

## **T1: Visualisation and Concurrent Systems Modelling**

### **T1.1. Role of Visualisation Tools**

What connection has **visualisation**

with **concurrent systems modelling**?

#### **ARGUE**

To understand a complex system, must:

- analyse the system into agents
- model interfaces between agents in terms of observations

**Visualisation** is the *means*

to make activity at the agent interfaces "visible" to the designer  
of approach an engineer takes when building a complex device.

### **Analogy with conventional engineering**

Engineer deals with components whose interaction is invisible

e.g. via electrical currents or hydraulic pressures

In constructing or diagnosing the faults in a complex system

engineer attaches equipment to the system

to make the interactions between components visible

measurements should reflect the activities they record

as accurately as possible

Accuracy

= precise correlation between stimulus and response

Ideally, a reliable and well-understood functional relationship

definitive scripts <--> interface mechanism to express correlation

**visualisation** aspect of the computer model of a complex system

<--> engineer's measuring instruments

"interface mechanism" because resembles mechanical linkage

that reliably and instantaneously transmits state change

### **Probing the system ....**

The engineer's design tools:

- devices to provoke state-changes
- complemented by measuring instruments

The engineer probes the system by experiments

– initiating changes and studying the response

Many such experiments

<--> activities ultimately carried out by other agents in the system

Visualisation tools

= "measuring instruments" to aid concurrent systems design

Desirable to

- separate system model from the visualisation
  - cf attach instruments to a system to monitor behaviour
- perform visualisation in parallel with normal system operation

Definitive scripts can achieve this objective:

only need appropriate references for use in the RHS of formulae.

**Visualisation unbounded:**

**why so many definitive notations?**

Compare

what an engineer conceives as component interaction

e.g. in propagation of signals, or application of forces

with

what can observe directly, through visual or audible output

Typically

**conceptual** view of interactions within the system

uses notions **without** visual significance

=> developing visualisations for such concept

is a process that has no clearly prescribed limits

also other forms of output we experience directly, e.g. sonification

Each definitive notation for graphics is in its own way

"converting abstract concepts into something visual".

Each notation specifies a different relationship between

what the designer in mind <--> what is observed on the screen

## Single-agent definitive programming

use of definitive notations for visualisation

= single agent definitive programming

where sole state changing agent is the system designer

Visualisation helps designer

- to grasp what is in fact invisible
- to model what a user does in practice see of the system

For instance, in the VCCS:

the speedometer

the cruise controller interface

the brake and pedal

represent the interface to the driver of the vehicle

the animation of the forces acting on the vehicle

the diagrammatic position of the vehicle

the clock

the throttle

assist the designer in understanding how the controller performs.

## **Definitive scripts for visualisation**

**– the representation of agent views**

single agent = designer

designer has perspective on the views of many different agents

Constructing definitive script for visualisation is

an exercise in knowledge representation, recording

- what agents can respond to
- what they can change

[ cf fundamental notions of LSD specification, to follow ... ]

In the VCCS:

the definitive programmer can make free with the script

the designer can modify it in any way that is

plausibly consistent with the real-world semantics

the mouse user can interact via the driver's interface

Analysis and representation of agent perceptions and privileges

is a first step towards

modelling and animation a concurrent system

## T1.2. Some Illustrative Examples

### T.1.2.1. The SCOUT Notation: Basic Principles

Assume designer-computer interaction

via the screen, the keyboard and the mouse

Consider visualisation in terms of

"state-changes to the screen"

different symbolic representations

model conceptually different kinds of observation

Three simple ways to describe patterns on the screen:

window layout	Scout
textual display	
2d-line-drawing	DoNaLD

Scout allows the designer to describe the whole screen layout

by devising windows in which to display

- graphical output in DoNaLD
- associated textual annotations

[Design and implementation of Scout is work of Simon Yung]

## T1.2. Some Illustrative Examples (cont)

### T1.2.2. The lines.sdae script

lines.sdae script is an exercise in visualisation for mathematics

animates combinatorial structures

associated with planar configurations of 4 lines

lines.sdae illustrates:

- combining conceptually different types of visualisation  
two DoNaLD + two ARCA windows  
combined and annotated within the SCOUT environment.

Lines in ARCA and DoNaLD have a very different significance

ARCA diagrams are abstract combinatorial graphs:

can trace path of coloured directed edges in an ARCA diagram

cf studying transitions in a finite state machine

- dependency relationships that cross conceptual boundaries

configuration of lines

*Donald*

~> ranked poset as functionally dependent diagram

~> ranked poset as combinatorial diagram *ARCA*

~> path through a Cayley diagram

e.g. map oriented line into coloured combinatorial edge

map sequence of ranks into combinatorial path

handled by "bridging definitions" + an action!

### **T1.2.2. The lines.sdae script**

Idealisation ....

- mathematical idealisation associated with the definitive script  
variables in the definitive script <---> Platonic points & lines  
visualisation is only as accurate

as the computer arithmetic and screen hardware allows

"can observe what we cannot simulate exactly on a computer"  
cf numerical solution of differential equations

### **T1.2.3. Putting rooms into windows: roomviewer.s script**

roomviewer.s illustrates use of Scout

- to say where and how to display (say) a DoNaLD picture  
DoNaLD room appears in 2 windows, differently displayed

In Scout independently specify

- the location and shape of the graphics window
- the portion of a DoNaLD picture to be displayed within it

Can exploit to adapt a window to the size of its contents

- as in the roomviewer.s menu buttons

or to ensure that a picture always stays within a fixed frame

- as in the DoNaLD poset in lines.sdae

- to connect textual annotations with

picture content and other aspects of system state:

monitoring the length of the cable *roomviewer.s*

whether the table obstructs the door

labelling the menu options to reflect status

displaying invariants of line configurations *lines.sdae*

These uses of text reflect different quite modes of interpretation

e.g. warning to designer

message to the user

information to the mathematician

### **The roomviewer.s script (cont)**

- to represent and agent privileges

designer experiments in extending and elaborating scripts  
by adding new definitions or redefining existing variables

can simulate agents with more restricted privileges

## From Visualisation to Animation

definitive script can be used to model agent privileges

to generalise single-agent definitive programming:

shift emphasis from

*identifying agent privileges*

– *what can agent do in principle,*

to *enabling conditions for exercising them*

– *when and how it acts*

In animating, complement Scout with actions in Eden:

- can introduce mouse sensitive regions <-> redefinitions  
e.g. menu buttons in roomviewer.s
- can impose constraints on redefinitions e.g.  
so that cable can't be overextended in roomviewer.s

NB in generalising single-agent programming

traditional sequential programming not a natural special case

No reason why not parallel redefinition

as in "designing VCCS interface whilst simulation is running"

conventions to restrict agents to exercise privileges in set pattern

- don't help us at the initial stages of specification
- obscure the experimental foundation of behaviour

The JUGS program as an illustrative example .....

## Issues discussed by Simon Yung in case study of JUGS

SCOUT: a definitive notation for SScreen layOUT

designed and implemented by Simon Yung

Case study: use of SCOUT for JUGS program prototyping

See tank.s, tank.e and tank.disp.e in ~wmb/public/demo/SCOUT

### 1) context for the JUGS problem

about the problem

- the key parameters
  - capacity and content, emptiness
  - menu status, target
- the agents
  - the interface designer
  - the programmer
  - the pupil
  - the teacher
- privileges of agents
  - redesign the display
  - design algorithms
  - push buttons
  - set problem parameters

### 2) modelling vs exploratory design

modelling: following an existing screen layout?

exploratory design: experimenting with new layouts?

### 3) the Screen Layout Modelling Process

Three stages:

- a) Consider form of the screen display in program execution
  - conceive screen in particular state
- b) Identify the geometric entities and invariant relationships
  - identify what is generic about the display  
e.g. windows always in the same place  
fixed size
  - identify what dimensions / attributes represent  
e.g. reverse video => unavailable option  
number of tildes = quantity of water
- c) Define locations and contents of windows in SCOUT

### 4) Special-purpose nature of the SCOUT notation

The assumptions that underlie SCOUT

The advantages in use of application-oriented notations

### 5) The flexibility offered to the designer by a definitive script

Representing the designer's privileges

Comparison with other paradigms

## 6) Separation of Control and Presentation

control of parameters for JUGS screen not specified in SCOUT  
=> faster program development / parallel development

## 7) Exploratory Screen Layout Development

Screen layout design by prototyping a first approximation  
then iterating by experimentation

Activities performed in exploratory design in JUGS

- adding and deleting items
- relocating display items
- modifying relationships between variables
- testing the design

Easy undo actions

## 8) Flexible arrangement of definitions and views of the design

Different arrangements of definitions conceptually different

OOP perspective

adapt to strategies for design

e.g. conceive regions of display: global layout  
vs window by window development

Possibility of automatic support for this