

Measuring Robustness in Cyber-Physical Systems under Sensor Attacks*

Jian Xiang^a, Ruggero Lanotte^b, Simone Tini^b, Stephen Chong^c, Massimo Merro^d

^aUNC Charlotte, 9201 University City Blvd, Charlotte, NC 28223, US

^bUniversity of Insubria, Via Valleggio 11, Como, 22100, Italy

^cHarvard University, 150 Western Ave, Boston, MA 02134, US

^dUniversity of Verona, Strada le Grazie 15, Verona, 37134, Italy

Abstract

This paper contributes a formal framework for quantitative analysis of bounded sensor attacks on cyber-physical systems, using the formalism of differential dynamic logic. Given a precondition and postcondition of a system, we formalize two quantitative safety notions, quantitative forward and backward safety, which respectively express (1) how strong the strongest postcondition of the system is with respect to the specified postcondition, and (2) how strong the specified precondition is with respect to the weakest precondition of the system needed to ensure the specified postcondition holds. We introduce two notions, forward and backward robustness, to characterize the robustness of a system against sensor attacks as the loss of safety. To reason about robustness, we introduce two simulation distances, forward and backward simulation distances, which are defined based on the behavioral distances between the original system and the system with compromised sensors. Forward and backward distances, respectively, characterize upper bounds of the degree of forward and backward safety loss caused by the sensor attacks. We verify the two simulation distances by expressing them as modalities, i.e., formulas of differential dynamic logic, and develop an ad-hoc proof system to reason with such formulas. We showcase our formal notions and reasoning techniques on two non-trivial case studies: an autonomous vehicle that needs to avoid collision and a water tank system.

Keywords: Cyber-physical system, safety, robustness, differential dynamic logic, quantitative analysis

1. Introduction

Cyber-Physical Systems (CPSs) are integrations of networking and distributed computing systems with physical processes, where feedback loops allow physical processes to affect computations and vice versa. A peculiar class of attacks in such systems is the so-called *physics-based attacks*: attacks targeting the physical devices (sensors and actuators) of CPSs [2, 3]. For instance, *sensor attacks*, such as DoS or integrity attacks on sensors, may lead to crashing the system under attack [4], or allow an adversary to control the system [5, 6].

The importance of ensuring the *safety* of CPSs motivates a growing body of work on formal verification for embedded and hybrid systems [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16], some of which focus on the analysis of sensor-based attacks [17, 3]. Existing work often treats satisfaction of safety as a boolean predicate: either a system satisfies a desired safety property or it does not. However, a simple yes/no answer doesn't fit the setting of CPSs, which interact with continuous and quantitative entities, such as measurements of the controlled physical process. For example, under the same road conditions, a vehicle with a shorter braking distance toward an obstacle is considered safer than a vehicle with a longer braking distance, even if both of

*This is an extended and revised version of a preliminary paper appeared in the proceedings of the *26th ACM International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control (HSCC'23)* [1].

Email addresses: jian.xiang@charlotte.edu (Jian Xiang), ruggero.lanotte@uninsubria.it (Ruggero Lanotte), simone.tini@uninsubria.it (Simone Tini), chong@seas.harvard.edu (Stephen Chong), massimo.merro@univr.it (Massimo Merro)

them can brake in time. Thus, when working with CPSs, a *quantitative* notion of safety can be much more informative than standard safety.

However, knowing the degree of safety of a CPS is not enough to analyze the effect of attacks targeting its sensors. For example, a vehicle with a very short braking distance may not be able to tolerate certain attacks on the *obstacle detection system*, resulting in unsafe runtime behaviors. Here, it is important to understand the *robustness* of a system’s safety under sensor attacks, that is, how the safety may change because of sensor attacks. For example, consider a vehicle equipped with a self-braking system whose *safety requirement* is to brake from the speed of 100 km/h when an obstacle is detected 40 meters away. And suppose the vehicle, at that speed, starts braking when the obstacle is detected 60 meters away. Assume that an adversary is able to perturb the readings of the distance to an obstacle by 10 meters without being detected. Then, the vehicle is still safe as it starts braking, at the speed of 100 km/h, when the obstacle is 50 meters away; 10 meters more than the safety requirements. The degree of safety loss is a clear indicator of the vehicle’s robustness against such an attack.

In this work, we define two notions of *quantitative safety* for CPSs and use them to analyze a system’s robustness under sensor attacks. Our threat model assumes *bounded sensor attacks*, that is, attacks that may compromise a subset of sensors and offset their readings by some degree. We do not model or discover the mechanisms by which attackers manipulate sensor values; we simply assume they are able to do so. We also assume every system has a known *precondition* and *postcondition*. The precondition specifies the initial conditions and environment when the system starts operating, and the postcondition specifies the desired condition that the system should always satisfy for it to be safe.

The first notion is *forward quantitative safety*, which estimates the room for maneuver to ensure that the system remains safe after any execution starting from a state satisfying the precondition. It basically estimates how strong the strongest postcondition is with respect to the desired safety postcondition. Said in other words, given a precondition, forward safety provides a quantification of the margins on possible strengthening of the safety postcondition with respect to the strongest postcondition. Technically, it is defined as the *shortest* distance between the set of states satisfying the strongest postcondition and the set of unsafe states. The larger this distance is, the further away the system’s reachable states are from unsafe states, and thus the safer the system is. Built upon forward safety, we introduce *forward robustness*, which characterizes the impact of a given sensor attack as a ratio: the degree of forward safety of the compromised system over the degree of forward safety of the original system. Intuitively, the closer the ratio gets to 1, the more robust the original system is against the attack. A ratio of 1 means the attack doesn’t weaken the safety guarantee at all.

The second notion is *backward quantitative safety*, which provides a degree of safety by estimating the room for maneuver to ensure that the system remains safe with respect to a given postcondition by weakening the precondition. It basically estimates how strong the specified precondition is with respect to the weakest precondition needed to ensure the safety of the system after its execution. Said in other words, given a safety postcondition, backward safety provides a quantification of the precondition with respect to the weakest precondition. Technically, it is defined as the *shortest* distance between the set of states satisfying the precondition and the set of “bad” initial states that may lead the system to unsafe states. The larger this distance is, the further away the system’s states that satisfy the precondition are from “bad” initial states, and thus the safer the system is. Built upon backward safety, we introduce *backward robustness* that characterizes the impact of a sensor attack as a ratio: the degree of backward safety of the compromised system over the original system. Similar to forward robustness, the closer the ratio gets to 1, the more robust the original system is against the attack.

The two robustness notions together give system designers a good way to understand and compare different design candidates by focusing either on preconditions or on postconditions. For example, if a system is likely to suffer from sensor attacks, a designer may simply choose a candidate design with better degrees of robustness. If one degree of robustness (e.g., forward robustness) is identical or similar among different designs, the designers may use the other (e.g., backward robustness) to compare the designs.

To reason about forward (and backward) robustness, we introduce a forward (and backward) simulation distance to, respectively, provide an upper bound of the loss of forward (and backward) safety caused by sensor attacks. The simulation distances are defined based on the behavioral distances [18] between the

original system and the system with compromised sensors. In particular, the forward simulation distance characterizes the *forward distance* between the two systems by quantifying the distance between their reachable states, given the same set of initial states. Thus, the forward distance between the original and the compromised system returns an upper bound on the admissible perturbations introduced by a sensor attack on the safety of the behaviors originating from a desired precondition. Analogously, the backward simulation distance characterizes the *backward distance* between the two systems by quantifying the distance between their sets of safe initial states, i.e., those states that never lead the system to an unsafe state, given the same set of safe final states. Thus, the backward distance between the original and the compromised system returns an upper bound on the admissible perturbations introduced by a sensor attack on the initial states leading to possible violations of safety, given a desired postcondition. We prove that the forward (and backward) simulation distance represents a sound proof technique for calculating upper bounds of forward (and backward) robustness as it returns upper bounds of the loss of forward (and backward) safety caused by sensor attacks.

In the paper, we work within the formalism of hybrid programs and *differential dynamic logic* ($d\mathcal{L}$) [19, 20, 21]. Hybrid programs are a formalism for modeling systems that have both continuous and discrete dynamic behaviors. Hybrid programs can express continuous evolution (as differential equations) as well as discrete transitions. Differential dynamic logic is the logic of hybrid programs, which is used to specify and verify safety properties.

To easily reason with the forward and backward distances, we express them as $d\mathcal{L}$ formulas and use existing $d\mathcal{L}$ axioms and proof rules to verify the formulas. Moreover, we introduce an ad-hoc *modality* and an associated *proof system* to efficiently reason with the modality. The proposed modality can be used to encode both forward and backward simulation distances in an intuitive and concise way. We formally prove the soundness of the encodings and the associated proof system. We demonstrate the applicability of the proof system on a case study on a water tank system.

The main contributions of this paper are the following:

- The notions of forward and backward quantitative safety in the context of differential dynamic logic, which models the safety properties of CPSs (Section 3).
- The notions of forward and backward quantitative robustness for systems under bounded sensor attacks, defined using the two notions of quantitative safety (Section 4).
- Two simulation distances, forward and backward simulation distances over hybrid programs, to reason about robustness (Section 5).
- Reasoning techniques for the two simulation distances based on an ad-hoc modality and its proof system (Section 6).
- Two case studies. The first one showcases the usefulness of the proposed notions on a case study on autonomous vehicles (Section 6.2). And the second one demonstrates the proof system for simulation distances in a case study of a water tank (Section 7).

We introduce preliminaries in Section 2. Section 8 discusses related work, and Section 9 concludes.

This is the journal version that extends and generalizes a conference paper [1]. The new contribution of this article are Section 6 and Section 7. Here, we also add detailed proofs of all theorems presented in the conference version and of the new results introduced in this journal version.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we recall the formalisms of hybrid programs [20] and Differential Dynamic Logic [19, 20, 21], the model of sensor attacks from [17] and a notion of distance between states from [22, 23].

2.1. Differential Dynamic Logic

Hybrid programs [20] are a formalism for modeling systems that have both continuous and discrete dynamic behaviors. Figure 1 gives the syntax for hybrid programs. Variables are real-valued and can be deterministically assigned ($x := \theta$, where θ is a real-valued term) or nondeterministically assigned ($x := *$). A

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta, \delta &::= x \mid c \mid \theta \oplus \delta \\
P, Q &::= x := \theta \mid x := * \mid x' = \theta \&\phi \mid ?\phi \mid P; Q \mid P \cup Q \mid P^* \\
\phi, \psi &::= \perp \mid \theta \sim \delta \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi \wedge \psi \mid \forall x. \phi \mid [P]\phi
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 1: Syntax of hybrid programs and \mathbf{dL}

hybrid program $x' = \theta \&\phi$ expresses the continuous evolution of variables: given the current value of variable x , the system follows the differential equation $x' = \theta$ for some (nondeterministically chosen) amount of time so long as the formula ϕ , the *evolution domain constraint*, holds for all of that time. Note that x can be a vector of variables and then θ is a vector of terms of the same dimension.

Hybrid programs also include the operations of Kleene algebra with tests [24]: testing whether a formula holds, sequential composition, nondeterministic choice, and nondeterministic repetition.

Differential dynamic logic (\mathbf{dL}) [19, 20, 21] is the dynamic logic [25] of hybrid programs. Figure 1 also gives the syntax for \mathbf{dL} formulas. In addition to the standard logical connectives of first-order logic, \mathbf{dL} includes primitive propositions that allow for comparisons of real-valued terms (which may include derivatives) and the *modality of necessity* $[P]\phi$, which holds in a state if and only if after any possible execution of hybrid program P , formula ϕ holds. The modality of necessity can be used to encode the *modality of existence*, i.e., $\langle P \rangle \phi = \neg[P]\neg\phi$. Common abbreviations for other logical connectives apply, e.g., $\phi \vee \psi = \neg(\neg\phi \wedge \neg\psi)$ and $\phi \rightarrow \psi = \neg\phi \vee \psi$.

The semantics of \mathbf{dL} [19, 21] is a Kripke semantics in which the Kripke model's worlds are the states of the system. Let \mathbb{R} denote the set of real numbers and \mathbb{V} denote the set of variables. A *state* is a map $\omega : \mathbb{V} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ assigning a real value $\omega(x)$ to each variable $x \in \mathbb{V}$. The set of all states is denoted by STA . The semantics of hybrid programs and \mathbf{dL} are shown in Figure 2. We write $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket$ to denote the set of states that satisfy formula ϕ . The value of term θ at state ω is denoted $\omega[\theta]$. The semantics of a program P is expressed as a transition relation $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ between states. If $(\omega, \nu) \in \llbracket P \rrbracket$ then there is an execution of P that starts in state ω and ends in state ν .

Safety properties of a system are often defined as follows:

Definition 1 (Safety). *A hybrid program P is safe for ϕ_{post} assuming ϕ_{pre} , denoted $\text{SAFE}(P, \phi_{\text{pre}}, \phi_{\text{post}})$, if $\phi_{\text{pre}} \rightarrow [P]\phi_{\text{post}}$ holds.*

$\text{SAFE}(P, \phi_{\text{pre}}, \phi_{\text{post}})$ means if ϕ_{pre} is true then ϕ_{post} holds after any possible execution of P . The program P often has the form $(\text{ctrl}; \text{plant})^*$, where *ctrl* models atomic actions of the controller and does not contain continuous parts; and *plant* models evolution of the physical environment and has the form of $x' = \theta \&\phi$. That is, the system is modeled as unbounded repetitions of a controller action followed by an update to the physical environment.

For example, consider a simple cooling system that operates in an environment where temperature grows at the rate of 1 degree per minute, shown in Figure 3. Let *temp* be the current temperature of the environment in degrees. The *safety condition* that we would like to enforce (ϕ_{post}) is that *temp* is no greater than 105 degrees. Let *delta* be the rate of change of the temperature (degrees per minute). Let t be the time elapsed since the controller was last invoked.

The program *plant* describes how the physical environment evolves over time interval (1 minute): temperature changes according to *delta* (i.e., $\text{temp}' = \text{delta}$) and time passes constantly (i.e., $t' = 1$). The differential equations evolve only within the time interval $t \leq 1$ and if *temp* is non-negative (i.e., $\text{temp} \geq 0$).

The hybrid program *ctrl* models the system's controller. If the temperature is above 100 degrees, the system activates cooling and the temperature drops at a rate of 0.5 degrees per time unit (i.e., $\text{delta} := -0.5$). The controller doesn't activate cooling under other temperatures. Then the temperature would grow at the rate of 1 degree per minute (i.e., $\text{delta} := 1$).

The formula to be verified, ϕ_{safety} , is shown at the last line of Figure 3. Given an appropriate precondition ϕ_{pre} , the axioms and proof rules of \mathbf{dL} can be used to prove that the safety condition ϕ_{post} holds. For this model, assuming the precondition of initial temperature of 100 degrees, i.e., ϕ_{pre} , we want to ensure the temperature stays no greater than 105 degrees, i.e., ϕ_{post} . The tactic-based theorem prover KeYmaera X [26] provides tool support.

Term semantics

$$\omega[[x]] = \omega(x)$$

$$\omega[[c]] = c$$

$$\omega[[\theta \oplus \delta]] = \omega[[\theta]] \oplus \omega[[\delta]] \text{ where } \oplus \text{ denotes corresponding arithmetic operations for } \oplus \in \{+, \times\}$$

Program semantics

$$[[x := \theta]] = \{(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu(x) = \omega[[\theta]] \text{ and for all other variables } z \neq x, \nu(z) = \omega(z)\}$$

$$[[x := *]] = \{(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu(z) = \omega(z) \text{ for all variables } z \neq x\}$$

$$[[x' = \theta \& \phi]] = \{(\omega, \nu) \mid \text{exists solution } \varphi : [0, r] \mapsto \text{STA of } x' = \theta \text{ with } \varphi(0) = \omega \text{ and } \varphi(r) = \nu, \\ \text{and } \varphi(t) \in [[\phi]] \text{ for all } t \in [0, r]\}$$

$$[[?\phi]] = \{(\omega, \omega) \mid \omega \in [[\phi]]\}$$

$$[[P; Q]] = \{(\omega, \nu) \mid \exists \mu, (\omega, \mu) \in [[P]] \text{ and } (\mu, \nu) \in [[Q]]\}$$

$$[[P \cup Q]] = [[P]] \cup [[Q]]$$

$$[[P^*]] = [[P]]^*, \text{ the transitive, reflexive closure of } [[P]]$$

Formula semantics

$$[[\perp]] = \emptyset$$

$$[[\theta \sim \delta]] = \{\omega \mid \omega[[\theta]] \sim \omega[[\delta]]\}, \text{ where } \sim \text{ denotes comparison for } \sim \in \{=, \leq, <, \geq, >\}$$

$$[[\neg\phi]] = \text{STA} \setminus [[\phi]]$$

$$[[\phi \wedge \psi]] = [[\phi]] \cap [[\psi]]$$

$$[[\forall x. \phi]] = [[x := *]\phi]$$

$$[[[P]\phi]] = \{\omega \mid \forall \nu \text{ if } (\omega, \nu) \in [[P]] \text{ then } \nu \in [[\phi]]\}$$

Figure 2: Semantics of hybrid programs and dL formulas

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{pre} &\equiv temp = 100 \\ \phi_{post} &\equiv temp \leq 105 \\ ctrl &\equiv t := 0; \\ &\quad (?temp > 100; delta := -0.5) \\ &\quad \cup (?temp \leq 100; delta := 1) \\ plant &\equiv temp' = delta, t' = 1 \& (temp \geq 0 \wedge t \leq 1) \\ \phi_{safety} &\equiv \phi_{pre} \rightarrow [(ctrl; plant)^*]\phi_{post} \end{aligned}$$

Figure 3: dL model of a cooling system

To present some of our definitions, we need to refer to the variables that occur in a hybrid program [20, 21]. We write $\text{VAR}(P)$ and $\text{VAR}(\phi)$ to denote, respectively, the set of all variables of program P and formula ϕ . Their definitions can be found in Appendix A.

2.2. Modeling Sensor Attacks

Recent work introduces a framework for modeling and analyzing sensor attacks in the setting of hybrid programs and dL [17]. It models sensing by separately representing physical values and their sensor reads, and then requires that variables holding sensor reads are equal to the underlying sensor's value. See, for instance, Figure 3 and Figure 4. Here, $temp_p$ represents the actual physical temperature and it changes according to $delta$, while $temp_s$ represents the variable into which the sensor's value is read. The controller program $ctrl$ sets the sensed values equal to the physical values, i.e., $temp_s := temp_p$, to indicate the sensor is working correctly.

Models of a system under sensor attack can be then derived by manipulating the variables representing the sensor reads. For example, with the model shown in Figure 4, an attack on the temperature sensor can be modeled by replacing $temp_s := temp_p$ with $temp_s := *$, allowing $temp_s$ to take arbitrary values.

We later extend this approach to model *bounded sensor attacks*.

2.3. Distance Metrics

To conduct quantitative analysis, we define a notion of *distance between states*, using the *Euclidean distance* $\rho : \text{STA} \times \text{STA} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:

$$\rho(\omega, \nu) = \sqrt{\sum_{x \in \mathbb{V}} (\omega(x) - \nu(x))^2} \quad (1)$$

Notice that ρ is a *metric*, namely, it satisfies the following properties: $\rho(\omega, \nu) = 0$ if and only if $\omega = \nu$; $\rho(\omega, \nu) = \rho(\nu, \omega)$; and $\rho(\omega, \nu) \leq \rho(\omega, \mu) + \rho(\mu, \nu)$ for $\omega, \nu, \mu \in \text{STA}$.

For a state ω and a real $\epsilon > 0$, the ball of ray ϵ centered in ω is the set of states $\mathbf{B}(\omega, \epsilon) = \{\nu \mid \rho(\omega, \nu) \leq \epsilon\}$.

We adopt existing notions [22, 23] to specify the distance between a state and a set of states:

- The distance between a state ω and a set of states $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \text{STA}$ is the *shortest* distance between ω and all states in \mathcal{S} , that is,

$$\mathbf{dist}(\omega, \mathcal{S}) = \mathbf{inf}\{\rho(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu \in \mathcal{S}\}$$

- The *depth* of ω in $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \text{STA}$ is the *shortest* distance between ω and the *boundary* of \mathcal{S} , that is,

$$\mathbf{depth}(\omega, \mathcal{S}) = \mathbf{inf}\{\rho(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu \in (\text{STA} \setminus \mathcal{S})\}$$

- The *signed distance* between ω and a set of states $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \text{STA}$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \mathcal{S}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{depth}(\omega, \mathcal{S}), & \text{if } \omega \in \mathcal{S} \\ -\mathbf{dist}(\omega, \mathcal{S}), & \text{if } \omega \notin \mathcal{S} \end{cases}$$

Note that in the first case the signed distance is a positive real number, while in the second case the signed distance is negative. Thus, $\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \mathcal{S}) > 0$ implies that $\mathbf{B}(\omega, \epsilon) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ for all $\epsilon < \mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \mathcal{S})$, whereas $\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \mathcal{S}) < 0$ implies that $\mathbf{B}(\omega, \epsilon) \subseteq (\text{STA} \setminus \mathcal{S})$ for all $\epsilon < -\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \mathcal{S})$. $\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \mathcal{S}) = 0$ is not very informative.

Here, we assume $\mathbf{inf} \emptyset = \infty$ and $\mathbf{inf} \mathbb{R} = -\infty$, and we let operator \mathbf{inf} in the set of $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty, -\infty\}$, thus every set has an infimum.

3. Quantitative Safety

The Boolean notion of safety in \mathbf{dL} , e.g., $\text{SAFE}(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, does not provide any quantitative information on how “good” (i.e., safe) the system is. In this section, we introduce two quantitative notions of safety. The two notions are the foundation of defining forward and backward robustness. They are, respectively, built on the *strongest postcondition* and *weakest precondition* in the setting of \mathbf{dL} . In defining quantitative safety, we use hybrid program P to model a system of interest, formula ϕ_{pre} as the precondition of the system, and ϕ_{post} as the postcondition.

3.1. Extended \mathbf{dL}

To help define quantitative safety, we extend \mathbf{dL} with another syntactic structure: $\langle \phi \rangle P$, which intuitively represents the *strongest postcondition* after the execution of the program P in a state satisfying the precondition ϕ . Its formal definition is the following:

$$\llbracket \langle \phi \rangle P \rrbracket = \{ \nu \mid \exists \omega \text{ such that } \omega \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket \text{ and } (\omega, \nu) \in \llbracket P \rrbracket \}$$

Its dual is the modality of necessity $[P]\phi$, which represents the *weakest precondition* to ensure that ϕ is satisfied after any execution of program P . Its formal definition was shown above in Figure 2.

3.2. Forward Quantitative Safety

A quantitative variation to the Boolean notion of safety, e.g., $\text{SAFE}(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, is *forward quantitative safety*, which provides a degree of safety by estimating the room of maneuver to ensure that the system remains in the safety region after any admissible execution. It basically estimates how strong the strongest

...
 $ctrl \equiv temp_s := temp_p; t := 0;$
 $(?temp_s > 100; delta := -0.5)$
 $\cup (?temp_s \leq 100; delta := 1)$
 $plant \equiv temp_p' = delta, t' = 1 \& (temp_p \geq 0 \wedge t \leq 1)$

Figure 4: dL model of a cooling system with sensing

postcondition $\phi_{pre}\langle P \rangle$ (obtained by the execution of program P in the precondition ϕ_{pre}) is with respect to the postcondition ϕ_{post} . In other words, this degree of safety gives an indication of the margins on possible strengthening of the postcondition ϕ_{post} .

Definition 2 (Forward quantitative safety). Given a real $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and formulas ϕ_{pre} and ϕ_{post} , a hybrid program P is forward u -safe for ϕ_{pre} and ϕ_{post} , denoted $F\text{-SAFE}_u(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, if

$$u = \mathbf{inf}\{\mathbf{Dist}(\nu, \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi_{pre}\langle P \rangle \rrbracket\}$$

Given a system P and a precondition ϕ_{pre} , the real number u measures the *shortest* distance between the set of states satisfying the strongest postcondition $\phi_{pre}\langle P \rangle$ and the set of unsafe states. If u is positive, then all reachable states by the system P from initial states satisfying the precondition ϕ_{pre} stay safe. The bigger u is, the safer the system is. Conversely, if u is negative, then some reachable states violate the safety condition ϕ_{post} . If u is 0, then the system cannot be considered safe as its safety may depend on very small perturbations of the system's variables [22].

Example 1. Consider the cooling system shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4, where $\phi_{pre} \equiv temp_p = 100$ and $\phi_{post} \equiv temp_p \leq 105$. During the execution of the system the temperature lies in the real interval $(99.5, 101]$, namely the strongest postcondition is $\phi_{pre}\langle P \rangle \equiv temp_p > 99.5 \wedge temp_p \leq 101$. Then, we have $F\text{-SAFE}_u(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, where $P = (ctrl; plant)^*$, for $u = 4$. So, u is our “degree of safety” with respect to ϕ_{post} : the system will always satisfy the postcondition $temp_p \leq 105$ with a margin of at least 4 degrees.

Now, consider a different postcondition $\phi'_{post} \equiv temp_p \leq 101$, then we have $F\text{-SAFE}_u(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi'_{post})$, for $u = 0$, and the system is actually safe, as $\text{SAFE}(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi'_{post})$ holds. However, for a slightly different postcondition $\phi''_{post} \equiv temp_p < 101$, we still have $F\text{-SAFE}_u(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi''_{post})$, for $u = 0$, but the system is actually unsafe, as $\text{SAFE}(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi''_{post})$ is false. This shows that when the degree of safety is 0 we cannot assess the safety of the system.

3.3. Backward Quantitative Safety

Another quantitative safety notion is *backward quantitative safety*, which estimates how strong the precondition is with respect to the required initial condition for the system to be safe. It provides quantitative information on how “good” (i.e., strong) the precondition ϕ_{pre} is with respect to the weakest precondition $[P]\phi_{post}$, while ensuring safety (i.e., ϕ_{post}) after executions of the system P . In other words, this degree of safety gives an indication of the margins on a possible weakening of the precondition ϕ_{pre} . It is defined as the *shortest* distance from states that satisfy the precondition to any “bad” initial states that can lead the system to unsafe states.

Definition 3 (Backward quantitative safety). Given a real $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and formulas ϕ_{pre} and ϕ_{post} , a hybrid program P is backward r -safe for ϕ_{pre} and ϕ_{post} , denoted $B\text{-SAFE}_r(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, if

$$r = \mathbf{inf}\{\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket [P]\phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket\}$$

Here, if r is positive then any execution of the system that starts from initial states in ϕ_{pre} shall always stay safe. The bigger r is, the safer the system is. On the contrary, if r is negative, then some initial states in ϕ_{pre} can lead the system's execution to an unsafe state. Similar to the forward quantitative safety, if r is 0 the system cannot be considered safe.

Example 2. Assuming the precondition ($temp_p = 100$) and the postcondition ($temp_p \leq 105$), we have $B\text{-SAFE}_r(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, for $r = 5$, since the weakest precondition is $[P]\phi_{post} \equiv temp_p \leq 105$. Then $r = 5$ is our “degree of safety” with respect to ϕ_{pre} : we have a room of maneuver of 5 on the precondition to ensure the postcondition after the execution of P .

The Boolean version of safety, $\text{SAFE}(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ of Definition 1, can be expressed in terms of backward quantitative safety.

Proposition 1. Given a program P and formula ϕ_{pre} and ϕ_{post} .

- If there is $r > 0$ such that $B\text{-SAFE}_r(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, then $\text{SAFE}(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$.
- If $\text{SAFE}(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ then there is $r \geq 0$ such that $B\text{-SAFE}_r(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$.

The results follow directly from the definitions.

Note that the two quantitative notions of safety never contradict each other, i.e., if one degree of safety is positive, the other is non-negative. And if one degree is negative, the other is non-positive.

Proposition 2. Given a program P and formula ϕ_{pre} and ϕ_{post} .

- If $F\text{-SAFE}_u(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ for some $u > 0$, then $B\text{-SAFE}_r(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ for some $r \geq 0$;
- If $B\text{-SAFE}_r(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ for some $r > 0$, then $F\text{-SAFE}_u(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ for some $u \geq 0$.

Intuitively, the two properties hold since positive values of both forward safety and backward safety ensure that by running P from states satisfying the preconditions, only states satisfying the postcondition can be reached. A formal proof is given in Appendix B.1.

However, the degree of safety of the two notions are not quantitatively related, i.e., given formula ϕ_{pre} , ϕ_{post} , and a hybrid program P , if $B\text{-SAFE}_u(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ and $F\text{-SAFE}_r(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ for some $u > 0$ and $r > 0$, the relationship between u and r can be arbitrary.

Notice that given a system P , a precondition ϕ_{pre} and a postcondition ϕ_{post} , forward quantitative safety, i.e., $F\text{-SAFE}_u(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ always holds for some u , since the infimum always exists (even for unsafe systems whose u is non-positive). The same for backward safety.

4. Quantitative Robustness

This section first introduces the *threat model* on sensor attacks and then provides two notions of robustness to measure the resilience of a CPS, in terms of forward and backward safety, respectively, with respect to a specific sensor attack.

4.1. Bounded Sensor Attacks

Existing work [17] considers a threat model of sensor attacks that the attackers can arbitrarily manipulate the sensor readings, e.g., compromised temperature sensor is modeled by $temp_s := *$. The threat model is too coarse and strong, in particular, when the system under attacks is equipped with some sort of IDS (for instance, anomaly detection IDSs [2]) that the attacker would like to evade.

In this work, we consider more refined sensor attacks in which the measurement deviation is bounded. Such finer attacks can be modeled by assignments of the form $q_s = q_p + o$, where q_s and q_p respectively represent sensor and physical values of a real-world quantity, and o represents a suitable offset. The idea is that for low values of $|o|$ the attack may remain *stealthy*, i.e., undetected by IDSs. The attack can be formalized as follows:

Definition 4 (Bounded S_A -sensor attack). Given a hybrid program P , a set of sensors $S_A \subseteq \text{VAR}(P)$ and an offset function $o : S_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, we write $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ to denote the program obtained by replacing in P all assignments to variables q_s in S_A , with programs of the form

$$q_s := *; ?(q_s \geq q_p - o(q_s) \wedge q_s \leq q_p + o(q_s))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
ctrl' &\equiv temp_s := *; \\
&\quad ?(temp_s \geq temp_p - 0.3 \wedge temp_s \leq temp_p + 0.3); \\
&\quad \dots
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 5: dL model of a cooling system under sensor attack (the omitted part is the same as the model in Figure 4)

For example, for the cooling system shown in Figure 4, consider a sensor attack introducing an offset 0.3 to the temperature sensor. Figure 5 shows a model of the system with compromised sensors.

The following theorem states that forward safety is affected by bounded sensor attacks in a proportional manner: the stronger the attack is, the lower the degree of safety of the attacked system.

Theorem 1. *Assume a hybrid program P , a set of sensors $S_A \subseteq \text{VAR}(P)$ and two offset functions $o_1 : S_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ and $o_2 : S_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, with $o_1(s) \leq o_2(s)$ for any $s \in S_A$, real numbers $u, u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, and properties ϕ_{pre} and ϕ_{post} . Then, if*

- F-SAFE $_u(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$
- F-SAFE $_{u_1}(\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o_1), \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$
- F-SAFE $_{u_2}(\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o_2), \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$

then $u_2 \leq u_1 \leq u$.

The detailed proof can be found in Appendix B.2. A similar theorem for backward safety can be proven:

Theorem 2. *Assume a hybrid program P , a set of sensors $S_A \subseteq \text{VAR}(P)$ and two offset functions $o_1 : S_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ and $o_2 : S_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, with $o_1(s) \leq o_2(s)$ for any $s \in S_A$, real numbers $r, r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, and properties ϕ_{pre} and ϕ_{post} . Then, if*

- B-SAFE $_r(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$
- B-SAFE $_{r_1}(\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o_1), \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$
- B-SAFE $_{r_2}(\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o_2), \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$

then $r_2 \leq r_1 \leq r$.

Also the proof of this result can be found in Appendix B.2.

4.2. Quantitative Robustness

With the definitions of quantitative safety, we can characterize the robustness of a system against sensor attacks as the loss of safety. In particular, the robustness notions are defined by comparing the degree of safety of the original system and the system whose sensors have been compromised. We introduce two notions of quantitative robustness, forward and backward robustness, which are built on the notions of forward and backward safety, respectively.

Forward Robustness. The first robustness notion, *forward robustness*, measures, intuitively, how much an attack affects the system's reachable states if the system starts with the expected precondition. Forward robustness characterizes the impact of a sensor attack as a ratio: the degree of safety of the compromised system over the degree of safety of the original system.

Definition 5 (Quantitative forward robustness). *Given a hybrid program P , a set of sensors $S_A \subseteq \text{VAR}(P)$, an offset function $o : S_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, real numbers $u, u_1, \delta \in \mathbb{R}$, and properties ϕ_{pre} and ϕ_{post} , we say that P is forward δ -robust under o -bounded S_A -attacks, written F-ROBUST($P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post}, S_A, o, \delta$), if*

- F-SAFE $_u(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, with $u > 0$
- F-SAFE $_{u_1}(\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o), \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$
- $\delta = u_1/u$.

As expected, forward robustness applies only to systems that are safe when not exposed to sensor attacks, i.e., $u > 0$. The value of ratio δ indicates the system's robustness under the sensor attack. Note that by Theorem 1, we know that $u_1 \leq u$. We can analyze δ via the following cases:

- $\delta = 1$: the attack doesn't affect the system's forward safety.
- $0 < \delta < 1$: then $0 < u_1 < u$. Given initial states where the precondition holds, reachable states of both the original system and the compromised system stay safe. The value of $(1 - \delta)$ quantifies the *percentage of forward safety that is lost* due to the attack. The closer δ is to 1, the more robust the system is.
- $\delta \leq 0$: then $u > 0$ and $u_1 \leq 0$. Executions of the original system stay safe, but the attack may be able to “break” the system: some of its executions under attack may run into unsafe states. The lower the value of δ , the more effective the attack can be. If $\delta = 0$ the attacked system can no longer be considered safe.

Example 3. Consider again the cooling system described before. We already know from Example 1 that $\text{F-SAFE}_4(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ for $\phi_{pre} \equiv \text{temp}_p = 100$ and $\phi_{post} \equiv \text{temp}_p \leq 105$, where P models the original system shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4. For the compromised system shown in Figure 5, starting again from ϕ_{pre} , during executions of $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$, the temperature lies in the interval $(99.2, 101.3]$. Thus we have $\phi_{pre} \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \equiv 99.2 \leq \text{temp}_p \leq 101.3$ and $\text{F-SAFE}_{3.7}(\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o), \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$. The degree of forward robustness of the original system with respect to the attack is: $\delta = 3.7/4 = 0.925$.

The value of δ can help engineers evaluate or compare different defense mechanisms against potential attacks. For a specific set of attacks, a mechanism with less safety loss, i.e., bigger δ , may be considered better than another one with more safety loss.

Note that using a ratio for δ is a better indicator of robustness than using an absolute value, e.g., $u - u_1$: it is consistent regardless of the units of measurement used for safety. For example, the ratio of robustness for a braking system with respect to a sensor attack would be the same whether the safety is measured in feet or in meters.

Backward Robustness. The second robustness notion, *backward robustness*, measures, intuitively, how resilient the initial states that satisfy the precondition are to sensor attacks whose goal is to drag the system into unsafe states. It characterizes the impact of a sensor attack as a ratio: the degree of safety of the compromised system over the degree of safety of the original system.

Definition 6 (Quantitative backward robustness). Given a hybrid program P , a set of sensors $S_A \subseteq \text{VAR}(P)$, an offset function $o : S_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, real numbers $r, r_1, \delta \in \mathbb{R}$, and properties ϕ_{pre} and ϕ_{post} , we say that P is backward δ -robust under o -bounded S_A -attacks, written $\text{B-ROBUST}(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post}, S_A, o, \delta)$, if

- $\text{B-SAFE}_r(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, with $r > 0$
- $\text{B-SAFE}_{r_1}(\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o), \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$
- $\delta = r_1/r$.

Again, backward robustness applies only to systems that are safe when not exposed to sensor attacks (i.e., $r > 0$). The meanings of different values of δ are analogous to values of δ in Definition 5.

Example 4. Consider again the cooling system. Given $\phi_{pre} \equiv \text{temp}_p = 100$ and $\phi_{post} \equiv \text{temp}_p \leq 105$, we already know from Example 2 that $\text{B-SAFE}_r(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, where P models the original system, for $r = 5.0$. Consider a sensor attack that offsets 0.3 degrees of sensor readings, formula $[\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)]\phi_{post}$ is $\text{temp}_p \leq 105.0$. So we know $\text{B-SAFE}_{r_1}(\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o), \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ for $r_1 = 5.0$. Therefore, the degree of backward robustness of the original system with respect to the attack is: $\delta = 5.0/5.0 = 1$. Meaning the attack doesn't affect the backward safety of the system.

5. Reasoning about Robustness with Simulation Distances

Using Definition 5 (and 6), we can compute forward (and backward) robustness of a system in terms of the forward (and backward) safety of the system, before and after a bounded sensor attack. However, the computation of forward and backward safety may be difficult, as they consider all admissible values to compute the infimum. This is particularly difficult for a system with compromised sensors, due to the complications caused by the offset function.

In this section, we introduce two *simulation distances* between hybrid programs, called *forward simulation distance* (or *forward distance*) and *backward simulation distance* (or *backward distance*). They quantify the behavioral distance between the original system and the compromised one, according to a forward and backward flavor, respectively. These distances allow us to compute an upper bound on the loss of forward (and backward) safety. The computed upper bounds are not necessarily tight bounds, but they are easier to reason with and can be verified with existing tools or via the proof systems proposed in Section 6.

To define forward (and backward) simulation distance between two programs, we extend the notion of distance between states, i.e., $\rho(\omega, \nu)$ given in Equation 1, to support computing distance on a set \mathcal{H} of variables [17]. Intuitively, variables in \mathcal{H} are the ones that are relevant to the specified precondition and postcondition. And thus computing distance over these variables gives us the quantitative distance of interest. Consider the cooling system example, we are interested in the behavioral distance between the original program and the compromised one with respect to the variable $temp_p$, rather than $temp_s$.

We introduce a new notion of distance between states with respect to a set \mathcal{H} of variables, as follows:

Definition 7. For a set of variables $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathbb{V}$, two states ω and ν are at \mathcal{H} -distance d , written $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \nu) = d$, if $\sqrt{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} (\omega(x) - \nu(x))^2} = d$. We write $\mathbf{Dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \mathcal{S})$ to denote $\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \mathcal{S})$ where $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \nu)$ is used instead of $\rho(\omega, \nu)$. Then, $\mathbf{depth}_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \mathcal{S})$ is defined in the same manner.

The following proposition shows that computing the forward and backward safety (using $\rho(\omega, \nu)$) can be reduced to a computation using $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \nu)$ with the appropriate variable sets \mathcal{H} , i.e., $\text{VAR}(\phi_{pre})$ or $\text{VAR}(\phi_{post})$.

Proposition 3. For $u, u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, and formula ϕ, ψ , if

- $u = \mathbf{inf}\{\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket) \mid \omega \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket\}$
- $u_1 = \mathbf{inf}\{\mathbf{Dist}_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket) \mid \omega \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket\}$
- $u_2 = \mathbf{inf}\{\mathbf{Dist}_{\text{VAR}(\psi)}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket) \mid \omega \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket\}$

then $u = u_1 = u_2$.

Intuitively, the proposition holds because the infimum value of u is essentially decided by the distance calculated with respect to the relevant variables in ϕ or ψ . The detailed proof can be found in Appendix B.3.

5.1. Forward Simulation Distance

We introduce the notion of *forward simulation distance*. Intuitively, programs P_1 and P_2 are in forward simulation at distance d if given the same initial condition, P_2 can mimic the behaviors of P_1 , i.e., P_2 is able to reach states whose distance from those reached by P_1 is at most d .

Definition 8 (Forward simulation distance). For hybrid programs P_1, P_2 , formula ϕ_{pre} and a set of variables \mathcal{H} , P_1 and P_2 are at forward simulation distance d with respect to ϕ_{pre} and \mathcal{H} , written

$$P_1 \sqsubseteq_{\phi_{pre}, \mathcal{H}, d}^F P_2$$

if for each state $\nu_1 \in \llbracket \phi_{pre}(P_1) \rrbracket$ there exists a state $\nu_2 \in \llbracket \phi_{pre}(P_2) \rrbracket$ such that $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq d$.

Here, for programs P and $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$, the forward simulation $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \sqsubseteq_{\phi_{pre}, \mathcal{H}, d}^F P$ expresses that for each state ν_1 reachable by $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$, from some initial states in $\llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket$, there is a state ν_2 reachable by P , from some initial state in $\llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket$, such that ν_1 and ν_2 are at distance at most d , for a fixed variable set \mathcal{H} . The distance d gives an upper bound on the perturbation introduced by the attack on the safety of the behaviors originating from $\llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket$. The set \mathcal{H} here often refers to variables that are relevant to the system's postcondition, i.e., $\text{VAR}(\phi_{post})$.

Example 5. Let P be the program modeling the cooling system shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4 and $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ the attacked version shown in Figure 5. Let \mathcal{H} be $\text{VAR}(\phi_{post}) = \{temp_p\}$. The forward distance between $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ and P with respect to ϕ_{pre} and \mathcal{H} is 0.3, as proven in the next section. Actually, by Example 3 we already know that 0.3 is indeed an upper bound of the loss of forward safety. In Example 3 we showed that 0.3 is the "exact" loss of forward safety. Therefore, in this case, the upper bound is tight.

The following theorem states that the forward simulation distance d between $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ and P with respect to $\text{VAR}(\phi_{\text{post}})$, is indeed an *upper bound* to the loss of forward safety due to the attack.

Theorem 3. For a hybrid program P , a set of variables $S_A \subseteq \text{VAR}(P)$, formulas ϕ_{pre} and ϕ_{post} , an offset function o , and $d, u \in \mathbb{R}$, if

- $\text{F-SAFE}_u(P, \phi_{\text{pre}}, \phi_{\text{post}})$, with $u > 0$
- $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \sqsubseteq_{\phi_{\text{pre}}, \text{VAR}(\phi_{\text{post}}), d}^{\text{F}} P$

then $\text{F-ROBUST}(P, \phi_{\text{pre}}, \phi_{\text{post}}, S_A, o, \delta)$, for some δ such that $\delta \geq (u - d)/u$.

The theorem says that d is an upper bound of the loss of forward safety, meaning that for some u_1 such that $d \geq u - u_1$ we have $\text{F-SAFE}_{u_1}(\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o), \phi_{\text{pre}}, \phi_{\text{post}})$. The detailed proof can be found in Appendix B.3.

5.2. Backward Simulation Distance

Symmetrically, we introduce *backward simulation distance* to reason with upper bounds of loss of backward safety caused by sensor attacks. Intuitively, programs P_1 and P_2 are in backward simulation distance d if for the same postcondition, P_2 can mimic the behaviors of P_1 that may violate the postcondition. This means that initial states that can lead to violation of safety condition of the two systems are distant at most d .

Definition 9 (Backward simulation distance). For hybrid programs P_1 and P_2 , formula ϕ_{post} and a set of variables \mathcal{H} , P_1 and P_2 are at backward simulation distance d with respect to ϕ_{post} and \mathcal{H} , formally written as

$$P_1 \sqsubseteq_{\phi_{\text{post}}, \mathcal{H}, d}^{\text{B}} P_2$$

if for each state $\omega_1 \in \llbracket \langle P_1 \rangle \neg \phi_{\text{post}} \rrbracket$ there exists a state $\omega_2 \in \llbracket \langle P_2 \rangle \neg \phi_{\text{post}} \rrbracket$ such that $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega_1, \omega_2) \leq d$.

Here, property $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \sqsubseteq_{\phi_{\text{post}}, \mathcal{H}, d}^{\text{B}} P$ means that for each initial state ω_1 , from which $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ can reach an unsafe state in $\llbracket \neg \phi_{\text{post}} \rrbracket$, there is an initial state ω_2 , from which P can reach a state in $\llbracket \neg \phi_{\text{post}} \rrbracket$, such that ω_1 and ω_2 are at distance at most d , with respect to a set of variables \mathcal{H} . Thus, the backward distance between the original and the compromised system returns an upper bound on the admissible perturbations introduced by a sensor attack on the initial states leading to possible violations of safety, fixed a desired postcondition ϕ_{post} . The set \mathcal{H} often is the set of variables that are relevant to the system's precondition, i.e., $\text{VAR}(\phi_{\text{pre}})$.

Example 6. Consider again be the program P , modeling the cooling system shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4, and $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ the attacked version shown in Figure 5. Let \mathcal{H} be $\text{VAR}(\phi_{\text{pre}}) = \{\text{temp}_p\}$. The backward distance between $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ and P with respect to ϕ_{post} and \mathcal{H} is 0 (as proven in the next section). From Example 4 we know that 0 is indeed an upper bound of the loss of backward safety. Also in this case the upper bound is tight, since in Example 4 we showed that 0 is the "exact" loss of backward safety.

The following theorem states that the backward simulation distance d between $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ and P with respect to variable set $\text{VAR}(\phi_{\text{pre}})$, is indeed an *upper bound* to the loss of backward safety due to the attack.

Theorem 4. For a hybrid program P , a set of variables $S_A \subseteq \text{VAR}(P)$, formulas ϕ_{pre} and ϕ_{post} , an offset function o and $d, r \in \mathbb{R}$, if

- $\text{B-SAFE}_r(P, \phi_{\text{pre}}, \phi_{\text{post}})$, with $r > 0$
- $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \sqsubseteq_{\phi_{\text{post}}, \text{VAR}(\phi_{\text{pre}}), d}^{\text{B}} P$

then $\text{B-ROBUST}(P, \phi_{\text{pre}}, \phi_{\text{post}}, S_A, o, \delta)$ for some δ such that $\delta \geq (r - d)/r$.

The theorem says that d is an upper bound to the loss of backward safety, meaning that we have $\text{B-SAFE}_{r_1}(\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o), \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ for some r_1 such that $d \geq r - r_1$. The detailed proof can be found in Appendix B.3.

Notice that, while both simulation distances are helpful to provide an estimation of the robustness of a CPS under attack, expressing and verifying simulation distances for a system under sensor attacks may be non-trivial. In the next section, we introduce approaches to encode and verify both simulation distances for systems that may suffer from sensor attacks.

6. Expressing and Verifying Simulation Distances

The content of this section is organized as follows. With the help of a use case on autonomous vehicles, we first demonstrate how to encode both forward and backward simulation distances as $d\mathcal{L}$ formulas, in particular via modalities. We then propose an ad-hoc modality, called D-modality, and formally prove that it can be used to encode both forward and backward simulation distances (Theorem 5 and Theorem 6). Furthermore, we define a proof system to reasoning with D-modality and prove its soundness (Proposition 5).

6.1. Encoding Simulation Distances as $d\mathcal{L}$ Formulas

The forward and backward simulation distance are defined upon distance between states that respectively satisfy two formulas. For example, the forward distance (Definition 8) is computed on states satisfying, respectively, $\phi_{pre}(P_1)$ and $\phi_{pre}(P_2)$. Moreover, both distances are formalized in a “forall exists” manner. Therefore, a direct way to verify them, is to compute the relevant two formulas, and then verify the distance between states that satisfy the two formulas.

Based on this insight, the following formula can be instantiated with different formulas to verify both simulation distances:

$$(\phi \wedge (\bar{y} = \bar{x})) \rightarrow \exists \bar{x}. (\psi \wedge (\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\bar{y}, \bar{x}) \leq d))$$

where ϕ and ψ are formulas specifying, respectively, conditions of the compromised system and the genuine system. They share the same set of variables. Here \bar{x} are variables used by ϕ and ψ , and \bar{y} are a list of *fresh* variables whose dimension is the same as \bar{x} . Variables in \bar{y} are (implicitly) universally quantified. The fresh variables are used to store values of \bar{x} that satisfy the first formula. The notation $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\bar{y}, \bar{x})$ computes the distance between two vectors of variables with respect to the set \mathcal{H} : $\sqrt{\sum_{\bar{x}(i) \in \mathcal{H}} (\bar{x}(i) - \bar{y}(i))^2}$, where $\bar{x}(i)$ and $\bar{y}(i)$ represent, respectively, the i th element in vector \bar{x} and \bar{y} .

The encoding can be used to verify forward distance by letting ϕ and ψ , respectively, be the formula $\phi_{pre}(\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o))$ and $\phi_{pre}(P)$.

Example 7. Consider the usual cooling system. From Example 1, we know the $\phi_{pre}(P)$ is given by the following: $99.5 < temp_p \leq 101$. For the compromised system shown in Figure 5, from Example 3 we know that $\phi_{pre}(\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o))$ is $99.2 < temp_p \leq 101.3$.

Thus, we can express that $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ and P are at forward distance 0.3 with respect to ϕ_{pre} and $\mathcal{H} = \text{VAR}(\phi_{pre}) = \{temp_p\}$ with the following formula:

$$(99.2 < temp_p \leq 101.3 \wedge fv_p = temp_p) \rightarrow (\exists temp_p. 99.5 < temp_p \leq 101 \wedge (\sqrt{(temp_p - fv_p)^2} \leq 0.3))$$

The encoding can also be instantiated for verifying backward simulation distance by letting ϕ and ψ be $\langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \neg \phi_{post}$ and $\langle P \rangle \neg \phi_{post}$, respectively.

Example 8. For the cooling system example, from Example 2 and Example 4 we know that $\langle P \rangle \neg \phi_{post}$ and $\langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \neg \phi_{post}$ are both $temp_p > 105$. We can express $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ and P are at backward simulation distance 0 with respect to ϕ_{post} and $\mathcal{H} = \{temp_p\}$, with the following formula:

$$(temp_p > 105.0 \wedge fv_p = temp_p) \rightarrow (\exists temp_p. temp_p > 105.0 \wedge \sqrt{(temp_p - fv_p)^2} \leq 0)$$

Both formulas in Example 7 and Example 8 can be easily verified with KeYmaera X.

6.2. Simulation Distances at Work on an Autonomous Vehicle

We now apply the encoding above to a non-trivial case study. In this case study, we pre-compute the weakest precondition and strongest postcondition involved, in particular, we compute $\phi_{pre}\langle\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)\rangle$ and $\phi_{pre}\langle P\rangle$ for forward distance, and $\langle\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)\rangle\text{-}\phi_{post}$ and $\langle P\rangle\text{-}\phi_{post}$ for backward distance.

Consider an autonomous vehicle that needs to stop before hitting an obstacle (Platzer introduces this autonomous vehicle example [20].) For simplicity, we model the vehicle in just one dimension. Figure 6 shows a $d\mathcal{L}$ model of such an autonomous vehicle with sensing. Let d_p and d_s , respectively, be the vehicle's physical and sensed distances from the obstacle. The safety condition that we would like to enforce (ϕ_{post}) is that d_p is positive. Let v_p be the vehicle's velocity towards the obstacle in meters per second (m/s) and v_s be its sensed value. Let a be the vehicle's acceleration (m/s²). Let t be the time elapsed since the controller was last invoked.

The hybrid program *plant* describes how the physical environment evolves over time interval ϵ : distance changes according to $-v_p$ (i.e., $d_p' = -v_p$), velocity changes according to the acceleration (i.e., $v_p' = a$), and time passes at a constant rate (i.e., $t' = 1$). The differential equations evolve only within the time interval $t \leq \epsilon$ and if v_p is non-negative (i.e., $v_p \geq 0$).

Program *ctrl* models the vehicle's controller. The vehicle can either accelerate at A m/s² or brake at $-B$ m/s². For the purposes of the model, the controller chooses nondeterministically between these options. Hybrid programs *accel* and *brake* express the controller accelerating or braking (i.e., setting a to A or $-B$ respectively). The controller can accelerate only if condition ψ is true, which captures that the vehicle can accelerate for the next ϵ seconds only if doing so would still allow it to brake in time to avoid the obstacle. In other words, ψ ensures that postcondition $\phi_{post} \equiv d_p > 0$ is satisfied by all runs of the system.

For the quantitative analysis of this model, we treat symbolic variables A, B, ϵ as the parameters of the system and set them as constants: $A = 1$, $B = 1$, and $\epsilon = 1$. In addition, in this case study, we verify the forward and backward distance using the $d\mathcal{L}$ encoding with formulas, after computing the relevant weakest preconditions and strongest postconditions using these constants.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\text{System Constants} : A = 1, B = 1, \epsilon = 1) \\
 \phi_{pre} & \equiv (2Bd_p > v_p^2) \wedge v_p \geq 0 \\
 \phi_{post} & \equiv d_p > 0 \\
 \psi & \equiv 2Bd_s > v_s^2 + (A + B)(A\epsilon^2 + 2v_s\epsilon) \\
 \text{accel} & \equiv ?\psi ; a := A \\
 \text{brake} & \equiv a := -B \\
 \text{ctrl} & \equiv d_s := d_p ; v_s := v_p ; (\text{accel} \cup \text{brake}) \\
 \text{plant} & \equiv d_p' = -v_p, v_p' = a, t' = 1 \ \& \ (v_p \geq 0 \wedge t \leq \epsilon) \\
 \phi_{safety} & \equiv \phi_{pre} \rightarrow [(\text{ctrl} ; \text{plant})^*]\phi_{post}
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 6: $d\mathcal{L}$ model of an autonomous vehicle with sensing

Bounded Sensor Attack. The formula ϕ_{safety} specifies the desired (Boolean) safety property: given an appropriate precondition ϕ_{pre} , the safety condition ϕ_{post} holds after any execution of the system. The safety property for system $P = (\text{ctrl} ; \text{plant})^*$ indeed holds. However, there is no margin for strengthening the postcondition or for weakening the precondition. More precisely, the testing $?\psi$ guarding the acceleration ensures that the strongest postcondition is $\phi_{pre}\langle P\rangle \equiv d_p > 0$, which coincides with the postcondition ϕ_{post} . Thus, by Definition 2 the system P satisfies $\text{F-SAFE}_0(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$. Analogously, the weakest precondition is $[P]\phi_{post} \equiv (2Bd_p > v_p^2) \wedge v_p \geq 0$, which coincides with the precondition ϕ_{pre} . Thus, by Definition 3, system P satisfies $\text{B-SAFE}_0(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$.

Then, the system's safety has no room for sensing errors. Any sensor attacks that offset the readings can compromise the safety.

Consider a bounded sensor attack on the velocity sensor that deviates the readings of v_s from v_p up to 1 m/s. We can model it by replacing $v_s := v_p$ with

$$v_s := *; ?(v_s \leq v_p + 1 \wedge v_s \geq v_p - 1)$$

in Figure 6. The system is not robust against this attack, i.e., the safety property no longer holds when the sensor is compromised.

A Safer Controller. Now, consider a different controller $ctrl'$ whose condition for acceleration is designed to tolerate the inaccuracy of sensed velocity at a maneuver of 2 m/s, then the system can then be modeled as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi' &\equiv 2Bd_s > (v_s + 2)^2 + (A + B)(A\epsilon^2 + 2(v_s + 2)\epsilon) \\ ctrl' &\equiv d_s := d_p; v_s := v_p; ((? \psi'; a := A) \cup a := -B) \end{aligned}$$

...

Let P' denote the new system, i.e., $P' = (ctrl'; plant)^*$. It still holds that $F\text{-SAFE}_0(P', \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ and $B\text{-SAFE}_0(P', \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$.

Consider a different precondition:

$$\phi'_{pre} \equiv (2Bd_p > (v_p + 2)^2) \wedge v_p \geq 0$$

Executing P' given precondition ϕ'_{pre} , we get a strongest postcondition $\phi'_{pre}\langle P' \rangle \equiv (2d_p > (v_p + 2)^2) \wedge v_p \geq 0$. So P' is forward safe for a degree of 2 with respect to ϕ_{post} , i.e., $F\text{-SAFE}_2(P', \phi'_{pre}, \phi_{post})$.

Forward Distance. We can prove $\text{ATTACKED}(P', S_A, o)$ and P' are at forward distance 1.5 with respect to ϕ'_{pre} and $\mathcal{H} = \text{VAR}(\phi_{post}) = \{d_p\}$. Formula $\phi'_{pre}\langle \text{ATTACKED}(P', S_A, o) \rangle$ is $(2d_p > (v_p + 1)^2) \wedge v_p \geq 0$, so the forward distance can be expressed as:

$$2d_p > (v_p + 1)^2 \wedge v_p \geq 0 \wedge d_p = fd_p \rightarrow \exists d_p. ((2d_p > (v_p + 2)^2) \wedge v_p \geq 0 \wedge \sqrt{(d_p - fd_p)^2} \leq 1.5)$$

Here, fd_p is a fresh variable. KeYmaera X easily verifies this formula. So, $\text{ATTACKED}(P', S_A, o) \sqsubseteq_{\phi'_{pre}, \{d_p\}, 1.5}^F P'$, being 1.5 the upper bound of the loss of forward safety. Since $F\text{-SAFE}_2(P', \phi'_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, by Theorem 3 it follows:

$$F\text{-ROBUST}(P', \phi'_{pre}, \phi_{post}, S_A, o, \delta)$$

for some $\delta \geq \frac{0.5}{2} = 0.25$. So the system is still safe under the attack, and the percentage of forward safety loss is at most 75%.

Backward Distance. We already know it holds that $B\text{-SAFE}_0(P', \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, so there is not much we can learn from backward simulation distance here.

Now consider the backward safety of P' with respect to ϕ'_{pre} and a different postcondition $\phi'_{post} \equiv d_p > 0.5$. We can compute that formula $\langle P' \rangle \neg \phi'_{post}$ is $d_p \leq 0.5 \vee (2(d_p - 0.5) \leq v_p^2 \wedge v_p \geq 0)$, and further compute $B\text{-SAFE}_{\sqrt{2}}(P', \phi'_{pre}, \phi'_{post})$. Then, $\langle \text{ATTACKED}(P', S_A, o) \rangle \neg \phi'_{post}$ is $d_p \leq 0.5 \vee (2d_p \leq (v_p + 1)^2 \wedge v_p \geq 0)$. We can express that program $\text{ATTACKED}(P', S_A, o)$ and P' are at backward distance 1 with respect to ϕ'_{post} and $\text{VAR}(\phi'_{pre})$:

$$\begin{aligned} ((d_p \leq 0.5 \vee (2d_p \leq (v_p + 1)^2 \wedge v_p \geq 0)) \wedge fd_p = d_p \wedge fv_p = v_p) \\ \rightarrow \\ \exists d_p v_p. (d_p \leq 0.5 \vee (2(d_p - 0.5) \leq v_p^2 \wedge v_p \geq 0)) \wedge \sqrt{(d_p - fd_p)^2 + (v_p - fv_p)^2} \leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

Again, the formula can be verified by KeYmaera X. Then by Theorem 4 and $B\text{-SAFE}_{\sqrt{2}}(P', \phi'_{pre}, \phi'_{post})$ it follows:

$$B\text{-ROBUST}(P', \phi'_{pre}, \phi'_{post}, S_A, o, \delta)$$

for some $\delta \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}-1}{\sqrt{2}}$. So the system is still backward safe under the attack, and the percentage of loss of backward safety due to the attack is at most $1/\sqrt{2} \approx 71\%$.

6.3. A Modality-based Approach

In the case study above, we have pre-computed the strongest postcondition and weakest precondition for the compromised system and the genuine system. However, such a computation may be difficult for certain systems. To alleviate this problem, we introduce another approach for encoding and reasoning with simulation distances using modalities.

Encoding Simulation Distances with Modalities. An alternative way to encode the two simulation distances is through modalities (c.f. Section 2.1) which directly express program executions. In the case of forward distance, i.e., $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \sqsubseteq_{\phi_{pre}, \mathcal{H}, d}^F P$, we can express it as the following $d\mathcal{L}$ formula:

$$(\phi_{pre} \wedge \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle (\bar{y} = \bar{x})) \rightarrow (\exists \bar{x}. \phi_{pre} \wedge \langle P \rangle (\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\bar{y}, \bar{x}) \leq d))$$

The left-hand-side formula encodes “for each state that can be reached from precondition ϕ_{pre} after an execution of the compromised program”. The fresh variables of \bar{y} are used to record the reachable states. The right-hand-side formula encodes “there is an execution of the genuine program under precondition ϕ_{pre} such that the distance between the corresponding final states is bound by d .”

We can similarly express the backward distance $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \sqsubseteq_{\phi_{post}, \mathcal{H}, d}^B P$:

$$(\bar{y} = \bar{x}) \wedge \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \neg \phi_{post} \rightarrow (\exists \bar{x}. (\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \leq d) \wedge \langle P \rangle \neg \phi_{post})$$

The left-hand-side formula encodes “for each initial state that can lead the compromised system to unsafe states”. The fresh variables of \bar{y} are used to record the initial states. The right-hand-side formula encodes “there is an initial state that can lead the genuine program to unsafe states such that the distance between the two initial states is bound by d ”.

D-modality. The modality-based encodings above closely follow the definitions of forward and backward distances. However, they may be cumbersome and difficult to reason with due to the quantifiers. To address this problem, we introduce a more efficient modality, denoted D-modality, to readily encode both forward and backward distances. We develop a proof system to reason with this new modality in an effective manner. The proof system contains a set of proof rules which can be derived from existing $d\mathcal{L}$ axioms and proof rules [20, 21].

The D-modality is designed to capture the forall exists relationship between the compromised program and the genuine program. To capture such a relationship, the modality needs to refer to variables in both programs. Since the compromised and genuine programs often refer to the same set of variables, the D-modality renames variables used by the genuine program into a fresh set of variables, and then captures the relationship between the two programs using both the original and renamed variables.

To rename variables we use renaming functions.

Definition 10 (Renaming function for P). For a $d\mathcal{L}$ program P and a set of variables V such that $V \cap \text{VAR}(P) = \emptyset$, a function $\xi : \text{VAR}(P) \rightarrow V$ is a renaming function for P if it is a bijection.

We write $\xi(P)$ for the program equivalent to P but whose variables have been renamed according to ξ . Renaming functions similarly apply to $d\mathcal{L}$ formulas and states. Moreover, for a state $\omega : \text{VAR}(P) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, we let $\xi(\omega)$ denote the state $\nu : \xi(\text{VAR}(P)) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that $\nu(\xi(x)) = \omega(x)$ for all $x \in \text{VAR}(P)$.

We now introduce D-modality, a special forall exists modality, written $[(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi$, and defined as

$$[(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi \equiv [\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)] \langle \xi(P) \rangle \phi$$

for a program P , a set of sensors $S_A \subseteq \text{VAR}(P)$, an offset function o , and a renaming function ξ .

Intuitively, $[(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi$ expresses the ability by the genuine program to simulate the compromised program with respect to a formula ϕ , which models a relational property on the states reachable by the two programs. More precisely, $[(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi$ formalises that for each state ν reachable by the compromised program $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ there is a state ν' reachable by the genuine program P such that $\nu \uplus \xi(\nu')$ satisfy ϕ ¹.

¹Here, as expected, the symbol \uplus denotes disjoint union.

Proposition 4. For a hybrid program P , a set of variables $S_A \subseteq \text{VAR}(P)$, an offset function o , a formula ϕ and a renaming function ξ , the set of states $\llbracket [(P, S_A, o)_\xi]\phi \rrbracket$ is equal to $\{\omega \uplus \xi(\omega') \mid \forall \nu \text{ if } (\omega, \nu) \in \llbracket \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rrbracket \text{ then } \exists \nu' \text{ s.t. } (\xi(\omega'), \xi(\nu')) \in \llbracket \xi(P) \rrbracket \text{ and } \nu \uplus \xi(\nu') \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket\}$.

Note that $\llbracket [(P, S_A, o)_\xi]\phi \rrbracket$ is a $d\mathcal{L}$ formula, thus the sound and complete proof calculus of $d\mathcal{L}$ [21] can be used to reason with this modality.

Encoding Forward Distances using the D-modality. In the following, we show how we can use the D-modality $\llbracket [(P, S_A, o)_\xi]\phi \rrbracket$ to encode the forward distance. The following theorem introduces the D-modality based encoding of the forward distance and states its soundness. Intuitively, if both genuine and compromised programs start under a precondition ψ then for any reachable state of the compromised program, there exists a reachable state of the genuine program satisfying ϕ , which ensures an upper bound of distance between the two reachable states. The formulas ϕ and ψ satisfy certain requirements to match the definition of the forward distance. Formally speaking,

Theorem 5 (D-modality based Encoding of Forward Distance). For a hybrid program P , a set of variables $S_A \subseteq \text{VAR}(P)$, an offset function o , formulas ψ , ϕ and ϕ_{pre} , a renaming function ξ , a set of variables \mathcal{H} and $d \in \mathbb{R}$, if we have

- $\psi \rightarrow \llbracket [(P, S_A, o)_\xi]\phi \rrbracket$
- $\phi_{pre} \rightarrow \exists \xi(\text{VAR}(\phi_{pre})). (\psi \wedge \xi(\phi_{pre}))$
- $\phi \rightarrow \rho_{\mathcal{H}}^\xi \leq d$, for $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}^\xi = \sqrt{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} (x - \xi(x))^2}$

then $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \sqsubseteq_{\phi_{pre}, \mathcal{H}, d}^F P$.

Let us go in some detail of the three requirements of the theorem. Here, the formula ψ captures the relationship between the initial states of the two programs $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ and $\xi(P)$. The first requirement expresses the following: if an execution of $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ starting from an initial state satisfying ψ reaches a state where ϕ holds, then there exists an execution of $\xi(P)$ starting from the same condition that reaches a state where ϕ holds as well. The second requirement says that each state in $\llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket$ is in relation with at least one state in $\llbracket \xi(\phi_{pre}) \rrbracket$ under the condition ψ . The first two requirements together capture the description “for each state $\nu_1 \in \llbracket \phi_{pre}(P_1) \rrbracket$, there exists a state $\nu_2 \in \llbracket \phi_{pre}(P_2) \rrbracket$ ” in the definition of the forward distance. The third requirement specifies that the postcondition ϕ ensures an upper bound of distance between reachable states of the two programs. It matches the description “ $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq d$ ” in the definition of the forward distance.

The detailed proof of this theorem can be found in Appendix B.4.

Encoding Backward Distances using the D-modality. We can also use the D-modality $\llbracket [(P, S_A, o)_\xi]\phi \rrbracket$ for encoding the backward distance. The following theorem introduces the D-modality based encoding of backward distances and states its soundness. Intuitively, if both genuine and compromised programs start from a precondition ϕ ensuring an upper bound d on its states, then for any reachable state of the compromised program that violates the postcondition ϕ_{post} , there exists a reachable state of the genuine program that violates ϕ_{post} . The precondition ϕ ensures that all possible initial states of the compromised program are considered. Formally,

Theorem 6 (D-modality based Encoding of Backward Distance). For a hybrid program P , a set of variables $S_A \subseteq \text{VAR}(P)$, an offset function o , formulas ϕ and ϕ_{post} , a renaming function ξ , a set of variables \mathcal{H} , and $d \in \mathbb{R}$, if we have

- $\phi \rightarrow \llbracket [(P, S_A, o)_\xi](\neg\phi_{post} \rightarrow \xi(\neg\phi_{post})) \rrbracket$
- $\forall \text{VAR}(P) \exists \xi(\text{VAR}(P)). \phi$
- $\phi \rightarrow \rho_{\mathcal{H}}^\xi \leq d$, for $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}^\xi = \sqrt{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} (x - \xi(x))^2}$

then $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \sqsubseteq_{\phi_{post}, \mathcal{H}, d}^B P$.

$\text{D-DEF} \\ \frac{}{[\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)]\langle \xi(P) \rangle \phi \leftrightarrow [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi}$		
$\text{D-}; \\ \frac{\Gamma \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \langle [(Q, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi \rangle}{\Gamma \vdash [(P; Q, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi}$	$\text{D-MR} \\ \frac{\Gamma \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi \quad \phi \vdash \psi}{\Gamma \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}$	$\text{D-}\wedge \\ \frac{\Gamma \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \langle \phi \wedge \psi \rangle}{\Gamma \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi \wedge [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}$
$\text{D-}\vee \\ \frac{\Gamma \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \langle \phi \vee \psi \rangle}{\Gamma \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \langle \phi \vee \psi \rangle}$	$\text{D-U} \\ \frac{\Gamma \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi \quad \Gamma \vdash [(Q, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi}{\Gamma \vdash [(P \cup Q, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi}$	
$\text{D-?} \\ (\phi_t \rightarrow (\xi(\phi_t) \wedge \phi)) \leftrightarrow [(\phi_t, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi$	$\text{D-INV} \\ \frac{\Gamma \vdash \phi_i \quad \phi_i \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i \quad \phi_i \vdash \psi}{\Gamma \vdash [(P^*, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}$	
$\text{D-V} \\ \frac{\phi \vdash [\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)] \phi_1 \quad \psi \vdash \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \psi_1}{(\phi \wedge \psi) \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \langle \phi_1 \wedge \psi_1 \rangle}$		
<p>where $(\text{VAR}(\phi) \cup \text{VAR}(\phi_1)) \cap \text{VAR}(\xi(P)) = \emptyset$ and $(\text{VAR}(\psi) \cup \text{VAR}(\psi_1)) \cap \text{VAR}(P) = \emptyset$</p>		
$\text{D-ODE-}\forall \\ \frac{\Gamma \vdash [x' = \theta] [\xi(x' = \theta)] \langle \psi(t, \xi(t)) \rightarrow \phi \rangle}{\Gamma \vdash [(x' = \theta, t' = 1, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi}$	$\text{D-ODE-M} \\ \frac{\Gamma \vdash [x' = \theta, \xi(x' = \theta)] \phi}{\Gamma \vdash [(x' = \theta, t' = 1 \ \& \ t \leq \epsilon, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi}$	

Table 1: Proof system for the derived modality

Let us explain the three requirements of the theorem. The formula ϕ captures the relationship between the initial states of the two programs $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ and $\xi(P)$. The first requirement expresses the following: if an execution of $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ starts from a state satisfying ϕ and it reaches a state where $\neg\phi_{\text{post}}$ holds, then there exists an execution of $\xi(P)$ starting from the same condition that reaches a state where $\xi(\neg\phi_{\text{post}})$ holds. The second requirement specifies that for any initial state of the compromised program, there always exists an initial state of the genuine program which can make the precondition ϕ true. That is, the formula ϕ does not restrict the possible values of variables in $\text{VAR}(P)$, thus the initial states of the compromised program $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$ can be arbitrary. Finally, similarly to the previous theorem, the third requirement specifies that the precondition ϕ ensures that d is an upper bound of distance between the initial states of the two programs.

The detailed proof of this theorem can be found in Appendix B.4.

We have presented the D-modality based encodings. To reason with the encodings, especially with item 1 in both Theorem 5 and 6, we develop a proof system, i.e., a set of proof rules for the D-modality.

6.4. A Proof System for D-modality

Our proof system allows us to derive *sequents* [20] of the form $\Gamma \vdash \Delta$, where *antecedent* Γ and *succedent* Δ are finite sets of $\text{d}\mathcal{L}$ formulas. The semantics of $\Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is that of the $\text{d}\mathcal{L}$ formula $\bigwedge_{\phi \in \Gamma} \phi \rightarrow \bigvee_{\psi \in \Delta} \psi$.

The set of proof rules are given in Table 1. For completeness, in Figure C.20 and Figure C.21 of the appendix we report the original axioms and proof rules of Platzer's $\text{d}\mathcal{L}$ formulas [21, 20]. Essentially, we extend the existing axioms and proof rules from [20, 21] with a set of proof rules to *effectively* reason with the modality $[(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi$.

Rule D-DEF is defined based on the definition of the D-modality. This rule can be applied on every program construct. Rule D-; decomposes the reasoning for a sequential composition of two programs into reasoning for both of them. Rule D-MR specifies that the D-modality holds for a postcondition ψ if the modality holds for a stronger postcondition ϕ . Rule D- \wedge and D- \vee reason with, respectively, the D-modality on a conjunction and disjunction of two formulas. Rule D- \cup deals with the nondeterministic choice of two subprograms. Rule D-? follows the semantics of the D-modality and $?\phi_t$. Rule D-INV is the loop invariant rule. We can reason with a program with loop P^* by identifying an invariant ϕ_i . Rule D-V reduces the reasoning of a D-modality into two separate proof obligations of the compromised program and the genuine program. Rule D-ODE- \forall reduces the reasoning with a D-modality to reasoning with the modality of necessity. Intuitively, the formula ϕ holds for all executions of $x' = \theta$ and $\xi(x' = \theta)$ if a timing condition ψ holds. Note that formula ψ only refers to variables t and $\xi(t)$; and there always exists a value of $\xi(t)$ that can make $\psi(t, \xi(t))$ true. Rule D-ODE-M is a simplified version of D-ODE- \forall , obtained by merging the two modalities of necessity in D-ODE- \forall into a single modality of necessity on the dynamics $x' = \theta$ and $\xi(x' = \theta)$. With this merging, all solutions of $x' = \theta$ and $\xi(x' = \theta)$ evolve for the same amount of time. Note that a proof obligation like $[x' = \theta, \xi(x' = \theta)]\phi$ is often easier to verify.

The soundness proof of these rules can be found in Appendix B.4. Now, we can state the soundness of the proof system.

Proposition 5 (Soundness of the rules in Table1). *If a sequent $\Gamma \vdash \Delta$ can be derived through the proof system then the formula $\bigwedge_{\phi \in \Gamma} \phi \rightarrow \bigvee_{\psi \in \Delta} \psi$ holds.*

7. Proof System at Work on a Water Tank System

In this case study, we demonstrate how to use the proof rules introduced in Table 1 to reason with the forward and backward distances.

Consider an example of a water tank shown in Figure 7, which is inspired by literature [27]. It mixes the salt and water inside the tank. Initially, it contains 50 lb of salt ($Q_p = 50$) dissolved in 100 gal of water ($x_L = 100$). An inflow of water containing 1/4 lb of salt/gal is entering the tank at a rate of r gal/min. The well-stirred mixture is draining from the tank at the same rate r . The tank has two modes of control: a switch-on mode with r set to 10 if the measured salt level is high ($?x_s \geq 25$) and a switch-off mode with r set to 0 if the measured salt level is low ($?x_s < 25$). The rate of change of salt in the tank x_p' is equal to the rate at which salt is flowing in minus the rate at which is flowing out: $x_p' = (r/4 - r * x_p/x_L)$, where x_p/x_L computes the concentration of the salt. The postcondition we are interested is that the salt level stays above a certain level ($x_p \geq 20$). Note that $x_p = 25$ is an equilibrium of the dynamics if $r > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\text{System Constants} : \epsilon = 1 \wedge x_L = 100) \\
& \phi_{pre} \equiv x_p = 50 \\
& \phi_{post} \equiv x_p \geq 20 \\
& \text{on} \equiv ?x_s \geq 25; r := 10 \\
& \text{off} \equiv ?x_s < 25; r := 0 \\
& \text{ctrl} \equiv x_s := x_p; (\text{on} \cup \text{off}) \\
& \text{plant} \equiv (x_p' = r/4 - r * x_p/x_L, t' = 1) \&(t \leq \epsilon) \\
& \phi_{safety} \equiv \phi_{pre} \rightarrow [(\text{ctrl}; \text{plant})^*]\phi_{post}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 7: dL model of a water tank with sensing

Bounded Sensor Attack. Consider a bounded sensor attack on the sensor of salt level that deviates the readings of x_s from x_p up to 3 lb. We can model it by replacing $x_s := x_p$ in Figure 7 with:

$$x_s := *; ?(x_s \leq x_p + 3 \wedge x_s \geq x_p - 3)$$

Forward Distance. We can use the proof rules in Table 1 and other $\text{d}\mathcal{L}$ axioms and rules to prove that $\text{ATTACKED}(P', S_A, o)$ and P' are at forward distance 3 with respect to ϕ_{pre} and $\mathcal{H} = \text{VAR}(\phi_{post}) = \{x_p\}$.

We show such a proof in Figure 9. Figure 8 presents the definitions of formulas and programs used in Figure 9. The proof rules used are shown at the left of each derivation step. A key step is applying invariant rule D-INV, which allows the proof to focus on an invariant ϕ_i . The invariant specifies that, intuitively, given the initial condition (ϕ_{pre}), for any salt level the compromised system can reach, there exists an execution of the genuine system whose reachable salt level would be within the same regions. The proof considers two regions of the salt level: the first one is that the initial (physical) salt level stays above 28, captured by the formula ϕ_{inv_2} . If both the genuine system and the compromised system begin executions from states specified by ϕ_{inv_2} , then for any salt level reachable by the compromised system, the genuine system can reach the same level by taking the same value of r and then evolving for the same period. Figure 11 and Figure 13 show, respectively, the proofs for the controller and plant in this scenario. The second region is where the initial (physical) salt level stays between 25 (non-inclusive) and 28, captured by the formula ϕ_{inv_1} . If both the genuine system and the compromised system begin executions from this region, then the reachable states of both systems stay within this region, no matter whether r is set to 10 or 0. The derivation for the obligation $\phi_{inv_1} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_{inv_1}$ (left branch of Figure 9) shows the proof for this scenario. In addition to the two scenarios, Figure 12 shows the proof that the two systems keep r at 10 if they both start with a salt level above 28. A notable step in Figure 13 is applying the proof rule D-ODE-M. It reduces the proof obligation into another one with a modality of necessity on the combined dynamics. The new obligation can be proven using the regular $\text{d}\mathcal{L}$ rules.

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_{pre} &\equiv x_p = 50 \wedge x_{p_1} = 50 \\
\phi_{post} &\equiv \sqrt{(x_p - x_{p_1})^2} \leq 3 \text{ (same as } \rho_h^\xi \leq 3) \\
\xi &\equiv \{x_p \mapsto x_{p_1}, x_s \mapsto x_{s_1}, r \mapsto r_1\} \\
\phi &\equiv \phi_{inv_2} \wedge (x_p - 3 \leq x_s \leq x_p + 3) \\
\psi &\equiv \phi_{inv_2} \wedge (r = r_1 = 10) \\
\varphi &\equiv (x_p = x_{p_1} \wedge x_p > 25) \\
\phi_i &\equiv \phi_{inv_1} \vee \phi_{inv_2} \\
\phi_{inv_{1a}} &\equiv 25 < x_p < 28 \\
\phi_{inv_{1b}} &\equiv 25 < x_{p_1} < 28 \\
\phi_{inv_1} &\equiv \phi_{inv_{1a}} \wedge \phi_{inv_{1b}} \\
\phi_{inv_2} &\equiv (x_p = x_{p_1} \wedge x_p \geq 28) \\
P &\equiv (\text{ctrl}; \text{plant}) \text{ in Figure 7} \\
P_{att} &\equiv \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 8: Formulas used in the example proof of a forward distance for the water tank case study

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{By d}\mathcal{L} \text{ rules} \qquad \text{By d}\mathcal{L} \text{ rules} \\
\hline
\phi_{inv_{1a}} \vdash [P_{att}] \phi_{inv_{1a}} \qquad \phi_{inv_{1b}} \vdash \langle \xi(P) \rangle \phi_{inv_{1b}} \\
\text{D-V} \frac{}{\phi_{inv_1} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_{inv_1}} \\
\text{WR} \frac{}{\phi_{inv_1} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_{inv_1} \vee [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_{inv_2}} \\
\text{D-V} \frac{}{\phi_{inv_1} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i} \qquad \text{Figure 10} \frac{}{\phi_{inv_2} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i} \\
\text{V-L} \frac{}{\phi_i \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i}
\end{array} \\
\hline
\text{D-INV} \frac{\phi_{pre} \vdash \phi_i \qquad \phi_i \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i \qquad \phi_i \vdash \phi_{post}}{\vdash \phi_{pre} \rightarrow [(P^*, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_{post}}
\end{array}$$

Figure 9: Proof of a forward distance for the water tank case study

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{Figure 11} \quad \text{Figure 12} \quad \text{Figure 13} \quad * \\
\frac{\text{D-U} \quad \phi \vdash [(on \cup off, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}{\text{D-MR} \quad \phi \vdash [(plant, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi} \quad \frac{\psi \vdash [(plant, S_A, o)_\xi] \varphi \quad \varphi \vdash \phi_i}{\text{D-MR} \quad \psi \vdash [(plant, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i} \\
\frac{\text{By D-DEF and then d}\mathcal{L} \text{ rules} \quad \phi_{inv_2} \vdash [(x_s := x_p, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi}{\text{D-MR} \quad \phi_{inv_2} \vdash [(x_s := x_p, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi} \quad \frac{\text{D-;} \quad \phi \vdash [((on \cup off), S_A, o)_\xi] [(plant, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i}{\text{D-;} \quad \phi \vdash [((on \cup off); plant, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i} \\
\frac{\text{D-;} \quad \phi_{inv_2} \vdash [(x_s := x_p, S_A, o)_\xi] [((on \cup off); plant, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i}{\text{D-;} \quad \phi_{inv_2} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i}
\end{array}$$

Figure 10: Proof of a forward distance for the water tank case study (continued)

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{By D-DEF and then d}\mathcal{L} \text{ rules} \quad \text{By D-DEF and then d}\mathcal{L} \text{ rules} \\
\frac{\phi \vdash [?(x_s \geq 25), S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_{inv_2}}{\text{D-MR} \quad \phi \vdash [?(x_s \geq 25), S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_{inv_2}} \quad \frac{\phi_{inv_2} \vdash [(r := 10, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}{\text{D-;} \quad \phi \vdash [?(x_s \geq 25), S_A, o)_\xi] [(r := 10, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi} \\
\frac{\text{D-;} \quad \phi \vdash [?(x_s \geq 25), S_A, o)_\xi] [(r := 10, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}{\text{D-;} \quad \phi \vdash [(on, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}
\end{array}$$

Figure 11: Proof of a forward distance for the water tank case study (switch-on mode)

$$\begin{array}{c}
* \\
\frac{\perp\text{L} \quad \phi \wedge (x_s < 25) \vdash (\xi(\phi_t) \wedge ([r := 5, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi)}{\text{D-?} \quad \phi \vdash (x_s < 25) \rightarrow (\xi(\phi_t) \wedge ([r := 5, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi)} \\
\frac{\text{D-;} \quad \phi \vdash [?(x_s < 25), S_A, o)_\xi] [(r := 5, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}{\text{D-;} \quad \phi \vdash [(off, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}
\end{array}$$

Figure 12: Proof of a forward distance for the water tank case study (off mode)

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{By d}\mathcal{L} \text{ rules} \\
\frac{\phi \vdash [x_p' = r/4 - r * x_p/100, x_{p_1}' = r_1/4 - r_1 * x_{p_1}/100] \varphi}{\text{D-ODE-M} \quad \phi \vdash [(plant, S_A, o)_\xi] \varphi}
\end{array}$$

Figure 13: Proof of a forward distance for the water tank case study (plant)

The proof above establishes that $\vdash \phi_{pre} \rightarrow [(P^*, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_{post}$ for $\phi_{pre} \equiv x_p = 50 \wedge x_{p_1} = 50$ and $\phi_{post} \equiv \rho_{it}^\xi \leq 3$. Then by Proposition 5 and Theorem 5 (the other conditions in Theorem 5 are trivially satisfied), we know that $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \sqsubseteq_{\phi_{pre}, \mathcal{H}, d}^F P$ for $d = 3$ and $\mathcal{H} = \{x_p\}$.

Backward Distance. We can also use the proof rules in Table 1 and other $\text{d}\mathcal{L}$ axioms and rules to prove that $\text{ATTACKED}(P', S_A, o)$ and P' are at backward distance 0 with respect to ϕ_{post} and $\mathcal{H} = \text{VAR}(\phi_{post}) = \{x_p\}$.

We present a proof in Figure 15. Figure 14 presents the definitions of formulas and programs used in Figure 15. The proof is similar to the example proof for forward distance. The key step is applying invariant rule D-INV , with an invariant ϕ_i . The invariant specifies that, intuitively, given the initial condition ϕ , for any salt level the compromised system can reach, there exists an execution of the genuine system whose reachable salt level would be within the same regions. The proof considers two regions of the salt level: the first one is that the initial (physical) salt level stays above 20, captured by the formula ϕ_{inv_2} . If both the genuine system and the compromised system begin executions from states specified by ϕ_{inv_2} , then for any salt level reachable by the compromised system, the genuine system can reach the same level by taking the same value of r and then evolving for the same period. Figure 18 and Figure 19 show, respectively, the proofs for the controller and plant in this scenario. The second region is where the initial (physical) salt level stays above 20 (inclusive), captured by the formula ϕ_{inv_1} . If both the genuine system and the compromised system begin executions from this region, then the reachable states of both systems stay within this region, no matter whether r is set to 10 or 0. The left branch of Figure 15 shows the proof for this scenario. In addition to the two scenarios, Figure 17 shows the proof that the two systems would keep $r = 0$ if they both start with a salt level below 20.

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi &\equiv x_p = x_{p_1} \\
\phi_{post} &\equiv x_p \geq 20 \vee (x_p < 20 \wedge x_{p_1} < 20) \text{ (same as } x_p < 20 \rightarrow x_{p_1} < 20) \\
\xi &\equiv \{x_p \mapsto x_{p_1}, x_s \mapsto x_{s_1}, r \mapsto r_1\} \\
\varphi &\equiv \phi_{inv_2} \wedge (x_p - 3 \leq x_s \leq x_p + 3) \\
\psi &\equiv \phi_{inv_2} \wedge (r = r_1 = 5) \\
\phi_i &\equiv \phi_{inv_1} \vee \phi_{inv_2} \\
\phi_{inv_{1a}} &\equiv x_p \geq 20 \\
\phi_{inv_{1b}} &\equiv x_{p_1} \geq 20 \\
\phi_{inv_1} &\equiv \phi_{inv_{1a}} \wedge \phi_{inv_{1b}} \\
\phi_{inv_2} &\equiv (x_p = x_{p_1} \wedge x_p < 20) \\
P &\equiv (ctrl; plant) \text{ in Figure 7} \\
P_{att} &\equiv \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 14: Formulas used in the example proof of a backward distance for the water tank case study

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{By d}\mathcal{L} \text{ rules} \qquad \text{By d}\mathcal{L} \text{ rules} \\
\hline
\text{D-V} \frac{\phi_{inv_{1a}} \vdash [P_{att}] \phi_{inv_{1a}} \quad \phi_{inv_{1b}} \vdash \langle \xi(P) \rangle \phi_{inv_{1b}}}{\phi_{inv_1} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_{inv_1}} \\
\text{WR} \frac{\phi_{inv_1} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_{inv_1}}{\phi_{inv_1} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_{inv_1} \vee [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_{inv_2}} \\
\text{D-V} \frac{\phi_{inv_1} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i \quad \phi_{inv_2} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i}{\phi_{inv_1} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i} \quad \text{Figure 16} \\
\text{D-INV} \frac{\phi \vdash \phi_i \quad \phi_{inv_1} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i \quad \phi_{inv_2} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i}{\vdash \phi \rightarrow [(P^*, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_{post}}
\end{array}
\end{array}$$

Figure 15: Proof of a backward distance for the water tank case study

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{By D-DEF and then d}\mathcal{L} \text{ rules} \\
\hline
\text{D-MR} \frac{\phi_{inv_2} \vdash [(x_s := x_p, S_A, o)_\xi] \varphi}{\phi_{inv_2} \vdash [(x_s := x_p, S_A, o)_\xi] [(on \cup off); plant, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i} \\
\text{D-; } \frac{\phi_{inv_2} \vdash [(x_s := x_p, S_A, o)_\xi] [(on \cup off); plant, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i}{\phi_{inv_2} \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{D-U} \frac{\text{Figure 17} \quad \text{Figure 18} \quad \text{Figure 19}}{\varphi \vdash [(on \cup off, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi \quad \psi \vdash [(plant, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i} \\
\text{D-MR} \frac{\varphi \vdash [(on \cup off, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi \quad \psi \vdash [(plant, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i}{\varphi \vdash [(on \cup off); plant, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i} \\
\text{D-; } \frac{\varphi \vdash [(on \cup off); plant, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i}{\varphi \vdash [(on, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}
\end{array}
\end{array}$$

Figure 16: Proof of a backward distance for the water tank case study (continued)

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{*} \\
\text{\(\perp\)-L} \frac{\varphi \wedge (x_s \geq 25) \vdash (\xi(?x_s \geq 25) \wedge ((r := 10, S_A, o)_\xi) \psi)}{\varphi \vdash (x_s \geq 25) \rightarrow (\xi(?x_s \geq 25) \wedge ((r := 10, S_A, o)_\xi) \psi)} \\
\text{\(\rightarrow\)-R} \frac{\varphi \vdash (x_s \geq 25) \rightarrow (\xi(?x_s \geq 25) \wedge ((r := 10, S_A, o)_\xi) \psi)}{\varphi \vdash [(?x_s \geq 25), S_A, o)_\xi] [(r := 10, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi} \\
\text{D-?} \frac{\varphi \vdash [(?x_s \geq 25), S_A, o)_\xi] [(r := 10, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}{\varphi \vdash [(on, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}
\end{array}$$

Figure 17: Proof of the backward distance for the water tank case study (Switch-on mode)

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{By D-DEF and d}\mathcal{L} \text{ rules} \qquad \text{By D-DEF and d}\mathcal{L} \text{ rules} \\
\hline
\text{D-MR} \frac{\varphi \vdash [(?x_s < 25), S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_{inv_2} \quad \phi_{inv_2} \vdash [(r := 5, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}{\varphi \vdash [(?x_s < 25), S_A, o)_\xi] [(r := 5, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi} \\
\text{D-; } \frac{\varphi \vdash [(?x_s < 25), S_A, o)_\xi] [(r := 5, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}{\varphi \vdash [(off, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}
\end{array}
\end{array}$$

Figure 18: Proof of the backward distance for the water tank case study (off mode)

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{By d}\mathcal{L} \text{ rules} \\
\hline
\text{D-ODE-M} \frac{\psi \vdash [x_p' = r/4 - r * x_p/100; x_{p_1}' = r_1/4 - r_1 * x_{p_1}/100]\phi}{\psi \vdash [(plant, S_A, o)_\xi]\phi} \quad \frac{}{\phi \vdash \phi_i} \\
\hline
\text{D-MR} \frac{\psi \vdash [(plant, S_A, o)_\xi]\phi}{\psi \vdash [(plant, S_A, o)_\xi]\phi_i}
\end{array}$$

Figure 19: Proof of the backward distance for the water tank case study (plant)

The proof establishes that $\vdash \phi \rightarrow [(P^*, S_A, o)_\xi]\phi_{post}$ for $\phi_{post} \equiv x_p < 20 \rightarrow x_{p_1} < 20$ and $\phi \equiv x_p = x_{p_1}$. Since $\phi \rightarrow \rho_{it}^\xi \leq 0$ and $\forall x_p \exists x_{p_1} \cdot \phi$, then by Proposition 5 and Theorem 6, $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \sqsubseteq_{\phi_{post}, \mathcal{H}, d}^B P$ holds for $d = 0$ and $\mathcal{H} = \{x_p\}$.

8. Related Work

Robustness of CPSs. Our work is a quantitative generalization of Xiang et al. [17], in the setting of hybrid programs and d \mathcal{L} . In that paper, the authors propose two notions of robustness for CPSs: *robustness of safety*, when (unbound) sensor attacks are unable to affect the system under attack, and *robustness of high-integrity state*, when high-integrity parts of the system cannot be compromised. In the current paper, we generalize the first of the two relations.

Fränzle et al. [28] classify the notions of robustness for CPSs as follows: (i) input/output robustness; (ii) robustness with respect to system parameters; (iii) robustness in real-time system implementation; (iv) robustness due to unpredictable environment; (v) robustness to faults. The notion of robustness considered in this paper falls in category (iv), where the attacks are the source of environment’s unpredictability. Other works study robustness properties for CPSs [29, 30, 31, 32]. Some of them focus on robustness against attacks [29, 30], even adopting quantitative reasonings [31, 32].

Our notion of forward robustness shares similarities with some existing notions of robustness, such as invariance [33] and input-to-state stability [34]. These notions concern if a system stays in a safe region when small changes happen to initial conditions, while forward robustness concerns if a system stays in a safe region when under attack. Although it might be possible to reformulate existing notions of robustness to characterize our forward robustness, our formulation focuses on modeling attacks which makes it easier to analyze their impact.

The current work extends and generalizes the paper by Chong et al. [1]. In particular, in Section 6, we first demonstrate how it is possible to encode both forward and backward simulation distances via modalities. Then, we propose a new modality, called D-modality, to encode both forward and backward distances (Theorem 5 and Theorem 6). Finally, we define a proof system to help reasoning on D-modality and prove its soundness (Proposition 5). The proof system has been applied in a new case study on the field of water tank (Section 7). Last but not least, unlike the conference version [1], the current paper provides in the appendix the full formal proofs of all results.

Signal Temporal Logic (STL) [35] is a specification formalism for expressing real-time temporal *safety* and performance properties, such as *robustness*, of CPSs. Ferrère et al. [36] study a quantitative extension of STL that classifies signals as inputs and outputs to specify the system-under-test as an input/output relation instead of a set of correct execution traces. The idea behind their approach is quite similar to that followed in our forward robustness, as they express families of admissible patterns of both the model inputs and the model preconditions that guarantee the desired behavior of the model output. Mohammadinejad et al. [37] adopt a dual approach, similar to that followed in our backward robustness. Given an output requirement they propose an algorithm to mine an environment assumption, consisting of a large subset of input signals for which the corresponding output signals satisfy the output requirement.

Formal Analysis of Sensor Attacks. Lanotte et al. [38, 3, 39] propose process-calculus approaches to model and analyze the impact of physics-based attacks, as sensor attacks in CPSs. Their threat models consider attacks that may manipulate both sensor readings and control commands. Their model of physics is discrete and they focus on crucial timing aspects of attacks, such as beginning and duration. Bernardeschi et al. [40] introduce a framework to analyze the effects of attacks on sensors and actuators. Controllers of systems

are specified using the formalism PVS [41]. The physics is described by other modeling tools. Their threat model is similar to ours: the effect of an attack is a set of assignments to the variables defined in the controller. Simulation is used to analyze the effects of attacks. Huang et al. [30] proposed a risk assessment method that uses a Bayesian network to model the attack propagation process and infers the probabilities of sensors and actuators to be compromised. These probabilities are fed into a stochastic hybrid system model to predict the evolution of the physical process. Then, the security risk is quantified by evaluating the system availability with the model.

9. Conclusion

A formal framework for *quantitative* analysis of bounded sensor attacks on CPSs is introduced. Given a precondition ϕ_{pre} and postcondition ϕ_{post} of a system P , we formalize two safety notions, *quantitative forward safety*, $F\text{-SAFE}_u(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, and *quantitative backward safety*, $B\text{-SAFE}_u(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, where $u \in \mathbb{R}$ respectively express: (1) how strong the strongest postcondition $\phi_{pre}\langle P \rangle$ is with respect to the postcondition ϕ_{post} , and (2) how strong the precondition ϕ_{pre} is with respect to the weakest precondition $[P]\phi_{post}$. The bigger u is, the safer the system is. On the contrary, if u is negative, then some reachable states violate the safety condition ϕ_{post} . If u is 0, then the system cannot be considered safe. We introduce *forward and backward robustness*, $F\text{-ROBUST}(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post}, S_A, o, \delta)$ and $B\text{-ROBUST}(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post}, S_A, o, \delta)$ respectively, to quantify the robustness δ , with $\delta \leq 1$, for a system P against *bounded sensor attacks*, as the ratio between the safety of the attacked system and the degree of safety of the original system; here, the value of $(1 - \delta)$ quantifies the *percentage of safety that is lost* due to the attack. The closer δ is to 1, the more robust the system is. To reason about the notions of robustness, we introduce two simulation distances, *forward and backward simulation distance*, defined based on the behavior distances between the original system and the compromised system, to characterize upper bounds of the degree of forward and backward safety loss caused by the sensor attacks. To reason with forward and backward simulation distances, we propose a new *modality* and a *proof system* to reason with the modality. The proposed modality can be used to encode both forward and backward simulation distances in an intuitive and concise way. We formally prove the soundness of the encodings and its associated proof system. We showcase our formal notions on two non-trivial examples: an autonomous vehicle that needs to avoid collision and a water tank system.

Future work. As observed in [42, 38, 3], *timing* is a critical issue when attacking CPSs. We aim at generalizing our threat model to deal with more sophisticated time-sensitive sensor attacks, where the attacker may specify (possibly periodic) attack windows in which offsets might be potentially different in each window, depending on the system state. This might be necessary to implement stealthy attacks working around adaptive IDSs.

References

- [1] S. Chong, R. Lanotte, M. Merro, S. Tini, J. Xiang, Quantitative robustness analysis of sensor attacks on cyber-physical systems, in: HSCC, ACM, 2023, pp. 20:1–20:12.
- [2] J. Giraldo, D. I. Urbina, A. Cardenas, J. Valente, M. Faisal, J. Ruths, N. O. Tippenhauer, H. Sandberg, R. Candell, A Survey of Physics-Based Attack Detection in Cyber-Physical Systems, ACM Comput. Surv. 51 (4) (2018) 76:1–76:36.
- [3] R. Lanotte, M. Merro, A. Munteanu, L. Viganò, A Formal Approach to Physics-based Attacks in Cyber-physical Systems, ACM Transactions on Privacy and Security 23 (1) (2020) 3:1–3:41.
- [4] Y. Son, H. Shin, D. Kim, Y. Park, J. Noh, K. Choi, J. Choi, Y. Kim, Rocking drones with intentional sound noise on gyroscopic sensors, in: USENIX Security, 2015, pp. 881–896.
- [5] Y. Cao, C. Xiao, B. Cyr, Y. Zhou, W. Park, S. Rampazzi, Q. A. Chen, K. Fu, Z. M. Mao, Adversarial sensor attack on LiDAR-based perception in autonomous driving, in: CCS, 2019, pp. 2267–2281.
- [6] D. Davidson, H. Wu, R. Jellinek, V. Singh, T. Ristenpart, Controlling UAVs with sensor input spoofing attacks, in: WOOT, 2016.
- [7] R. Alur, Principles of cyber-physical systems, MIT Press, 2015.
- [8] K. G. Larsen, Verification and performance analysis for embedded systems, in: TASE, IEEE, 2009, pp. 3–4.
- [9] E. A. Lee, S. A. Seshia, Introduction to embedded systems: A cyber-physical systems approach, MIT press, 2016.

- [10] P. Tabuada, *Verification and control of hybrid systems: a symbolic approach*, Springer, 2009.
- [11] A. Tiwari, Logic in software, dynamical and biological systems, in: *LICS, IEEE*, 2011, pp. 9–10.
- [12] V. Nigam, C. Talcott, A. Urquiza, Towards the Automated Verification of Cyber-Physical Security Protocols: Bounding the Number of Timed Intruders, in: *ESORICS*, Vol. 9879 of LNCS, Springer, 2016, pp. 450–470.
- [13] V. Nigam, C. L. Talcott, Formal Security Verification of Industry 4.0 Applications, in: *ETFA, IEEE*, 2019, pp. 1043–1050.
- [14] M. Barrère, C. Hankin, N. Nicolaou, D. G. Eliades, T. Parisini, Measuring cyber-physical security in industrial control systems via minimum-effort attack strategies, *J. Inf. Secur. Appl.* 52 (2020) 102471.
- [15] D. Bresolin, P. Collins, L. Geretti, R. Segala, T. Villa, S. Z. Gonzalez, A computable and compositional semantics for hybrid automata, in: *HSCC, ACM*, 2020, pp. 18:1–18:11.
- [16] I. Jahandideh, F. Ghassemi, M. Sirjani, An actor-based framework for asynchronous event-based cyber-physical systems, *Software and Systems Modeling* 20 (2021) 641–665.
- [17] J. Xiang, N. Fulton, S. Chong, Relational analysis of sensor attacks on Cyber-Physical Systems, in: *CSF, IEEE*, 2021, pp. 1–16.
- [18] A. Giacalone, C. Jou, S. A. Smolka, Algebraic reasoning for probabilistic concurrent systems, in: M. Broy, C. B. Jones (Eds.), *Programming concepts and methods: Proceedings of the IFIP Working Group 2.2, 2.3 Working Conference on Programming Concepts and Methods*, Sea of Galilee, Israel, 2-5 April, 1990, North-Holland, 1990, pp. 443–458.
- [19] A. Platzer, Differential dynamic logic for hybrid systems, *Journal of Automated Reasoning* 41 (2) (2008) 143–189.
- [20] A. Platzer, *Logical foundations of cyber-physical systems*, Vol. 662, Springer, 2018.
- [21] A. Platzer, A complete uniform substitution calculus for differential dynamic logic, *Journal of Automated Reasoning* 59 (2) (2017) 219–265.
- [22] G. E. Fainekos, G. J. Pappas, Robustness of temporal logic specifications for continuous-time signals, *Theoretical Computer Science* 410 (42) (2009) 4262–4291.
- [23] S. Boyd, S. P. Boyd, L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*, Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [24] D. Kozen, Kleene algebra with tests, *TOPLAS* 19 (3) (1997) 427–443.
- [25] D. Harel, D. Kozen, J. Tiuryn, *Dynamic Logic*, MIT Press, 2000.
- [26] N. Fulton, S. Mitsch, J.-D. Quesel, M. Völpl, A. Platzer, KeYmaera X: An axiomatic tactical theorem prover for hybrid systems, in: *CADE*, Vol. 9195 of LNCS, Springer, 2015, pp. 527–538.
- [27] W. E. Boyce, R. C. DiPrima, *Elementary differential equations and boundary value problems*, Wiley, 2012.
- [28] M. Fränzle, J. Kapinski, P. Prabhakar, Robustness in cyber-physical systems, *Dagstuhl Reports* 6 (9) (2016) 29–45.
- [29] F. Hu, Y. Lu, A. V. Vasilakos, Q. Hao, R. Ma, Y. Patil, T. Zhang, J. Lu, X. Li, N. N. Xiong, Robust cyber-physical systems: concept, models, and implementation, *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.* 56 (2016) 449–475.
- [30] K. Huang, C. Zhou, Y. Tian, S. Yang, Y. Qin, Assessing the Physical Impact of Cyberattacks on Industrial Cyber-Physical Systems, *IEEE Trans. Industrial Electronics* 65 (10) (2018) 8153–8162.
- [31] P. Tabuada, S. Y. Caliskan, M. Rungger, R. Majumdar, Towards robustness for cyber-physical systems, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.* 59 (12) (2014) 3151–3163.
- [32] M. Rungger, P. Tabuada, A notion of robustness for cyber-physical systems, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.* 61 (8) (2016) 2108–2123.
- [33] A. D. Ames, X. Xu, J. W. Grizzle, P. Tabuada, Control barrier function based quadratic programs for safety critical systems, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 62 (8) (2016) 3861–3876.
- [34] A. A. Agrachev, A. S. Morse, E. D. Sontag, H. J. Sussmann, V. I. Utkin, E. D. Sontag, Input to state stability: Basic concepts and results, *Nonlinear and optimal control theory: lectures given at the CIME summer school held in Cetraro, Italy June 19–29, 2004* (2008) 163–220.
- [35] O. Maler, D. Nickovic, Monitoring temporal properties of continuous signals, in: *FORMATS/FTRTFT*, Vol. 3253 of LNCS, 2004, pp. 152–166.
- [36] T. Ferrère, D. Nickovic, A. Donzé, H. Ito, J. Kapinski, Interface-aware signal temporal logic, in: *HSCC, ACM*, 2019, pp. 57–66.
- [37] S. Mohammadinejad, J. V. Deshmukh, A. G. Puranic, Mining environment assumptions for cyber-physical system models, in: *ICCPS, IEEE*, 2020, pp. 87–97.
- [38] R. Lanotte, M. Merro, S. Tini, Towards a Formal Notion of Impact Metric for Cyber-Physical Attacks, in: *IFM*, Vol. 11023 of LNCS, Springer, 2018, pp. 296–315.
- [39] R. Lanotte, M. Merro, A. Munteanu, S. Tini, Formal Impact Metrics for Cyber-physical Attacks, in: *CSF, IEEE*, 2021, pp. 1–16.
- [40] C. Bernardeschi, A. Domenici, M. Palmieri, Formalization and co-simulation of attacks on cyber-physical systems, *Journal of Computer Virology and Hacking Techniques* 16 (1) (2020) 63–77.
- [41] S. Owre, J. M. Rushby, N. Shankar, PVS: A prototype verification system, in: *CADE*, Vol. 607 of LNCS, Springer, 1992, pp. 748–752.
- [42] M. Krotofil, A. A. Cárdenas, Resilience of Process Control Systems to Cyber-Physical Attacks, in: *NordSec*, Vol. 8208 of LNCS, Springer, 2013, pp. 166–182.

Appendix A. Definitions

We present the formal definition of variable set (i.e., $\text{VAR}(\phi)$), which involve bound variables, must bound variables, and free variables.

Definition 11 (Bound variables). *The set $\text{BV}(\phi)$ of bound variables of dL formula ϕ is defined inductively as:*

$$\begin{aligned}\text{BV}(\theta \sim \delta) &= \emptyset \quad \sim \in \{<, \leq, =, >, \geq\} \\ \text{BV}(\neg\phi) &= \text{BV}(\phi) \\ \text{BV}(\phi \wedge \psi) &= \text{BV}(\phi) \cup \text{BV}(\psi) \\ \text{BV}(\forall x. \phi) &= \{x\} \cup \text{BV}(\phi) \\ \text{BV}([P]\phi) &= \text{BV}(P) \cup \text{BV}(\phi)\end{aligned}$$

The set $\text{BV}(P)$ of bound variables of hybrid program P , i.e., those may potentially be written to, is defined inductively as:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{BV}(x := \theta) &= \text{BV}(x := *) = \{x\} \\ \text{BV}(\? \phi) &= \emptyset \\ \text{BV}(x' = \theta \& \phi) &= \{x, x'\} \\ \text{BV}(P; Q) &= \text{BV}(P \cup Q) = \text{BV}(P) \cup \text{BV}(Q) \\ \text{BV}(P^*) &= \text{BV}(P)\end{aligned}$$

Definition 12 (Must-bound variables). *The set $\text{MBV}(P) \subseteq \text{BV}(P)$ of most bound variables of hybrid program P , i.e., all those that must be written to on all paths of P , is defined inductively as:*

$$\begin{aligned}\text{MBV}(x := \theta) &= \text{MBV}(x := *) = \{x\} \\ \text{MBV}(\? \phi) &= \emptyset \\ \text{MBV}(x' = \theta \& \phi) &= \{x, x'\} \\ \text{MBV}(P \cup Q) &= \text{MBV}(P) \cap \text{MBV}(Q) \\ \text{MBV}(P; Q) &= \text{MBV}(P) \cup \text{MBV}(Q) \\ \text{MBV}(P^*) &= \emptyset\end{aligned}$$

Definition 13 (Free variables). *The set $\text{FV}(\theta)$ of variables of term θ is defined inductively as:*

$$\begin{aligned}\text{FV}(\theta) &= \{\theta\} \\ \text{FV}(c) &= \emptyset \\ \text{FV}(\theta \oplus \delta) &= \text{FV}(\theta) \cup \text{FV}(\delta)\end{aligned}$$

The set $\text{FV}(\phi)$ of free variables of dL formula ϕ is defined inductively as:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{FV}(\theta \sim \delta) &= \text{FV}(\theta) \cup \text{FV}(\delta) \\ \text{FV}(\neg\phi) &= \text{FV}(\phi) \\ \text{FV}(\phi \wedge \psi) &= \text{FV}(\phi) \cup \text{FV}(\psi) \\ \text{FV}(\forall x. \phi) &= \text{FV}(\phi) \setminus \{x\} \\ \text{FV}([P]\phi) &= \text{FV}(P) \cup (\text{FV}(\phi) \setminus \text{MBV}(P))\end{aligned}$$

The set $\text{FV}(P)$ of bound variables of hybrid program P is defined inductively as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{FV}(x := \theta) &= \text{FV}(\theta) \\
\text{FV}(x := *) &= \emptyset \\
\text{FV}(\phi) &= \text{FV}(\phi) \\
\text{FV}(x' = \theta \ \&\phi) &= \{x\} \cup \text{FV}(\theta) \cup \text{FV}(\phi) \\
\text{FV}(P \cup Q) &= \text{FV}(P) \cup \text{FV}(Q) \\
\text{FV}(P; Q) &= \text{FV}(P) \cup (\text{FV}(Q) \setminus \text{MBV}(P)) \\
\text{FV}(P^*) &= \text{FV}(P)
\end{aligned}$$

Definition 14 (Variable sets). The set $\text{VAR}(P)$, variables of hybrid program P is $\text{BV}(P) \cup \text{FV}(P)$. The set $\text{VAR}(\phi)$, variables of dL formula ϕ is $\text{BV}(\phi) \cup \text{FV}(\phi)$.

Appendix B. Proofs

In this section, we provide the proofs of all results stated in the paper.

Appendix B.1. Proofs of results in Section 3

Proof of Proposition 2. We prove the two properties separately.

Let us start with first property. If $\text{F-SAFE}_u(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, then, by definition, it holds that $u = \mathbf{inf}\{\text{Dist}(\nu, \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \langle P \rangle \rrbracket\}$. Since, by the hypothesis, $u > 0$, then by definition of $\mathbf{Dist}(-, -)$ it follows that all states $\nu \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \langle P \rangle \rrbracket$ satisfy $\nu \in \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket$, thus implying that all states $\omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket$ are such that all states ν with $(\omega, \nu) \in \llbracket P \rrbracket$ satisfy $\nu \in \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket$. By the definition of the modality of necessity, this implies that all states $\omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket$ are also in $\llbracket [P] \phi_{post} \rrbracket$, thus implying $\mathbf{dist}(\omega, \llbracket [P] \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \geq 0$ and, consequently, $\mathbf{inf}\{\text{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket [P] \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket\} \geq 0$. By definition, property $\text{B-SAFE}_r(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ for some $r \geq 0$ follows.

Let us consider now the second property. If $\text{B-SAFE}_r(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, then, by definition, it holds that $r = \mathbf{inf}\{\text{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket [P] \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket\}$. Since, by the hypothesis, $r > 0$, then by definition of $\mathbf{Dist}(-, -)$ it follows that all states in $\llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket$ are also in $\llbracket [P] \phi_{post} \rrbracket$, thus implying that all states $\omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket$ are such that all states ν with $(\omega, \nu) \in \llbracket P \rrbracket$ satisfy $\nu \in \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket$. By the definition of modality $\phi_{pre} \langle P \rangle$, this implies that all states $\nu \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \langle P \rangle \rrbracket$ are also in $\llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket$, thus implying $\mathbf{dist}(\nu, \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \geq 0$ and, consequently, $\mathbf{inf}\{\text{Dist}(\nu, \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \langle P \rangle \rrbracket\} \geq 0$. By definition, property $\text{F-SAFE}_u(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ for some $u \geq 0$ follows. \square

Appendix B.2. Proofs of results in Section 4

Proof of Theorem 1. We prove the inequality $u_1 \leq u$, the inequality $u_2 \leq u_1$ can be proved similarly. The behaviors of the system with compromised sensors subsume the behaviors of the original program, since the sensed values q_s can take the correct physical value q_p . Therefore we know that $\llbracket \phi_{pre} \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o_1) \rangle \rrbracket$ contains all states of $\llbracket \phi_{pre} \langle P \rangle \rrbracket$. Then, according to the definition of forward safety, $u = \mathbf{inf}\{\text{Dist}(\nu, \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \langle P \rangle \rrbracket\}$ can only be no smaller than $u_1 = \mathbf{inf}\{\text{Dist}(\nu, \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o_1) \rangle \rrbracket\}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. We prove the inequality $r_1 \leq r$, the inequality $r_2 \leq r_1$ can be proved similarly. As observed above in the proof of Theorem 1, the behaviors of the system with compromised sensors subsume the behaviors of the original program. Therefore we know that $\llbracket [P] \phi_{post} \rrbracket$ contains all states of $\llbracket [\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o_1)] \phi_{post} \rrbracket$. Then, according to the definition of backward safety, we can conclude that value $r = \mathbf{inf}\{\text{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket [P] \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket\}$ can only be no smaller than value $r_1 = \mathbf{inf}\{\text{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket [\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o_1)] \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket\}$. \square

Appendix B.3. Proofs of results in Section 5

Proof of Proposition 3. We show $u_1 = u$. Property $u_2 = u$ can be proved analogously.

Property $u_1 = u$ follows if we show that for all states $\omega \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket$ it holds

$$\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket) = \mathbf{Dist}_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket) \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where, by definition, we have:

$$\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket) = \begin{cases} \inf\{\rho(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \neg\phi \rrbracket\} & \text{if } \omega \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket \\ -\inf\{\rho(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket\} & \text{if } \omega \notin \llbracket \phi \rrbracket \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathbf{Dist}_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket) = \begin{cases} \inf\{\rho_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \neg\phi \rrbracket\} & \text{if } \omega \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket \\ -\inf\{\rho_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket\} & \text{if } \omega \notin \llbracket \phi \rrbracket. \end{cases}$$

We prove Equation B.1, by distinguishing two cases, $\omega \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$ and $\omega \notin \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$.

Case $\omega \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$. Since $\rho(\omega, \nu) \geq \rho_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \nu)$ for all states ν , we infer $\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket) \geq \mathbf{Dist}_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket)$. We can prove that also $\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket) \leq \mathbf{Dist}_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket)$ holds, thus confirming Equation B.1. For an arbitrary state $\nu \in \llbracket \neg\phi \rrbracket$, $\rho_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \nu)$ is equal to $\rho(\omega, \nu')$, where ν' is the state such that:

$$\nu' = \begin{cases} x \mapsto \nu(x) & \text{if } x \in \text{VAR}(\phi) \\ x \mapsto \omega(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Notice that ν' belongs to $\llbracket \neg\phi \rrbracket$, since $\nu \in \llbracket \neg\phi \rrbracket$ and states ν' and ν assign the same value to all variables occurring in ϕ . By the arbitrariness of ν in $\llbracket \neg\phi \rrbracket$, we get that all values in set $\{\rho_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \neg\phi \rrbracket\}$ are also in set $\{\rho(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \neg\phi \rrbracket\}$, thus implying $\inf\{\rho_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \neg\phi \rrbracket\} \geq \inf\{\rho(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \neg\phi \rrbracket\}$, which gives $\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket) \leq \mathbf{Dist}_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket)$.

Case $\omega \notin \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$. Since $\rho(\omega, \nu) \geq \rho_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \nu)$ for all states ν , we infer $\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket) \leq \mathbf{Dist}_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket)$. We can prove that also $\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket) \geq \mathbf{Dist}_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket)$ holds, thus confirming Equation B.1. For an arbitrary state $\nu \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$, $\rho_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \nu)$ is equal to $\rho(\omega, \nu')$, where ν' is the state such that:

$$\nu' = \begin{cases} x \mapsto \nu(x) & \text{if } x \in \text{VAR}(\phi) \\ x \mapsto \omega(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Notice that ν' belongs to $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket$, since $\nu \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$ and states ν' and ν assign the same value to all variables occurring in ϕ . By the arbitrariness of ν in $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket$, we get that all values in set $\{\rho_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket\}$ are also in set $\{\rho(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket\}$, thus implying $-\inf\{\rho_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket\} \leq -\inf\{\rho(\omega, \nu) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket\}$, which gives $\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket) \geq \mathbf{Dist}_{\text{VAR}(\phi)}(\omega, \llbracket \phi \rrbracket)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. Let \mathcal{H} be the set of variables $\text{VAR}(\phi_{\text{post}})$. We need to prove

$$\text{F-SAFE}_{u_1}(\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o), \phi_{\text{pre}}, \phi_{\text{post}}) \text{ for } u_1 \geq u - d$$

where, by definition of forward safety, we know that

$$u_1 = \inf\{\mathbf{Dist}(\nu, \llbracket \phi_{\text{post}} \rrbracket) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi_{\text{pre}} \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \rrbracket\}$$

Therefore, the proof obligation is

$$\inf\{\mathbf{Dist}(\nu, \llbracket \phi_{\text{post}} \rrbracket) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi_{\text{pre}} \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \rrbracket\} \geq u - d \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Consider any state $\nu \in \llbracket \phi_{\text{pre}} \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \rrbracket$. The hypothesis $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \sqsubseteq_{\phi_{\text{pre}}, \mathcal{H}, d}^{\text{F}} P$ ensures that there is some state $\nu' \in \llbracket \phi_{\text{pre}} \langle P \rangle \rrbracket$ with $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu, \nu') \leq d$. We can show that $\mathbf{Dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu', \llbracket \phi_{\text{post}} \rrbracket) \geq u$. Indeed, the hypothesis $\text{F-SAFE}_u(P, \phi_{\text{pre}}, \phi_{\text{post}})$ coincides, by definition, with property

$$u = \inf\{\mathbf{Dist}(\nu, \llbracket \phi_{\text{post}} \rrbracket) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi_{\text{pre}} \langle P \rangle \rrbracket\}$$

which, by Proposition 3, can be rewritten as

$$u = \inf\{\mathbf{Dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu, \llbracket \phi_{\text{post}} \rrbracket) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi_{\text{pre}} \langle P \rangle \rrbracket\}$$

from which we infer $\mathbf{Dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu', \llbracket \phi_{\text{post}} \rrbracket) \geq u$ since $\nu' \in \llbracket \phi_{\text{pre}} \langle P \rangle \rrbracket$.

Since $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(_, _)$ is a metric, it is symmetric, thus implying $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu, \nu') = \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu', \nu)$, and satisfies the triangular property. By the triangular property we infer that for any state $\nu'' \notin \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket$, it holds

$$\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu', \nu'') \leq \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu', \nu) + \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu, \nu'') \quad (\text{B.3})$$

By definition of $\mathbf{Dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu', \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket)$ and the properties $\mathbf{Dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu', \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \geq u$ and $\nu'' \notin \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket$ we infer $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu', \nu'') \geq u$. From this inequality, property $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu, \nu') \leq d$ and Equation B.3, we infer $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu, \nu'') \geq u - d$. By definition of $\mathbf{Dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu, \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket)$ and the arbitrariness of ν in $\llbracket \phi_{pre} \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \rrbracket$, we infer

$$\mathbf{inf}\{\mathbf{Dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu, \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \rrbracket\} \geq u - d$$

which, by Proposition 3, can be rewritten as:

$$\mathbf{inf}\{\mathbf{Dist}(\nu, \llbracket \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \nu \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \rrbracket\} \geq u - d$$

which coincides with the proof obligation Equation B.2. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. Let \mathcal{H} be the set of variables $\text{VAR}(\phi_{pre})$. We have to prove

$$\text{B-SAFE}_{r_1}(\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o), \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post}) \text{ for } r_1 \geq r - d$$

where, by definition of backward safety, we have

$$r_1 = \mathbf{inf}\{\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket\}$$

Therefore, the proof obligation is

$$\mathbf{inf}\{\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket\} \geq r - d$$

which, by Proposition 3 can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{inf}\{\mathbf{Dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \llbracket \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket\} \geq r - d$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\forall \omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket. \forall \omega' \in \llbracket \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \neg \phi_{post} \rrbracket. \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \omega') \geq r - d \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Let us fix any $\omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket$. For each $\omega' \in \llbracket \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \neg \phi_{post} \rrbracket$ the property $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \omega') \geq r - d$ is immediate if $\omega' \in \llbracket \langle P \rangle \neg \phi_{post} \rrbracket$, since in that case the hypothesis $\text{B-SAFE}_r(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$, which coincides with $r = \mathbf{inf}\{\mathbf{Dist}(\omega, \llbracket \langle P \rangle \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket\}$, and with $\mathbf{inf}\{\mathbf{Dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \llbracket \langle P \rangle \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket\}$ by Proposition 3, ensures that $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \omega') > r$. The interesting case is $\omega' \in \llbracket \langle P \rangle \phi_{post} \rrbracket$. By the hypothesis $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \sqsubseteq_{\phi_{post}, \mathcal{H}, d}^{\text{B}} P$ there is a state $\omega'' \in \llbracket \langle P \rangle \neg \phi_{post} \rrbracket$ with $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega', \omega'') \leq d$. The hypothesis $\text{B-SAFE}_r(P, \phi_{pre}, \phi_{post})$ and Proposition 3 ensure that $r = \mathbf{inf}\{\mathbf{Dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \llbracket \langle P \rangle \phi_{post} \rrbracket) \mid \omega \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket\}$. This inequality together with $\omega'' \in \llbracket \langle P \rangle \neg \phi_{post} \rrbracket$ give $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega'', \omega) \geq r$. Since $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(_, _)$ is a metric, it is symmetric, thus implying that $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \omega'') = \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega'', \omega)$. Moreover $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(_, _)$ satisfies the triangular property, which ensures that

$$\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \omega'') \leq \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \omega') + \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega', \omega'')$$

From this inequality, $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega'', \omega) \geq r$ and $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega', \omega'') \leq d$ we infer $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\omega, \omega') \geq r - d$. This completes the proof. \square

Appendix B.4. Proofs of results in Section 6

Proof of Proposition 4. The thesis follows from the definition of the modalities of necessity $\llbracket _ \rrbracket$ - and existency $\langle _ \rangle$ - and the definition of renaming function ξ . \square

Proof of Theorem 5. We have to prove that for each state $\nu_1 \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \rrbracket$, there exists a state $\nu_2 \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \langle P \rangle \rrbracket$ such that $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq d$. Given an arbitrary state $\nu_1 \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \rrbracket$, there exists a state $\omega_1 \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket$ such that $(\omega_1, \nu_1) \in \llbracket \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rrbracket$. From $\omega_1 \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket$ and the hypothesis $\phi_{pre} \rightarrow \exists \xi(\text{VAR}(\phi_{pre})) . (\psi \wedge \xi(\phi_{pre}))$ we infer that there is some state $\omega_2 \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket$ such that $\omega_1 \uplus \xi(\omega_2) \in \llbracket \psi \rrbracket$. From the hypothesis $\psi \rightarrow \llbracket (P, S_A, o)_{\xi} \phi \rrbracket$ we have that $\omega_1 \uplus \xi(\omega_2) \in \llbracket \llbracket (P, S_A, o)_{\xi} \phi \rrbracket \rrbracket$. By the hypothesis $\phi \rightarrow \rho_{\mathcal{H}}^{\xi} \leq d$, we derive $\omega_1 \uplus \xi(\omega_2) \in \llbracket \llbracket (P, S_A, o)_{\xi} \rrbracket (\rho_{\mathcal{H}}^{\xi} \leq d) \rrbracket$. From this fact and Proposition 4, we derive that there exists a state ν_2 such that $(\xi(\omega_2), \xi(\nu_2)) \in \llbracket \xi(P) \rrbracket$ and $\nu_1 \uplus \xi(\nu_2) \in$

$\llbracket (\rho_h^\xi \leq d) \rrbracket$. Now, from $(\xi(\omega_2), \xi(\nu_2)) \in \llbracket \xi(P) \rrbracket$ we derive that $(\omega_2, \nu_2) \in \llbracket P \rrbracket$. Moreover, since $\omega_2 \in \llbracket \phi_{pre} \rrbracket$, we have that $\nu_2 \in \llbracket \phi_{pre}(P) \rrbracket$. It remains to prove that $\rho_h(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq d$. From $\nu_1 \uplus \xi(\nu_2) \in \llbracket (\rho_h^\xi \leq d) \rrbracket$ we have that $\sqrt{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} (\nu_1(x) - (\xi(\nu_2))(\xi(x)))^2} \leq d$. Since $\sqrt{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} (\nu_1(x) - (\xi(\nu_2))(\xi(x)))^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} (\nu_1(x) - \nu_2(x))^2} = \rho_h(\nu_1, \nu_2)$ we have that $\rho_h(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq d$, which concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 6. We have to prove that for each state $\omega_1 \in \llbracket \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \neg \phi_{post} \rrbracket$, there is a state $\omega_2 \in \llbracket \langle P \rangle \neg \phi_{post} \rrbracket$ with $\rho_h(\omega_1, \omega_2) \leq d$. Given an arbitrary state $\omega_1 \in \llbracket \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \neg \phi_{post} \rrbracket$, by the hypothesis $\forall \text{VAR}(P) \exists \xi(\text{VAR}(P)). \phi$, there is some state ω_2 such that $\omega_1 \uplus \xi(\omega_2) \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$. From the hypothesis $\phi \rightarrow \llbracket \langle P, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \langle \neg \phi_{post} \rightarrow \xi(\neg \phi_{post}) \rangle \rrbracket$, we have that $\omega_1 \uplus \xi(\omega_2) \in \llbracket \llbracket \langle P, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \langle \neg \phi_{post} \rightarrow \xi(\neg \phi_{post}) \rangle \rrbracket \rrbracket$. Since $\omega_1 \in \llbracket \langle \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rangle \neg \phi_{post} \rrbracket$, then there exists a state $\nu_1 \in \llbracket \neg \phi_{post} \rrbracket$ such that $(\omega_1, \nu_1) \in \llbracket \text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o) \rrbracket$. From this fact and since $\omega_1 \uplus \xi(\omega_2) \in \llbracket \llbracket \langle P, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \langle \neg \phi_{post} \rightarrow \xi(\neg \phi_{post}) \rangle \rrbracket \rrbracket$, by Proposition 4, there exists a state ν_2 such that $(\xi(\omega_2), \xi(\nu_2)) \in \llbracket \xi(P) \rrbracket$ and $\xi(\nu_2) \in \llbracket \xi(\neg \phi_{post}) \rrbracket$. Therefore $\xi(\omega_2) \in \llbracket \langle \xi(P) \rangle \xi(\neg \phi_{post}) \rrbracket$, thus implying $\omega_2 \in \llbracket \langle P \rangle \neg \phi_{post} \rrbracket$. It remains to prove that $\rho_h(\omega_1, \omega_2) \leq d$. By $\omega_1 \uplus \xi(\omega_2) \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$ and the hypothesis $\phi \rightarrow \rho_h^\xi \leq d$, we infer $\omega_1 \uplus \xi(\omega_2) \in \llbracket \rho_h^\xi \leq d \rrbracket$ implying $\sqrt{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} (\omega_1(x) - (\xi(\omega_2))(\xi(x)))^2} \leq d$. Since $\sqrt{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} (\omega_1(x) - (\xi(\omega_2))(\xi(x)))^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} (\omega_1(x) - \omega_2(x))^2} = \rho_h(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ we have that $\rho_h(\omega_1, \omega_2) \leq d$ which concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 5. We prove the soundness of these proof rules using the default $d\mathcal{L}$ axioms and rules [21, 20]. We write P_{att} to denote $\text{ATTACKED}(P, S_A, o)$, and P_ϵ to denote $\xi(P)$. In the proof derivation, we ignore certain parts, using the notation \dots , if they are similar to the other parts presented in the same derivation.

- Rule D-DEF is sound as it is defined according to the definition of the modality.
- The following derivation shows the soundness proof of the rule D-;. The key step is the right branch. The implication $\langle P_\epsilon \rangle [Q_{att}] \langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi \rightarrow [Q_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi$ holds, intuitively, because the diamond modality of P_ϵ in the conclusion can always take the execution of P_ϵ that makes the premise hold.

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{D-DEF} \frac{\Gamma \vdash \llbracket \langle P, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \rrbracket \llbracket \langle Q, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \rrbracket \phi}{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle [Q_{att}] \langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi} \quad \frac{\vdash \langle P_\epsilon \rangle [Q_{att}] \langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi \rightarrow [Q_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi}{\langle P_\epsilon \rangle [Q_{att}] \langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vdash [Q_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi} \\ \text{MR} \frac{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle [Q_{att}] \langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi \quad \langle P_\epsilon \rangle [Q_{att}] \langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vdash [Q_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi}{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] [Q_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi} \\ \text{[;] AND D-DEF} \frac{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] [Q_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi}{\Gamma \vdash \llbracket \langle P; Q, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \rrbracket \phi} \end{array}$$

- The following derivation shows the soundness proof of the rule D-MR.

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{D-DEF} \frac{\Gamma \vdash \llbracket \langle P, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \rrbracket \phi}{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi} \quad \text{SEM} \frac{\phi \vdash \psi}{\langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vdash \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \psi} \\ \text{MR} \frac{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \quad \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vdash \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \psi}{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \psi} \\ \text{D-DEF} \frac{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \psi}{\Gamma \vdash \llbracket \langle P, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \rrbracket \psi} \end{array}$$

- The following derivation shows the soundness proof of the rule D- \wedge .

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{D-MR} \frac{\Gamma \vdash \llbracket \langle P, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \rrbracket (\phi \wedge \psi) \quad \phi \wedge \psi \vdash \phi}{\Gamma \vdash \llbracket \langle P, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \rrbracket \phi} \quad \text{D-MR} \frac{\Gamma \vdash \llbracket \langle P, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \rrbracket (\phi \wedge \psi) \quad \phi \wedge \psi \vdash \psi}{\Gamma \vdash \llbracket \langle P, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \rrbracket \psi} \\ \text{\wedge R} \frac{\Gamma \vdash \llbracket \langle P, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \rrbracket \phi \quad \Gamma \vdash \llbracket \langle P, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \rrbracket \psi}{\Gamma \vdash \llbracket \langle P, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \rrbracket \phi \wedge \llbracket \langle P, S_A, o \rangle_\xi \rrbracket \psi} \end{array}$$

- The following derivation shows the soundness proof of the rule D- \vee .

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{D-DEF} \frac{\Gamma \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi \vee [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vee [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \psi} \\
\text{CUTR} \frac{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vee [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \psi}{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle (\phi \vee \psi)} \\
\text{M}\langle \rangle \frac{\phi \vdash (\phi \vee \psi)}{\langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vdash \langle P_\epsilon \rangle (\phi \vee \psi)} \\
\text{M}\square \frac{\langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vdash \langle P_\epsilon \rangle (\phi \vee \psi)}{[P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle (\phi \vee \psi)} \quad \dots \\
\text{VL} \frac{[P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle (\phi \vee \psi) \quad \dots \quad [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \psi \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle (\phi \vee \psi)}{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle (\phi \vee \psi)} \\
\text{D-DEF} \frac{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle (\phi \vee \psi)}{\Gamma \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] (\phi \vee \psi)}
\end{array}$$

- The following derivation shows the soundness proof of the rule D-U. The left \dots proves the obligation of $\Gamma \vdash [Q_{att}] \langle (P_\epsilon) \phi \vee (Q_\epsilon) \phi \rangle$ the same way as the proof for $\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle (P_\epsilon) \phi \vee (Q_\epsilon) \phi \rangle$. And the right \dots proves the obligation $\langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vdash \langle (P \cup Q)_\epsilon \rangle \phi$ the same way as the proof for $\langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vdash \langle (P \cup Q)_\epsilon \rangle \phi$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{D-DEF} \frac{\Gamma \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi}{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi} \\
\text{D-MR} \frac{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \quad \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vdash \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vee \langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi}{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle (P_\epsilon) \phi \vee (Q_\epsilon) \phi \rangle} \quad \dots \quad \frac{\langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vdash \langle (P \cup Q)_\epsilon \rangle \phi}{\langle P_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vee \langle Q_\epsilon \rangle \phi \vdash \langle (P \cup Q)_\epsilon \rangle \phi} \quad \dots \\
\text{[U]} \frac{\Gamma \vdash [P_{att}] \langle (P_\epsilon) \phi \vee (Q_\epsilon) \phi \rangle \quad \dots \quad \Gamma \vdash [(P \cup Q)_{att}] \langle (P_\epsilon) \phi \vee (Q_\epsilon) \phi \rangle}{\Gamma \vdash [(P \cup Q)_{att}] \langle (P \cup Q)_\epsilon \rangle \phi} \\
\text{MR} \frac{\Gamma \vdash [(P \cup Q)_{att}] \langle (P \cup Q)_\epsilon \rangle \phi}{\Gamma \vdash [(P \cup Q, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi} \\
\text{D-DEF} \frac{\Gamma \vdash [(P \cup Q, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi}{\Gamma \vdash [(P \cup Q, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi}
\end{array}$$

- The proof for the rule D-? is as follows:

$$[[?]\phi_t, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi \leftrightarrow ([?]\phi_t) \langle ? \xi(\phi_t) \rangle \phi \leftrightarrow ([?]\phi_t) \xi(\phi_t) \wedge \phi \leftrightarrow (\phi_t \rightarrow (\xi(\phi_t) \wedge \phi))$$

- The following derivation shows the soundness proof of the rule D-INV. The key step is to derive $\phi_i \vdash [(P^*, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i$ from $\phi_i \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i$. This can be done by induction on the number of iteration taken by P^* , in particular, assume we can derive $\phi_i \vdash [(P^n, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i$, then using the rule D-; we can derive $\phi_i \vdash [(P^{n+1}, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\phi_i \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i}{\phi_i \vdash [(P^*, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i} \\
\rightarrow_L \frac{\Gamma \vdash \phi_i \quad \phi_i \vdash [(P^*, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i}{\Gamma \vdash [(P^*, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i} \quad \phi_i \vdash \psi \\
\text{D-MR} \frac{\Gamma \vdash [(P^*, S_A, o)_\xi] \phi_i \quad \phi_i \vdash \psi}{\Gamma \vdash [(P^*, S_A, o)_\xi] \psi}
\end{array}$$

- The following derivation shows the soundness proof of the rule D-V. Note that the branch on the right says given $\psi \vdash \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \psi_1$, we have $(\phi_1 \wedge \psi) \vdash \langle P_\epsilon \rangle (\phi_1 \wedge \psi_1)$. This is sound because program P_ϵ doesn't refer to the variables in ϕ_1 .

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{M}\langle \rangle \frac{\phi \vdash [P_{att}] \phi_1}{(\phi \wedge \psi) \vdash [P_{att}] \phi_1} \quad \text{V} \frac{\frac{\phi \wedge \psi \vdash \psi}{(\phi \wedge \psi) \vdash [P_{att}] \psi}}{\psi \vdash \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \psi_1} \\
\text{MR} \frac{(\phi \wedge \psi) \vdash [P_{att}] \phi_1 \quad \psi \vdash \langle P_\epsilon \rangle \psi_1}{(\phi \wedge \psi) \vdash [P_{att}] (\phi_1 \wedge \psi_1)} \\
\text{WL} \frac{(\phi \wedge \psi) \vdash [P_{att}] (\phi_1 \wedge \psi_1)}{(\phi \wedge \psi) \vdash [(P, S_A, o)_\xi] (\phi_1 \wedge \psi_1)}
\end{array}$$

- The rule D-ODE- \forall is sound because, given $[x' = \theta][\xi(x' = \theta)](\psi(t, \xi(t)) \rightarrow \phi)$, we know that for all solutions of $x' = \theta$ and $\xi(x' = \theta)$, their reachable states satisfy ϕ when the condition ψ holds. And since ψ only concerns time, and we have no constraints on the time in the model of dynamics, there must exist states where ψ holds.
- The rule D-ODE-M is sound because it is a specialized variant of the rule D-ODE- \forall . A box modality $[x' = \theta, \xi(x' = \theta)]\phi$ forces the two dynamics evolve for the same duration. Thus, if $[x' = \theta, \xi(x' = \theta)]\phi$ holds, then for any reachable state of $x' = \theta$, a solution of $\xi(x' = \theta)$ can reach a state so ϕ holds, by evolving for the same duration as $x' = \theta$. The evolution constraint $t \leq \epsilon$ won't affect as both dynamics evolve for the same duration.

□

Appendix C. The proof rules of the proof calculus $d\mathcal{L}$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\neg_R \frac{\Gamma, \phi \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \neg \phi, \Delta} \quad \wedge_R \frac{\Gamma \vdash \phi, \Delta \quad \Gamma \vdash \psi, \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \phi \wedge \psi, \Delta} \quad \vee_R \frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \phi, \psi}{\Gamma \vdash \phi \vee \psi, \Delta} \quad \rightarrow_R \frac{\Gamma, \phi \vdash \Delta, \psi}{\Gamma \vdash \phi \rightarrow \psi, \Delta} \quad \text{ID} \frac{}{\phi, \Gamma \vdash \phi, \Delta} \\
\neg_L \frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \phi}{\neg \phi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \quad \wedge_L \frac{\Gamma, \phi, \psi \vdash \Delta}{\phi \wedge \psi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \quad \vee_L \frac{\phi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta \quad \psi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\phi \vee \psi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \quad \rightarrow_L \frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \phi \quad \psi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\phi \rightarrow \psi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \\
\leftrightarrow_R \frac{\Gamma, \phi \vdash \Delta, \psi \quad \Gamma, \psi \vdash \Delta, \phi}{\Gamma \vdash \phi \leftrightarrow \psi, \Delta} \quad \leftrightarrow_L \frac{\phi \wedge \psi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta \quad \neg \phi \wedge \neg \psi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\phi \leftrightarrow \psi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \quad \text{CUT} \frac{\Gamma, C \vdash \Delta \quad \Gamma \vdash \Delta, C}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta} \\
\top_R \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{true}, \Delta} \quad \perp_L \frac{}{\text{false}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \quad \text{WR} \frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \phi, \Delta} \quad \text{WL} \frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\phi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \quad \text{PR} \frac{\Gamma \vdash \psi, \phi, \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \phi, \psi, \Delta} \quad \text{PL} \frac{\psi, \phi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\phi, \psi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}
\end{array}$$

Figure C.20: Standard propositional sequent calculus proof rules with cut rule [20]

$$[\text{:=}] [x := e]\phi(x) \leftrightarrow \phi(e) \quad [:\text{*}] [x := *]\phi(x) \leftrightarrow \forall x, \phi(x) \quad [?] [?\psi]\phi \leftrightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \phi)$$

$$[\text{'}] [x' = f(x) \& q(x)]\phi(x) \leftrightarrow \forall t \geq 0 ((\forall 0 \leq s \leq t, q(x(s))) \rightarrow [x := x(t)]\phi(x)) \quad (\text{if } x'(t) = f(x(t)))$$

$$[\cup] [P \cup Q]\phi \leftrightarrow ([P]\phi \wedge [Q]\phi) \quad [;] [P; Q]\phi \leftrightarrow [P][Q]\phi \quad [*] [P^*]\phi \leftrightarrow \phi \wedge [P][P^*]\phi \quad \langle \cdot \rangle \neg[P]\phi \leftrightarrow \langle P \rangle \neg\phi$$

$$\text{K} [P]\phi \rightarrow \psi \rightarrow ([P]\phi \rightarrow [P]\psi) \quad \text{I} [P^*]\phi \leftrightarrow \phi \wedge [P^*](\phi \rightarrow [P]\phi) \quad \forall \phi \rightarrow [P]\phi \quad (FV(P) \cap BV(P) = \emptyset)$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\llbracket \langle \rangle \rrbracket [P](\phi \wedge \psi) \leftrightarrow ([P]\phi \wedge [P]\psi) \quad \text{LOOP} \frac{\Gamma \vdash J, \Delta \quad J \vdash \phi \quad J \vdash [P]J}{\Gamma \vdash [P^*]\phi, \Delta} \\
\text{CUTR} \frac{\Gamma \vdash \psi, \Delta \quad \Gamma \vdash \psi \rightarrow \phi, \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \phi, \Delta} \quad \text{CUTL} \frac{\psi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta \quad \Gamma \vdash \Delta, \phi \rightarrow \psi}{\phi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \quad \text{MR} \frac{\Gamma \vdash [P]\phi, \Delta \quad \phi \vdash \psi}{\Gamma \vdash [P]\psi, \Delta} \\
\text{M}\llbracket \rrbracket \frac{\Gamma \vdash \phi \rightarrow \psi, \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash [P]\phi \rightarrow [P]\psi, \Delta} \quad \text{M}\langle \rangle \frac{\Gamma \vdash \phi \rightarrow \psi, \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \langle P \rangle \phi \rightarrow \langle P \rangle \psi, \Delta}
\end{array}$$

Figure C.21: Other key axioms and proof rules of $d\mathcal{L}$ proof calculus [21, 20]