

Probabilistic Analysis of Weakly-Hard Real-Time Systems

Eun-Young Kang¹² and Dongrui Mu² and Li Huang²

¹University of Namur, Belgium

²School of Data & Computer Science, Sun Yat-Sen University, China

eykang@fundp.ac.be

{mudr, huangl223}@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Modeling and analysis of non-functional properties, such as timing constraints, is crucial in automotive real-time embedded systems. EAST-ADL is a domain specific architectural language dedicated to safety-critical automotive embedded system design. We have previously specified EAST-ADL timing constraints in Clock Constraint Specification Language (CCSL) and proved the correctness of specification by mapping the semantics of the constraints into UPPAAL models amenable to model checking. In most cases, a bounded number of violations of timing constraints in automotive systems would not lead to system failures when the results of the violations are negligible, called Weakly-Hard (WH). Previous work is extended in this paper by including support for probabilistic analysis of timing constraints in the context of WH: Probabilistic extension of CCSL, called PrCCSL, is defined and the EAST-ADL timing constraints with stochastic properties are specified in PrCCSL. The semantics of the extended constraints in PrCCSL is translated into UPPAAL-SMC models for formal verification. Furthermore, a set of mapping rules is proposed to facilitate guarantee of translation. Our approach is demonstrated on an autonomous traffic sign recognition vehicle case study.

Keywords: EAST-ADL, UPPAAL-SMC, Probabilistic CCSL, Weakly-Hard System, Statistical Model Checking

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	preliminary	3
3	Running Example: Traffic Sign Recognition Vehicle	5
4	Probabilistic Extension of <i>Relation</i> in CCSL	10
5	Specification of Timing Constraints in PrCCSL	14
6	Translating CCSL & PrCCSL into UPPAAL-SMC	21
6.1	Mapping CCSL to UPPAAL-SMC	21
6.2	Representation of PrCCSL in UPPAAL-SMC	24
7	Modeling the Behaviors of AV and its Environment in UPPAAL-SMC	28
8	Experiments: Verification & Validation	34
9	Related work	38
10	Conclusion	39
	References	40

List of Figures

3.1	AV in EAST-ADL augmented with TADL2 constraints (R. IDs) specified in PrCCSL (Spec. R. IDs)	6
4.1	Example of a Run	10
6.1	UPPAAL-SMC model of clock tick and history	21
6.2	STA of CCSL <i>expressions</i>	22
6.3	Observer STA of Subclock and Coincidence	26
7.1	STAs of f_p s in Environment f_t	29
7.2	Modeling system behaviors in UPPAAL-SMC	30
7.3	Periodically triggered ports speed and obstacle	31
7.4	Internal behaviours of Controller in UPPAAL-SMC	31
7.5	Representation of substates of Normal state in UPPAAL-SMC . .	32
7.6	STAs utilized to verify R3	33
8.1	Simulation Result of R13	36
8.2	Frequency Histogram of End-to-End timing constraint (R17) . .	37
8.3	Performance analysis of verifying R5 with <i>Expected Value</i> and <i>Simulation</i> . The number of runs ranges from 100 to 500 with increment as 100.	37

Chapter 1

Introduction

Model-driven development is rigorously applied in automotive systems in which the software controllers interact with physical environments. The continuous time behaviors (evolved with various energy rates) of those systems often rely on complex dynamics as well as on stochastic behaviors. Formal verification and validation (V&V) technologies are indispensable and highly recommended for development of safe and reliable automotive systems [3,4]. Conventional V&V, i.e., testing and model checking have limitations in terms of assessing the reliability of hybrid systems due to both the stochastic and non-linear dynamical features. To ensure the reliability of safety critical hybrid dynamic systems, *statistical model checking (SMC)* techniques have been proposed [11, 12, 24]. These techniques for fully stochastic models validate probabilistic performance properties of given deterministic (or stochastic) controllers in given stochastic environments.

Conventional formal analysis of timing models addresses worst case designs, typically used for hard deadlines in safety critical systems, however, there is great incentive to include “less-than-worst-case” designs to improve efficiency but without affecting the quality of timing analysis in the systems. The challenge is the definition of suitable model semantics that provide reliable predictions of *system timing*, given the timing of individual components and their compositions. While the standard worst case models are well understood in this respect, the behavior and the expressiveness of “less-than-worst-case” models is far less investigated. In most cases, a bounded number of violations of timing constraints in systems would not lead to system failures when the results of the violations are negligible, called Weakly-Hard (WH) [8, 28]. In this paper, we propose a formal probabilistic modeling and analysis technique by extending the known concept of WH constraints to what is called “typical” worst case model and analysis.

EAST-ADL (Electronics Architecture and Software Technology - Architecture Description Language) [5, 14], aligned with AUTOSAR (Automotive Open System Architecture) standard [1], is a concrete example of the MBD approach for the architectural modeling of safety-critical automotive embedded systems. A system in EAST-ADL is described by **Functional Architectures (FA)** at different abstraction levels. The FA are composed of a number of interconnected

function prototypes (f_p), and the f_p s have ports and connectors for communication. EAST-ADL relies on external tools for the analysis of specifications related to requirements. For example, behavioral description in EAST-ADL is captured in external tools, i.e., SIMULINK/STATEFLOW [31]. The latest release of EAST-ADL has adopted the time model proposed in the Timing Augmented Description Language (TADL2) [9]. TADL2 expresses and composes the basic timing constraints, i.e., repetition rates, End-to-End delays, and synchronization constraints. The time model of TADL2 specializes the time model of MARTE, the UML profile for Modeling and Analysis of Real-Time and Embedded systems [29]. MARTE provides CCSL, a time model and a Clock Constraint Specification Language, that supports specification of both logical and dense timing constraints for MARTE models, as well as functional causality constraints [26].

We have previously specified non-functional properties (timing and energy constraints) of automotive systems specified in EAST-ADL and MARTE/CCSL, and proved the correctness of specification by mapping the semantics of the constraints into UPPAAL models for model checking [22]. Previous work is extended in this paper by including support for probabilistic analysis of timing constraints of automotive systems in the context WH: 1. Probabilistic extension of CCSL, called PrCCSL, is defined and the EAST-ADL/TADL2 timing constraints with stochastic properties are specified in PrCCSL; 2. The semantics of the extended constraints in PrCCSL is translated into verifiable UPPAAL-SMC [2] models for formal verification; 3. A set of mapping rules is proposed to facilitate guarantee of translation. Our approach is demonstrated on an autonomous traffic sign recognition vehicle (AV) case study.

The paper is organized as follows: Chapter 2 presents an overview of CCSL and UPPAAL-SMC. The AV is introduced as a running example in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 presents the formal definition of PrCCSL. The timing constraints that are applied on top of AV are specified using CCSL in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 describes a set of translation patterns from CCSL/PrCCSL to UPPAAL-SMC models and how our approaches provide support for formal analysis at the design level. The behaviours of AV system and the stochastic behaviours of the environments are represented as a network of Stochastic Timed Automata presented in Chapter 7. The applicability of our method is demonstrated by performing verification on the AV case study in Chapter 8. Chapter 9 and Chapter 10 present related work and the conclusion.

Chapter 2

preliminary

In our framework, we consider a subset of CCSL and its extension with stochastic properties that is sufficient to specify EAST-ADL timing constraints in the context of WH. Formal Modeling and V&V of the EAST-ADL timing constraints specified in CCSL are performed using UPPAAL-SMC.

Clock Constraint Specification Language (CCSL) [6, 26] is a UML profile for modeling and analysis of real-time systems (MARTE) [7, 25]. In CCSL, a clock represents a sequence of (possibly infinite) instants. An event is a clock and the occurrences of an event correspond to a set of ticks of the clock. CCSL provides a set of clock constraints that specifies evolution of clocks' ticks. The physical time is represented by a dense clock with a base unit. A dense clock can be discretized into a discrete/logical clock. *idealClock* is a predefined dense clock whose unit is second. We define a universal clock *ms* based on *idealClock*: $ms = idealClock \text{ discretizedBy } 0.001$. *ms* representing a periodic clock that ticks every 1 millisecond in this paper. A step is a tick of the universal clock. Hence the length of one step is 1 millisecond.

CCSL provides two types of clock constraints, *relation* and *expression*: A *relation* limits the occurrences among different events/clocks. Let C be a set of clocks, $c1, c2 \in C$, **coincidence** relation ($c1 \equiv c2$) specifies that two clocks must tick simultaneously. **Precedence** relation ($c1 \prec c2$) delimits that $c1$ runs faster than $c2$, i.e., $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, where \mathbb{N}^+ is the set of positive natural numbers, the k^{th} tick of $c1$ must occur prior to the k^{th} tick of $c2$. **Causality** relation ($c1 \preceq c2$) represents a relaxed version of **precedence**, allowing the two clocks to tick at the same time. **Subclock** ($c1 \subseteq c2$) indicates the relation between two clocks, *superclock* ($c1$) and *subclock* ($c2$), s.t. each tick of the subclock must correspond to a tick of its superclock at the same step. **Exclusion** ($c1 \# c2$) prevents the instants of two clocks from being coincident. An *expression* derives new clocks from the already defined clocks: **periodicOn** builds a new clock based on a *base* clock and a *period* parameter, s.t., the instants of the new clock are separated by a number of instants of the *base* clock. The number is given as *period*. **DelayFor** results in a clock by delaying the *base* clock for a given number of ticks of a *reference* clock. **Infimum**, denoted **inf**, is defined as the slowest clock that is

faster than both $c1$ and $c2$. **Supremum**, denoted **sup**, is defined as the fastest clock that is slower than $c1$ and $c2$.

UPPAAL-SMC performs the probabilistic analysis of properties by monitoring simulations of complex hybrid systems in a given stochastic environment and using results from the statistics to determine whether the system satisfies the property with some degree of confidence. Its clocks evolve with various rates, which are specified with *ordinary differential equations* (ODE). UPPAAL-SMC provides a number of queries related to the stochastic interpretation of Timed Automata (STA) [12] and they are as follows, where N and $bound$ indicate the number of simulations to be performed and the time bound on the simulations respectively:

1. *Probability Estimation* estimates the probability of a requirement property ϕ being satisfied for a given STA model within the time bound: $Pr[bound] \phi$.
2. *Hypothesis Testing* checks if the probability of ϕ being satisfied is larger than or equal to a certain probability P_0 : $Pr[bound] \phi \geq P_0$.
3. *Probability Comparison* compares the probabilities of two properties being satisfied in certain time bounds: $Pr[bound_1] \phi_1 \geq Pr[bound_2] \phi_2$.
4. *Expected Value* evaluates the minimal or maximal value of a clock or an integer value while UPPAAL-SMC checks the STA model: $E[bound; N](min : \phi)$ or $E[bound; N](max : \phi)$.
5. *Simulations*: UPPAAL-SMC runs N simulations on the STA model and monitors k (state-based) properties/expressions ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_k along the simulations within simulation bound $bound$: $simulate N [\leq bound] \{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k\}$.

Chapter 3

Running Example: Traffic Sign Recognition Vehicle

An autonomous vehicle (AV) [20, 21] application using Traffic Sign Recognition is adopted to illustrate our approach. The AV reads the road signs, e.g., “speed limit” or “right/left turn”, and adjusts speed and movement accordingly. The functionality of AV, augmented with timing constraints and viewed as **Functional Design Architecture (FDA)** (`designFunctionTypes`), consists of the following f_p s in Fig. 3.1: **System** function type contains four f_p s, i.e., the **Camera** captures sign images and relays the images to **SignRecognition** periodically. **SignRecognition** analyzes each frame of the detected images and computes the desired images (sign types). **Controller** determines how the speed of the vehicle is adjusted based on the sign types and the current speed of the vehicle. **VehicleDynamic** specifies the kinematics behaviors of the vehicle. **Environment** function type consists of three f_p s, i.e., the information of traffic signs, random obstacles, and speed changes caused by environmental influence described in **TrafficSign**, **Obstacle**, and **Speed** f_p s respectively.

We consider the **Periodic**, **Execution**, **End-to-End**, **Synchronization**, **Sporadic**, and **Comparison** timing constraints on top of the AV EAST-ADL model, which are sufficient to capture the constraints described in Fig. 3.1. Furthermore, we extend EAST-ADL/TADL2 with an **Exclusion** timing constraint (R27 – R31) that integrates relevant concepts from the CCSL constraint, i.e., two events cannot occur simultaneously.

R1. The camera must capture an image every 50ms. In other words, a **Periodic** acquisition of **Camera** must be carried out every 50ms.

R2. The captured image must be recognized by an AV every 200ms, which can be interpreted as a **Periodic** constraint on **SignRecognition** f_p .

R3. The obstacle will be detected by vehicle every 40ms, i.e., a **Periodic** timing constraint should be applied on the *obstacle* input port of **Controller**.

R4. The speed of the vehicle should be updated periodically with the period as 30ms, i.e., a **Periodic** timing constraint should be applied on the *speed* input port of **Controller**.




Figure 3.1: AV in EAST-ADL augmented with TADL2 constraints (R. IDs) specified in PrCCSL (Spec. R. IDs)

R5. The detected image should be computed within $[100, 150]$ ms in order to generate the desired sign type, the SignRecognition must complete its execution within $[100, 150]$ ms.

R6. After the Camera is triggered, the captured image should be sent out from Camera within 20 – 30ms, i.e., the execution time of Camera should be between 20 and 30ms.

R7. After an obstacle is detected, the Controller should send out a request to brake the vehicle within 100 – 150ms, i.e., the execution time for Controller should be in the range $[100, 150]$ ms.

R8. After the command/request from controller is arrived at VehicleDynamic, the speed should be updated within 50 – 100ms. That is, the Execution timing constraint applied on VehicleDynamic is 50 – 100ms.

R9. If the mode of AV switches to “emergency stop” due to the certain obstacle, it should not revert back to “automatic running” mode within a specific time period. That is interpreted as a Sporadic constraint, i.e., the mode of AV is changed to “stop” because of the encounter of obstacle, it should not revert back to “run” mode within 500ms.

R10. If the mode of AV switches to “emergency stop” due to the certain obstacle, it should not revert back to “accelerate” mode within a specific time period. That is interpreted as a Sporadic constraint, i.e., the mode of AV is changed to “stop”

because of the encounter of obstacle, it should not revert back to “accelerate” mode within 500ms.

R11. If the mode of AV switches to “emergency stop” due to the certain obstacle, it should not revert back to “turn left” mode within a specific time period. That is interpreted as a **Sporadic** constraint, i.e., the mode of AV is changed to “stop” because of the encounter of obstacle, it should not revert back to “turn left” mode within 500ms.

R12. If the mode of AV switches to “emergency stop” due to the certain obstacle, it should not revert back to “turn right” mode within a specific time period. That is interpreted as a **Sporadic** constraint, i.e., the mode of AV is changed to “stop” because of the encounter of obstacle, it should not revert back to “turn right” mode within 500ms.

R13. The required environmental information should arrive to the controller within 40ms. That is input signals (**speed**, **signType**, **direct**, **gear** and **torque** ports) must be detected by **Controller** within a given time window, i.e., the tolerated maximum constraint is 40ms.

R14. After the execution of **Controller** is finished, all the requests of controller should be updated within 30ms. That is output signals (on **reqTorq**, **reqDirect**, **reqGear**, **reqBrake** ports) must be sent within a given time window, i.e., the tolerated maximum constraint is 30ms.

R15. The requests from the controller should be arrived to **VehicleDynamic** within 30ms. That is input signals (**reqTorq**, **reqDirect**, **reqGear**, **reqBrake**) must be detected by **VehicleDynamic** within a given time window, i.e., the tolerated maximum constraint is 30ms.

R16. After execution of **VehicleDynamic** is finished, the information of vehicle should be updated within 40ms, i.e., the **Synchronization** applied on the output ports (**speed**, **direct**, **gear**, **torque**) is 40ms.

R17. When a traffic sign is recognized, the speed of AV should be updated within [150, 250]ms. An **End-to-End** constraint on **Controller** and **VehicleDynamic**, i.e., the time interval measured from the input arrival of **Controller** to the instant at which the corresponding output is sent out from **VehicleDynamic** must be within [150, 250]ms.

R18. After the camera is triggered to capture the image, the computation of the traffic sign should be finished within [120, 180]ms, i.e., the **End-to-End** timing constraint applied on **Camera** and **SignRecognition** should be between 120ms and 180ms.

R19. The time interval measured from the instant at which the camera captures an image of traffic sign, to the instant at which the status of AV (i.e., speed, direction) is updated, should be within [270, 430]ms. That is, **End-to-End** timing constraint applied on **Camera** and **VehicleDynamic** should be between 270 and 430ms.

R20. When a left turn sign is recognized, the vehicle should turn towards left within 500ms, which can be interpreted as an **End-to-End** timing constraint applied on the event **DetectLeftSign** and **StartTurnLeft**.

R21. When a right turn sign is recognized, the vehicle should turn towards right within 500ms, which can be interpreted as an **End-to-End** timing constraint applied on the event **DetectRightSign** and **StartTurnRight**.

R22. When a stop sign is recognized, the vehicle should start to brake within 200ms, which can be interpreted as an **End-to-End** timing constraint applied on the event **DetectStopSign** and **StartBrake**.

R23. When a stop sign is recognized, the vehicle should be stop completely within 3000ms, which can be interpreted as an **End-to-End** timing constraint applied on the event **DetectStopSign** and **Stop**.

R24. The execution time interval from **Controller** to **VehicleDynamic** should be less than or equal to the sum of the worst case execution time interval of each f_p .

R25. The execution time interval from **Camera** to **SignRecognition** should be less than or equal to the sum of the worst case execution time interval of each f_p .

R26. The execution time interval from **Camera** to **VehicleDynamic** should be less than or equal to the sum of the worst case execution time interval of each f_p .

R27. While AV turns left, the “turning right” mode should not be activated. The events of turning left and right considered as exclusive and specified as an **Exclusion** constraint.

R28. While AV is braking, the “accelerate” mode should not be activated. The events of braking and accelerating are considered as exclusive and specified as an **Exclusion** constraint.

R29. When AV is in the emergency mode because of the obstacle occurrence, “turn left” mode must not be activated, i.e., the events of handling emergency and turning left are exclusive and specified as a **Exclusion** constraint.

R30. When AV is in the emergency mode because of the encounter of an obstacle, “turn right” mode must not be activated, i.e., the events of handling emergency and turning right are exclusive and specified as an **Exclusion** constraint.

R31. When AV is in the emergency mode because of the encounter of an obstacle, “accelerate” mode must not be activated, i.e., the events of handling emergency and accelerating are exclusive and specified as an **Exclusion** constraint.

Delay constraint gives duration bounds (minimum and maximum) between two events *source* and *target*. This is specified using *lower*, *upper* values given as either **Execution** constraint (R5 – R8) or **End-to-End** constraint (R17 – R23). **Synchronization** constraint (R13 – R16) describes how tightly the occurrences of a group of events follow each other. All events must occur within a sliding window, specified by the *tolerance* attribute, i.e., the maximum time interval allowed between events. **Periodic** constraint states that the period of successive

occurrences of a single event must have a time interval (R1 – R4). **Sporadic** constraint states that *events* can arrive at arbitrary points in time, but with defined minimum inter-arrival times between two consecutive occurrences (R9 – R12). **Comparison** constraint delimits that two consecutive occurrences of an event should have a minimum inter-arrival time (R24 – R26). **Exclusion** constraint refers that two events must not occur at the same time (R27 – R31). Those timing constraints are formally specified (see as **R. IDs** in Fig. 3.1) using the subset of clock *relations* and *expressions* (see Chapter 2) in the context of WH. The timing constraints are then verified utilizing UPPAAL-SMC and are described further in the following chapters.

Chapter 4

Probabilistic Extension of *Relation* in CCSL

To perform the formal specification and probabilistic verification of EAST-ADL timing constraints (R1 – R31 in Sec 3.), CCSL *relations* are augmented with probabilistic properties, called PrCCSL, based on WH [8]. More specifically, in order to describe the bound on the number of permitted timing constraint violations in WH, we extend CCSL *relations* with a probabilistic parameter p , where p is the probability threshold. PrCCSL is satisfied if and only if the probability of *relation* constraint being satisfied is greater than or equal to p . As illustrated in Fig. 3.1, EAST-ADL/TADL2 timing constraints (R. IDs in Fig. 3.1) can be specified (Spec. R. IDs) using the PrCCSL *relations* and the conventional CCSL *expressions*.

A *time system* is specified by a set of clocks and clock constraints. An execution of the time system is a **run** where the occurrences of events are clock ticks.

Definition 1 (Run) A *run* R consists of a finite set of consecutive steps where a set of clocks tick at each step i . The set of clocks ticking at step i is denoted as $R(i)$, i.e., for all i , $0 \leq i \leq n$, $R(i) \in R$, where n is the number of steps of R .

Fig. 4.1 presents a **run** R consisting of 10 steps and three clocks $c1$, $c2$ and $c3$. The ticks of the three clocks along with steps are shown as “cross” symbols (x). For instance, $c1$, $c2$ and $c3$ tick at the first step, hence $R(1) = \{c1, c2, c3\}$.




Figure 4.1: Example of a Run

The history of a clock c presents the number of times the clock c has ticked prior to the current step.

Definition 2 (History) For $c \in C$, the *history* of c in a run R is a function:

$H_R^c: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. For all instances of step i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $H_R^c(i)$ indicates the number of times the clock c has ticked prior to step i in run R , which is initialized as 0 at step 0. It is defined as:

$$H_R^c(i) = \begin{cases} 0, & i = 0 \\ H_R^c(i-1), & c \notin R(i) \wedge i > 0 \\ H_R^c(i-1) + 1, & c \in R(i) \wedge i > 0 \end{cases}$$

Definition 3 (PrCCSL) Let $c1$, $c2$ and R be two logical clocks and a *run*. The probabilistic extension of relation constraints, denoted $c1 \sim_p c2$, is satisfied if the following condition holds:

$$R \models c1 \sim_p c2 \iff Pr(c1 \sim c2) \geq p$$

where $\sim \in \{\subseteq, \equiv, \prec, \succ, \#\}$, $Pr(c1 \sim c2)$ is the probability of the relation $c1 \sim c2$ being satisfied, and p is the probability threshold.

The five CCSL relations, **subclock**, **coincidence**, **exclusion**, **causality** and **precedence**, are considered and their probabilistic extensions are defined.

Definition 4 (Probabilistic Subclock) Let $c1$, $c2$ and \mathcal{M} be two logical clocks and a system model. Given k runs = $\{R_1, \dots, R_k\}$, the probabilistic extension of **subclock** relation between $c1$ and $c2$, denoted $c1 \subseteq_p c2$, is satisfied if the following condition holds:

$$\mathcal{M} \models c1 \subseteq_p c2 \iff Pr[c1 \subseteq c2] \geq p$$

where $Pr[c1 \subseteq c2] = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \{R_j \models c1 \subseteq c2\}$, $R_j \in \{R_1, \dots, R_k\}$, i.e., the ratio of runs that satisfies the **subclock** relation out of k runs.

A run R_j satisfies the **subclock** relation between $c1$ and $c2$ “if $c1$ ticks, $c2$ must tick” holds at every step i in R_j , s.t., $(R_j \models c1 \subseteq c2) \iff (\forall i \ 0 \leq i \leq n, c1 \in R(i) \implies c2 \in R(i))$. “ $R_j \models c1 \subseteq c2$ ” returns 1 if R_j satisfies $c1 \subseteq c2$, otherwise it returns 0.

Coincidence relation delimits that two clocks must always tick at the same step, i.e, if $c1$ and $c2$ are coincident, then $c1$ and $c2$ are subclocks of each other.

Definition 5 (Probabilistic Coincidence) The probabilistic **coincidence** relation between $c1$ and $c2$, denoted $c1 \equiv_p c2$, is satisfied over \mathcal{M} if the following condition holds:

$$\mathcal{M} \models c1 \equiv_p c2 \iff Pr[c1 \equiv c2] \geq p$$

where $Pr[c1 \equiv c2] = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \{R_j \models c1 \equiv c2\}$ is determined by the number of runs satisfying the **coincidence** relation out of k runs.

A run, R_j satisfies the **coincidence** relation on $c1$ and $c2$ if the assertion holds: $\forall i, 0 \leq i \leq n, (c1 \in R(i) \implies c2 \in R(i)) \wedge (c2 \in R(i) \implies c1 \in R(i))$. In other words, the satisfaction of **coincidence** relation is established when the two conditions “if $c1$ ticks, $c2$ must tick” and “if $c2$ ticks, $c1$ must tick” hold at every step.

The inverse of **coincidence** relation is **exclusion**, which specifies two clocks cannot tick at the same step.

Definition 6 (Probabilistic Exclusion) *For all k runs over \mathcal{M} , the probabilistic **exclusion** relation between $c1$ and $c2$, denoted $c1 \#_p c2$, is satisfied if the following condition holds:*

$$\mathcal{M} \models c1 \#_p c2 \iff Pr[c1 \# c2] \geq p$$

where $Pr[c1 \# c2] = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \{R_j \models c1 \# c2\}$ is the ratio of the runs satisfying the **exclusion** relation out of k runs.

A run, R_j , satisfies the **exclusion** relation on $c1$ and $c2$ if $\forall i, 0 \leq i \leq n, (c1 \in R(i) \implies c2 \notin R(i)) \wedge (c2 \in R(i) \implies c1 \notin R(i))$, i.e., for every step, if $c1$ ticks, $c2$ must not tick and vice versa.

The probabilistic extension of **causality** and **precedence** relations are defined based on the history of clocks.

Definition 7 (Probabilistic Causality) *The probabilistic **causality** relation between $c1$ and $c2$ ($c1$ is the cause and $c2$ is the effect), denoted $c1 \preceq_p c2$, is satisfied if the following condition holds:*

$$\mathcal{M} \models c1 \preceq_p c2 \iff Pr[c1 \preceq c2] \geq p$$

where $Pr[c1 \preceq c2] = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \{R_j \models c1 \preceq c2\}$, i.e., the ratio of runs satisfying the **causality** relation among the total number of k runs.

A run R_j satisfies the **causality** relation on $c1$ and $c2$ if the condition holds: $\forall i, 0 \leq i \leq n, H_R^{c1}(i) \geq H_R^{c2}(i)$. A tick of $c1$ satisfies **causality** relation if $c2$ does not occur prior to $c1$, i.e., the history of $c2$ is less than or equal to the history of $c1$ at the current step i .

The strict **causality**, called **precedence**, constrains that one clock must always tick faster than the other.

Definition 8 (Probabilistic Precedence) *The probabilistic **precedence** relation between $c1$ and $c2$, denoted $c1 \prec_p c2$, is satisfied if the following condition holds:*

$$\mathcal{M} \models c1 \prec_p c2 \iff Pr[c1 \prec c2] \geq p$$

where $Pr[c1 \prec c2] = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \{R_j \models c1 \prec c2\}$ is determined by the number of runs satisfying the precedence relation out of the k runs.

A run R_j satisfies the precedence relation if the condition (expressed as $(1) \wedge (2)$) holds: $\forall i, 0 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\underbrace{(H_R^{c1}(i) \geq H_R^{c2}(i))}_{(1)} \wedge \underbrace{(H_R^{c2}(i) = H_R^{c1}(i))}_{(2)} \implies (c2 \notin R(i))$$

(1) The history of $c1$ is greater than or equal to the history of $c2$; (2) $c1$ and $c2$ must not be coincident, i.e., when the history of $c1$ and $c2$ are equal, $c2$ must not tick.

Chapter 5

Specification of Timing Constraints in PrCCSL

To describe the property that a timing constraint is satisfied with the probability greater than or equal to a given threshold, CCSL and its extension PrCCSL are employed to capture the semantics of probabilistic timing constraints in the context of WH. Below, we show the CCSL/PrCCSL specification of EAST-ADL timing constraints, including **Execution**, **Periodic**, **End-to-End**, **Sporadic**, **Synchronization**, **Exclusion** and **Comparison** timing constraints. In the system, events are represented as clocks with identical names. The ticks of clocks correspond to the occurrences of the events.

Periodic timing constraints (R1 – R4) can be specified using `periodicOn` *expression* and `probabilistic coincident relation`. R1 states that the camera must be triggered periodically with a period 50ms. We first construct a periodic clock `prd_50` which ticks after every 50 ticks of `ms` (the universal clock). Then the property that the `periodic` timing constraint is satisfied with probability no less than the threshold p can be interpreted as the `probabilistic coincidence relation` between `cmrTrig` (the event that **Camera** f_p being triggered) and `prd_50`. The corresponding specification is given below, where \triangleq means “is defined as”:

$$prd_50 \triangleq \text{periodicOn } ms \text{ period } 50 \quad (5.1)$$

$$cmrTrig \equiv_p prd_50 \quad (5.2)$$

By combining (1) and (2), we can obtain the the specification of R1:

$$cmrTrig \equiv_p \{\text{periodicOn } ms \text{ period } 50\} \quad (5.3)$$

In similar, the CCSL/PrCCSL specification of R2 – R4 can be derived:

$$\mathbf{R2} : \text{signTrig} \equiv_p \{\text{periodicOn } ms \text{ period } 200\} \quad (5.4)$$

$$\mathbf{R3} : \text{obsDetect} \equiv_p \{\text{periodicOn } ms \text{ period } 40\} \quad (5.5)$$

$$\mathbf{R4} : \text{spUpdate} \equiv_p \{\text{periodicOn } ms \text{ period } 30\} \quad (5.6)$$

where *signTrig* is the event/clock that **SignRecognition** f_p is triggered, *obsDetect* represents the event that the object detection is activated by the vehicle and *spUpdate* denotes the event that the speed is updated (i.e., recieved by **Controller**) from the environment.

Since the *period* attribute of the **Periodic** timing constraint R2 is 200ms, which is an integral multiple of the *period* of R1, R2 can be interpreted as a **subclock** relation, i.e., the event *signTrig* should be a *subclock* of *cmrTrig*. The specification is given below:

$$signTrig \sqsubseteq_p cmrTrig \quad (5.7)$$

Execution timing constraints (R5 – R8) can be specified using **delayFor expression** and **probabilistic causality relation**. To specify R5, which states that the **SignRecognition** f_p must finish execution within [100, 150]ms, i.e., the interval measured from the input event of the f_p (i.e., the event that the image is received by the f_p , denoted *imIn*) to the output event of the f_p (denoted *imIn*) must have a minimum value 100 and a maximum value 150. We divide this property into two subproperties: R5(1) The time duration between *imIn* and *signOut* should be greater than 100ms. R5(2) The time duration between *imIn* and *signOut* should be less than 150ms. To specify property R5(1), we first construct a new clock *imIn_dly100* by delaying *imIn* (the input event of **SignRecognition**) for 100ms. To check whether R5(1) is satisfied within a probability threshold is to verify whether the **probabilistic causality** between *imIn_dly100* and *signOut* is valid. The specification of R5(1) is given below:

$$imIn_dly100 \triangleq imIn \text{ delayFor } 100 \text{ on } ms \quad (5.8)$$

$$imIn_dly100 \preceq_p signOut \quad (5.9)$$

By combining (7) and (8), we can obtain the the specification of R5(1):

$$\{imIn \text{ delayFor } 100 \text{ on } ms\} \preceq_p signOut \quad (5.10)$$

Similarly, to specify property R5(2), a new clock *imIn_dly150* is generated by delaying *imIn* for 150 ticks on *ms*. Afterwards, the property that R5(2) is satisfied with a probability greater than or equal to p relies on whether the **probabilistic causality relation** is satisfied. The specification is illustrated as follows:

$$imIn_dly150 \triangleq imIn \text{ delayFor } 150 \text{ on } ms \quad (5.11)$$

$$signOut \preceq_p imIn_dly150 \quad (5.12)$$

By combining (10) and (11), we can obtain the the specification of R5(2):

$$signOut \preceq_p \{imIn \text{ delayFor } 150 \text{ on } ms\} \quad (5.13)$$

Analogously, the CCSL/PrCCSL specification of R6 – R8 can be derived:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R6} : \{cmrTrig \text{ delayFor } 20 \text{ on } ms\} \preceq_p cmrOut \\ cmrOut \preceq_p \{cmrTrig \text{ delayFor } 30 \text{ on } ms\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R7} : \{ctrlIn \text{ delayFor } 100 \text{ on } ms\} \preceq_p ctrlOut \\ ctrlOut \preceq_p \{ctrlIn \text{ delayFor } 150 \text{ on } ms\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R8} : \{vdIn \text{ delayFor } 50 \text{ on } ms\} \preceq_p vdOut \\ vdOut \preceq_p \{vdIn \text{ delayFor } 100 \text{ on } ms\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

where *cmrTrig* is the event that the Camera f_p being triggered, *cmrOut* represents the event that the captured image is sent out. *ctrlIn* (*ctrlOut*) represents the input (resp. output) event of Controller f_p . *vdIn* (*vdOut*) represents the input (resp. output) event of VehicleDynamic f_p .

Sporadic timing constraints (R9 – R12) can be specified using **delayFor expression** and **probabilistic precedence relation**. R9 states that there should be a minimum delay between the event *veRun* (the event that the vehicle is in the “run” mode) and the event *obstc* (the event that the vehicle detects an obstacle), which is specified as 500ms. To specify R9, we first build a new clock *obstc_dly500* by delaying *obstc* for 500 ticks of *ms*. We then check the probabilistic precedence relation between *obst_dly500* and *veRun*:

$$obstc_dly500 \triangleq obstc \text{ delayFor } 500 \text{ on } ms \quad (5.17)$$

$$obstc_dly500 \prec_p veRun \quad (5.18)$$

By combining (16) and (17), we can obtain the the specification of R9:

$$\{obstc \text{ delayFor } 500 \text{ on } ms\} \prec_p veRun \quad (5.19)$$

Analogously, the CCSL/PrCCSL specification of R10 – R12 can be derived:

$$\mathbf{R10} : \{obstc \text{ delayFor } 500 \text{ on } ms\} \prec_p veAcc \quad (5.20)$$

$$\mathbf{R11} : \{obstc \text{ delayFor } 500 \text{ on } ms\} \prec_p tLeft \quad (5.21)$$

$$\mathbf{R12} : \{obstc \text{ delayFor } 500 \text{ on } ms\} \prec_p tRight \quad (5.22)$$

where *veAcc* is the event/clock that the vehicle is accelerating. *tLeft* and *tRight* represent the event that the vehicle transits from the “emergency stop” mode to “turn left” and “turn right” mode respectively.

Synchronization timing constraints (R13 – R16) can be specified using **infimum** and **supremum expression**, together with **probabilistic precedence relation**. R13 states that the five input events must be detected by Controller within the maximum tolerated time, given as 40ms. The synchronization timing constraint

can be interpreted as: the time interval between the earliest/fastest and the latest/slowest event among the five input events, i.e., *speed*, *signType*, *direct*, *gear* and *torque*, must not exceed 40ms. To specify the constraints, **infimum** is utilized to express the fastest event (denoted inf_{ctrlIn}) while **supremum** is utilized to specify the slowest event sup_{ctrlIn} . sup_{ctrlIn} and inf_{ctrlIn} are defined as:

$$sup_{ctrl} \triangleq \text{Sup}(\text{Sup}(\text{speed}, \text{signType}), \text{Sup}(\text{Sup}(\text{direct}, \text{gear}), \text{torque})) \quad (5.23)$$

$$inf_{ctrl} \triangleq \text{Inf}(\text{Inf}(\text{speed}, \text{signType}), \text{Inf}(\text{Inf}(\text{direct}, \text{gear}), \text{torque})) \quad (5.24)$$

where $\text{Inf}(c1, c2)$ (resp. $\text{Sup}(c1, c2)$) is the **infimum** (resp. **supremum**) operator returns the slowest clock faster than $c1$ and $c2$. Afterwards, we construct a new clock inf_{ctrlIn_dly40} that is the inf_{ctrlIn} delayed for 40 ticks of ms , which is defined as:

$$inf_{ctrlIn_dly40} \triangleq inf_{ctrl} \text{delayFor } 40 \text{ on } ms \quad (5.25)$$

Therefore, the **synchronization** constraint R13 can be represented as the **probabilistic causality relation** between sup_{ctrlIn} and inf_{ctrlIn_dly40} , given as the CCSL/PrCCSL expression below:

$$sup_{ctrlIn} \preceq_p inf_{ctrlIn_dly40} \quad (5.26)$$

By combining (24) and (25), we can obtain the the specification of R13:

$$sup_{ctrlIn} \preceq_p \{inf_{ctrlIn} \text{delayFor } 40 \text{ on } ms\} \quad (5.27)$$

In similar, the CCSL/PrCCSL specification of R14 – R16 can be derived. For R14, we first construct the clocks that represent the fastest and slowest output event/clock among the four output events of **Controller** f_p , i.e., *reqTorq*, *reqDirect*, *reqGear* and *reqBrake*. Then the property that the synchronization constraint is satisfied with a probability greater than or equal to p can be interpreted as a **probabilistic causality relation**:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R14} : sup_{ctrlOut} &\triangleq \text{Sup}(\text{Sup}(\text{reqTorq}, \text{reqDirect}), \text{Sup}(\text{reqGear}, \text{reqBrake})) \\ inf_{ctrlOut} &\triangleq \text{Inf}(\text{Inf}(\text{reqTorq}, \text{reqDirect}), \text{Inf}(\text{reqGear}, \text{reqBrake})) \\ &sup_{ctrlOut} \preceq_p \{inf_{ctrlOut} \text{delayFor } 30 \text{ on } ms\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

For R15, we first construct the fastest and slowest input event/clock among the four input events of **VehicleDynamic**, i.e., *reqTorq*, *reqDirect*, *reqGear* and *reqBrake*. Then the property that the synchronization constraint is satisfied with a probability greater than or equal to p can be interpreted as a **probabilistic causality relation**:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R15} : sup_{vdIn} &\triangleq \text{Sup}(\text{Sup}(\text{reqTorq}, \text{reqDirect}), \text{Sup}(\text{reqGear}, \text{reqBrake})) \\ inf_{vdIn} &\triangleq \text{Inf}(\text{Inf}(\text{reqTorq}, \text{reqDirect}), \text{Inf}(\text{reqGear}, \text{reqBrake})) \\ &sup_{vdIn} \preceq_p \{inf_{vdIn} \text{delayFor } 40 \text{ on } ms\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

For R16, we first construct the fastest and slowest output event/clock among the four output events of `VehicleDynamic`, i.e., `speed`, `direct`, `torque` and `gear`. Then the property that the synchronization constraint is satisfied with a probability greater than or equal to p can be interpreted as a **probabilistic causality relation**:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{R16} : \text{sup}_{vdOut} &\triangleq \text{Sup}(\text{Sup}(\text{speed}, \text{direct}), \text{Sup}(\text{gear}, \text{torque})) \\
 \text{inf}_{vdOut} &\triangleq \text{Inf}(\text{Inf}(\text{speed}, \text{direct}), \text{Inf}(\text{gear}, \text{torque})) \\
 \text{sup}_{vdOut} &\preceq_p \{ \text{inf}_{vdOut} \text{ delayFor } 40 \text{ on } ms \}
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

End-to-End timing constraints (R17 – R23) can be specified using `delayFor expression` and **probabilistic precedence relation**. To specify R17, which limits that the time duration measured from the instant of the occurrence of the event that `Controller` f_p receive the traffic sign type information (denoted as `signIn`), to the occurrence of event that the speed is sent out from the output port of `VehicleDynamic` f_p (denoted as `spOut`) should be between 150 and 250ms. We divide this property into two subproperties: R17(1). The time duration between `signIn` and `spOut` should be more than 150ms. R17(2). The time duration between `signIn` and `spOut` should be less than 250ms. To specify property R17(1), we first construct a new clock `signIn_dly150` by delaying `signIn` for 150ms. To check whether R17(1) is satisfied within a probability threshold p is to verify whether the **probabilistic precedence** between `signIn_dly150` and `spOut` is valid. The specification of R17(1) is given below:

$$\text{signIn_dly150} \triangleq \text{signIn delayFor } 150 \text{ on } ms \tag{5.31}$$

$$\text{signIn_dly150} \prec_p \text{spOut} \tag{5.32}$$

By combining (30) and (31), we can obtain the the specification of R17(1):

$$\{ \text{signIn delayFor } 150 \text{ on } ms \} \prec_p \text{spOut} \tag{5.33}$$

Similarly, to specify property R17(2), a new clock `signIn_dly250` is generated by delaying `signIn` for 250 ticks on `ms`. Afterwards, the property that R17(2) is satisfied with a probability greater than or equal to p relies on whether the **probabilistic precedence relation** is satisfied. The specification is illustrated as follows:

$$\text{signIn_dly250} \triangleq \text{signIn delayFor } 250 \text{ on } ms \tag{5.34}$$

$$\text{spOut} \prec_p \text{signIn_dly250} \tag{5.35}$$

By combining (33) and (34), we can obtain the the specification of R17(2):

$$\text{spOut} \prec_p \{ \text{signIn delayFor } 250 \text{ on } ms \} \tag{5.36}$$

In similar, the CCSL/PrCCSL specification of R18 – R23 can be derived:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R18} : \{cmrTrig \text{ delayFor } 120 \text{ on } ms\} &\prec_p \text{ signOut} \\ \text{signOut} &\prec_p \{cmrTrig \text{ delayFor } 180 \text{ on } ms\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R19} : \{cmrTrig \text{ delayFor } 270 \text{ on } ms\} &\prec_p \text{ spOut} \\ \text{spOut} &\prec_p \{cmrTrig \text{ delayFor } 430 \text{ on } ms\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.38)$$

$$\mathbf{R20} : \{\text{startTurnLeft} \prec_p \text{ DetectLeftSign} \text{ delayFor } 500 \text{ on } ms\} \quad (5.39)$$

$$\mathbf{R21} : \{\text{startTurnRight} \prec_p \text{ DetectRightSign} \text{ delayFor } 500 \text{ on } ms\} \quad (5.40)$$

$$\mathbf{R22} : \{\text{startBrake} \prec_p \text{ DetectStopSign} \text{ delayFor } 500 \text{ on } ms\} \quad (5.41)$$

$$\mathbf{R23} : \{\text{Stop} \prec_p \text{ DetectStopSign} \text{ delayFor } 3000 \text{ on } ms\} \quad (5.42)$$

Comparison timing constraints (R24 – R26) can be specified using `delayFor` expression and **probabilistic causality relation**. R24 states that the execution time interval from `Controller` to `VehicleDynamic` should be less than or equal to the sum of the worst case execution time of `Controller` and `VehicleDynamic`, denoted as W_{ctrl} and W_{vd} respectively. To specify **comparison** constraint, we first construct a new clock `signIn_dly250` by delaying `signIn` for 250 ticks of ms . Afterwards, we generate another new clock `signIn_dlysw` that is the `signIn` clock delayed for sum of the *worst case execution time* of the two f_p s. The specification is illustrated as follows:

$$\text{signIn_dly250} \triangleq \text{signIn} \text{ delayFor } 250 \text{ on } ms \quad (5.43)$$

$$\text{signIn_dlysw} \triangleq \text{signIn} \text{ delayFor } (W_{ctrl} + W_{vd}) \text{ on } ms \quad (5.44)$$

Therefore, the property that the probability of comparison constraint is satisfied should be greater than or equal to the threshold p can be interpreted as a **probabilistic causality relation** between `signIn_dly250` and `signIn_dlysw`:

$$\text{signIn_dly250} \preceq_p \text{signIn_dlysw} \quad (5.45)$$

By combining (42), (43) and (44), we can obtain the the specification of R24:

$$\{\text{signIn} \text{ delayFor } 250 \text{ on } ms\} \preceq_p \{\text{signIn} \text{ delayFor } (W_{ctrl} + W_{vd}) \text{ on } ms\} \quad (5.46)$$

Analogously, the CCSL/PrCCSL specification of R25 and R26 can be derived:

$$\mathbf{R25} : \{cmrTrig \text{ delayFor } 180 \text{ on } ms\} \preceq_p \{cmrTrig \text{ delayFor } (W_{cmr} + W_{sr}) \text{ on } ms\} \quad (5.47)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R26} : \{cmrTrig \text{ delayFor } 430 \text{ on } ms\} &\preceq_p \\ \{cmrTrig \text{ delayFor } (W_{cmr} + W_{sr} + W_{ctrl} + W_{vd}) \text{ on } ms\} & \end{aligned} \quad (5.48)$$

where W_{cmr} and W_{vd} represent the worst case execution time of **Camera** and **SignRecognition** respectively.

Exclusion timing constraints (R27 – R31) can be specified using **exclusion relation** directly. R27 states that the two events *turnLeft* (the event that the vehicle is turning left) and *rightOn* (the event that the turn right mode is activated) should be exclusive, which can be expressed as:

$$turnLeft \#_p rightOn \quad (5.49)$$

Analogously, the **Exclusion** timing constraints R28 – R31 can be specified using **exclusion relation**:

$$\mathbf{R28} : veAcc \#_p veBrake \quad (5.50)$$

$$\mathbf{R29} : emgcy \#_p turnLeft \quad (5.51)$$

$$\mathbf{R30} : emgcy \#_p rightOn \quad (5.52)$$

$$\mathbf{R31} : emgcy \#_p veAcc \quad (5.53)$$

where *emgcy* is the event that the vehicle is in the *emergency* mode, *veBrake* and *veAcc* represent the event that the vehicle is braking or accelerating, respectively.

Chapter 6

Translating CCSL & PrCCSL into UPPAAL-SMC

To formally verify the EAST-ADL timing constraints given in Chapter 3 using UPPAAL-SMC, we investigate how those constraints, specified in CCSL *expressions* and PrCCSL *relations*, can be translated into STA and probabilistic UPPAAL-SMC queries [12]. CCSL *expressions* construct new clocks and the *relations* between the new clocks are specified using PrCCSL. We first provide strategies that represent CCSL *expressions* as STA. We then present how the EAST-ADL timing constraints defined in PrCCSL can be translated into the corresponding STAs and UPPAAL-SMC queries based on the strategies.

6.1 Mapping CCSL to UPPAAL-SMC

We first describe how the universal clock (TimeUnit *ms*), tick and history of CCSL can be mapped to the corresponding STAs. Using the mapping, we then demonstrate that CCSL *expressions* can be modeled as STAs. The TimeUnit is implicitly represented as a single *step* of time progress in UPPAAL-SMC's *clock* [22]. The STA of TimeUnit (universal time defined as *ms*) consists of one location and one outgoing transition whereby the physical time and the duration of TimeUnit *ms* are represented by the *clock* variable *t* in Fig. 6.1.(a). *clock* resets every time a transition is taken. The duration of TimeUnit is expressed by the invariant $t \leq 1$, and guard $t \geq 1$, i.e., a single step of the discrete time progress (tick) of universal time.




Figure 6.1: UPPAAL-SMC model of clock tick and history

A clock c , considered as an event in UPPAAL-SMC, and its tick, i.e., an occurrence of the event, is represented by the synchronization channel $c!$. Since UPPAAL-SMC runs in chronometric semantics, in order to describe the discretized steps of runs (Rs), we consider if c ticks in the time range of $[i, i + 1)$ ($i + 1$ is excluded), c ticks at step i . The STA of tick and history is shown in Fig. 6.1.(b). hc is the history of c , and tc indicates whether c ticks at the current step. A function $upper()$ rounds the time instant (real number) up to the nearest greater integer. When c ticks via $c?$ at the current time step, tc is set to 1 prior to the time of the next step ($t < u$). hc is then increased by 1 ($hc++$) at the successive step (i.e., when $t = u$). For example, when c ticks at $time = 1.5$ (see Fig. 6.1.(c)), $upper()$ returns the value of 2 and tc becomes 1 during the time interval $[1.5, 2)$, followed by hc being increased by 1 at $t = 2$.

Based on the mapping patterns of ms , tick and history, we present how **periodicOn**, **delayFor**, **infimum** and **supremum** expressions can be represented as UPPAAL-SMC models.

PeriodicOn: $c \triangleq \text{periodicOn } ms \text{ period } q$, where \triangleq means “is defined as”. **PeriodicOn** builds a new clock c based on ms and a *period* parameter q , i.e., c ticks at every q^{th} tick of ms . The STA of **periodicOn** is illustrated in Fig. 6.2.(a). This STA initially stays in the *loop* location to detect q occurrences (ticks) of ms . The value x counts the number of ms ticks. When ms occurs ($ms?$), the STA takes the outgoing transition and increases x by 1. It “iterates” until ms ticks q times ($x == q$), then it activates the tick of c (via $c!$). At the successive step ($ms?$), it updates the history of c ($hc++$) and sets $x = 1$. The STA then returns to *loop* and repeats the calculation. This **periodicOn** STA can be used for the translation of EAST-ADL **Periodic** timing constraint (R1 in Fig. 3.1) into its UPPAAL-SMC model.




Figure 6.2: STA of CCSL expressions

DelayFor: $c \triangleq c1 \text{ delayFor } d \text{ on } c2$. **DelayFor** defines a new clock c based on $c1$ (*base* clock) and $c2$ (*reference* clock), i.e., each time $c1$ ticks, at the d^{th}

tick of c_2 , c ticks (each tick of c corresponds to a tick of c_1). Kang et al. [22] and Suryadevara et al. [32] presented translation rules of `delayFor` into UPPAAL models. However, their approaches are not applicable in the case after c_1 ticks, and c_1 ticks again before the d^{th} tick of c_2 occurs. For example (see Fig. 4.1), assume that d is 3. After the 1^{st} tick of c_1 (at step 0) happens, if c_1 ticks again (at step 2) before the 3^{rd} tick of c_2 occurs (at step 4), the 2^{nd} tick of c_1 is discarded in their approaches. To alleviate the restriction, we utilize spawnable STA [12] as semantics denotation of `delayFor` expression and the STA of `delayFor` is shown in Fig. 6.2.(c). As presented in Fig. 6.2.(b), when the v^{th} tick of c_1 occurs ($c_1[v?]$), its `delayFor` STA is spawned by `source` STA. The spawned STA stays in the *wait* location until c_2 ticks d times. When c_2 ticks d times ($x == d$), it transits to the *tick* location and triggers c ($c!$). At the next step ($ms?$), the STA increases hc by 1 and moves to *finish* location and then becomes inactive, i.e., calculation of the v^{th} tick of c is completed. This `delayFor` STA can be utilized to construct the UPPAAL-SMC models of EAST-ADL timing requirements R5 – R26 in Chapter 3.

Given two clocks c_1 and c_2 , their **infimum** (resp. **supremum**) is informally defined as the slowest (resp. fastest) clock faster (resp. slower) than both c_1 and c_2 . **infimum** and **supremum** are useful in order to group events occurring at the same time and decide which one occurs first and which one occurs last. The representative STAs for both *expressions* are utilized for the translation of EAST-ADL **Synchronization** timing constraint (R13 in Chapter 3) into the UPPAAL-SMC model.

Infimum creates a new clock c , which is the slowest clock faster than c_1 and c_2 . The STA of **infimum** is illustrated in Fig. 6.2.(d). When c_1 (c_2) ticks via $c_1?$ ($c_2?$), the STA transits to the $s1$ ($s2$) location and compares the history of the two clocks ($h1$ and $h2$) to check whether the current ticking clock c_1 (c_2) is faster than c_2 (c_1). If so, i.e., the condition “ $h1 \geq h2$ ($h2 \geq h1$)” holds, the STA takes a transition to the *tick* location and activates the tick of c ($c!$). After updating the history ($hc++$), it returns to the *init* location and repeats the calculation.

Supremum builds a new clock c , which is the fastest clock slower than c_1 and c_2 . It states that if c_1 ticks at the current step and c_1 is slower than c_2 , then c ticks. The STA of **supremum** is shown in Fig. 6.2.(e). When c_1 (c_2) ticks via $c_1?$ ($c_2?$), the STA transits to the $s1$ ($s2$) location and compares the history of the two clocks and decides whether c_1 (c_2) is slower than c_2 (c_1). If c_1 (c_2) ticks slower than c_2 (c_1), i.e., $h1 < h2$ ($h2 < h1$), or c_1 and c_2 tick at the same rate, i.e., “ $h1 == h2 \ \&\& \ t_2 == 1$ ($h1 == h2 \ \&\& \ t_1 == 1$)” holds, the tick of c is triggered. The STA then updates the history of c and goes back to *init* and repeats the process.

6.2 Representation of PrCCSL in UPPAAL-SMC

In this section, the translation of EAST-ADL timing constraints specified in PrCCSL into STA and *Hypothesis Testing* query (refer to Chapter 2) is provided from the view point of the analysis engine UPPAAL-SMC.

Recall the definition of PrCCSL in Chapter 4. The probability of a *relation* being satisfied is interpreted as a ratio of runs that satisfies the *relation* among all runs. It is specified as *Hypothesis Testing* queries in UPPAAL-SMC, $H_0: \frac{m}{k} \geq P$ against $H_1: \frac{m}{k} < P$, where m is the number of runs satisfying the given *relation* out of all k runs. k is decided by strength parameters α (the probability of false positives, i.e., accepting H_1 when H_0 holds) and β (probability of false negatives, i.e., accepting H_0 when H_1 holds), respectively [10].

Based on the mapping patterns of tick and history in Chapter 6.1, the probabilistic extension of **exclusion**, **causality** and **precedence** relations are expressed as *Hypothesis Testing* queries straightforwardly.

Probabilistic Exclusion is employed to specify EAST-ADL **Exclusion** timing constraint, $turnLeft \#_p rightOn$ (Spec. R27 in Fig. 3.1). It states that the two events, $turnLeft$ and $rightOn$ (the vehicle is turning left and right), must be exclusive. The ticks of $turnLeft$ and $rightOn$ events are modeled using the STA in Fig. 6.1.(b). Based on the definition of **probabilistic exclusion** (Chapter 4), R8 is expressed in *Hypothesis Testing* query: $Pr[bound] ([]((t_{turnLeft} \implies \neg t_{rightOn}) \wedge (t_{rightOn} \implies \neg t_{turnLeft}))) \geq P$, where $t_{turnLeft}$ and $t_{rightOn}$ indicate the ticks of $turnLeft$ and $rightOn$, respectively. $bound$ is the time bound of simulation, in our setting $bound = 3000$.

Probabilistic Causality is used to specify EAST-ADL **Synchronization** timing constraint, $sup \prec_p \{inf \text{ delayFor } 40 \text{ on } ms\}$ (Spec. R13 in Fig. 3.1), where sup (inf) is the fastest (slowest) event slower (faster) than five input events, $speed$, $signType$, $direct$, $gear$ and $torque$. Let SUP and INF denote the **supremum** and **infimum** operator, i.e., $SUP(c1, c2)$ (resp. $INF(c1, c2)$) returns the **supremum** (resp. **infimum**) of clock $c1$ and $c2$. sup and inf can now be expressed with the nested operators (where \triangleq means “is defined as”):

$$sup \triangleq SUP(speed, SUP(SUP(signType, direct), SUP(gear, torque)))$$

$$inf \triangleq INF(speed, INF(INF(signType, direct), INF(gear, torque)))$$

For the translation of sup (inf) into UPPAAL-SMC model, we employ the STA of **supremum** (resp. **infimum**) (Fig. 6.2.(d) and (e)) for each SUP (INF) operator. A new clock $dinf$ is generated by delaying inf for 40 ticks of ms : $dinf \triangleq \{inf \text{ delayFor } 40 \text{ on } ms\}$. The UPPAAL-SMC model of $dinf$ is achieved by adapting the spawnable *DelayFor* STA (Fig. 6.2). Based on the **probabilistic causality** definition, R13 is interpreted as: $Pr[\leq bound]([] h_{sup} \geq h_{dinf}) \geq P$, where h_{sup} and h_{dinf} are the history of sup and $dinf$ respectively.

Similarly, Execution (R5) and Comparison (R25) timing constraints specified in probabilistic causality using `delayFor` can be translated into *Hypothesis Testing* queries. R5 ($\{imIn \text{ delayFor } 100 \text{ on } ms\} \prec_p \text{ signOut}, \text{ signOut} \prec_p \{imIn \text{ delayFor } 150 \text{ on } ms\}$) specifies that the execution time of `SignRecognition` f_p measured from input port `imIn` to output port `signOut` should be limited within $[100, 150]$ ms. To translate Execution timing constraint into UPPAAL-SMC STA, two new clocks SL and SU are constructed by delaying `imIn` for 100 and 150 ticks of ms : $SL \triangleq \{imIn \text{ delayFor } 100 \text{ on } ms\}$, $SU \triangleq \{imIn \text{ delayFor } 150 \text{ on } ms\}$. According to the definition of probabilistic causality, R5 can be specified as: $Pr[\leq bound]([] h_{SL} \geq h_S) \geq P$, $Pr[\leq bound]([] h_S \geq h_{SU}) \geq P$, where h_{SU} and h_{SL} represent the history of SU and SL , and h_S indicates the history of clock `signOut`.

Comparison constraint (R25) specified as $\{signIn \text{ delayFor } 250 \text{ on } ms\} \prec_p \{signIn \text{ delayFor } \sum WCET \text{ on } ms\}$ can be model using the `DelayFor` STA. Two new clocks CU , com are generated: $CU \triangleq \{signIn \text{ delayFor } 250 \text{ on } ms\}$, $com \triangleq \{signIn \text{ delayFor } \sum WCET \text{ on } ms\}$, where $\sum WCET$ represents the sum of worst case execution time of `Controller` and `VehicleDynamics` f_p s. Therefore, R25 can be expressed as the query: $Pr[\leq bound]([] (ex_{con} == wcet_{con} \wedge ex_{vd} == wcet_{vd}) \implies (h_{con} \geq h_{CU}) \geq P$, where $ex_{con} == wcet_{con} \wedge ex_{vd} == wcet_{vd}$ restricts that when the execution is the worst case (i.e., the execution time is the longest), the probabilistic causality relation between `con` and CU should be guaranteed.

Probabilistic Precedence is utilized to specify EAST-ADL End-to-End timing constraint (R17). It states that the time duration between the *source* event `signIn` (input signal on the `signType` port of `Controller`) and the *target* event `spOut` (output signal on the `speed` port of `VehicleDynamic`) must be within a time bound of $[150, 250]$, and that is specified as UPPAAL-SMC quires (56) and (57):

$$\{signIn \text{ delayFor } 150 \text{ on } ms\} \prec_p \text{ spOut} \quad (6.1)$$

$$\text{ spOut} \prec_p \{signIn \text{ delayFor } 250 \text{ on } ms\} \quad (6.2)$$

Two clocks, *lower* and *upper*, are defined by delaying `signIn` for 150 and 250 ticks of ms respectively: $lower \triangleq \{signIn \text{ delayFor } 150 \text{ on } ms\}$, and $upper \triangleq \{signIn \text{ delayFor } 250 \text{ on } ms\}$. The corresponding UPPAAL-SMC models of *lower* and *upper* are constructed based on the `delayFor` STA (shown in Fig. 6.2). Finally, the R17 specified in PrCCSL is expressed as UPPAAL-SMC quires (3) and (4), where h_{lower} , h_{upper} and h_{spOut} are the history of *lower*, *upper* and `spOut`. t_{spOut} and t_{upper} represent the tick of *upper* and `spOut` respectively:

$$Pr[\leq bound]([] h_{lower} \geq h_{spOut} \wedge ((h_{lower} == h_{spOut}) \implies t_{spOut} == 0)) \geq P \quad (6.3)$$

$$Pr[\leq bound]([] h_{spOut} \geq h_{upper} \wedge ((h_{spOut} == h_{upper}) \implies t_{upper} == 0)) \geq P \quad (6.4)$$

In similar, EAST-ADL **Sporadic** timing constraint (R9) specified in **probabilistic precedence** can be translated into *Hypothesis Testing* query $Pr[\leq bound]([]ho \geq hv \wedge ((hv == ho) \implies t_{va} == 0)) \geq P$, where ho represents the history of the clock/event that obstacle occurs, and t_{va} and hv indicates the ticks and history of the clock that the vehicle starts to move.

In the case of properties specified in either **probabilistic subclock** or **probabilistic coincidence**, such properties can not be directly expressed as UPPAAL-SMC queries. Therefore, we construct an observer STA that captures the semantics of standard **subclock** and **coincidence relations**. The observer STA are composed to the system STA, namely a network STA NSTA, in parallel. Then, the probabilistic analysis is performed over the NSTA which enables us to verify the EAST-ADL timing constraints specified in **probabilistic subclock** and **probabilistic coincidence** of the entire system using UPPAAL-SMC. Further details are given below.

Probabilistic Subclock is employed to specify EAST-ADL **Periodic** timing constraint, given as $signRecTrig \sqsubseteq_p cTrig$ (Spec. R2 in Fig.1). The standard **subclock relation** states that *superclock* must tick at the same step where *subclock* ticks. Its corresponding STA is shown in Fig. 6.3.(a). When $signRecTrig$ ticks ($signRecTrig?$), the STA transits to the *wait* location and detects the occurrence of $cTrig$ until the time point of the subsequent step (u). If $cTrig$ occurs prior to the next step ($tcTrig == 1$), the STA moves to the *success* location, i.e., the **subclock relation** is satisfied at the current step. Otherwise, it transits to the *fail* location. R2 specified in **probabilistic subclock** is expressed as: $Pr[bound]([] \neg Subclock.fail) \geq P$. UPPAAL-SMC analyzes if the *fail* location is never reachable from the system NSTA, and whether the probability of R2 being satisfied is greater than or equal to P .




Figure 6.3: Observer STA of Subclock and Coincidence

Probabilistic Coincidence is adapted to specify EAST-ADL **Periodic** timing constraint, given as $cTrig \equiv_p \{\text{periodicOn } ms \text{ period } 50\}$ (Spec. R1 in Fig.1). To express R1 in UPPAAL-SMC, first, a periodic clock $prdClk$ ticking every 50^{th} tick of ms is defined: $prdClk \triangleq \text{periodicOn } ms \text{ period } 50$. The corresponding UPPAAL-SMC model of $prdClk$ is generated based on the **periodicOn** STA shown in Fig. 6.2.(a) by setting q as 50. Then, we check if $cTrig$ and $prdClk$ are coincident by employing the **coincidence** STA shown in Fig. 6.3.(b). When $cTrig$ ($prdClk$) ticks via $cTrig?$ ($prdClk?$), the STA checks if the other

clock, $prdClk$ ($cTrig$), ticks prior to the next step, i.e., whether $tprdClk == 1$ ($tcTrig == 1$) holds or not when $t \leq u$. The STA then transits to either the *success* or *fail* location based on the judgement. R1 specified in **probabilistic coincidence** is expressed as: $Pr[bound]([] \neg Coincidence.fail) \geq P$. UPPAAL-SMC analyzes if the probability of R1 being satisfied is greater than or equal to P .

Chapter 7

Modeling the Behaviors of AV and its Environment in UPPAAL-SMC

To capture the behaviours of the AV system and the stochastic behaviours of its environments, e.g., random traffic signs, each f_p in Fig. 3.1 is modeled as an STA in UPPAAL-SMC. The random traffic sign in the environment is recognised by AV. The speed of the AV is influenced by the condition of the road. Obstacles on the road occurs randomly. To model these stochastic behaviours, we model the three f_p s in the Environment f_t into three STAs, which are presented in Fig. 7.1. In **TrafficSign** (Fig. 7.2.(b)) STA, *sign_num* represents the random traffic sign type, which is generated every 4ms to 8ms. To represent the integration of the AV system and the environment, the speed of AV is equal to the speed of in the environment, the **Speed** (shown in Fig. 7.1.(c)) STA updates the speed of the vehicle in the environment from the by activating the execution of *update()* function periodically. **Obstacle** STA generates a signal randomly based on probability distribution to represent random obstacles.

The system model of AV is represented as the STAs shown in Fig. 7.2. **Camera** STA is triggered periodically (Fig. 7.2.(a)). When the execution of camera is finished, i.e., the transition from *s4* to *s5* is taken, the *update()* function is triggered and the value of *sign_num* is assigned to *signType*. Since the input ports (**speed** and **obstacle**) of **Controller** are triggered periodically, the AV system obtains the speed of the vehicle and the road information by executing the *update()* periodically (Fig. 7.3).

The internal behaviours of **Controller** f_p is captured in Fig. 7.4. When the vehicle is in the “normal” mode (Fig. 7.4.(c)) and it encounters an obstacle, the “emergency stop” mode will be activated (Fig. 7.4.(b)) and the vehicle begins to stop. In “normal” mode, the vehicle adjusts its movement according to the traffic signs, e.g., when it detects a turn left sign, it will turn left (Fig. 7.5.(d)). The **Controller** then sends out requests for **VehicleDynamic** to change the direction or the speed of the four wheels.

To verify R1 to R31, STAs of CCSL *expressions* *periodicOn*, *infinum*, *supremum* and *delayFor* and STAs of PrCCSL *relations* *coincidence* and *subclock*







Figure 7.1: STAs of f_p s in Environment f_t




(a) Camera



(b) SignRecognition



(c) Controller



(d) VehicleDynamic

Figure 7.2: Modeling system behaviors in UPPAAL-SMC




Figure 7.3: Periodically triggered ports speed and obstacle





Figure 7.4: Internal behaviours of Controller in UPPAAL-SMC





Figure 7.5: Representation of substates of Normal state in UPPAAL-SMC


Figure 7.6: STAs utilized to verify R3

are utilized. For example, to verify R3, a *periodicOn* STA generates a new clock c with period 40 (Fig. 7.6.(a)). When c ticks, the *periodico* will be assigned to 1. The probabilistic coincidence *relation* between c and the triggering of the obstacle port should hold. When the input port is triggered, *obstrig* will become 1 in Fig. 7.3.(b). Coincidence STA (Fig. 7.6.(b)) is employed for checking the coincidence *relation* between c and *obstacle*.

Chapter 8

Experiments: Verification & Validation

We have formally analyzed over 30 properties (associated with timing constraints) of the system including *deadlock freedom*. A list of selected properties (Chapter 3) are verified using UPPAAL-SMC and the results are listed in Table.8.1. Five types of UPPAAL-SMC queries are employed to specify R1 – R31, *Hypothesis Testing* (HT), *Probability Estimation* (PE), *Probability Comparison* (PC), *Expected Value* (EV) and *Simulations* (SI).

1. *Deadlock Freedom*: Because of the insufficient memory caused by the periodically triggered STA `ms`, the *Deadlock Freedom* property cannot be checked successfully.
2. *Hypothesis Testing*: All properties are established as valid with 95% level of confidence;
3. *Probability Estimation*: The probability of each property being satisfied is computed and its approximate interval is given as $[0.902, 1]$;
4. *Expected Value*: The expected values of time durations of timing constraints (R1, R2, R5, R9, R13, R15, R17, R24 – R25) are evaluated. For example, during the analysis of R1, the time interval between two consecutive triggerings of the `Camera` is evaluated as 50 and that validates R1. Furthermore, UPPAAL-SMC evaluates the expected maximum duration bound of `End-to-End` timing constraint by checking R17 and generates the frequency histogram of the expected bound (see Fig. 8.2). It illustrates that the expected bound is always less than 250ms and 90% of the duration is within the range of $[207, 249]$;
5. *Probability Comparison*: is applied to confirm that the probability of `SignRecognition` f_p completing its execution within $[100, 125]$ ms is greater than the probability of completion within $[125, 150]$ ms (R5). The query results in a comparison probability ratio greater than or equal to 1.1, i.e., the execution time of `SignRecognition` f_p is most likely less than 125ms. Similarly, R6 – R8 can be analyzed.
6. *Simulation*: The simulation result of `Synchronization` timing constraint (R13) is demonstrated in Fig. 8.1. h_{inf} , h_{sup} and h_{dinf} are history of *inf*, *sup* and *dinf* respectively. Recall Spec. R13 (see Fig. 3.1), the *causality relation* between *dinf* and *sup* is satisfied. As the simulation of R13 shows (Fig. 8.1), the rising edge of h_{sup} (in blue) always occurs prior to h_{dinf} (in red). It indicates that *sup* always runs faster than *dinf*, thus the *causality relation* is validated.

We estimate the performance (i.e., time, memory and CPU consumption)

Table 8.1: Verification Results in UPPAAL-SMC

Type	R.ID	Q	Expression	Result	Time	Mem	CPU	
Periodic	R1	HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \neg \text{Coin.fail}) \geq 0.95$	valid	48.7	32.7	31.3	
		PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \neg \text{Coin.fail})$	[0.902, 1]	12.6	35.6	29.8	
		EV	$E[\leq 3000; 500]([\] \max : \text{cam.t})$	50±0	83.3	33.3	31.7	
		SI	simulate 500 $[\leq 3000](\text{camtrig}, \text{p1trig})$	valid	80.9	32.9	32.5	
	R2	HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \neg \text{Sub.fail}) \geq 0.95$	valid	48.9	32.9	29.3	
		PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \neg \text{Sub.fail})$	[0.902, 1]	12.3	35.5	30.4	
		EV	$E[\leq 3000; 500]([\] \max : \text{sf.t})$	200±0	80.6	32.5	32.2	
		SI	simulate 500 $[\leq 3000](\text{strig}, \text{p2trig})$	valid	85.5	33.1	32.3	
	R3	HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \neg \text{Coin}_{\text{obs}}.fail) \geq 0.95$	valid	57.6	40.5	34.6	
		PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \neg \text{Coin}_{\text{obs}}.fail)$	[0.902, 1]	13.8	40.4	31.1	
	R4	HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \neg \text{Coin}_{\text{sp}}.fail) \geq 0.95$	valid	56.7	40.4	32.4	
		PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \neg \text{Coin}_{\text{sp}}.fail)$	[0.902, 1]	13.6	35.9	34.0	
Execution	R5	HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{SU}} \leq h_{\text{S}}) \geq 0.95$	valid	76.5	40.4	32.3	
		PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{SU}} \leq h_{\text{S}})$	[0.902, 1]	18.1	40.3	30.8	
		HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{S}} \leq h_{\text{SL}}) \geq 0.95$	valid	77.6	37.7	31.7	
		PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{S}} \leq h_{\text{SL}})$	[0.902, 1]	16.5	40.0	31.5	
		PC	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \text{SR.exec} \implies (\text{SR.t} \geq 100 \wedge \text{SR.t} \leq 125)) \geq \Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \text{SR.exec} \implies (\text{SR.t} \geq 125 \wedge \text{SR.t} \leq 150))$	≥ 1.1	8.3	31.7	32.3	
		EV	$E[\leq 3000; 500]([\] \max : \text{checkexe.t})$	147.2±0.7	85.8	32.4	36.0	
		SI	simulate 500 $[\leq 3000](h_{\text{SU}}, h_{\text{S}}, h_{\text{SL}})$	valid	89.5	34.0	34.0	
	R6	HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{camU}} \leq h_{\text{C}}) \geq 0.95$	valid	42.8	37.9	33.2	
		PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{camU}} \leq h_{\text{C}})$	[0.902, 1]	10.8	37.9	30.8	
		HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{C}} \leq h_{\text{camL}}) \geq 0.95$	valid	38.1	34.4	32.3	
		PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{C}} \leq h_{\text{camL}})$	[0.902, 1]	9.9	37.9	31.2	
		PC	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \text{cam.exec} \implies (\text{cam.t} \geq 20 \wedge \text{cam.t} \leq 25)) \geq \Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \text{cam.exec} \implies (\text{cam.t} \geq 25 \wedge \text{cam.t} \leq 30))$	≥ 1.1	4s	34.0	30.9	
	R7	HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{conU}} \leq h_{\text{con}}) \geq 0.95$	valid	45.6	38.2	33.7	
		HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{con}} \leq h_{\text{conL}}) \geq 0.95$	valid	46.3	38.3	32.6	
		PC	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \text{con.exec} \implies (\text{con.t} \geq 100 \wedge \text{con.t} \leq 125)) \geq \Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \text{con.exec} \implies (\text{con.t} \geq 125 \wedge \text{con.t} \leq 150))$	≥ 1.1	6.9	34.0	29.3	
		SI	simulate 100 $[\leq 3000](h_{\text{conU}}, h_{\text{con}}, h_{\text{conL}})$	valid	33.4	38.8	34.2	
	R8	PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{vdu}} \leq h_{\text{vd}})$	[0.902, 1]	14.5	35.8	35.4	
		PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{vd}} \leq h_{\text{vdl}})$	[0.902, 1]	15.4	35.9	33.1	
		PC	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \text{VD.exec} \implies (\text{VD.t} \geq 50 \wedge \text{VD.t} \leq 75)) \geq \Pr[\leq 3000]([\] \text{VD.exec} \implies (\text{VD.t} \geq 75 \wedge \text{VD.t} \leq 100))$	≥ 1.1	10.1	34.1	31.5	
		SI	simulate 100 $[\leq 3000](h_{\text{vdu}}, h_{\text{vd}}, h_{\text{vdl}})$	valid	35.8	39.2	33.3	
	Sporadic	R9	HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] hv \leq ho \wedge ((hv == ho) \implies t_{\text{va}} == 0)) \geq 0.95$	valid	3h	33.1	30.0
			PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] hv \leq ho \wedge ((hv == ho) \implies t_{\text{va}} == 0))$	[0.902, 1]	45.4	33.1	29.4
			EV	$E[\leq 3000; 500]([\] \max : \text{obs.t})$	667±79	80.8	29.7	31.7
			SI	simulate 500 $[\leq 3000](hv, ho, v)$	valid	88.6	29.5	31.0
R10		HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] ha \leq ho \wedge ((ha == ho) \implies t_{\text{acc}} == 0)) \geq 0.95$	valid	2.4h	44.7	29.2	
		PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] ha \leq ho \wedge ((ha == ho) \implies t_{\text{acc}} == 0))$	[0.902, 1]	57.6	43.4	28.7	
R11		HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] htl \leq ho \wedge ((htl == ho) \implies t_{\text{t1}} == 0)) \geq 0.95$	valid	1.8h	46.3	31.3	
		SI	simulate 100 $[\leq 3000](htl, ho, tl)$	valid	56.2	42.4	30.7	
R12		PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] htr \leq ho \wedge ((htr == ho) \implies t_{\text{tr}} == 0))$	[0.902, 1]	52.9	44.1	31.0	
		SI	simulate 100 $[\leq 3000](htr, ho, tr)$	valid	56.7	41.7	29.8	
Synchronization		R13	HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{dinf}} \geq h_{\text{sup}}) \geq 0.95$	valid	53.9	32.7	31.9
			PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{dinf}} \geq h_{\text{sup}})$	[0.902, 1]	13.7	35.5	30.4
	EV		$E[\leq 3000; 500]([\] \max : \text{checksync.t})$	30.6±0.21	72.4	32.6	31.6	
	SI		simulate 500 $[\leq 3000](h_{\text{dinf}}, h_{\text{sup}})$	valid	86.8	32.6	32.0	
	R14	PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{codinf}} \geq h_{\text{cosup}})$	[0.902, 1]	13.9	36.4	34.4	
		SI	simulate 100 $[\leq 3000](h_{\text{codinf}}, h_{\text{cosup}})$	valid	41.8	37.5	33.4	
	R15	PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{vidinf}} \geq h_{\text{visup}})$	[0.902, 1]	14.3	40.5	35.1	
		EV	$E[\leq 3000; 100]([\] \max : \text{checksyncvd.t})$	16.5±0.2	19.4	46.5	25.5	
	R16	HT	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{vddinf}} \geq h_{\text{vdsup}}) \geq 0.95$	valid	55.2	45.3	32.1	
		PE	$\Pr[\leq 3000]([\] h_{\text{vddinf}} \geq h_{\text{vdsup}})$	[0.902, 1]	13.9	40.7	33.5	

Type	R.ID	Q	Expression	Result	Time	Mem	CPU	
End-to-End	R17	HT	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] h_{\text{lower}} \geq h_{\text{spOut}} \wedge ((h_{\text{lower}} == h_{\text{spOut}}) \implies t_{\text{spOut}} == 0) \geq 0.95$	valid	54.2	32.9	31.4	
		PE	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] h_{\text{lower}} \geq h_{\text{spOut}} \wedge ((h_{\text{lower}} == h_{\text{spOut}}) \implies \neg t_{\text{spOut}}) \geq 0.95$	[0.902, 1]	13.1	35.3	29.4	
		HT	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] h_{\text{spOut}} \geq h_{\text{upper}} \wedge ((h_{\text{spOut}} == h_{\text{upper}}) \implies t_{\text{upper}} == 0) \geq 0.95$	valid	1.3h	32.2	32.6	
		PE	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] h_{\text{spOut}} \geq h_{\text{upper}} \wedge ((h_{\text{spOut}} == h_{\text{upper}}) \implies \neg t_{\text{upper}}) \geq 0.95$	[0.902, 1]	19.8	34.1	32.0	
		EV	$E[\leq 3000; 500][\langle \langle \] \max : \text{checke2e.t}$	229.7±0.9	83.3	32.5	30.6	
		SI	simulate 500 $[\leq 3000](h_{\text{CU}}, h_{\text{VD}}, h_{\text{CL}}, t_{\text{CU}}, t_{\text{VD}})$	valid	89.8	32.9	30.2	
	R18	HT	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] h_{\text{cam1}} \geq h_{\text{signOut}} \wedge ((h_{\text{con1}} == h_{\text{signOut}}) \implies t_{\text{signOut}} == 0) \geq 0.95$	valid	3.1h	45.33	31.3	
		HT	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] h_{\text{camu}} \leq h_{\text{signOut}} \wedge ((h_{\text{conu}} == h_{\text{signOut}}) \implies t_{\text{conu}} == 0) \geq 0.95$	valid	56.6	46.7	31.6	
		SI	simulate 100 $[\leq 3000](h_{\text{camu}}, h_{\text{signOut}}, t_{\text{cam1}})$	valid	50.5	39.9	28.6	
	R19	PE	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] h_{\text{cam1}} \geq h_{\text{vdOut}} \wedge ((h_{\text{cam1}} == h_{\text{vdOut}}) \implies t_{\text{vdOut}} == 0) \geq 0.95$	[0.902, 1]	52.7	39.3	30.4	
		PE	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] h_{\text{camu}} \leq h_{\text{vdOut}} \wedge ((h_{\text{camu}} == h_{\text{vdOut}}) \implies t_{\text{camu}} == 0) \geq 0.95$	[0.902, 1]	2.4h	45.6	30.2	
		SI	simulate 100 $[\leq 3000](h_{\text{camu}}, h_{\text{vdOut}}, t_{\text{cam1}})$	valid	1.9h	40.8	29.8	
	R20	HT	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] h_{\text{L}} \geq h_{\text{t1}} \wedge ((h_{\text{t1}} == h_{\text{L}}) \implies t_{\text{t1}} == 0) \geq 0.95$	valid	151.3	41.9	29.1	
		SI	simulate 100 $[\leq 3000](h_{\text{L}}, h_{\text{t1}}, t_{\text{t1}})$	valid	58.4	37.3	24.5	
	R21	HT	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] h_{\text{R}} \geq h_{\text{tr}} \wedge ((h_{\text{t1}} == h_{\text{R}}) \implies t_{\text{tr}} == 0) \geq 0.95$	valid	75.9	46.8	31.3	
		SI	simulate 100 $[\leq 3000](h_{\text{R}}, h_{\text{tr}}, t_{\text{tr}})$	valid	64.8	41.8	32.0	
	R22	PE	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] h_{\text{st}} \geq h_{\text{st}} \wedge ((h_{\text{st}} == h_{\text{st}}) \implies t_{\text{st}} == 0) \geq 0.95$	[0.902, 1]	18.5	41.9	27.3	
		SI	simulate 100 $[\leq 3000](h_{\text{st}}, h_{\text{st}}, t_{\text{st}})$	valid	57.5	36.9	33.5	
R23	PE	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] h_{\text{stop}} \geq h_{\text{stu}} \wedge ((h_{\text{stop}} == h_{\text{stu}}) \implies t_{\text{stu}} == 0) \geq 0.95$	[0.902, 1]	26.8	42.3	27.8		
	SI	simulate 100 $[\leq 3000](h_{\text{stop}}, h_{\text{stu}}, t_{\text{stu}})$	valid	73.6	42.4	27.9		
Comparison	R24	HT	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] (ex_{\text{con}} == wcet_{\text{con}} \wedge ex_{\text{vd}} == wcet_{\text{vd}}) \implies (h_{\text{cu}} \geq h_{\text{com}}) \geq 0.95$	valid	57.4	36.7	28.4	
		PE	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] (ex_{\text{con}} == wcet_{\text{con}} \wedge ex_{\text{vd}} == wcet_{\text{vd}}) \implies (h_{\text{cu}} \geq h_{\text{com}}) \geq 0.95$	[0.902, 1]	14.7	35.5	26.7	
		EV	$E[\leq 3000; 500][\langle \langle \] \max : \text{control.t}$	146.7±0.28	74.9	29.4	32.7	
		EV	$E[\leq 3000; 500][\langle \langle \] \max : \text{vd.t}$	96.6±0.27	74.2	29.4	31.4	
		SI	simulate 500 $[\leq 3000](h_{\text{cu}}, h_{\text{com}})$	valid	86.6	29.5	32.5	
		R25	EV	$E[\leq 3000; 100][\langle \langle \] \max : \text{camera.t}$	29.8±0.02	18.7	39.6	29.9
	EV		$E[\leq 3000; 100][\langle \langle \] \max : \text{signreg.t}$	143.5±0.7	16.5	33.2	28.7	
	R26	HT	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] ex_{\text{con}} == wcet_{\text{con}} \wedge ex_{\text{vd}} == wcet_{\text{vd}} \wedge ex_{\text{cam}} == wcet_{\text{cam}} \wedge ex_{\text{sign}} == wcet_{\text{sign}} \implies (h_{\text{au}} \geq h_{\text{a}}) \geq 0.95$	valid	2.1h	42.5	30.1	
		PE	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] ex_{\text{con}} == wcet_{\text{con}} \wedge ex_{\text{vd}} == wcet_{\text{vd}} \wedge ex_{\text{cam}} == wcet_{\text{cam}} \wedge ex_{\text{sign}} == wcet_{\text{sign}} \implies (h_{\text{au}} \geq h_{\text{a}}) \geq 0.95$	[0.902, 1]	56.9	40.7	29.7	
	Exclusion	R27	HT	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] \neg(t_{\text{Right}} == 1 \wedge t_{\text{Left}} == 1) \geq 0.95$	valid	57.4	36.7	28.4
			PE	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] \neg(t_{\text{Right}} == 1 \wedge t_{\text{Left}} == 1) \geq 0.95$	[0.902, 1]	14.7	35.5	26.7
			PC	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] \neg(t_{\text{Right}} == 1 \wedge t_{\text{Left}} == 1) \geq \text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] \neg(\neg(t_{\text{Right}} == 1 \wedge t_{\text{Left}} == 1)) \geq 1.1$	≥ 1.1	10.9	34.2	31.3
SI			simulate 500 $[\leq 3000](t_{\text{Right}}, t_{\text{Left}})$	valid	85.5	29.6	32.6	
R28		HT	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] \neg(t_{\text{b}} == 1 \wedge t_{\text{acc}} == 1) \geq 0.95$	valid	57.5	44.6	35.9	
		PE	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] \neg(t_{\text{b}} == 1 \wedge t_{\text{acc}} == 1) \geq 0.95$	[0.902, 1]	14.3	40.7	35.6	
R29		HT	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] \neg(t_{\text{eme}} == 1 \wedge t_{\text{Left}} == 1) \geq 0.95$	valid	62.6	40.6	33.6	
		SI	simulate 100 $[\leq 3000](t_{\text{eme}}, t_{\text{Left}})$	valid	46.5	36.4	34.2	
R30		HT	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] \neg(t_{\text{eme}} == 1 \wedge t_{\text{Right}} == 1) \geq 0.95$	valid	63.8	36.3	34.2	
		SI	simulate 100 $[\leq 3000](t_{\text{Right}}, t_{\text{eme}})$	valid	47.7	36.4	34.5	
R31		HT	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] \neg(t_{\text{eme}} == 1 \wedge t_{\text{acc}} == 1) \geq 0.95$	valid	59.1	36.3	35.2	
		PE	$\text{Pr}[\leq 3000][\langle \langle \] \neg(t_{\text{eme}} == 1 \wedge t_{\text{acc}} == 1) \geq 0.95$	[0.902, 1]	15.5	36.7	30.1	




Figure 8.1: Simulation Result of R13




Figure 8.2: Frequency Histogram of End-to-End timing constraint (R17)




Figure 8.3: Performance analysis of verifying R5 with *Expected Value* and *Simulation*. The number of runs ranges from 100 to 500 with increment as 100.

of verifying R5 by using *Expected Value* and *Simulation* queries with different numbers of runs assigned. As shown in Fig. 8.3, along with the increase of the number of runs, for both queries, the verification time grows proportionally, while the CPU and memory have no significant changes.

Chapter 9

Related work

In the context of EAST-ADL, efforts on the integration of EAST-ADL and formal techniques based on timing constraints were investigated in several works [15, 17, 23, 30], which are however, limited to the executional aspects of system functions without addressing stochastic behaviors. Kang [22] and Suryadevara [32, 33] defined the execution semantics of both the controller and the environment of industrial systems in CCSL which are also given as mapping to UPPAAL models amenable to model checking. In contrast to our current work, those approaches lack precise stochastic annotations specifying continuous dynamics in particular regarding different clock rates during execution. Ling [34] transformed a subset of CCSL constraints to PROMELA models to perform formal verification using SPIN. Zhang [35] transformed CCSL into first order logics that are verifiable using SMT solver. However, their works are limited to functional properties, and no timing constraints are addressed. Though, Kang et al. [16, 19] and Marinescu et al. [27] presented both simulation and model checking approaches of SIMULINK and UPPAAL-SMC on EAST-ADL models, neither formal specification nor verification of extended EAST-ADL timing constraints with probability were conducted. Our approach is a first application on the integration of EAST-ADL and formal V&V techniques based on probabilistic extension of EAST-ADL/TADL2 constraints using PrCCSL and UPPAAL-SMC. An earlier study [18, 20, 21] defined a probabilistic extension of EAST-ADL timing constraints and presented model checking approaches on EAST-ADL models, which inspires our current work. Specifically, the techniques provided in this paper define new operators of CCSL with stochastic extensions (PrCCSL) and verify the extended EAST-ADL timing constraints of CPS (specified in PrCCSL) with statistical model checking. Du. et al. [13] proposed the use of CCSL with probabilistic logical clocks to enable stochastic analysis of hybrid systems by limiting the possible solutions of clock ticks. Whereas, our work is based on the probabilistic extension of EAST-ADL timing constraints with a focus on probabilistic verification of the extended constraints, particularly, in the context of WH.

Chapter 10

Conclusion

We present an approach to perform probabilistic verification on EAST-ADL timing constraints of automotive systems based on WH at the early design phase: 1. Probabilistic extension of CCSL, called PrCCSL, is defined and the EAST-ADL/TADL2 timing constraints with stochastic properties are specified in PrCCSL; 2. The semantics of the extended constraints in PrCCSL is translated into verifiable UPPAAL-SMC models for formal verification; 3. A set of mapping rules is proposed to facilitate guarantee of translation. Our approach is demonstrated on an autonomous traffic sign recognition vehicle (AV) case study. Although, we have shown that defining and translating a subset of CCSL with probabilistic extension into UPPAAL-SMC models is sufficient to verify EAST-ADL timing constraints, as ongoing work, advanced techniques covering a full set of CCSL constraints are further studied. Despite the fact that UPPAAL-SMC supports probabilistic analysis of the timing constraints of AV, the computational cost of verification in terms of time is rather expensive. Thus, we continue to investigate complexity-reducing design/mapping patterns for CPS to improve effectiveness and scalability of system design and verification.

Acknowledgment

This work is supported by the NSFC, EASY Project: 46000-41030005.

References

- [1] Automotive open system architecture. <https://www.autosar.org/>
- [2] UPPAAL-SMC. <http://people.cs.aau.dk/~adavid/smc/>
- [3] IEC 61508: Functional safety of electrical electronic programmable electronic safety related systems. International Organization for Standardization, Geneva (2010)
- [4] ISO 26262-6: Road vehicles functional safety part 6. Product development at the software level. International Organization for Standardization, Geneva (2011)
- [5] MAENAD. <http://www.maenad.eu/> (2011)
- [6] André, C.: Syntax and semantics of the clock constraint specification language (CCSL). Ph.D. thesis, INRIA (2009)
- [7] André, C., Mallet, F.: Clock constraints in UML/MARTE CCSL. HAL - INRIA (2008)
- [8] Bernat, G., Burns, A., Llamosi, A.: Weakly hard real-time systems. *Transactions on Computers* **50**(4), 308 – 321 (2001)
- [9] Blom, H., Feng, L., Lönn, H., Nordlander, J., Kuntz, S., Lisper, B., Quinton, S., Hanke, M., Peraldi-Frati, M.A., Goknil, A., Deantoni, J., Defo, G.B., Klobedanz, K., Özhan, M., Honcharova, O.: TIMMO-2-USE Timing Model, Tools, Algorithms, Languages, Methodology, Use Cases. Tech. rep., TIMMO-2-USE (2012)
- [10] Bulychev, P., David, A., Larsen, K.G., Mikučionis, M., Poulsen, D.B., Legay, A., Wang, Z.: UPPAAL-SMC: Statistical model checking for priced timed automata. In: QAPL. pp. 1–16. EPTCS (2012)
- [11] David, A., Du, D., Larsen, K.G., Legay, A., Mikučionis, M., Poulsen, D.B., Sedwards, S.: Statistical model checking for stochastic hybrid systems. In: HSB. pp. 122 – 136. EPTCS (2012)
- [12] David, A., Larsen, K.G., Legay, A., Mikučionis, M., Poulsen, D.B.: UPPAAL-SMC tutorial. *STTT* **17**(4), 397 – 415 (2015)

- [13] Du, D., Huang, P., Jiang, K., Mallet, F., Yang, M.: MARTE/pCCSL: Modeling and refining stochastic behaviors of CPSs with probabilistic logical clocks. In: FACS. pp. 111 – 133. Springer (2016)
- [14] EAST-ADL Consortium: EAST-ADL domain model specification v2.1.9. Tech. rep., MAENAD European Project (2011)
- [15] Goknil, A., Suryadevara, J., Peraldi-Frati, M.A., Mallet, F.: Analysis support for TADL2 timing constraints on EAST-ADL models. In: ECSA. pp. 89 – 105. Springer (2013)
- [16] Kang, E.Y., Chen, J., Ke, L., Chen, S.: Statistical analysis of energy-aware real-time automotive systems in EAST-ADL/Stateflow. In: ICIEA. pp. 1328 – 1333. IEEE (2016)
- [17] Kang, E.Y., Enoiu, E.P., Marinescu, R., Seceleanu, C., Schobbens, P.Y., Pettersson, P.: A methodology for formal analysis and verification of EAST-ADL models. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* **120**(12), 127–138 (2013)
- [18] Kang, E.Y., Huang, L., Mu, D.: Formal verification of energy and timed requirements for a cooperative automotive system. In: SAC. pp. 1492 – 1499. ACM (2018)
- [19] Kang, E.Y., Ke, L., Hua, M.Z., Wang, Y.X.: Verifying automotive systems in EAST-ADL/Stateflow using UPPAAL. In: APSEC. pp. 143 – 150. IEEE (2015)
- [20] Kang, E.Y., Mu, D., Huang, L., Lan, Q.: Model-based analysis of timing and energy constraints in an autonomous vehicle system. In: QRS. pp. 525 – 532. IEEE (2017)
- [21] Kang, E.Y., Mu, D., Huang, L., Lan, Q.: Verification and validation of a cyber-physical system in the automotive domain. In: QRS. pp. 326 – 333. IEEE (2017)
- [22] Kang, E.Y., Schobbens, P.Y.: Schedulability analysis support for automotive systems: from requirement to implementation. In: SAC. pp. 1080 – 1085. ACM (2014)
- [23] Kang, E.Y., Schobbens, P.Y., Pettersson, P.: Verifying functional behaviors of automotive products in EAST-ADL2 using UPPAAL-PORT. In: SAFE-COMP. pp. 243 – 256. Springer (2011)
- [24] Legay, A., Viswanathan, M.: Statistical model checking: challenges and perspectives. *STTT* **17**(4), 369 – 376 (2015)

- [25] Mallet, F., Peraldi-Frati, M.A., Andre, C.: MARTE CCSL to execute EAST-ADL timing requirements. In: ISORC. pp. 249 – 253. IEEE (2009)
- [26] Mallet, F., De Simone, R.: Correctness issues on MARTE/CCSL constraints. *Science of Computer Programming* **106**, 78 – 92 (2015)
- [27] Marinescu, R., Kaijser, H., Mikučionis, M., Seceleanu, C., Lönn, H., David, A.: Analyzing industrial architectural models by simulation and model-checking. In: FTSCS. pp. 189 – 205. Springer (2014)
- [28] Nicolau, G.B.: Specification and analysis of weakly hard real-time systems. *Transactions on Computers* pp. 308 – 321 (1988)
- [29] Object Management Group: UML profile for MARTE: Modeling and analysis of real-time embedded systems (2015)
- [30] Qureshi, T.N., Chen, D.J., Persson, M., Törngren, M.: Towards the integration of UPPAAL for formal verification of EAST-ADL timing constraint specification. In: TiMoBD workshop (2011)
- [31] Simulink and Stateflow. <https://www.mathworks.com/products.html>
- [32] Suryadevara, J.: Validating EAST-ADL timing constraints using UPPAAL. In: SEAA. pp. 268 – 275. IEEE (2013)
- [33] Suryadevara, J., Seceleanu, C., Mallet, F., Pettersson, P.: Verifying MARTE/CCSL model behaviors using UPPAAL. In: SEFM. pp. 1 – 15. Springer (2013)
- [34] Yin, L., Mallet, F., Liu, J.: Verification of MARTE/CCSL time requirements in PROMELA/SPIN. In: ICECCS. pp. 65 – 74. IEEE (2011)
- [35] Zhang, M., Ying, Y.: Towards SMT-based LTL model checking of clock constraint specification language for real-time and embedded systems. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* **52**(4), 61 – 70 (2017)