

Planning with Probabilistic Opacity and Transparency: A Computational Model of Opaque/Transparent Observations

Sumukha Udupa¹ and Jie Fu¹

Abstract—Qualitative opacity of a secret is a security property, which means that a system trajectory satisfying the secret is observation-equivalent to a trajectory violating the secret. In this paper, we study how to synthesize a control policy that maximizes the probability of a secret being made opaque against an eavesdropping attacker/observer, while subject to other task performance constraints. In contrast to existing belief-based approach for opacity-enforcement, we develop an approach that uses the observation function, the secret, and the model of the dynamical systems to construct a so-called opaque-observations automaton which accepts the exact set of observations that enforce opacity. Leveraging this opaque-observations automaton, we can reduce the optimal planning in Markov decision processes(MDPs) for maximizing probabilistic opacity or its dual notion, transparency, subject to task constraints into a constrained planning problem over an augmented-state MDP. Finally, we illustrate the effectiveness of the developed methods in robot motion planning problems with opacity or transparency requirements.

I. INTRODUCTION

Opacity is a security and privacy property that evaluates whether an observer (intruder) can deduce a system’s secret by monitoring its behavior. A system is opaque if its secret behavior or private information is made uncertain to an adversarial intruder. Initially introduced for cryptographic protocols by Mazaré [12], opacity has since then been explored with various notions depending on the nature of the secret. For instance, state-based opacity ensures that the observer cannot discern if a secret state has been visited, language-based opacity enforces that the observer cannot discern if the trajectory is in a set of secret trajectories [2], [4], [5], [8], [14], [17].

To set the context, consider a scenario involving an autonomous robot (Player 1 or P1) tasked with routine monitoring in a power plant. A sensor network is deployed for daily activity monitoring but can be vulnerable to eavesdropping attacks. Should there be an unauthorized Player 2 (P2) observing the sensor network, P1 must make P2 uncertain if a sequence of waypoints has been visited to enforce location security. Now, the planning question is how can P1 ensure maximal opacity to P2, while fulfilling the routine task beyond a specific threshold?

In this study, we explore language-based opacity and its dual notion, transparency, in stochastic systems with two players, where one player has imperfect observations. Quantitative opacity quantifies the security level of a system [3]. In competitive settings, achieving maximum probabilistic

opacity under task constraints is crucial, while in cooperative scenarios like human-robot interactions, maximizing probabilistic transparency is essential.

The classical approach for opacity enforcement is to construct a belief-based planning problem (see Related Work) where P1 tracks P2’s belief state regarding the current or past state. However, this approach is computationally expensive.

Instead, we present an approach to construct a computational model of opaque observations, which are observations obtained by state trajectories that enforce opacity. We use a Finite State Transducer (FST) to encode the observation function of state trajectories and then the synchronization product between the FST and secret language, expressed as a Deterministic Finite Automaton (DFA), to construct another DFA accepting the set of opaque observations. A product between the Markov decision process (MDP), task DFA, and the opaque-observations DFA is then computed. We show that the maximally opaque (maximally transparent) control policy under the task performance constraints can be solved as a constrained planning problem in this product.

A. Related Work

In the supervisory control of discrete event systems (DES), researchers have developed opacity-enforcing controllers by modelling the control systems as a DFA in the presence of a passive observer [13], [14], [24]. Different approaches have been proposed to either synthesize [6], [20], [21] or verify opacity [9], [15], [19] in deterministic systems. Saboori *et al.* [16] synthesized a supervisor to enforce qualitative opacity by restricting system behaviors. Cassez *et al.* [6] suggests using a dynamic mask to filter unobservable events, verifying opacity through solving a 2-player safety game. In [21], Xie *et al.* proposed a nondeterministic supervisor to prevent the observer, aware of the supervisor’s nondeterminism, from determining the secret. Besides enforcing opacity, sensor attack strategies to compromise opacity has been investigated in [22], where they proposed an information structure that records state estimates for both the supervisor and attacker. In game-theoretic approaches to opacity enforcement, Maubert *et al.* [11] introduced a game where a player with perfect observations aims to enforce current state opacity against another player with imperfect observations. In our previous work [18] we explored qualitative opacity enforcement in a stochastic environment with both the players having partial observation. These works primarily address qualitative opacity, whereas our research examines the probabilistic notions of opacity and transparency.

S. Udupa and J. Fu are with the Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611 USA. (e-mail: sudupa, fujie@ufl.edu)

In stochastic DESs, several studies delve into quantifying opacity. Saboori *et al.* [17] introduced notions of current state opacity for probabilistic finite automata, along with verification algorithms to verify if the system is probabilistically opaque for a given threshold. Yin *et al.* [23] extended this to the notions of infinite and K-step opacity. Keroglou *et al.* [8] explored model-based opacity, where the defender conceals the system model using a hidden Markov model. Bérard *et al.* [2] extended language-based opacity to ω -regular properties on MDP. Bérard *et al.* define the notions of symmetrical opacity, and define probabilistic disclosures. They showed that the quantitative questions relating to opacity become decidable for the class of ω -regular secrets. Liu *et al.* [10] studied approximate opacity in continuous stochastic control systems, developing a verification method for general continuous-state MDPs with finite abstractions.

Our proposed approach considers probabilistic opacity/transparency-enforcement in MDPs, distinguishing it from qualitative approaches. In existing stochastic methods, verification commonly involves tracking current state estimates or maintaining a belief state for opacity enforcement. In our method, we instead study an FST-based computational model of opaque observations to directly encode state trajectories, allowing us to construct another DFA that precisely accepts the set of opaque observations to enforce opacity/transparency. Our proposed computational model has the potential for extension to scenarios involving active attackers, without the need for tracking the belief of state estimates for the agents (a direction we leave for future work).

Organization: In Section II, we introduce preliminaries, and frame the problem. Section III presents our computational model. In Section IV, we use the computational model to solve an optimal planning problem. Section V illustrates the planning problem’s application in a gridworld scenario. Finally, we conclude in Section VI.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

Notations: Let Σ be a finite set of symbols, called the alphabet. We denote a set of all ω -regular words as Σ^ω obtained by concatenating the elements in Σ infinitely many times. A sequence of symbols $w = \sigma_0\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_n$ with $\sigma_i \in \Sigma$ for any $0 \leq i \leq n$, is a finite word. The set Σ^* is the set of all finite words that can be generated with Σ . The length of a word is denoted by $|w|$. For a word $w = uv$, u is a prefix of v for $u \in \Sigma^*$ and $v \in \Sigma^\omega$. Let \mathbf{R} denote the set of real numbers. Given a finite set Z , the set of probability distributions over Z is represented as $\mathcal{D}(Z)$. Given $d \in \mathcal{D}(Z)$, the support of d is $\text{Supp}(d) = \{z \in Z \mid d(z) > 0\}$.

A. Markov decision process

We consider the interaction of P1 with a stochastic environment, monitored by P2 with partial observations, modeled as a terminating MDP (without the reward function).

Definition 1. *A probabilistic transition system (i.e., an MDP without the reward function) is a tuple*

$$M = (S, A, P, \mu_0, s_\top, s_\perp, \mathcal{AP}, O, L)$$

where S is a finite set of states, A is a finite set of actions. $s_\top \in S$ is the initiating state, which is a unique start state. $s_\perp \in S$ is the terminating state, which is a unique sink state. The set A is the action set, which includes a special initiating action and a terminating action a_\top and a_\perp respectively. a_\top is only enabled in s_\top , while a_\perp is enabled for any $s \in S \setminus \{s_\top, s_\perp\}$. $P : S \times A \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(S)$ is a probabilistic transition function, with $P(s' | s, a)$ representing the probability of reaching state s' given action a at state s . μ_0 is the initial distribution on states $S \setminus \{s_\top\}$ such that $\mu_0(s)$ represents the probability of s being the initial state. For $s_\top \in S$, $P(s_\top, a_\top, s) = \mu_0(s)$. That is, if P1 selects the initiating action a_\top , then an initial state is reached surely. For any $s \in S \setminus \{s_\top, s_\perp\}$, $P(s, a_\perp, s_\perp) = 1$. That is, if P1 selects the terminating action a_\perp , then a terminating state s_\perp is reached surely. Finally, for any $a \in A \setminus \{a_\top, a_\perp\}$, $P(s_\perp, a, s_\perp) = 1$, i.e., all allowed actions form a self-loop. \mathcal{AP} is a set of atomic propositions, $L : S \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{AP}}$ is the labeling function that maps a state to a set of atomic propositions that evaluate true at that state. The initiating state is labeled with a “starting” symbol, \bowtie , i.e., $L(s_\top) = \bowtie$. The terminating state is labeled the “ending” symbol \boxtimes , i.e., $L(s_\perp) = \boxtimes$. $O \subseteq 2^S$ is the set of all finite observables.

A finite play $\rho = s_\top a_\top s_0 a_0 s_1 \dots s_n a_\perp s_\perp$ is a sequence of interleaving states and player’s actions, where for all $i \geq 0$, $P(s_{i+1} | s_i, a_i) > 0$. Let $\text{Plays}(M) \subseteq (S \times A)^* S$ be the set of finite plays that can be generated from the game M . The labeling of a finite play, denoted by $L(\rho)$, is defined as $L(\rho) = \bowtie L(s_0) L(s_1) \dots L(s_n) \boxtimes$ i.e., the labeling function omits the actions from the play and applies to states only.

A randomized, finite-memory strategy is a function $\pi : \text{Plays}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(A)$ mapping a play to a distribution over actions. A randomized, Markov strategy is a function $\pi : S \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(A)$ mapping the current state to a distribution over actions. The stochastic process generated by applying a policy π to the MDP M is denoted as M^π , with transition dynamics $P^\pi(s | s_\top) = \mu_0(s)$ for the initiating state and $P^\pi(s' | s) = \sum_{a \in A} P(s, a, s') \cdot \pi(a | s)$ for all $s \in S \setminus \{s_\top\}$.

Information structure: We assume that 1) P1 has perfect observation of states and actions. 2) P2 has partial observation of states and no observation of P1’s actions.

Definition 2 (Transition-Observation function). *The transition-observation function of P2 is $\text{Obs} : S \times A \times S \rightarrow O$ mapping a transition (s, a, s') to an observation $o \in O$. The observation function of P2 is extended to plays in M as $\text{Obs} : \text{Plays}(M) \rightarrow O^*$ such that for any play $\rho = \rho_1 \cdot s_n a_n s_{n+1}$, $\text{Obs}(\rho) = \text{Obs}(\rho_1) \cdot \text{Obs}(s_n a_n s_{n+1})$ which is the observation of the prefix ρ_1 concatenated with the observation of the last transition. Two plays ρ_1, ρ_2 are observation-equivalent iff $\text{Obs}(\rho_1) = \text{Obs}(\rho_2)$.*

The inverse observation function of P2 $\text{Obs}^{-1} : \text{Obs}(M) \rightarrow 2^{\text{Plays}(M)}$ maps each $\eta \in \text{Obs}(M)$ to the set $\text{Obs}^{-1}(\eta) = \{\rho \in \text{Plays}(M) \mid \text{Obs}(\rho) = \eta\}$. Given a play $\rho \in \text{Plays}(M)$, we denote the set of plays that are observation-equivalent to ρ in P2’s perspective by $[\rho]_2$.

Objective and secret in temporal logic In the game arena, P1 aims to achieve a temporal objective ψ specified by a Linear Temporal Logic over Finite Traces (LTL_f) formula, while P2 observes P1. P1 also holds a secret LTL_f formula φ with the goal of concealing whether φ is satisfied or not from P2. The two formulas ψ and φ may be different.

The syntax of the LTL_f formula is given as follows.

Definition 3 (LTL_f [7]). *An (LTL_f) formula over \mathcal{AP} is defined inductively as follows:*

$$\varphi := p \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \mid \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \mid \bigcirc\varphi \mid \varphi_1 \mathbf{U} \varphi_2 \mid \diamond\varphi \mid \square\varphi,$$

where $p \in \mathcal{AP}$; \neg , \wedge and \vee are the Boolean operators negation, conjunction and disjunction, respectively; and \bigcirc , \mathbf{U} , \diamond and \square denote the temporal modal operators for *next*, *until*, *eventually* and *always*, respectively.

The operator $\bigcirc\varphi$ specifies that formula φ holds at the next time instant. $\varphi_1 \mathbf{U} \varphi_2$ denotes that there exists a future time instant at which φ_2 holds, and that φ_1 holds at all time instants up to and including that future instant. The formula $\diamond\varphi$ specifies that φ holds at some future instant, and $\square\varphi$ specifies that φ holds at all current and future time instants. See [7] for detailed semantics of LTL_f.

For any LTL_f formula φ over \mathcal{AP} , a set of words $\text{Words}(\varphi) = \{w \subseteq (2^{\mathcal{AP}})^* \mid w \models \varphi\}$ that satisfy the formula is associated.

Definition 4 (DFA). *A DFA is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, \iota, F)$ with a finite set of states Q , a finite alphabet Σ , a deterministic transition function $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow Q$, extended recursively as $\delta(q, \sigma u) = \delta(\delta(q, \sigma), u)$ for $\sigma \in \Sigma, u \in \Sigma^*$. ι is the initial state, and $F \subseteq Q$ is a set of accepting states.*

A Nondeterministic Finite Automaton (NFA) is defined similarly to a DFA, with a nondeterministic transition function $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow 2^Q$, where for every $q \in Q$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$, transition occurs to a set of states $X \in 2^Q$.

Using the method of De Giacomo and Vardi [7], we convert the LTL_f formulae into DFA that accepts $\text{Words}(\varphi)$ with $\Sigma = 2^{\mathcal{AP}}$. We have the DFA accepting all the words satisfying the secret φ as $\mathcal{A}_s = (Q_s, 2^{\mathcal{AP}}, \delta_s, \iota_s, F_s)$, and the DFA accepting all words satisfying the task specification ψ as \mathcal{A} . Both DFAs are considered to be complete ¹.

B. Probabilistic opacity and transparency

We introduce the definition of symmetric opacity as in [3].

Definition 5 (Symmetrical Opacity). *An LTL_f formula φ is opaque to P2 with respect to a play $\rho \in \text{Plays}(M)$ iff either of the following cases hold: 1) $L(\rho) \models \varphi$; and there exists at least one observation-equivalent play $\rho' \in [\rho]_2$ with $L(\rho') \not\models \varphi$; or 2) $L(\rho) \not\models \varphi$; and there exists at least one observation-equivalent play $\rho' \in [\rho]_2$ with $L(\rho') \models \varphi$.*

We now define transparency as a dual property of opacity.

¹An incomplete DFA can be completed by adding a sink state and redirecting all undefined transitions to that sink state.

Definition 6 (Symmetrical Transparency). *An LTL_f formula φ is transparent to P2 with respect to a play $\rho \in \text{Plays}(M)$ iff either of the following cases hold: 1) $L(\rho) \models \varphi$; and for any observation-equivalent play $\rho' \in [\rho]_2$, $L(\rho') \models \varphi$, or 2) $L(\rho) \not\models \varphi$; and for any observation-equivalent play $\rho' \in [\rho]_2$ with $L(\rho') \not\models \varphi$.*

We define the set of opaque and non-opaque runs for the secret φ and observation function Obs as follows.

- The set of opaque runs is as given below.

$$\mathcal{S}_H = \{\rho \in \text{Plays}(M) \mid \exists \rho' \in [\rho]_2, (L(\rho) \not\models \varphi \wedge L(\rho') \models \varphi) \vee (L(\rho) \models \varphi \wedge L(\rho') \not\models \varphi)\} \quad (1)$$

- The set of transparent runs is

$$\mathcal{S}_T = \{\rho \in \text{Plays}(M) \mid \forall \rho' \in [\rho]_2, (L(\rho) \models \varphi \implies L(\rho') \models \varphi) \vee (L(\rho) \not\models \varphi \implies L(\rho') \not\models \varphi)\} \quad (2)$$

It is easy to see $\mathcal{S}_T \cap \mathcal{S}_H = \emptyset$.

Lemma 1. $\mathcal{S}_H \cup \mathcal{S}_T = \text{Plays}(M)$.

The proof follows from the definition and thus is omitted.

The following definition of quantitative opacity has been introduced in [2] for probabilistic systems.

Definition 7 (Probabilistic opacity and transparency). *Given the MDP M , observation function Obs, the secret φ and policy π , the probabilistic opacity of φ in the stochastic process M^π is*

$$PH(\varphi; M^\pi, \text{Obs}) = \Pr(\mathcal{S}_H; M^\pi)$$

where $\Pr(\mathcal{S}_H; M^\pi)$ denotes the probability of an opaque run given M^π . The probabilistic transparency of φ in M^π is

$$PT(\varphi; M^\pi, \text{Obs}) = \Pr(\mathcal{S}_T; M^\pi)$$

We also define the set of runs that satisfy the task specification as given below.

$$\mathcal{S}_\psi = \{\rho \in \text{Plays}(M) \mid L(\rho) \models \psi\} \quad (3)$$

Problem 1. *Given the MDP M , secret φ , task ψ and the observation function Obs, compute a strategy π^* for P1 that maximizes the probabilistic opacity of φ while ensuring that the probability of satisfying the task ψ is greater than ϵ . Formally,*

$$\begin{aligned} \max PH(\varphi; M^\pi, \text{Obs}) \\ \text{s.t. } \Pr(\mathcal{S}_\psi; M^\pi) \geq \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

By replacing the maximization with minimization, and Lemma 1, the solution of the optimization problem is a policy that maximizes the probabilistic transparency of φ under a task performance constraint.

To illustrate our definitions, we introduce a running example.

Example 1 (Part I). *Consider the MDP in Fig.1 with 7 states, s_1 through s_7 (s_1 as the initial state i.e., $\mu_0(s_1) = 1$). Here, s_4 is a sink, and edges are labeled with actions*




Fig. 1. MDP for the illustrative example. The colored boxes represent the observation partition of the state space.

and transition probabilities. The transition-observation of a transition to P2, $\text{Obs}(s, a, s')$, is a set of states that are observation equivalent to s' (actions are not observable). The MDP has observation-equivalent states sets $\{s_1\}$, $\{s_2, s_3\}$, $\{s_4\}$, $\{s_5, s_6\}$ and $\{s_7\}$. P1's task is to eventually reach s_4 ($\psi = \diamond s_4$), and secret formula is satisfied if P1 reaches the state s_6 , ($\varphi = \diamond s_6$). P1 must compute a strategy for maximal probabilistic opacity of φ while ensuring to satisfy ψ with a probability $\geq \epsilon$. We can also consider the planning problem where P1 is to maximize the probabilistic transparency with respect to φ under the task performance constraint.

III. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we present a computational model to obtain the opaque observations of P2. Using this computational model, we formulate constrained MDPs to solve Problem 1.

A. A computational model for opaque observations

To solve Problem 1, we need to construct the set \mathcal{S}_H of opaque runs, which is measurable. However, the set of possible runs in M can be large or infinite, such an enumeration procedure cannot terminate and therefore we cannot construct \mathcal{S}_H for planning purpose. We present a method to construct a DFA that accepts the set of opaque observations.

Definition 8 (Opaque observations). *Given the secret φ , an observation $\rho_o \in O^*$ is opaque iff there is an opaque run $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_H$ and $\rho_o = \text{Obs}(\rho)$. The set of opaque observations is OpqObs .*

First, it is seen that the observation function $\text{Obs} : \text{Plays}(M) \rightarrow O^*$ can be expressed as an FST whose input strings are $\text{Plays}(M)$ and output strings are the observations of $\text{Plays}(M)$.

Definition 9 (Finite-state transducer representation for the observation function). *The FST encoding of the observation function $\text{Obs} : \text{Plays}(M) \rightarrow O^*$ is a tuple*

$$\mathcal{A}_o = \langle S, \Sigma_I, \Sigma_O, T_o \rangle$$

where

- S is the finite set of states of the MDP.
- $\Sigma_I = S \times A \times S$ is the set of input symbols, which are the transitions in the MDP.

- $\Sigma_O = O \cup \{\times, \bowtie\}$ is the set of output symbols, which are the observations in the MDP and two symbols \times and \bowtie marking the beginning and ending of a word.
- $T_o : S \times \Sigma_I \rightarrow S \times \Sigma_O$ is a deterministic transition function that maps a given pair of state and input to a next state and an output. The transition function is constructed as follows:

- if $s_\top \in S$ is the initiating state, the input (s_\top, a_\top, s) is enabled if $\mu_0(s) > 0$ in the MDP M , then

$$T_o(s_\top, (s_\top, a_\top, s)) = (s, \times),$$

- if $s \in S$, then the input (s, a, s') is enabled if $P(s, a, s') > 0$ in the MDP M ,

$$T_o(s, (s, a, s')) = (s', o),$$

where $o = \text{Obs}(s, a, s')$.

- for any state $s \in S$, if a_\perp action is enabled, then

$$T_o(s, (s, a_\perp, s_\perp)) = (s_\perp, \bowtie).$$

A transition from state t to t' given input $\sigma \in \Sigma_I$ and output $o \in \Sigma_O$ is also denoted $t \xrightarrow[\sigma]{o} t'$. Given a sequence of inputs, also called input word $w = \sigma_0 \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n$, the transducer generates a sequence of transitions, or a run $\rho = t_0 \xrightarrow[\sigma_0]{\sigma_0} t_1 \xrightarrow[\sigma_1]{\sigma_1} t_2 \dots \xrightarrow[\sigma_{n-1}]{\sigma_{n-1}} t_n$ with the output uniquely determined as $w_o = o_0 o_1 \dots o_n$.

By construction, it is noted that for any play $\rho = s_\top a_\top s_0 \dots s_n a_\perp s_\perp$, the corresponding input to the FST is

$$\text{In}(\rho) = (s_\top, a_\top, s_0)(s_0, a_0, s_1)(s_1, a_1, s_2) \dots (s_{n-1}, a_{n-1}, s_n)(s_n, a_\perp, s_\perp).$$

The output is

$$\text{Out}(\rho) = \times \text{Obs}(s_0, a_0, s_1) \text{Obs}(s_1, a_1, s_2) \dots \text{Obs}(s_{n-1}, a_{n-1}, s_n) \bowtie.$$

The corresponding run is $\text{Run}(\rho) = s_\top s_0 s_1 s_2 \dots s_n s_\perp$.

Example 2 (Part II). *Continuing the Example 1, a fraction of FST encoding of the observation function is shown in Fig. 2. Each of the states in the transducer represent the states in the MDP shown in Fig. 1 along with initiating (s_\top) and terminating (s_\perp) states. Transitions are labeled with input and output symbols. For instance, the transition from s_1 to s_2 is labeled (s_1, a, s_2) as input and $[s_2, s_3]$ as output symbols. Each state also has a transition to the terminating state s_\perp .*

The next step is to compute a product between the FST of the observation function and the DFA accepting the secret.

Definition 10 (Product FST). *Given the FST representation of the observation function \mathcal{A}_o , and the secret DFA \mathcal{A}_s , the product of the FST and DFA is a tuple,*

$$\mathcal{A}_H = \langle Q_h, \Sigma_I, \Sigma_O, T_h, \iota_h, F_h \rangle$$

- $Q_h = S \times Q_s$ is the set of states.
- $\iota_h = (s_\top, \iota_s)$ is the initial state.
- $T_h : Q_h \times \Sigma_I \rightarrow Q_h \times \Sigma_O$ is the transition function and is defined as follows. We consider the following cases:




Fig. 2. A fragment of FST encoding the observation function.

For $\sigma \in S \times A \times S$, if $s \xrightarrow{\sigma} s'$ in \mathcal{A}_o and $q \xrightarrow{a} q'$ in \mathcal{A}_s , then,

1) For $\sigma = (s_\top, a_\top, s)$, and $s_\top \xrightarrow{\sigma} s$, let

$$(s_\top, \iota_s) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (s, q)$$

where $q = \delta(\iota_s, L(s))$.

2) For $\sigma = (s, a_\perp, s_\perp)$, and $s \xrightarrow{\sigma} s_\perp$, let

$$(s, q) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (s_\perp, q).$$

3) For any other σ , let

$$(s, q) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (s', q') \text{ if and only if } \delta_s(q, L(s')) = q'.$$

4) Any state (s, q) where $s = s_\perp$ is a sink state.

- $F_h = \{(s_\perp, q) \mid q \in F_s\}$ is a set of accepting states.

From the above construction, we establish a mapping $\mathfrak{R} : \text{Plays}(M) \rightarrow \text{Run}(\mathcal{A}_H)$ between plays in MDP M and runs in the product of the FST and DFA \mathcal{A}_H as follows: For a play $\rho = s_\top a_\top s_0 \dots s_n a_\perp s_\perp \in \text{Plays}(M)$, there is a run (i.e., a state sequence augmented with automata states) $\hat{\rho}$ such that $\hat{\rho} = (s_\top, \iota_s)(s_0, q_0) \dots (s_n, q_n)(s_\perp, q_n)$ where $q_i = \delta(q_{i-1}, L(s_i))$ for $i \geq 1$ and $q_0 = \delta(\iota_s, L(s_0))$.

Lemma 2. A run $\rho \in \text{Plays}(M)$ is such that $L(\rho) \models \varphi$ iff $\mathfrak{R}(\rho)$ ends in (s_\perp, q) where $q \in F_s$.

Proof. By construction, consider a run $\rho = s_\top a_\top \dots a_\perp s_\perp \in \text{Plays}(M)$, if $\mathfrak{R}(\rho)$ ends in (s_\perp, q) with $q \in F_s$, then $L(s_\top s_0 \dots s_n s_\perp)$ is accepted by \mathcal{A}_s . Thus, $L(\rho) \models \varphi$. \square

We denote the last/final state of $\mathfrak{R}(\rho)$ as $\text{Last}(\rho)$. We then compute two NFAs from the product transducer.

Definition 11. Given the product FST $\mathcal{A}_H = \langle Q_h, \Sigma_I, \Sigma_O, T_h, \iota_h, F_h \rangle$, the output language accepted by \mathcal{A}_H is obtained as the set $L_O(\mathcal{A}_H) = \{\text{Out}(\rho) \mid \rho \in \Sigma_I^*, \text{Last}(\rho) \in \{s_\perp\} \times F_s\}$.

The NFA accepting $L_O(\mathcal{A}_H)$ is obtained from \mathcal{A}_H by removing the input symbols and use the output symbols on each transition as the input symbol.

Lemma 3. For any $\rho \in \text{Plays}(M)$, if $\rho \models \varphi$, $\text{Out}(\rho) \in L_O(\mathcal{A}_H)$ and if $\rho \not\models \varphi$, $\text{Out}(\rho) \notin L_O(\mathcal{A}_H)$.

Proof. By construction, $\text{Last}(\rho) = (s_\perp, q)$ where $q \in F_s$. From Lemma 2, we have that $L(\rho) \models \varphi$. \square

Also, let $\mathcal{A}_H^\dagger = \langle Q_h, \Sigma_I, \Sigma_O, T_h, \iota_h, F_h^\dagger \rangle$ where $F_h^\dagger = \{(s_\perp, q) \mid q \in Q_s \setminus F_s\}$. The output language $L_O(\mathcal{A}_H^\dagger)$ and its NFA is obtained in a similar way.

Theorem 1. The set of opaque runs is $Z = \text{Obs}^{-1}(L_O(\mathcal{A}_H) \cap L_O(\mathcal{A}_H^\dagger))$.

Proof. From Def. 11, for any $u \in L_O(\mathcal{A}_H)$, there exists an input string ρ' such that $L(\rho') \models \varphi$ and $\text{Out}(\rho') = u$. For any $u \in L_O(\mathcal{A}_H^\dagger)$, there exists an input string ρ'' such that $L(\rho'') \models \neg\varphi$ and $\text{Out}(\rho'') = u$. Thus, if $\text{Obs}(\rho) = u \in L_O(\mathcal{A}_H) \cap L_O(\mathcal{A}_H^\dagger)$, then ρ, ρ', ρ'' are observation-equivalent. On observing $\text{Obs}(\rho)$ ($= \text{Obs}(\rho') = \text{Obs}(\rho'')$), P2 cannot know if $L(\rho) \models \varphi$ or not.

Next, we aim to show that any run not in Z must be transparent. For any $\rho \notin Z$, $\text{Obs}(\rho) \notin L_O(\mathcal{A}_H) \cap L_O(\mathcal{A}_H^\dagger)$. Since $L_O(\mathcal{A}_H) \cup L_O(\mathcal{A}_H^\dagger) = \text{Obs}(\text{Plays}(M))$ includes all possible observations, it is either (I) $\text{Obs}(\rho) \in (L_O(\mathcal{A}_H) \setminus L_O(\mathcal{A}_H^\dagger))$ or (II) $\text{Obs}(\rho) \in (L_O(\mathcal{A}_H^\dagger) \setminus L_O(\mathcal{A}_H))$. In Case (I), the observation informs that φ is satisfied by ρ because any run violating φ is not observation-equivalent to ρ . In case (II), the observation informs P2 that φ is violated because any run satisfying φ is not observation-equivalent to ρ . \square



Fig. 3. (a) DFA for the task specification $\psi = \diamond s_4$. (b) DFA for the secret specification $\varphi = \diamond s_6$.

Corollary 1, as it follows from Theorem 1, facilitates the computation of the set of opaque observations.

Corollary 1. The set of opaque observations is $\text{OpqObs} = L_O(\mathcal{A}_H) \cap L_O(\mathcal{A}_H^\dagger)$.

We compute the intersection product of NFAs accepting the languages $L_O(\mathcal{A}_H)$ and $L_O(\mathcal{A}_H^\dagger)$ in the usual manner as in [1]. This results in another NFA, which can be determinized into a DFA as in [1]. We call this DFA $\mathcal{A}^{\text{opaque}} = \langle \hat{Q}, \hat{\Sigma}_O, \hat{\delta}, \hat{\iota}, \hat{F} \rangle$ as the *opaque-observation DFA* as it accepts precisely the set of observations that are opaque to P2 (follows from Corollary 1).




Fig. 4. A fragment of product FST.




Fig. 5. A fragment of NFA for $L_O(\mathcal{A}_H)$.

Example 3 (Part III). Continuing with Example 1, the task specification for P1 is $\psi = \diamond s_4$ and secret is $\varphi = \diamond s_6$, represented by the DFAs shown in the Fig. 3(a) and Fig. 3(b).

The product FST is constructed with the secret DFA and the FST representation of the observation function. A fragment of the product FST is shown in Fig. 4. Nodes represent the transducer state augmented with the DFA state (e.g., (s_1, q_1) where s_1 is transducer and q_1 is the DFA states). The transitions include input and output symbols, like the transducer representation of the observation function.

With the product FST, we construct an NFA accepting $L_O(\mathcal{A}_H)$ as shown in Fig. 5, where the state (s_\perp, q_2) is the final accepting state. Likewise, NFA for accepting $L_O(\mathcal{A}_H^\dagger)$, with (s_\perp, q_1) as the final accepting state. The edges in the NFA are labeled with the observations received by P2.

Next, we make use of the above computed opaque-observation DFA in our planning algorithm.

IV. PLANNING ALGORITHM

Finally, we can compute a product MDP for solving the optimal opacity/transparency planning problem:

Definition 12 (Product MDP). Given the MDP $M = (S, A, P, \mu_0, s_T, s_\perp, \mathcal{AP}, L)$, the task DFA $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, \iota, F)$, and the opaque-observation DFA $\mathcal{A}^{opaque} = (\hat{Q}, \Sigma_O, \hat{\delta}, \hat{\iota}, \hat{F})$ with reward, the product MDP $(M \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}^{opaque})$ is a tuple,

$$\mathcal{M} = (V, A, \mathcal{P}, v_0, R_1, R_2)$$

where

- $V = \{(s, q, \hat{q}) \mid s \in S, q \in Q, \hat{q} \in \hat{Q}\}$ is the set of states where each state includes a state from the MDP M , a state from task DFA \mathcal{A} and a state from the opaque-observations DFA \mathcal{A}^{opaque} respectively.
- A is the set of actions.
- $\mathcal{P} : V \times A \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(V)$ is the probabilistic transition function. For each state $v = (s, q, \hat{q}) \in V$, an action $a \in A$ enabled from s and state $v' = (s', q', \hat{q}') \in V$, $\mathcal{P}(v, a, v') = P(s, a, s')$ if $q' = \delta(q, L(s'))$ and $\hat{q}' = \hat{\delta}(\hat{q}, \text{Obs}(s, a, s'))$.
- $v_0 = (s_T, q_0, \hat{q}_0) \in V$ is the initial state, where, $q_0 = \iota$ and $\hat{q}_0 = \hat{\iota}$.
- $R_1 : V \times A \times V \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is the reward function for the task specification. For a state $(s, q, \hat{q}) \in V$, action $a \in A$

and $(s', q', \hat{q}') \in V$, the reward is given by

$$R_1((s, q, \hat{q}), a, (s', q', \hat{q}')) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } q \notin F, q' \in F \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- $R_2 : V \times A \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is the reward function for enforcing opacity. For a state $(s, q, \hat{q}) \in V$, action $a \in A$, the reward is given by

$$R_2((s, q, \hat{q}), a) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \hat{q} \in \hat{F}, a = a_\perp \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By construction, for any policy, the accumulated rewards R_1 relates to the probability of satisfying the task specification ($\Pr(\mathcal{S}_\psi; M^\pi)$) and the accumulated rewards R_2 relates to the probability of enforcing opacity ($PH(\varphi; M^\pi, \text{Obs})$). Since M specifies that a_\perp is unavailable in s_\perp , the agent can only receive the reward once.

We now show that the above product MDP can be formulated as a constrained linear program. We formulate the LP problem using the occupancy measures. The optimal opacity enforcement problem (Problem 1) can be solved using the following LP:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_m \sum_{v \in V, a \in A} R_2(v, a) m(v, a). \\ & \text{s.t.} \sum_{a \in A} m(v, a) = \sum_{v' \in V, a' \in A} m(v', a') \mathcal{P}(v', a', v) + \nu(v) \\ & \forall v \in V. \\ & m(v, a) \geq 0. \\ & \sum_{v \in V, a \in A, v' \in V} \mathcal{P}(v, a, v') R_1(v, a, v') m(v, a) \geq \epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $m(v, a)$ is the occupancy measure that represents the probability of taking an action a from v , ν is the initial distribution of \mathcal{M} such that $\nu(v_0) = 1$. Since the agent can receive the reward for both R_1, R_2 functions only once, for any policy, the total reward (without discounting) is bounded. Using the solution of LP, the optimal policy for P1 π^* is obtained as $\pi^*(v, a) = \frac{m(v, a)}{\sum_{a' \in A} m(v, a')}$.

V. CASE STUDY

In this section, we showcase our optimal planning algorithm on Example 1 and then in a power plant monitoring scenario. The LPs are solved using the Gurobi solver on an Intel Core i7 CPU @ 3.2 GHz with 32 GB RAM.

Example 4 (Part IV). We now setup the LP formulation for Example 1. With the opaque-observations DFA \mathcal{A}^{opaque} , MDP M and task DFA \mathcal{A} , we construct the product MDP \mathcal{M} . With \mathcal{M} , we set up the LP formulations to maximize probabilistic opacity, and maximize probabilistic transparency.

Discussion: Table I presents results for varying thresholds to maximize opacity, and Table II shows the results for varying thresholds to maximize transparency. Experimental validations of $PH(\varphi)$, $PT(\psi)$, and the probability of task specification are tabulated for P1's policy, obtained by running it for 5000 instances.

Threshold (ϵ)	Max. $PH(\varphi)$	Exp. $PH(\varphi)$	Exp. Task
0.4	0.7	0.6966	0.3974
0.6	0.6	0.6036	0.5936
0.8	0.4	0.4032	0.7924

TABLE I

RESULTS OF LP FOR THE RUNNING EXAMPLE ENFORCING OPACITY.

Threshold (ϵ)	Max. $PT(\varphi)$	Exp. $PT(\varphi)$	Exp. Task
0.4	0.9828	0.9833	0.3980
0.6	0.9742	0.9751	0.5966
0.8	0.9658	0.9667	0.7951

TABLE II

RESULTS FOR THE RUNNING EXAMPLE ENFORCING TRANSPARENCY.

For comparison, a policy that uniformly chooses an action at each state for P1 was applied for 5000 runs yielded a task satisfaction probability of 0.3402 and $PH(\varphi)$ of 0.275.

Observations from the LP solutions revealed interesting scenarios. In s_5 , opacity enforcement can be achieved by choosing the terminating action when P2 observes $[s_5, s_6]$. This policy is generated when the threshold is 0.4. Increasing the threshold prioritizes task satisfaction, leading to a policy requiring P1 to take the actions b and then a to prevent P2 from observing $[s_4]$. Likewise, in s_7 with a threshold 0.8, the policy recommends playing action a with probability 0.786 and terminate with a probability 0.214. However, this could result in P2 observing $[s_6]$, thus not enforcing opacity.

A. Opacity enforcement

Consider a power plant as represented in the 6×6 gridworld shown in Fig.6. The plant (C) is in cell 8, a control center (A) in cell 34 and two data centers (B) in cells 16 and 25. Security alarms are placed in the cells 1, 11, 13, 15, 27 and 35. A robot is performing a routine maintenance task on the plant, specified by the LTL_f formula $\psi = \diamond C$.

The robot moves in four compass directions. It enters the intended cell with a probability $p = 0.6$, and the neighboring cells with probability $(1 - p)/2$. Cells 17 and 23 have bouncing walls. If the robot hits into the boundary or bouncing walls, it stays in its previous cell. Entering cells with security alarms triggers them and disables the robot.

P2 observes the robot through a set of binary range sensors (1,2,3,4, yellow, green, indigo and purple resp.) and a precision sensor (5, blue). The binary sensors return a value True when the robot is in the range and False otherwise, while the precision sensors return the exact position of the robot when the robot is in range. The coverage of each of the sensor is shown in Fig. 6. P2 also deploys a dynamic sensor flying between cells 34 and 16, with a 0.65 probability to move to the next cell and 0.35 to stay. The drone's camera provides precision sensing for the drone's cell and the north cell (e.g., at 34, it precisely monitors 34 and 28).

We consider the scenario where the robot, controlled by P1, aims to enforce opacity under task constraints. P1 has the task $\psi = \diamond C$. Additionally, P1 must perform a secret task specified by the LTL_f formula $\varphi = \diamond B \wedge \diamond A$. The opaque-observations DFA, with 585 states is constructed in an average time of 90.1576s for the considered configuration. Subsequently, the product MDP, with 7596 states is

Experiment	Prob. Opacity	Exp. Opacity
No drone	0.7058	0.7102
Drone covers larger area	0.6154	0.6179
No Sensor 3	0.7950	0.7894

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF OPACITY ENFORCEMENT (WITH THRESHOLD 0.4).

Threshold (ϵ)	Prob. Opacity	Exp. Opacity	Exp. Task
0.4	0.6766	0.6678	0.4014
0.6	0.5333	0.5401	0.6021
0.7	0.4611	0.4625	0.7056
0.8	0.3448	0.3359	0.8046
0.95	0.1079	0.1085	0.9504

TABLE IV

ENFORCED PROBABILISTIC OPACITY AND EXPERIMENTAL VALIDATION.

constructed in 2.9703s. The LP for optimal policy is solved in an average time of 3099.1386s.

Table IV summarizes opacity enforcement probabilities at various task satisfaction thresholds. As the task specification threshold increases, the probability of enforcing opacity decreases under the solved policy. For lower thresholds, the policy suggests terminating the game after satisfying the secret. While with a higher threshold, the robot is compelled to take the specific path through cells 16, 10, and 9 or 4 to reach the target in cell 8. Notably, taking the path to cell 16 from 22 reveals to P2 that cell 16 has been reached, compromising opacity. Thus, opacity is only enforced when reaching cell 34 (or A) is concealed.

To assess the impact of sensors on probabilistic opacity, we conduct experiments under the following conditions: 1) No drone in environment, 2) The drone flies between the cells 34, 22 and 25. 3) No sensor 3 in the environment. The results are tabulated in Table III, specifically for a threshold of 0.4 (due to page limitations). From Table III, it is evident that in the absence drone or sensor 3, P1 achieves better opacity enforcement. As P2's sensing capabilities decrease, the probability of opacity enforcement increases as expected.




Fig. 6. Gridworld depiction of power plant (sensors numbered in red).

B. Transparency enforcement

Consider a case where P1 enforces transparency, in a setup similar to the opacity enforcement case, shown in the Fig. 7. The environment includes one data center (B) in the cell 25 and a control center (A) in the cell 34. Three sensors are present: sensor 1 a static precision sensor that monitors the cells 30 and 31, sensor 2 a static binary sensor that

