is basically a reachability game [25]). We say $\text{Ver}(v)$ (resp. $\text{Ref}(v)$) if v is a verifier's node (resp. refuter's node v).

A weak masking game graph is defined in the same way as strong masking game graph in Def. 5, with the exception that $\Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}$ contains the distinguished *silent* action τ . Moreover, the set of labelled transitions (denoted as E_W^G) is now defined using the weak transition relations (i.e., E_W and E'_W) from the given transition systems.

Figure 2 shows a part of the strong masking game graph for the running example considering the transition systems A^M and A'' . We can clearly observe on the game graph that the Verifier cannot mimic the transition $(s_0, \#, t_3, R) \xrightarrow{R_1^2} (s_0, R_1^2, t_3, V)$ selected by the Refuter which reads a 1 at state t_3 on the fault-tolerant implementation. This is because the Verifier can only read a 0 at state s_0 . Then, the s_{err} is reached and the Refuter wins.

Theorem 3. *Given transition systems $A = \langle S, \Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}, E, s_0 \rangle$ and $A' = \langle S', \Sigma'_{\mathcal{F}}, E', s'_0 \rangle$ (considering A^M instead of A), we state that $A \prec_{Mask} A'$ iff the verifier has a winning strategy for the strong masking game graph $\mathcal{G}_{A^M, A'}$.*

Similarly, we can state the same for the weak masking game graph by Theorem 2.

Theorem 4. *Given transition systems $A = \langle S, \Sigma_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \{\tau\}, E_W, s_0 \rangle$ and $A' = \langle S', \Sigma'_{\mathcal{F}} \cup \{\tau\}, E'_W, s'_0 \rangle$ (considering A^M instead of A), we state that $A \preceq_{Mask} A'$ iff the verifier has a winning strategy for the weak masking game graph $\mathcal{G}_{A^M, A'}$.*

Using the standard properties of reachability games we get the following property.

Theorem 5. *For any A and A' , the masking game graph $\mathcal{G}_{A^M, A'}$ is determined. Furthermore, the strong (weak) masking game graph can be determined in time $O(|E^G|)$ ($O(|E_W^G|)$, respectively).*




Fig. 2. Part of the masking game graph for memory cell model with two faults

The set of winning states for the Refuter can be defined in a standard way from the error state [25]. Let us adapt these ideas to our setting, the sets U_i^j are defined as follows:

- $U_i^j = \emptyset$, if $i = 0$ or $j = 0$,
- $U_1^1 = \{s_{err}\}$,
- $U_{i+1}^{j+1} = \{v' \mid Ref(v') \wedge post(v') \cap U_{i+1}^j \neq \emptyset\} \cup \{v' \mid Ver(v') \wedge post(v') \subseteq \bigcup_{j' < j} U_{i+1}^{j'} \wedge post(v') \cap U_{i+1}^j \neq \emptyset \wedge \pi_2(v') \notin \mathcal{F}\} \cup \{v' \mid Ver(v') \wedge post(v') \subseteq \bigcup_{i' < i, j' < j} U_{i'}^{j'} \wedge post(v') \cap U_i^j \neq \emptyset \wedge \pi_2(v') \in \mathcal{F}\}$

then $U^k = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} U_i^k$ and $U = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} U^k$. Intuitively, the subindex i in sets U_i^k indicates that at most after $i - 1$ faults we will reach the error state. The following lemma is straightforwardly proven using standard techniques of reachability games [8].

Lemma 1. *The Refuter has a winning strategy iff $s_{init} \in U^k$, for some k .*

3.4 Quantitative Masking

In this section, we extend the strong masking simulation game introduced above with quantitative objectives to define the notion of masking fault-tolerance dis-

tance. Note that we use the attribute “quantitative” in a non-probabilistic sense.

Definition 6. *Given transition systems $A = \langle S, \Sigma, E, s_0 \rangle$ and $A' = \langle S', \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}, E', s'_0 \rangle$, we define the quantitative strong masking game graph $\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'} = \langle S^G, S_R, S_V, \Sigma^G, E^G, s_0^G, v^G \rangle$ as follows:*

- $\langle S^G, S_R, S_V, \Sigma^G, E^G, s_0^G \rangle$ are defined as Definition 5,
- $v^G(s \xrightarrow{e} s') = (\chi_{\mathcal{F}}(e), \chi_{s_{err}}(s'))$

where $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the characteristic function over the set \mathcal{F} , which returns 1 if $e \in \mathcal{F}$ and 0 otherwise. Similarly, for $\chi_{s_{err}}$ over the singleton set $\{s_{err}\}$. Note that the cost function returns a pair of numbers instead of a single number. It is direct to codify this pair into a number, but we do not do it here for the sake of clarity. We remark that a quantitative weak masking game graph is defined in the same way as a quantitative strong game graph defined above but using the weak masking game graph.

Given a quantitative strong masking game graph with the weight function v^G and a play $\rho = \rho_0 \sigma_0 \rho_1 \sigma_1 \rho_2, \dots$, for all $i \geq 0$, let $v_i = v^G(\rho_i \xrightarrow{\sigma_i} \rho_{i+1})$. We define the *masking payoff function* as follow:

$$f_{mask}(\rho) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{pr}_1(v_n)}{1 + \sum_{i=0}^n \text{pr}_0(v_i)},$$

which is proportional to the inverse of the number of masking movements made by the verifier. To see this, note that the numerator of $\frac{\text{pr}_1(v_n)}{1 + \sum_{i=0}^n \text{pr}_0(v_i)}$ will be 1 when we reach the error state, that is, in those paths not reaching the error state this formula returns 0. Furthermore, if the error state is reached, then the denominator will count the faulty transitions taken until the error state. All of them, excepting maybe the last one, were matched by a masking step, and the last masking step leads to an error. That is, the transitions that have a value 1 are those that masks relevant faults (i.e., faults that lead to the error state). The others are mapped to 0. Then, the refuter wants to maximize the value of any run, that is, she will try to execute faults leading to the state s_{err} . In contrast, the verifier wants to avoid s_{err} and then she will try to mask faults with actions that take her away from the error state. More precisely, the value of the quantitative masking game for the refuter is defined as $val_R(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}) = \sup_{\pi_R \in \Pi_R} \inf_{\pi_V \in \Pi_V} f_{mask}(out(\pi_R, \pi_V))$. Analogously, the value of the game for the verifier is defined as $val_V(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}) = \inf_{\pi_V \in \Pi_V} \sup_{\pi_R \in \Pi_R} f_{mask}(out(\pi_R, \pi_V))$. Then, we define the value of the quantitative strong masking game, denoted by $val(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'})$, as the value of the game either for the refuter or the verifier, i.e., $val(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}) = val_R(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}) = val_V(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'})$. This can be done because quantitative strong masking games are determined as we prove below in Theorem 6.

Definition 7. *Given transition systems A and A' , the masking distance between A and A' , denoted by $\delta_{mask}(A, A')$ is defined as: $\delta_{mask}(A, A') = val(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'})$.*

We would like to remark that the *masking distance* is defined in the same way for the quantitative weak masking game graph. Roughly speaking, we are interesting on measuring the number of faults that can be masked. The value of the game is essentially determined by the faulty and masking labels on the game graph and how the players can find a strategy to lead or avoid the state s_{err} , independently if there are or not silent actions.

Let us now state some basic properties of this kind of games. First, we state that quantitative strong masking games are determined as stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 6. *For any quantitative strong masking game $\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}$ with payoff function f_{mask} we have that:*

$$\inf_{\pi_V \in \Pi_V} \sup_{\pi_R \in \Pi_R} f_{mask}(out(\pi_R, \pi_V)) = \sup_{\pi_R \in \Pi_R} \inf_{\pi_V \in \Pi_V} f_{mask}(out(\pi_R, \pi_V))$$

The following result allows us to calculate the value of this kind of games:

Theorem 7. *Given a quantitative strong masking game $\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}$ we have that:*

- If $s_{init} \in U_i^j$ for some $j \geq 1$ and $i \geq 1$, then $val(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}) = \frac{1}{w}$ where $w = \min\{i \mid \exists j : s_{init} \in U_i^j\}$,
- otherwise, $val(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}) = 0$.

where the sets U 's is defined as in Subsection 3.3 over the qualitative part of the game.

Note that the sets U_i^j can be calculated using a bottom-up breadth-first search from the error state. Thus, the strategies for the refuter and the verifier can be defined using these sets, without taking into account the history of the play. That is, we have the following theorems:

Theorem 8. *Players R and V have memoryless winning strategies for $\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}$.*

Theorem 9. *The quantitative strong (weak) masking game can be determined in time $O(|S^G| + |E^G|)$ (resp. $O(|S^G| + |E_W^G|)$).*

Now, we present some basic properties of the masking distance.

Theorem 10. *For any transition systems A and A' : $\delta_{mask}(A, A') = 0$ iff $A \prec_{Mask} A'$ (resp. $A \preceq_{Mask} A'$).*

This follows from Theorem 7. That is, the masking distance between two systems is 0 if and only if there is a masking simulation between them. Noting that $A \prec_{Mask} A$ (the same for $A \preceq_{Mask} A$) for any transition system A , we obtain that $\delta_{mask}(A, A) = 0$ by Theorem 10, i.e., the reflexivity of δ_{mask} . For instance, for our running example, the masking distance is 1/3 with a redundancy of 3 bits and considering two faults. This means that only one fault can be masked by this implementation. We can prove a version of the triangle inequality for our notion of distance.

Theorem 11. *For every transition systems $A = \langle S, \Sigma, E, s_0 \rangle$, $A' = \langle S', \Sigma'_{\mathcal{F}'}, E', s'_0 \rangle$, and $A'' = \langle S'', \Sigma''_{\mathcal{F}''}, E'', s''_0 \rangle$ with $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}''$, it holds that:*

$$\delta_{mask}(A, A'') \leq \delta_{mask}(A, A') + \delta_{mask}(A', A'').$$

These two properties imply that masking distance is a directed semi-metric [6,9]. Moreover, it is interesting to note that the triangle inequality property has practical applications. When developing critical software is quite common to develop a first version of the software taking into account some possible anticipated faults. Later, more plausible faults could be observed after testing and execution of the system. Consequently, the system is modified with additional fault-tolerant capabilities to be able to overcome them. Theorem 11 tells us that incrementally measuring the masking distance between these different versions of the software provides an upper bound to the actual distance between the nominal system and its last fault-tolerant version. That is, if the sum of the distances obtained between the different versions is a small number, then we can ensure that the final system will exhibit an acceptable masking tolerance to faults w.r.t. the nominal system.

4 Experimental Evaluation

4.1 Details of the implementation

The approach described in this paper have been implemented in a tool called MaskD: Masking Distance Tool. This is written in Java and is free software. The tool MaskD takes as input a nominal model and its fault-tolerant implementation, and produces as output the masking distance among them. The input models are specified using a guarded command language. More precisely, programs are described in a guarded command style. A guarded command is composed of a boolean condition over the actual state of the system and an assignment, written as *Guard* \rightarrow *Command*. These syntactical constructions are called actions, and a program consists of a collection of actions. The language also allows user to label an action as internal. Moreover, some actions are used to represent faults. The tool has an option to print the error trace. Another option is to allow the user to start a simulation from the initial state of the game graph and enables the user to interactively choose every state, step by step. The tool also allows for deadlock to be considered an error state in the game.

4.2 Experimental results

We report on Table 2 the results of the masking distance for multiple instances of several case studies. These are: a redundant cell memory, the bounded retransmission protocol, and a variation of the dining philosopher problem. In more details, we have adopted the odd/even philosophers model, where there are $n - 1$ *even* philosophers that pick the right fork first, and 1 *odd* philosopher that picks the left fork first. In this case, we consider that there is a fault whenever an even philosopher behaves as an odd one. We have evaluated this problem on

Case Study	Redundancy	Masking Distance	Time
Memory	3 bits	0.333	0.7s
	5 bits	0.25	1.5s
	7 bits	0.2	27s
	9 bits	0.167	34m33s
Philosophers	2 phils	0.5	0.3s
	3 phils	0.333	0.6s
	4 phils	0.25	7.1s
	5 phils	0.2	13m.53s
BRP(1)	1 retransm.	0.333	1.2s
	3 retransm.	0.2	1.4s
	5 retransm.	0.143	1.5s
	7 retransm.	0.111	2.1s
BRP(3)	1 retransm.	0.333	5.5s
	3 retransm.	0.2	14.9s
	5 retransm.	0.143	1m28s
	7 retransm.	0.111	4m40s
BRP(5)	1 retransm.	0.333	6.7s
	3 retransm.	0.2	32s
	5 retransm.	0.143	1m51s
	7 retransm.	0.111	6m35s

Table 1. Results of the masking distance for the case studies.

four instances with 2, 3, 4, and 5 philosophers, respectively. It is worth noting that for this case study, we consider deadlock as an error state. We have also evaluated our framework with the Bounded Retransmission Protocol (BRP) [14] where silent actions are involved. We carried out experiments with three sizes of chunks (1, 3, and 5) and varying the retransmission limits with 1, 3, 5, and 7. Note that *BRP(1)* on Table 2 denotes that the number of chunks is equal to 1. Similarly, for *BRP(3)* and *BRP(5)*. We observe that the masking distance values are not affected by the number of chunks to be sent on the protocol. This is expected due to the masking distance depend on the redundancy added to mask the faults, which is in this case the number of retransmissions.

We have run our experiments on a MacBook Air with Processor 1.3 GHz Intel Core i5 and a memory of 4 Gb. The tool and case studies for reproducing the results are available at <https://github.com/lputruele/MaskD>.

5 Related Work

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in the quantitative generalizations of the boolean notion of correctness and the corresponding quantitative verification questions [3,5,15,16]. The framework described in [5] is the closest related work to our approach. The authors generalize the traditional notion of simulation relation to three different versions of simulation distance: *correctness*, *coverage*, and *robustness*. These are defined using quantitative games with *discounted-sum*

and *mean-payoff* objectives, two well-known cost functions. Similarly to that work, we also consider distances between purely discrete (non-probabilistic, untimed) systems. Correctness and coverage distances are concerned with the nominal part of the systems, and so faults play no role on them. On the other hand, robustness distance measures how many unexpected errors can be performed by the implementation in such a way that the resulting behavior is tolerated by the specification. So, it can be used to analyze the resilience of the implementation. Note that, robustness distance can only be applied to correct implementations, that is, implementations that preserve the behavior of the specification but perhaps do not cover all its behavior. As noted in [5], bisimilarity sometimes implies a distance of 1. In this sense a greater grade of robustness (as defined in [5]) is achieved by pruning critical points from the specification. Furthermore, the errors considered in that work are transitions mimicking the original ones but with different labels. In contrast to this, in our approach we consider that faults are injected into the fault-tolerant implementation, where their behaviors are not restricted by the nominal system. This follows the idea of model extension in fault-tolerance where faulty behavior is added to the nominal system. Further, note that when no faults are present, the masking distance between the specification and the implementation is 0 when there are bisimilar, and it is 1 otherwise. It is useful to note that robustness distance is not reflexive. We believe that all these definitions of distance between systems capture different notions useful for software development, and they can be used together, in a complementary way, to obtain an in-depth evaluation of fault-tolerant implementations.

6 Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper, we presented a notion of masking fault-tolerance distance between systems built on a characterization of masking tolerance via simulation relations and a corresponding game representation with quantitative objectives. Our framework is well-suited to support engineers for the analysis and design of fault-tolerant systems. More precisely, we have defined a computable masking distance function such that an engineer can measure the masking tolerance of a given fault-tolerant implementation, i.e., the number of faults that can be masked. Thereby, the engineer can measure and compare the masking fault-tolerance distance of alternative fault-tolerant implementations, and select one that fits best to her preferences.

There are many directions for future work. We have only defined a notion of fault-tolerance distance for masking fault-tolerance, similar notions of distance can be defined for other levels of fault-tolerance like failsafe and non-masking, we leave this as a further work.

References

1. Krzysztof R. Apt and Erich Grädel. *Lectures in Game Theory for Computer Scientists*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 1st edition, 2011.
2. Anish Arora and Mohamed G. Gouda. Closure and convergence: A foundation of fault-tolerant computing. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 19(11):1015–1027, 1993.
3. Udi Boker, Krishnendu Chatterjee, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Orna Kupferman. Temporal specifications with accumulative values. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, 15(4):27:1–27:25, 2014.
4. Pablo F. Castro, Pedro R. D’Argenio, Ramiro Demasi, and Luciano Putruele. Measuring masking fault-tolerance. *CoRR*, abs/1801.10140, 2018.
5. Pavol Cerný, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Arjun Radhakrishna. Simulation distances. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 413(1):21–35, 2012.
6. Moses Charikar, Konstantin Makarychev, and Yury Makarychev. Directed metrics and directed graph partitioning problems. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2006, Miami, Florida, USA, January 22-26, 2006*, pages 51–60, 2006.
7. Luca de Alfaro, Marco Faella, and Mariëlle Stoelinga. Linear and branching system metrics. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, 35(2):258–273, 2009.
8. Luca de Alfaro, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Orna Kupferman. Concurrent reachability games. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 386(3):188–217, 2007.
9. Luca de Alfaro, Rupak Majumdar, Vishwanath Raman, and Mariëlle Stoelinga. Game refinement relations and metrics. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 4(3), 2008.
10. Ramiro Demasi, Pablo F. Castro, Thomas Stephen Edward Maibaum, and Nazareno Aguirre. Simulation relations for fault-tolerance. *Formal Asp. Comput.*, 29(6):1013–1050, 2017.
11. Josee Desharnais, Vineet Gupta, Radha Jagadeesan, and Prakash Panangaden. Metrics for labelled markov processes. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 318(3):323–354, 2004.
12. Jean-Claude Fernandez and Laurent Mounier. ”on the fly” verification of behavioural equivalences and preorders. In *Computer Aided Verification, 3rd International Workshop, CAV ’91, Aalborg, Denmark, July, 1-4, 1991, Proceedings*, pages 181–191, 1991.
13. Felix C. Gärtner. Fundamentals of fault-tolerant distributed computing in asynchronous environments. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 31, 1999.
14. Jan Friso Groote and Jaco van de Pol. A bounded retransmission protocol for large data packets. In *Algebraic Methodology and Software Technology, 5th International Conference, AMAST ’96, Munich, Germany, July 1-5, 1996, Proceedings*, pages 536–550, 1996.
15. Thomas A. Henzinger. From boolean to quantitative notions of correctness. In *Proceedings of the 37th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2010, Madrid, Spain, January 17-23, 2010*, pages 157–158, 2010.
16. Thomas A. Henzinger. Quantitative reactive modeling and verification. *Computer Science - R&D*, 28(4):331–344, 2013.
17. Thomas A. Henzinger, Rupak Majumdar, and Vinayak S. Prabhu. Quantifying similarities between timed systems. In *Formal Modeling and Analysis of Timed Systems, Third International Conference, FORMATS 2005, Uppsala, Sweden, September 26-28, 2005, Proceedings*, pages 226–241, 2005.

18. Mei-Chen Hsueh, Timothy K. Tsai, and Ravishankar K. Iyer. Fault injection techniques and tools. *Computer*, 30(4):75–82, April 1997.
19. Ravishankar K. Iyer, Nithin Nakka, Weining Gu, and Zbigniew Kalbarczyk. Fault injection. In *Encyclopedia of Software Engineering*, pages 287–299, 2010.
20. Leslie Lamport, Robert E. Shostak, and Marshall C. Pease. The Byzantine generals problem. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 4(3):382–401, 1982.
21. Kim G. Larsen, Uli Fahrenberg, and Claus R. Thrane. Metrics for weighted transition systems: Axiomatization and complexity. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 412(28):3358–3369, 2011.
22. Donald A. Martin. The determinacy of blackwell games. *J. Symb. Log.*, 63(4):1565–1581, 1998.
23. Carver Mead and Lynn Conway. *Introduction to VLSI systems*. Addison-Wesley, 1980.
24. R. Milner. *Communication and Concurrency*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 1989.
25. Marcin Jurdziński. Algorithms for solving parity games. In Krzysztof R. Apt and Erich Grädel, editors, *Lectures in Game Theory for Computer Scientist*, chapter 3, pages 74–95. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2011.
26. Colin Stirling. Bisimulation, modal logic and model checking games. *Logic Journal of the IGPL*, 7(1):103–124, 1999.
27. Claus R. Thrane, Uli Fahrenberg, and Kim G. Larsen. Quantitative analysis of weighted transition systems. *J. Log. Algebr. Program.*, 79(7):689–703, 2010.

A Definitions

Definition 8. Given two transition systems $A = \langle S, \Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}, E_W, s_0 \rangle$ and $A' = \langle S', \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}, E'_W, s'_0 \rangle$ (where $\Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}$ possible contains the distinguished silent action τ), we define the weak masking game graph $\mathcal{G}_{A^M, A'} = \langle S^G, S_R, S_V, \Sigma^G, E_W^G, s_0^G \rangle$ for two players as follows:

- $\Sigma^G = \Sigma_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}} \cup \{\tau\}$
- $S^G = (S \times (\Sigma_{\mathcal{M}}^1 \cup \Sigma_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \cup \{\tau\} \cup \{\#\}) \times S' \times \{R, V\}) \cup \{s_{err}\}$
- The initial state is $s_0^G = \langle s_0, \#, s'_0, R \rangle$, where the refuter starts playing
- Refuter's states of the graph are $S_R = \{(s, \#, s', R) \mid s \in S \wedge s' \in S'\} \cup \{s_{err}\}$
- Verifier's states of the graph are $S_V = \{(s, \sigma, s', V) \mid s \in S \wedge s' \in S' \wedge \sigma \in \Sigma^G \setminus \{M\}\}$

and E_W^G is the minimal set satisfying:

- $\{(s, \#, s', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (t, \sigma^1, s', V) \mid \exists \sigma \in \Sigma : s \xrightarrow{\sigma} t \in E_W\} \subseteq E_W^G$,
- $\{(s, \#, s', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (s, \sigma^2, t', V) \mid \exists \sigma \in \Sigma' : s' \xrightarrow{\sigma} t' \in E'_W\} \subseteq E_W^G$,
- $\{(s, \sigma^2, s', V) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (t, \#, s', R) \mid \exists \sigma \in \Sigma : s \xrightarrow{\sigma} t \in E_W\} \subseteq E_W^G$,
- $\{(s, \sigma^1, s', V) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (s, \#, t', R) \mid \exists \sigma \in \Sigma' : s' \xrightarrow{\sigma} t' \in E'_W\} \subseteq E_W^G$,
- $\{(s, F_i^2, s', V) \xrightarrow{M} (t, \#, s', R) \mid \exists s \xrightarrow{M} t \in E^M\} \subseteq E_W^G$, for any $F_i \in \mathcal{F}$
- If there is no outgoing transition from some state s then transitions $s \xrightarrow{\sigma} s_{err}$ and $s_{err} \xrightarrow{\sigma} s_{err}$ for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, are added.

B Proofs of Properties

Proof of Lemma 1. The Refuter has a winning strategy iff $s_{init} \in U^k$, for some k .

Proof. \Rightarrow) Suppose that the Refuter has a winning strategy namely π and that $s_{init} \notin U_i^k$ for any i and k . This means that $\pi(s_{init})$ returns a node v such that $v \notin U_i^k$ (for any i and k) (by definition of U_i^k), and from there the Verifier can select a node $v' \notin U_i^k$ (for any i and k), and again this can be repeated forever. Therefore, the play never reaches s_{err} , which means that the Verifier wins and that leads to a contradiction.

\Leftarrow) Consider $s_{init} \in U^k$ for some k , where we have that $s_{init} \in U_i^k$ for some i by definition. Any winning strategy for the refuter is simple, for any $v \in U_i^j$, $\pi(v) = v'$ being v' some node in U_i^{j-1} which exists by definition. Since $s_{init} \in U^k$ and the Refuter has to play, then the play will reach in $j - 1$ steps the set U^1 , i.e., the s_{err} state. \diamond

Proof of Theorem 3. Given transition systems $A = \langle S, \Sigma, E, s_0 \rangle$ and $A' = \langle S', \Sigma'_F, E', s'_0 \rangle$, we state that $A \prec_{Mask} A'$ iff the verifier has a winning strategy for the game $\mathcal{G}_{A^M, A'}$.

Proof. \Rightarrow) Suppose that $A \prec_{Mask} A'$, then there exists a masking simulation $\mathbf{M} \subseteq S \times S'$ by Definition 2. Then, the strategy of the verifier is constructed as follows, for states (s, σ^i, s', V) with $s \mathbf{M} s'$ and $\sigma \notin \mathcal{F}$, the strategy selects either a transition $s \xrightarrow{\sigma} w$ or $s' \xrightarrow{\sigma} w'$ depending if $i = 1$ or $i = 2$, respectively. In case of $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}$, then the strategy returns the transition $(s, F_j^2, s', V) \xrightarrow{M} (s, \#, s', R)$, for any $F_j \in \mathcal{F}$. This can be done since $s \mathbf{M} s'$. Furthermore, in any case we have $w \mathbf{M} s'$, $s \mathbf{M} w'$ or $s \mathbf{M} s'$, respectively. Thus, the strategy can be applied again for any movement of the Refuter. Summing up, the Verifier can play forever and then the strategy is winning for her. Hence, the strategy is winning for game $\mathcal{G}_{A^M, A'}$ since $s_{init} \mathbf{M} s'_{init}$.

\Leftarrow) Suppose that the verifier has a winning strategy from the initial state. Then, we define a masking simulation relation as $\mathbf{M} = \{(s, s') \mid V \text{ has a winning strategy for } (s, \#, s', R)\}$. It is simple to see that it is a masking simulation. Furthermore, $s_{init} \mathbf{M} s'_{init}$, then $A \prec_{Mask} A'$. \diamond

Proof of Theorem 6. For any quantitative strong masking game $\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}$ with payoff function f_{mask} we have that:

$$\inf_{\pi_V \in \Pi_V} \sup_{\pi_R \in \Pi_R} f_{mask}(out(\pi_R, \pi_V)) = \sup_{\pi_R \in \Pi_R} \inf_{\pi_V \in \Pi_V} f_{mask}(out(\pi_R, \pi_V))$$

Proof. In order to prove that the masking payoff function f_{mask} is determined we have to prove that it is bounded and Borel measurable (Martin's theorem [22]). First, f_{mask} is bounded by definition. Second, to see that f_{mask} is Borel measurable note that $f_{mask}(\Omega) \subseteq [0, 1]$, and then it is sufficient to prove that, for every rational x , $f_{mask}^{-1}((-\infty, x])$ is Borel in the Cantor topology of infinite executions. Consider $f_{mask}^{-1}([-\infty, x])$ for an arbitrary x , this is the same as $f_{mask}^{-1}([0, \frac{1}{a}])$ for a given a . But, $f_{mask}^{-1}([0, \frac{1}{a}]) = \bigcup_{b \geq a} A_b$ where $A_b = \bigcup_{i > 0} A_b^i$ for $A_b^i = \{\rho_0 \sigma_0 \rho_1 \sigma_1 \dots \mid \rho_i = s_{err} \wedge \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \chi_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma_j) = b\}$. Note that $A_b^i = \{C_{\rho_0 \sigma_0 \dots \rho_i} \mid \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \chi_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma_j) = b\}$ where $C_{\rho_0 \sigma_0 \dots \rho_i}$ is the cone corresponding to initial segment $\rho_0 \sigma_0 \dots \rho_i$ which is Borel measurable, and so A_b^i , A_b and $f_{mask}^{-1}((-\infty, x])$ are Borel measurable. \diamond

Proof of Theorem 7. Given a quantitative strong masking game $\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}$ we have that:

- If $s_{init} \in U_i^j$ for some $j \geq 1$ and $i \geq 1$, then $val(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}) = \frac{1}{w}$ where $w = \min\{i \mid \exists j : s_{init} \in U_i^j\}$,
- otherwise, $val(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}) = 0$.

where the sets U 's is defined as in Subsection 3.3 over the qualitative part of the game.

Proof. First, note that any play avoiding state s_{err} has value 0. By definition of the game, each transition performed by the Refuter must be followed by a transition selected by the Verifier. These transitions (the matches performed by the Verifier) have cost $(1, 0)$ since the target of any of these transition is different

from s_{err} . Because we have an infinite number of these matches, when state s_{err} is not reached, the valuation of these plays is $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{0}{1 + \sum_{i=0}^n v_i} = 0$. Otherwise, if $s_{init} \in U_i^j$ for some $j \geq 1$, we denote by Π the set of Refuter's strategies satisfying the following: If $v \in U_i^j$ for $i, j > 1$ and $post(v) \cap U_i^{j-1} \neq \emptyset$, then $\pi(v) = v'$, for some $v' \in post(v) \cap U_i^{j-1}$. Note that $\Pi \neq \emptyset$, since any Refuter's node in a set U_i^j has a successor belonging to U_i^{j-1} . Now, any play from s_{init} following a strategy in Π contains the occurrence of at most i faults since the unique way of decreasing i is by performing a masking after a fault, and $i \leq j$ always. That is, for any $\pi_V \in \Pi_V$ and $\pi_R \in \Pi$ we have that $val(\pi_V, \pi_R) = \frac{1}{i}$. Thus, $val(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}) \geq \frac{1}{i}$. Hence, $val(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}) \geq \frac{1}{w}$ for $w = \min\{i \mid \exists j : s_{init} \in U_i^j\}$.

Now, note that for those nodes $s_i \notin U_i^j$ for every i and j , the Verifier has strategies π_V such that $val(\pi_V, \pi_R) = 0$ for any Refuter's strategy π_R . Then, for any Refuter's strategy $\pi_R \notin \Pi$ we have that $\inf_{\pi_R \in \Pi_R} val(\pi_V, \pi_R) = 0$. That is, for any Refuter's strategy we have $\inf_{\pi_V \in \Pi_V} val(\pi_V, \pi_R) \leq \frac{1}{w}$ for $w = \min\{i \mid \exists j : s_{init} \in U_i^j\}$. Therefore, $\sup_{\pi_R \in \Pi_R} \inf_{\pi_V \in \Pi_V} val(\pi_V, \pi_R) \leq \frac{1}{w}$. That is, $val(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}) \leq \frac{1}{w}$, i.e., $val(\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}) = \frac{1}{w}$. \diamond

Proof of Theorem 11. For every transition systems $A = \langle S, \Sigma, E, s_0 \rangle$, $A' = \langle S', \Sigma', E', s'_0 \rangle$, and $A'' = \langle S'', \Sigma'', E'', s''_0 \rangle$ with $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}''$, it holds that:

$$\delta_{mask}(A, A'') \leq \delta_{mask}(A, A') + \delta_{mask}(A', A'').$$

Proof. Let us consider any node $(s, \#, s'', R)$ of the game $\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A''}$ belonging to U_i^j with $j \geq 2$. Note that j cannot be the error state and so $j \neq 1$; moreover, after the movement of the Refuter we have at least one movement from the Verifier. In addition, for every nodes $(s, \#, s', R)$ in $\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}$ with $(s, \#, s', R) \in U_{i'}^{k'}$ and $(s', \#, s'', R)$ of game $\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A''}$ with $(s', \#, s'', R) \in U_{i''}^{k''}$ it holds that $\frac{1}{i} \leq \frac{1}{i'} + \frac{1}{i''}$. For the sake of convenience, when a node s does not belong to any U_i^k , we assume $s \in U_\infty$. Then, we just define $\frac{1}{\infty} = 0$. The result follows from this fact and theorem 7. The proof is by induction on i .

Base Case: For $i = 1$, we perform an induction on j . Let $j = 2$ and suppose that $(s, \#, s'', R) \in U_1^2$. This means that we have a transition $(s, \#, s'', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (w, \sigma^t, w'', V)$, where $t \in \{1, 2\}$, that cannot be matched by the Verifier. In case that $t = 1$, then this play is a transition $(s, \#, s'', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma^t} (w, \sigma^t, s'', V)$ from A . Now, let $(s, \#, s', R)$ and $(s', \#, s'', R)$ be a pair of nodes of A and A' , respectively. By definition, we have a transition $(s, \#, s', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (w, \#, s', R)$ in $\mathcal{Q}_{A^M, A'}$. In case that the Verifier cannot match this play in that game we have that $(s, \#, s', R) \in U_1^2$. This finishes the proof since $1 \leq 1 + k''$, regardless of the value of k'' . Otherwise, we have a play by the refuter $(w, \#, s', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma^1} (w, \sigma^1, w', V)$ and we also have a transition $(s', \#, s'', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (w', \sigma, s'', V)$. But, this cannot be matched by our initial assumption, that is, $(s', \#, s'', R) \in U_1^2$. This finalizes the base case for j . For $t = 2$, the reasoning is similar using the transitions of A'' . Now, for the inductive case of the second induction consider $j > 2$

and $i = 1$, that is, $(s, \#, s'', R) \in U_1^j$. This means that we have a transition $(s, \#, s'', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma^t} (w, \sigma^t, w'', V)$ with $t \in \{1, 2\}$. Consider now any pairs of states $(s, \#, s', R)$ in $\mathcal{Q}_{A, A'}$ and $(s', \#, s'', R)$ in $\mathcal{Q}_{A', A''}$. In case of $t = 1$, then we have a transition $(s, \#, s'', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma^1} (w, \sigma^1, s'', V)$ where $\text{post}((w, \sigma^1, s'', V)) \subseteq \bigcup^{k \leq j} U_1^j$. By definition of game $Q_{A^M, A'}$, we have a transition $(s, \#, s', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (w, \sigma, s', V)$. In case that it cannot be matched, then the result follows. Otherwise, we have transitions $(w, \sigma, s', V) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (w, \#, w', R)$ for $w' \in S'$. Therefore, there must be also a transition $(s', \#, s'', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (w', \sigma, s'', V)$. Similarly, in case that this cannot be matched we have $(s', \#, s'', R) \in U_1^2$ and the proof finishes. In other case, we have a collection of transitions $(w', \sigma, s'', V) \rightarrow (w', \#, w'', R)$ for $w'' \in S''$. Note that for any of these pairs $(w, \#, w', R)$ and $(w', \#, w'', R)$, we have that $(s, \#, s'', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (w, \sigma^1, s'', V) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (w, \#, w', R)$. Then, $(w, \#, w', R) \in U_1^{j-2}$ and by inductive hypothesis for all of these pairs we have $(w, \#, w', R) \in U_1^{j'}$ and $(w', \#, w'', R) \in U_1^{j''}$. Now, taking k' as the maximum of all these j' and k'' as the maximum of all these j'' , we obtain that $(w, \sigma, s', V) \in U_1^{k'+1}$ and $(w', \sigma, s'', V) \in U_1^{k''+1}$. This implies that $(s, \sigma, s', V) \in U_1^{k'+2}$ and $(s', \sigma, s'', V) \in U_1^{k''+2}$, which finishes the proof.

Inductive Case: For $i > 1$ the proof is as follows. Assume that $(s, \#, s'', R) \in U_i^j$. Since $1 < i < j$, we have a transition $(s, \#, s'', R) \xrightarrow{\sigma^t} (w, \sigma^t, w'', V)$. In case that $\sigma^t = F^2$ for some $F \in \mathcal{F}''$, then we must have a transition $(s, F^2, w'', V) \xrightarrow{M} (s, \#, w'', R)$ and $(s, \#, w'', R) \in U_{i-1}^{j-2}$. On the other hand, in game $\mathcal{Q}_{A', A''}$ we must have a transition $(s', \#, s'', R) \xrightarrow{F} (s', F^2, w'', V)$ by definition. In case that $F \in \mathcal{F}'$, then $F \in \Sigma'$. On the contrary, if it cannot be matched, then the result follows. Otherwise, we have a collection of transitions $(s', F^2, w'', V) \xrightarrow{F} (w', \#, w'', R)$. So, in game $\mathcal{Q}_{A, A'}$ we have at least an edge $(s, \#, s', R) \xrightarrow{F} (s, F^2, w', V)$. By the initial assumption, this can be masked, and then there is a transition $(s, F^2, w', V) \xrightarrow{M} (s, \#, w', R)$. By induction, we have $(s, \#, w', R) \in U_{i'}^{j'}$ and $(w', \#, w'', R) \in U_{i''}^{j''}$ such that $\frac{1}{i-1} \leq \frac{1}{i'} + \frac{1}{i''}$. Note that $(s, F^2, w', V) \in U_{i'-1}^{j'-1}$, since we have a unique (masking) transition from (s, F^2, V, w') . Now, let us define $k'' = \max\{i'' \mid \text{for all states } (s', \#, w'', V) \in U_{i''}^{j''}\}$. Then, $(s', F^2, s'', V) \in U_{i''}^{k''}$ and we have that $(s, \#, s', R) \in U_{i'+1}^{j'}$ and $(s', \#, s'', V) \in U_{i''}^{k''}$ with $\frac{1}{i} \leq \frac{1}{i'+1} + \frac{1}{i''}$ by definition of sets U 's. This finishes the proof for this case. In case that $\sigma^t \neq F^2$, the proof proceeds by induction on j as the second induction in the base case. \diamond

C Case Studies

Let us illustrate the use of the notion of masking distance introduced above by means of some well-known case studies from the area of fault-tolerance.

C.1 Byzantine Agreement

The Byzantine generals problem, introduced in [20], is a classic problem of distributed agreement. We have a commanding general with $n - 1$ lieutenants. The communication between the commander and his lieutenants is performed through messengers. The commander may decide to attack an enemy city or to retreat; then, he sends the order to his lieutenants. Some of the lieutenants (or perhaps the commander) might be traitors. As a consequence, traitors might deliver false messages or perhaps they just avoid sending messages. The loyal lieutenants must agree on attacking or retreating after $m + 1$ rounds of communication, where m is the maximum numbers of traitors. As proved by Lamport, the algorithm can ensure correct operation only if fewer than one third of the generals are traitors. We assume the following: the messages are delivered correctly and all the lieutenants can communicate directly with each other; in this scenario they can recognize who is sending a message. Faults convert loyal lieutenants into traitors. Finally, traitors cannot forge messages on behalf of loyal lieutenants.




Fig. 3. Nominal model and ft-implementation for the Byzantine Agreement Problem with $n = 4$ and $m = 1$.

Let us model this problem for four generals (one of them being the commander). Consider the following actions, **send** represents the commander sending his value to all lieutenants, **fw** denotes distributed forwarding of lieutenants' values, and **agree** represents a consensus between the lieutenants (this is achieved by voting), **restart** goes back to the initial state. Faults occur when some general becomes traitor. Figure 3 depicts the specification and the implementation for $n = 4$ and $m = 1$. For the sake of simplicity, the implementation only shows one possible sequence of betrayals for the lieutenants, but it is easy to see that the same behavior applies for other combinations. In the masking game, the s_{err}

state is reached when more than one betrayal has been committed, since there cannot be an agreement, and the forceful restart cannot be simulated by the normal system. The value of δ_{mask} for this configuration is $1/3$.

C.2 Bounded Retransmission Protocol

Consider the bounded retransmission protocol (BRP) [14], this is a variant of the alternating bit protocol. The BRP protocol sends a file in a number of chunks, but allows only for a bounded number of retransmissions for each chunk. Let N denote the number of chunks and M the maximum number of retransmissions allowed for each chunk. A state in this system maintains the current number of chunks to be sent, say n with $n \in \{0, \dots, N\}$, and the number of retransmission attempts left, say r with $r \in \{0, \dots, M\}$. We consider the actions of sending and receiving messages, the send action decrements n and the receive action reestablishes r to M , respectively. Moreover, a restart action is considered for the case that all chunks of the current message have been correctly delivered. A fault occurs whenever a chunk sent was lost and a retransmission is consumed (i.e. $r := r - 1$). An interesting property that one might associate with this model is that the value of r is never less than 0 (i.e it never falls short on retransmission attempts). To model this system we use labels `send`, `receive` and `restart` for




Fig. 4. Nominal model and ft-implementation for the BRP with $N = 2$ and $M = 2$.

denoting the aforementioned operations. Figure 4 illustrates normal and faulty versions for $N = 2$ and $M = 2$. In the corresponding masking game graph for these two systems, it can be seen that the s_{err} state is reached when $r < 0$ and the implementation is forced to restart. This action cannot be simulated by the specification, which, at that point, can only receive messages. The value of δ_{mask}

for this configuration is equal to $1/4$.

C.3 The Muller C-element

This is a simple delay-insensitive circuit [23], it contains two boolean inputs and one boolean output. Its logical behavior is described as follows: if both inputs are true (resp. false) then the output of the C-element becomes true (resp. false). If the inputs do not change, the output remains the same. In [2], the following (informal) specification of the C-element with inputs x and y and output z is given: (i) *Input x (resp. y) changes only if $x \equiv z$ (resp., $y \equiv z$)*, (ii) *Output z becomes true only if $x \wedge y$ holds, and becomes false only if $\neg x \wedge \neg y$ holds*; (iii) *Starting from a state where $x \wedge y$, eventually a state is reached where z is set to the same value that both x and y have. Ideally, both x and y change simultaneously. Faults may delay changing either x or y .* Let us consider an implementation of the C-element with a majority voting circuit involving three inputs, where an extra input u in the circuit is added. Then, the predicate $\text{maj}(x, y, u)$ returns the value of the majority circuit, which is assumed to work correctly. In addition to the traditional logical behavior of the C-element, u and z have to change at the same time, where the output z is fed back to the input u . Figure 5 shows two models of this circuit. A exhibits the nominal behavior of the C-element containing only normal transitions, whereas A' takes into account different faults, and provides a reaction to these.




Fig. 5. Nominal model and ft-implementation for the Muller C-element.

We assume that every state in these models is composed of boolean variables x , y , u , and z , where x , y , and u represent the inputs, and z represents the output. For instance, the state s_0 contains the information $x = 0$, $y = 0$, $u = 0$, and $z = 0$. Transitions are labeled by subsets of the set $\{cx, cy, cu, cz\}$ of actions; action cx (resp., cy and cu) is the action that changes input x (resp., y and u); cz is the action of changing output z . When actions cx and cy are executed at the same

Case Study	Redundancy	$\delta_{mask}(A, A')$
Memory	$k > 1$ bits	$\frac{1}{2 + \lfloor \frac{k-1}{2} \rfloor}$
Byzantine	$k > 2$ generals	$\frac{1}{2 + \lfloor \frac{k-1}{3} \rfloor}$
BRP	$k \geq 0$ retransm.	$\frac{1}{2+k}$

Table 2. Masking distances for the case studies.


time, we just write cxy . We only consider faults that delays the change of the inputs x or y (i.e., in this case, the inputs do not change simultaneously). The value of $\delta_{mask}(A, A')$ is equal to 0, which means that this version of the Muller C-element with majority circuit is full masking fault-tolerance.

C.4 Summary of Results.

We have evaluated the application of the masking distance on the examples with different degrees of redundancy. For instance, we have evaluated the memory cell with redundancy of 3 bits and the masking distance is $1/3$, for 5 bits its distance is $1/4$, and so on. We have observed on each of these distances that they follow a common pattern w.r.t. the redundancy added. Thus, we have derived a general formula, $\frac{1}{2 + \lfloor \frac{k-1}{2} \rfloor}$, with redundancy of $k > 1$. Similarly, we have measured the Byzantine Agreement and BRP with diverse redundancy size and derived a general formula for them. Particularly, for the Muller C-element circuit we did not derive any formula because it is a full masking example and its masking distance is always 0. Table 2 shows the general formula for each case study.

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

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1811.05548v1>



This figure "BRP2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1811.05548v1>

This figure "BRP3.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1811.05548v1>

This figure "Byz4G.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1811.05548v1>

