draft-bortzmeyer-language-state-machines

Stéphane Bortzmeyer - AFNIC

IETF 68 - Prague

The question

You have two extremely different ways to write specs / standards:

- Use only a formal language and write specs in Lotos or similar. Hard, very hard (may be impossible) but allows to automatic processing (checking, pretty-printing, ...).
- Use only natural language. Easy but you cannot check it or translate to code automatically.

An intermediate solution is to use mostly natural language with a few formal languages for specific tasks. This is what IETF does: English + (ABNF and / or MIB).

Other formal languages are being developed (draft-ietf-rohc-formal-notation for describing packet headers).

State machines

There are many of them in RFCs but no formal language.

- Stuck to ASCII-ART, informal tables or lists of tuples,
- No automatic checking possible (these checks catch a lot of ABNF mistakes, for instance)
- No code generation possible

Cosmogol, a candidate

- Based on the "list of tuples" approach,
- Current state, message, next state, action: a transition,
- Formal syntax,
- 4 A reference implementation which can:
 - Check the SM (for instance its connectivity),
 - 2 Translate to Graphviz or Graph::Easy.

Example

Do we want a formal SM language?

- Do we want a formal SM language?
- If so, do we develop one?

- Do we want a formal SM language?
- ② If so, do we develop one?
 - If not, which one to use? State Chart XML, UML, Z.100/SDL?

- Do we want a formal SM language?
- 2 If so, do we develop one?
 - If not, which one to use? State Chart XML, UML, Z.100/SDL?
 - If yes, is Cosmogol a good candidate? If yes, all the following issues should be for the WG to work on
 - Named sets of states / messages?
 - ② Substates
 - Syntax details?
 - Unicode identifiers?

Creating a WG?

Depends on the output of the previous discussions.

Volunteers to work?

See proposed charter sent on the mailing list.