

## INSIDE DISCRETE-EVENT SIMULATION SOFTWARE: HOW IT WORKS AND WHY IT MATTERS

Thomas J. Schriber

Computer and Information Systems  
The University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1234, U.S.A.

Daniel T. Brunner

Systemflow Simulations, Inc.  
6366 Guilford Avenue, Suite 300  
Indianapolis, IN 46220-1750, U.S.A.

### ABSTRACT

This paper provides simulation practitioners and consumers with a grounding in how discrete-event simulation software works. Topics include discrete-event systems; entities, resources, control elements and operations; simulation runs; entity states; entity lists; and entity-list management. The implementation of these generic ideas in AutoMod and SLX is described. The paper concludes with several examples of “why it matters” for modelers to know how their simulation software works, including coverage of SIMAN, ProModel and GPSS/H as well as the other two tools.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

A “black box” approach is often taken in teaching and learning discrete-event simulation software. The external characteristics of the software are studied, but the foundation on which the software is based is ignored or is touched on only briefly. Choices made in implementation of the foundation might not be studied at all and related to step-by-step model execution. The modeler therefore might not be able to think things through when faced with such needs as developing good approaches for modeling complex situations, using interactive tools to come to a rapid understanding of error conditions arising during model development, and using interactive tools to verify that complex system logic has been captured correctly in a model. The objective of this paper, then, is to describe the logical underpinnings of discrete-event simulation and illustrate this material in terms of various implementations of discrete-event simulation software.

This paper is a revised version of an identically named paper from the 1996 Winter Simulation Conference (Schriber and Brunner 1996). The 1996 paper covered the entity-list management rules and “why it matters” for SIMAN, ProModel, and GPSS/H. An expanded version of

the 1996 material containing figures, flow charts, and additional text is in Schriber and Brunner (1998).

### 1.2 Structure of the Paper

In Sections 2, 3 and 4 we comment on the nature of discrete-event simulation; basic simulation constructs such as entities, resources, control elements, and operations; and model execution. Sections 5 and 6 deal in a general way with entity states and entity management data structures. Section 7 discusses three specific implementations of entity management rules. Section 8 explores “why it matters.”

### 1.3 Terminology and Conventions

Throughout this paper we use terms that we define as well as terms reserved by the developers of particular simulation tools. Terms we define are **boldfaced** on first use. Tool-specific terms are Capitalized or, where appropriate, are spelled out in ALL CAPS.

## 2 ABOUT DISCRETE-EVENT SIMULATION

### 2.1 The Transaction-Flow World View

The “transaction-flow world view” often provides the basis for discrete-event simulation. In the transaction-flow world view, a system is visualized as consisting of discrete units of traffic that move (“flow”) from point to point in the system while competing with each other for the use of scarce resources. The units of traffic are sometimes called “transactions,” giving rise to the phrase “transaction flow.”

Numerous systems fit the preceding description. Included are many manufacturing, material handling, transportation, health care, civil, natural resource, communication, defense, and information processing systems, and queuing systems in general.

## 2.2 The Nature of Discrete-Event Simulation

A discrete-event simulation is one in which the state of a model changes at only a discrete, but possibly random, set of simulated time points. Two or more traffic units often have to be manipulated at one and the same time point. Such “simultaneous” movement of traffic at a time point is achieved by manipulating units of traffic *serially* at that time point. This often leads to logical complexities in discrete-event simulation because it raises questions about the *order* in which two or more units of traffic are to be manipulated at one time point.

## 2.3 Discrete-Event Modeling Languages

The challenges faced by a *modeler* escalate for the *designer* of a modeling language. The designer must take the logical requirements of discrete-event simulation into account in a generalized way. Choices and tradeoffs exist. As a result, although discrete-event simulation languages are similar in broad terms, they can and typically do differ in subtle but important particulars.

## 3 ENTITIES, RESOURCES, CONTROL ELEMENTS, AND OPERATIONS

The term **entity** is used here to designate a unit of traffic (a “transaction”). Entities instigate and respond to **events**. An event is a happening that changes the state of a model (or system). In a model of an order-filling system, for example, the arrival of an order, which is an event, might be simulated by bringing an entity into the model.

There are two possible types of entities, here referred to as **external entities** and **internal entities**. External entities are those whose creation and movement is explicitly arranged for by the modeler. In contrast, internal entities are created and manipulated implicitly by the simulation software itself. For example, internal entities might be used in some languages to simulate machine *failures*, whereas external entities might be used to simulate the *use* of machines.

The term **resource** designates a system element that provides service (such as a drill, an automated guided vehicle, or space in an input buffer). The users of resources are usually entities. (A work-in-process entity claims space in an input buffer, then captures an automated guided vehicle to move it to the input buffer.) Resources are usually capacity-limited, so entities compete for their use and sometimes must wait to use them, experiencing delay as a result.

The term **control element** designates a construct that supports other delays or logical alternatives based on a system’s state. Control elements can take the form of switches, counters, user data values, and system data

values built into the modeling tool. Complex control may rely on truth-valued expressions that use arithmetic and/or Boolean combinations of control elements.

An **operation** is a step carried out by or on an entity while it moves through a system. The operations applicable to a ship at a harbor might be these: arrive; capture a berth; capture a tugboat; get pulled into the berth; free the tugboat; load cargo; etc.

## 4 OVERVIEW OF MODEL EXECUTION

### 4.1 Experiments, Replications, and Runs

A simulation project is composed of **experiments**. Experiments are differentiated by the use of alternatives in a model’s logic and/or data. An alternate part sequencing rule might be tried, for example, or the quantity of various machines might be varied.

Each experiment consists of one or more **replications** (trials). A replication is a simulation that uses the experiment’s model logic and data but a different set of random numbers, and so produces different statistical results that can then be analyzed across a set of replications.

A replication involves initializing the model, running it until a run-ending condition is met, and reporting results. This “running it” phase is called a **run**.

### 4.2 Inside a Run

During a run the simulation **clock** (an internally managed, stored data value) tracks the passage of *simulated* time (as distinct from *wall-clock* time). The clock advances in discrete steps (typically of unequal size) during the run. After all possible actions have been taken at a given simulated time, the clock is advanced to the time of the next earliest event. Then the appropriate actions are carried out at this new simulated time, etc.

The execution of a run thus takes the form of a two-phase loop: “carry out all possible actions at the current simulated time,” followed by “advance the simulated clock,” repeated over and over again until a run-ending condition comes about. The two phases are here respectively called the **Entity Movement Phase** (EMP) and the **Clock Update Phase** (CUP).

## 5 ENTITY STATES

Entities migrate from state to state while they work their way through a model. An entity is always in one of five alternative states, as detailed below.

## 5.1 The Active State

The **Active State** is the state of the currently moving entity. Only one entity moves at any instant of *wall-clock* time. This entity progresses through its operations nonstop until it encounters a delay. It then migrates to an alternative state. Some other entity then becomes the next active entity. And so on.

## 5.2 The Ready State

During an Entity Movement Phase there may be *more than one* entity ready to move, and yet entities can only move (be in the Active State) one-by-one. The **Ready State** is the state of entities waiting to enter the Active State during the current Entity Movement Phase.

## 5.3 The Time-Delayed State

The **Time-Delayed State** is the state of entities waiting for a *known* future simulated time to be reached so that they can then (re)enter the Ready State. A “part” entity is in a Time-Delayed State, for example, while waiting for the future simulated time at which an operation being performed on it by a machine will come to an end.

## 5.4 The Condition-Delayed State

The **Condition-Delayed State** is the state of entities delayed until some specified condition comes about, e.g., a “part” entity might wait in the Condition-Delayed State until its turn comes to use a machine. Condition-Delayed entities are removed *automatically* from the Condition-Delayed state when conditions permit.

## 5.5 The Dormant State

Sometimes it is desirable to put entities into a state from which no escape will be triggered automatically by changes in model conditions. We call this state the **Dormant State**. Dormant-State entities rely on modeler-supplied logic to transfer them from the Dormant State back to the Ready State. Job-ticket entities might be put into a Dormant State, for example, until an operator entity decides which job-ticket to pull next.

## 6 ENTITY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES

Simulation software uses the following lists to organize and track entities in the five entity states.

## 6.1 The Active Entity

The active entity forms an unnamed “list” consisting only of the active entity. The Active-State entity moves nonstop until encountering an operation that puts it into another state (transfers it to another list) or removes it from the model. A Ready-State entity then becomes the next Active-State entity. Eventually there is no possibility of further action at the current time. The EMP then ends and a Clock Update Phase begins.

## 6.2 The Current Events List

Entities in the Ready State are kept in a single list here called the **current events list** (CEL). Entities migrate to the current events list from the future events list, from delay lists, and from user-managed lists. (Each of these latter lists is described below). In addition, entities cloned from the Active-State entity usually start their existence on the current events list.

## 6.3 The Future Events List

Entities in the Time-Delayed State belong to a single list into which they are inserted at the beginning of their time-based delay. This list, called the **future events list** (FEL) here, is usually ranked by increasing entity **move time**. (Move time is the simulated time at which an entity is scheduled to try to move again.) At the time of entity insertion into the FEL, the entity’s move time is calculated by adding the value of the simulation clock to the known (sampled) duration of the time-based delay.

After an Entity Movement Phase is over, the Clock Update Phase sets the clock’s value to the move time of the FEL’s highest ranked (smallest move time) entity. This entity is then transferred from the FEL to the CEL, migrating from the Time-Delayed State to the Ready State and setting the stage for the next EMP to begin.

The preceding statement assumes there are not *other* entities on the FEL whose move time matches the clock’s updated value. In the case of move-time ties, some tools will transfer all the time-tied entities from the FEL to the CEL during a single CUP, whereas other tools take a “one entity transfer per CUP” approach.

Languages that work with internal entities usually use the FEL to support the timing requirements of these entities. The FEL is typically composed both of external and internal entities in such languages.

## 6.4 Delay Lists

**Delay lists** are lists of entities in the Condition-Delayed State. These entities are waiting for a condition to come about (e.g., waiting their turn to use a machine) so they can

be transferred automatically into the Ready State on the current events list. Delay lists, which are generally created automatically by the simulation software, are managed by using **related waiting** or **polled waiting**.

If a delay can be related easily to events in the model that might resolve the condition, then related waiting can be used to manage the delay list. For example, suppose a machine's status changes from busy to idle. In response, the software can automatically remove the next machine-using entity from the appropriate delay list and put it in the Ready State on the current events list. Related waiting is the prevalent approach used to manage conditional delays.

If the delay condition is too complex to be related easily to events that might resolve it, polled waiting can be used. With polled waiting the software checks routinely to see if entities can be transferred from one or more delay lists to the Ready State. Complex delay conditions for which polled waiting can be useful include Boolean combinations of state changes, e.g., a part supply runs low or an output bin needs to be emptied.

## 6.5 User-Managed Lists

**User-managed lists** are lists of entities in the Dormant State. The modeler must take steps to establish such lists and provide the logic needed to transfer entities to and from the lists. (The underlying software has no way to know why entities are put into user-managed lists and so has no basis for removing entities from such lists.)

## 7 IMPLEMENTATION IN TWO TOOLS

The tools chosen for commentary on implementation particulars are AutoMod, Version 8, from AutoSimulations, Inc., and SLX, Release 1, from Wolverine Software Corporation. (See the References.) A previous version of this paper (Schriber and Brunner 1996) covered Systems Modeling Corporation's SIMAN, ProModel Corporation's ProModel, and Wolverine Software Corporation's GPSS/H in similar detail. These five are among more than *forty* tools reported in 1997 for discrete-event simulation (Swain 1997). Some other tools might be better suited than any of these for particular modeling activities, but we think that these tools are representative. (Those interested in the possibility of implementing discrete-event simulation models in a non-simulation programming language such as C or C++ are referred to Balci 1988.)

### 7.1 AutoMod

AutoMod equivalents for the preceding generic terms are given in Table 1. For example, AutoMod uses *Actions* to specify operations for *Loads*.

Table 1: AutoMod Terminology

Generic Term	AutoMod Equivalent
External Entity	Load
Internal Entity	Logical Load
Resource	Resource; Queue; Block
Control Element	Counter; Process Traffic Limit
Operation	Action
Current Events List	Current Event List
Future Events List	Future Event List
Delay List	Delay List; Condition Delay List; Load Ready List
User-Managed List	Order List

#### 7.1.1 The Current Event List

The current events list is named the Current Event List in AutoMod. Cloned Loads, Loads leaving the Future Event List due to a clock update, and Loads ordered off Order Lists are placed immediately on the CEL. The insertion rule is to rank by priority and then FIFO within the priority class.

When the CEL becomes empty, the Condition Delay List (see below) is checked, and Loads may be transferred from there to the CEL. This continues until the CEL is empty and no more Loads can be transferred, at which point the EMP is over and a CUP is initiated.

#### 7.1.2 The Future Event List

The AutoMod Future Event List (FEL) is like future events lists in other tools. Loads arrive on the FEL in the Time-Delayed State by executing a WAIT FOR statement. AutoMod allows the specification of time units (day, hr, min, sec) in a WAIT FOR statement.

The AutoMod CUP will remove multiple Transactions from the FEL if they are tied for the earliest move time, inserting them one by one into their appropriate place on the CEL.

There are also internal entities in AutoMod, called Logical Loads, that do things such as wait on the FEL to trigger scheduled shift breaks.

#### 7.1.3 Delay Lists

Delay Lists (DL) are lists of loads waiting to claim capacity of a finite capacity element (a resource or control element such as an individual Resource, Queue, Block, Counter, or Process). Each finite capacity element within the model has one DL associated with it.

The waiting that results from this mechanism is related waiting. Whenever capacity is freed, one Load from the head of the element's DL gets tentatively placed on the

CEL (but a placeholder is left on the DL). When that Load is encountered during the EMP, it tries to claim the requested capacity. If it fails (for example because it wants two units but only one is free), it is returned to the DL in its original place.

Immediately after this evaluation (and before the active Load executes any more Actions), if there is still any capacity, the *next* Load on the DL is placed on the CEL. Processing of the active Load then continues. After each time a tentatively placed Load is evaluated during the EMP, the existence of available capacity will cause another Load to be removed from the DL.

### 7.1.4 The Condition Delay List

For conditional waiting other than the five cases enumerated above, AutoMod has a WAIT UNTIL statement that results in polled waiting. WAIT UNTIL conditions can be compounded using Boolean operators. If a Load executes a WAIT UNTIL and the condition is false, the Load is placed on a single global AutoMod list called the Condition Delay List (CDL).

After the CEL has been emptied, but before the simulation clock progresses, *all* loads on the CDL are moved to the CEL *if* there has been a state change to at least one element of the same general type (e.g. Queue) that *any* Load on the CDL is waiting for. (This mechanism is primarily polled although the global triggering mechanism is related.)

If the CEL is now non-empty then the EMP resumes. If the condition that a CEL Load is waiting for is false, AutoMod moves that Load from the Current Event List back to the CDL. The CDL may get emptied multiple times during one EMP until eventually the CEL gets emptied without having triggered a state change related to any Load on the CDL. A CUP then occurs.

Because of the potential for repetitive list migration when using WAIT UNTIL, AutoMod’s vendor encourages users to use Order Lists or other explicit control mechanisms to manage complex waiting.

### 7.1.5 Order Lists

AutoMod implements the Dormant State with Order Lists, which are user-managed lists of Loads. After a Load puts itself onto an Order List (by executing a WAIT TO BE ORDERED Action), it can only be removed by another Load (which executes an ORDER Action). Loads successfully ordered are placed immediately on the CEL (one at a time according to how they were chosen from the Order List, and ranked on the CEL FIFO by priority).

Order Lists can achieve performance improvements over CDL waiting because Order Lists are never scanned except on explicit request.

AutoMod Order Lists offer several interesting wrinkles including the ability for an ordering Load to place a back order if the ORDER action is not satisfied, the ability for a Load on an Order List to be ordered to *continue* (to the next Action) instead of to a Process (this feature is useful for control handshaking), and the ability to have a function called for each Load on the Order List (by using the ORDER...SATISFYING Action).

### 7.1.6 Other Lists

AutoMod has a number of material handling constructs that are integrated with Load movement. For vehicle systems there are three other types of lists. Loads on Load Ready Lists (LRL) (one list per vehicle system) are waiting to be picked up by a vehicle. Loads claimed and picked up by a vehicle reside on the vehicle’s Vehicle Claim List (VCL) and Vehicle Onboard List (VOL) respectively, during which time, the vehicle becomes the active “load” and moves among AutoMod’s lists (FEL, CEL, and possibly DLs) instead of the Load.

## 7.2 SLX

SLX is a hierarchical language in which the built-in primitives are at a lower level than most simulation languages, facilitating user (or developer) definition of the behavior of many system elements. This philosophy allows the SLX developer to create higher-level modeling tools whose constructs have precisely defined yet modifiable behavior.

Equivalents for the generic terms for users of low-level SLX are given in Table 2. For example, SLX uses *Control Variables* to act as Control Elements. The “control” modifier can be attached to a global or local Variable of any data type (integer, real, string, etc.). (A local Variable is analogous to an attribute in other tools.)

Note that SLX has two types of Objects: Active and Passive. An Active Object is distinguished from a Passive Object by the presence of actions – executable Statements – in an Active Object’s Class definition.

Table 2: SLX Terminology (low-level)

Generic Term	SLX Equivalent
External Entity	Active Object and its Puck(s)
Internal Entity	none
Resource	Control Variable
Control Element	Control Variable
Operation	Statement
Current Events List	Current Events Chain
Future Events List	Future Events List
Delay List	Delay List
User-Managed List	Set (see section 7.2.4)

Table 3 shows how higher-level tools based on SLX might exploit the definitional capabilities of SLX.

Table 3: Tools Based On SLX

Generic Term	SLX Equivalent
Resource	Active or Passive Object
Control Element	Active or Passive Object
Operation	User-defined Statement
Delay List	User-defined based on Set
User-Managed List	User-defined based on Set

### 7.2.1 The Current Events Chain

The current events list is named the Current Events Chain (CEC) in SLX. The members of the CEC are called Pucks.

What is a Puck? SLX dissociates the concept of an Active Object (with its associated local data) from a Puck, which is the “moving entity” that executes the actions, carries its own entity scheduling data, and migrates from list to list. The effect of this dissociation is that a single Object can “own” more than one Puck. All Pucks owned by a single Object share the Object’s local data (attributes). One application of this “local parallelism” feature is the use of a second Puck to simulate a balk time while the original Puck is waiting for some condition (Henriksen 1997).

Activating a new Object creates one Puck and launches that Puck into the actions. In many cases no additional Pucks are ever created, and the combination of an Active Object and its Puck forms the equivalent to an entity in the terminology of this paper. (Passive Objects have no actions and therefore own no Pucks.)

Newly activated Pucks, Pucks leaving the Future Event List due to a clock update, and reactivated Pucks (see 7.2.4 below) are placed immediately into the CEC. The CEC is ranked FIFO by priority. The SLX CEC is empty when an EMP ends.

### 7.2.2 The Future Events List

The SLX Future Events List (FEL) is like future events lists in other tools. Loads arrive on the FEL in the Time-Delayed State by executing an ADVANCE statement.

The SLX CUP will remove multiple Pucks from the FEL if they are tied for the earliest move time, inserting them one by one into their appropriate place on the CEC.

Because the low-level primitives in SLX do not include downtimes or even repetitive Puck generation, all activity on the SLX FEL unfolds as specified by the developer of the SLX model. However, if a user is using a model (or a model builder) that contains higher-level primitives defined by a developer, chances are that all kinds of things are going on behind the scenes, hidden from the higher-level user’s view.

### 7.2.3 Delay Lists

Delay Lists (DL) are lists of Pucks waiting (through WAIT UNTIL) for state changes in any combination of Control Variables and the simulation clock value. All higher-level constructs defined by developers can use this mechanism. Each Control Variable (which may be a local Variable, in which case there is one for each Object in the Class) has a separate DL associated with it.

A DL is ranked by order of insertion. The entire contents of a DL are removed whenever the associated Control Variable changes value and are inserted one at a time into the CEC. Removed Pucks that are waiting on compound conditions are removed from each other Delay List to which they belong. As these entities are encountered on the CEC during the EMP, those failing to pass their WAIT UNTIL are returned to the Delay List(s) for those Control Variables still contributing to the falseness of the condition.

For conditions that include a reference to the clock, the Puck is inserted if necessary into the FEL, subject to early removal from the FEL if the condition becomes true do to other Control Variable changes.

This low-level related waiting mechanism based on Control Variables is the default SLX approach to modeling all types of simple or compound Condition-Delayed states.

### 7.2.4 Sets and User-Managed Waiting

SLX handles the Dormant State in a unique way. Instead of moving the Puck from the active state to a user-managed list and suspending it, all in the same operation, SLX breaks this operation into two pieces.

First, the Puck should join a Set. But joining a Set does not automatically suspend the Puck. A Puck can belong to any number of Sets. Set membership merely provides other Pucks with access to the member Puck.

To go into the Dormant state, a Puck executes a WAIT statement. It then is suspended indefinitely, outside of any particular list, until another Puck identifies the waiting Puck and executes a REACTIVATE statement on it. Often the REACTIVATING Puck is scanning a Set to find the Puck to REACTIVATE, but a Set is not exactly the same as a user-managed list in our terminology. A Dormant-state Puck might be a member of no Sets (as long as a pointer to it has been stashed somewhere) or of one or more Sets.

An SLX developer can easily define a user-managed list construct, using Sets, WAIT, and REACTIVATE as building blocks, that mimics those of other languages or offer unique features of its own.

## 8 WHY IT MATTERS

### 8.1 Overview

We now describe five situations that reveal some of the practical differences in implementation particulars among SIMAN, ProModel, GPSS/H, AutoMod, and SLX. These differences reflect differing implementation choices made by the software designers.

None of the alternative approaches mentioned in each subsection is either intrinsically “right” or “wrong.” The modeler simply must be aware of the alternative in effect in the simulation software being used and work with it to produce the desired outcome. (If a modeler is unaware of the alternative in effect, it is possible to mis-model a situation and perhaps not become aware of this fact.)

We finish the “why it matters” discussion with some comments on how knowledge of software internals is needed to make effective use of software checkout tools.

### 8.2 Trying to Re-capture a Resource Immediately

Suppose a part releases a machine, then immediately attempts to re-capture the machine. The modeler might – or might not – want a more highly qualified waiting part, if any, be the next to capture the machine.

Of interest here is the order of events following the giving up of a server. There are at least three alternatives: (1) Coupled with the giving up of the server is the *immediate* choosing of the next user of the server, without the releasing entity having yet become a contender for the server. (2) The choosing of the next user of the server is *deferred* until the releasing entity has become a contender. (3) “Neither of the above;” that is, without paying heed to other contenders, the releasing entity recaptures the server immediately.

SIMAN implements (1) by default. ProModel implements (2). GPSS/H and AutoMod implement (3) by default. In SLX, using a low-level Control Variable as the resource state, the result is also (3). (However developers could implement higher-level resource constructs in SLX that behave in any of the three ways.)

### 8.3 The First in Line is Still Delayed

Suppose two Condition-Delayed entities are waiting in a list because no units of a particular resource are idle. Suppose the first entity needs *two* units of the resource, whereas the second entity only needs *one* unit. Now assume that one unit of the resource becomes idle. The needs of the first list entity cannot yet be satisfied, but the needs of the second entity can. What will happen?

There are at least three possible alternatives: (1) Neither entity claims the idle resource unit. (2) The first

entity claims the one idle resource unit and waits for a second unit. (3) The second entity claims the idle resource unit and goes on its way.

As in Section 8.2, each of these alternatives comes into play in the tools considered here. SIMAN (SEIZE) and ProModel (GET or USE) implement (1) and (2) respectively by default. AutoMod (GET or USE), GPSS/H (ENTER or TEST), and SLX (WAIT UNTIL on a Control Variable) implement (3) by default.

### 8.4 Yielding Control

Suppose the active entity wants to give control to one or more Ready-State entities, but then needs to become the active entity again before the simulation clock has been advanced. This might be useful, for example, if the active entity has opened a switch permitting a set of other entities to move past a point in the model, and then needs to re-close the switch after the forward movement has been accomplished. (Perhaps a group of identically-flavored cartons of ice cream is to be transferred from an accumulation point to a conveyor leading to a one-flavor-per-box packing operation.)

In SIMAN and AutoMod, the effect can be accomplished approximately with a DELAY (SIMAN) or WAIT FOR (AutoMod) that puts the active entity into a Time-Delayed State for an arbitrarily short but non-zero simulated time.

In ProModel, “WAIT 0” can be used to put the active entity back on the FEL. It will be returned later (at the same simulated time) by the CUP to the Active State.

In GPSS/H, the active Transaction (“Xact”) can execute a YIELD (BUFFER) Block to shift from the Active State to the Ready State and restart the CEC scan. Higher-priority (and higher-ranked same priority) Xacts on the CEC can then try to become active, one by one, before the control-yielding Xact itself again becomes active at the same simulated time. (A “PRIORITY PR,YIELD” Block can alternatively be used in order to reposition the just-active Xact behind equal-priority Xacts on the CEC prior to restarting the scan.)

In SLX there is also a YIELD statement. A normal YIELD shifts the active Puck to the back of its priority class on the CEC and picks up the next Puck. It is also possible to YIELD to a specific other Puck that is on the CEC, in which case the active Puck is not shifted.

### 8.5 Conditions Involving the Clock

If an entity needs to wait until a particular clock value has been reached, every language has a time-delay for FEL waiting. But what if an entity needs to wait for a compound condition involving the clock, such as “wait until my input buffer is empty or it is exactly 5:00 PM?”

A typical approach to this is to clone a dummy (“shadow”) entity to do the time-based waiting. Management of dummy entities can be cumbersome, particularly for very complex rules. ProModel has no polled waiting, so a dummy entity would be required.

If a single entity tries to wait on a compound condition involving the clock, other problems can arise. SIMAN and AutoMod detect the truth of these conditions through their end-of-EMP polling mechanisms. GPSS/H also detects the truth through its version of polled waiting (refusal-mode TEST). But in the absence of a clone that waits on the FEL until exactly 5:00 PM, all three of those tools are subject to the possibility that the first EMP that finds the condition true has a clock value *greater* than 5:00 PM.

SLX recognizes the clock as a related wait-until target. A WAIT UNTIL using a future clock value in a way that contributes to the falseness of the condition will cause the Puck to be scheduled onto the FEL to force an EMP at the precise time referenced. This solves the greater-than-the-desired-time problem. Note that this Puck may also be waiting on one or more delay lists.

## 8.6 Mixed-Mode Waiting

Suppose many entities are waiting to capture a particular resource, while a user-defined controller entity is waiting for the condition “shift status is off-shift and number waiting is less than six and resource is not currently in use” to take some action (such as shutting the resource down, in languages that allow user-defined entities to shut down resources, or printing a status message). How can we guarantee that the controller will be able to cut in front of the waiting entities at the appropriate instant (before the resource is recaptured)?

One way to handle this would be through entity priorities, in languages that offer this mechanism. However, as described below, that may not work even if the controller has higher priority than any other entity.

The key issue is the method used to implement the waiting. If it is related for the entities and polled for the compound condition, things can get complicated. (This is what we mean by the term “mixed-mode waiting.”) Every time the resource comes free, a new entity will be selected from a delay list immediately in SIMAN and via the CEL in AutoMod, in both cases preceding the end-of-EMP checking for polled wait conditions (and thereby ignoring the entity priority of the controller). There are many ways to work around this if desired, such as using a different type of operation to force a polled wait for entities wishing to use the resource.

In GPSS/H, using a high-priority controller Transaction at a refusal-mode TEST Block, the controller waits at the front of the CEC. The RELEASE of the Facility will trigger a scan restart and the controller will do its job.

In ProModel there is no polled waiting but there can be related waiting on compound conditions involving Variables. Variables would have to be defined and manipulated for each element of the Boolean condition and, to assure equal competition, the entities might also have to use WAIT UNTIL instead of GET or USE. Another possibility with ProModel would be to have the entity that frees the resource do some state-checking right away (in effect becoming a surrogate for the controller). This is possible because of the deferred-selection method used by ProModel (see Section 8.2).

In the related waiting of SLX, a Puck awaiting a compound condition will be registered on the delay lists of those (and only those) Control Variables that are contributing to the falseness of the condition at the time it is evaluated. The SLX architecture (in which only global or local Control Variables and the clock can be referenced in any sort of conditional wait at the lowest level) assures that there will already be Variables underlying the state changes being monitored. The model developer needs only to be sure they are defined as Control Variables.

## 8.7 Interactive Model Verification

We now comment briefly on why a detailed understanding of “how simulation software works” supports interactive probing of simulation-model behavior.

In general, simulation models can be run interactively or in batch mode. Interactive runs are of use in checking out (verifying) model logic during model-building and in troubleshooting a model when execution errors occur. Batch mode is then used to make production runs.

Interactive runs put a magnifying glass on a simulation model while it executes. The modeler can follow the active entity step by step and display the current and future events lists and the delay and user-managed lists as well as other aspects of the model. These activities yield valuable insights into model behavior for the modeler who knows the underlying concepts. Without such knowledge, the modeler might not take full advantage of the interactive tools provided by the software or, worse yet, might even avoid using the tools.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Much of the information in this paper was derived from conversations with software-vendor personnel. The authors gratefully acknowledge the support provided by David T. Sturrock, Deborah A. Sadowski, C. Dennis Pegden and Vivek Bapat, all of Systems Modeling Corporation; Charles Harrell of ProModel Corporation; Kenneth Farnsworth and Tyler Phillips, of AutoSimulations, Inc.; and Robert C. Crain and James O. Henriksen, of Wolverine Software Corporation.



## REFERENCES

- Balci, O. 1988. The implementation of four conceptual frameworks for simulation modeling in high-level languages. In *Proceedings of the 1988 Winter Simulation Conference*, ed. M. Abrams, P. Haigh, and J. Comfort, 287-295. La Jolla, California: Society for Computer Simulation.
- Crain, R. C. 1997. Simulation using GPSS/H. In *Proceedings of the 1997 Winter Simulation Conference*, ed. S. Andradóttir, K. Healy, D. Withers, and B. Nelson, 576-573. Piscataway, New Jersey: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers.
- Henriksen, J. O. 1997. An introduction to SLX. In *Proceedings of the 1997 Winter Simulation Conference*, ed. S. Andradóttir, K. Healy, D. Withers, and B. Nelson, 559-566. Piscataway, New Jersey: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers.
- Henriksen, J. O., and R. C. Crain. 1998. *GPSS/H Reference Manual*, 4th Edition. Annandale, Virginia: Wolverine Software Corporation.
- Pegden, C. D., R. E. Shannon, and R. P. Sadowski. 1995. *Introduction to Simulation Using SIMAN*, Second Edition. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Phillips, T. 1997. Know your AutoMod current events. In *AutoFlash* newsletter, July 1997, Volume 10, Number 7. Bountiful, Utah: AutoSimulations, Inc.
- ProModel Corporation. 1995. *ProModel Version 3 User's Guide*. Orem, Utah: ProModel Corporation.
- Schriber, T. J. 1991. *An Introduction to Simulation Using GPSS/H*. New York, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schriber, T. J., and D. T. Brunner. 1996. Inside simulation software: How it works and why it matters. In *Proceedings of the 1996 Winter Simulation Conference*, ed. J. Charnes, D. Morrice, D. Brunner, and J. Swain, 23-30. Piscataway, New Jersey: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers.
- Schriber, T. J. and D. T. Brunner. 1998. How Discrete-Event Simulation Software Works. Chapter 24 in *Handbook of Simulation: Principles, Methodology, Advances, Applications, and Practice*, ed. J. Banks. New York, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Swain, J. J. 1997. Simulation Software Survey: Simulation Goes Mainstream. *OR/MS Today*, October '97, 35-46, Baltimore, Maryland: INFORMS.
- Wolverine Software Corporation. 1996. *SLX: An introduction for GPSS/H users*. Annandale, Virginia: Wolverine Software Corporation.
- computer systems, and mining. He received a B.S.E.E. from Purdue University and an MBA from The University of Michigan. He has served as the Winter Simulation Conference Publicity Chair (1988), Business Chair (1992), General Chair (1996), and Transportation Applications Track Coordinator (1998). He is a member of IIE and SCS.

**THOMAS J. SCHRIBER** is a Professor of Computer and Information Systems at The University of Michigan. He is a Fellow of the Institute of Decision Sciences and is the 1996 recipient of the INFORMS College of Simulation Distinguished Service Award. He teaches modeling and decision analysis and discrete-event simulation in Michigan's MBA program. He is a member of ASIM (the German-language simulation society), DSI, IIE, and INFORMS.

## AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

**DANIEL T. BRUNNER** is President of Systemflow Simulations, Inc., a services firm active in manufacturing, material handling, distribution, transportation, health care,