

Autonomous System Safety Properties with Multi-Machine Hybrid Event-B

Richard Banach

Department of Computer Science,
University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK
richard.banach@manchester.ac.uk

Event-B is a well known methodology for the verified design and development of systems that can be characterised as discrete transition systems. Hybrid Event-B is a conservative extension that interleaves the discrete transitions of Event-B (assumed to be temporally isolated) with episodes of continuously varying state change. While a single Hybrid Event-B machine is sufficient for applications with a single locus of control, it will not do for autonomous systems, which have several loci of control by default. Multi-machine Hybrid Event-B is designed to allow the specification of systems with several loci of control. The formalism is succinctly surveyed, pointing out the subtle semantic issues involved. The multi-machine formalism is then used to specify a relatively simple incident response system, involving a controller, two drones and three responders, working in a partly coordinated and partly independent fashion to manage a putative hazardous scenario.

1 Introduction

These days, there is an inexorable drive to automate as many of the tasks that humans engage in to progress their everyday lives as possible. The motives range from gaining efficiency, to enabling genuinely new activities which would otherwise be impossible. Autonomous systems can be deployed to achieve both aims. Properly designed, not only can they enable efficiencies in activities traditionally undertaken by humans (e.g. logistics), but they can also enable activities (e.g. reactor core investigation) that would be lethal for humans.

Proper design of autonomous systems implies the ability to place great trust in their operation, given that they act in a manner much less supervised than is the case for conventional systems. If a system is to be given responsibility for deciding its own course of action (to whatever degree is considered reasonable), it must be understood how the gamut of its decision making capabilities keep it aligned with the widest considerations that its behaviour may affect. In other words, the boundary between the autonomous system and the wider environment needs to be reliably appreciated, and the greater the creativity that the system is permitted to display in meeting its local challenges, the greater the burden of understanding that is imposed on system design to ensure that letting the system do its thing will not jeopardise either itself, or elements of the wider environment.

To try to ensure this, all available techniques for enhancing system assurance may be brought to bear. As well as the traditional approaches of careful design and testing, more formal approaches, that aim to strengthen the guarantees that can be given regarding system behaviour, may be used. This highlights safety properties, the focus of the B-Method.

The significant self-agency of autonomous systems means that they are often cyber-physical systems [9, 17, 11]. The consequent interaction between discrete and continuous dynamics raises a challenge for verification [10, 14]. The contribution of this paper is to show that the architecture and capabilities of multi-machine Hybrid Event-B are suitable for formalising the challenge just described.

Hybrid Event-B was envisaged as a conservative extension of conventional Event-B that was able to accommodate continuous and smooth behaviour in a rigorous way. The foundations of the formalism were investigated in three papers [6, 7, 4], referred to below as PaperI, PaperII, PaperIII. These may be consulted for full technical details; a less detailed overview appears in [5]. Of particular relevance to the present work is [7], in which the multi-machine version of the formalism was explored, arriving at a framework that copes equally comfortably with multi-machine continuous behaviour as it does with the more familiar discrete behaviours more typically used in verification. Given that autonomous systems perforce exhibit a degree of disconnect between themselves and any environment, a modelling and verification framework that captures this structural aspect in separate constructs is intrinsically useful. The main thrust of the present paper is the assertion that these aspects of the multi-machine version of Hybrid Event-B are particularly expressive and helpful in organising the exploration and verification of the complex scenarios that arise when autonomous systems are investigated.

The rest of the paper is as follows. Section 2 introduces Hybrid Event-B as a natural extension of Event-B. Section 3 introduces Hybrid Event-B refinement. Section 4 presents the main features of multiple cooperating Hybrid Event-B machines. Section 5 applies the multi-machine formalism to present a simple incident response system, involving a controller, two drones and three responders, working in a partly coordinated and partly independent fashion to manage a putative hazardous scenario. Each of the agents mentioned is specified in its own machine, and the architecture of the multi-machine formalism conveniently captured the cooperation mechanisms needed. Section 6 briefly considers verification for Hybrid Event-B and of the case study, and Section 7 concludes.

2 From Event-B to Hybrid Event-B

The B-Method [1] and Event-B in particular [3] have, by now, a well established pedigree. By way of introduction, Fig. 1 shows a simple Event-B machine **Nodes**. A static node set $NSet$ is defined in the context $\mathbf{N}Ctx$, and a dynamic set nod can add elements of $NSet$ to itself via the guarded event $AddNode$. The dynamics of the machine consists of the state transitions that ensue as events are executed one by one. Each possible sequence of transitions can be collected into a system trace. It is assumed that, in the real world, some non-empty interval of real world time elapses between each event occurrence.

The restriction to discrete events makes the original Event-B poorly suited for investigating the hybrid and cyber-physical systems that are prevalent today. But the real-time gap assumed to be present between discrete event occurrence, makes a convenient opening for interleaving pieces of continuous behaviour into the time intervals between them, and this was how Hybrid Event-B was designed.

The intuition just described results in there being two kinds of event in Hybrid Event-B. There are **mode** events, which specify discrete changes of state—just as in Event-B—and there are **pliant** events, which specify episodes of continuous state update. Since we have continuous state update, a number




Figure 1: A simple Event-B machine, together with its context.




Figure 2: A schematic Hybrid Event-B machine.

of technical details have to be handled. Time becomes a crucial entity — all variables now become, semantically, functions of real time (and not, as in Event-B, functions of an index into a sequence of state values). We have to have a policy about how wild, or well behaved, the functions of time are permitted to be, and for that, we demand that these functions have well defined left and right limits everywhere, and are continuous from the right. We also want to use differential equations (ODEs) to specify behaviour, so we need to restrict to functions which are piecewise solutions to ODE systems.

Fig. 2 shows a simple Hybrid Event-B machine. After the machine name is the TIME declaration, which names the variable used to denote real time (if needed). This permits read-only access to time in the rest of the machine. Time is synchronised (via a WHEN clause) with the start of a run in the *INITIALISATION*. Next comes a CLOCK variable clk ; these can be reset to some value (but are otherwise read-only) and allow time to be measured from convenient starting points. Then come the PLIANT and VARIABLES declarations. The former introduces the pliant variables, while the latter introduces the mode variables. Next come the INVARIANTS. These are required to hold *at all times*, so, for example the invariant ‘ $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ’ means that the function of time that is the semantic value of the variable x is a *real valued* function of time. A little thought shows that this is the same convention used in Event-B (aside from time being real rather than an index). Accepting that $x \in \mathbb{R}$ holds at all times, does not help in knowing how values of x at ‘nearby’ times are related. To keep things under control, we must insist that the semantic value of x is, again, at least piecewise, a solution to some ODE system.

The events are next. The mode events (STATUS ordinary) are *exactly* as in Event-B, and the syntax of *MoEv* in Fig. 2 shows which variables can be updated by a mode event, using the generic *BApred* syntax. The pliant events (STATUS pliant), such as *PliEv*, contain novel features and require more care. The WHERE guard is as in Event-B, imposing enabledness conditions that involve mode variables only. The INIT guard imposes enabledness conditions that involve the pliant variables (but which can also involve mode variables, if needed). The actual state update is specified in the COMPLY and SOLVE clauses. Since the purpose of a pliant event is to specify state update over an extended period of time, some tricky technical issues arise, which we mostly ignore in this overview. See PaperI for a full discussion.

The SOLVE clause is the easiest to describe. It can contain one or more ODEs (with syntax $\mathcal{D}x = \phi$) and one or more direct assignments (with syntax $y := E$). Provided the RHSs of these forms are as well behaved as stipulated above, no special problems arise. Thus, direct update to something which is already well behaved poses no problems, and integrating an ODE with well behaved RHS improves the already acceptable behaviour as regards smoothness. By contrast, the COMPLY clause imposes invariant-like constraints that must hold during the execution of the pliant event, and are indicated by *BDApred*, the

before-during-after clause (the analogue of Event-B's *BApred*). Essentially, the same caveats regarding time dependent behaviours that we mentioned in the context of invariants must hold for the properties that comprise *BDAPred*.

As for almost all formal semantics of hybrid system notations, the semantics of Hybrid Event-B is operational. Starting with the *INITIALISATION* mode event, mode and pliant event executions alternate within a run. Each mode event execution must enable at least one pliant event and disable all mode events — after which a pliant event execution then takes over. Each pliant event execution runs until one of three things happens. (1) Some mode event becomes enabled. At that moment the pliant event execution is preempted, and then some enabled mode event execution takes over. (2) The running pliant event becomes infeasible and the run stops (finite termination). (3) Neither of the preceding options occurs and the pliant event runs forever (nontermination). Note the language in the immediately preceding remarks. They indicate that there are choices to be made at mode→pliant handover and pliant→mode handover. These choices are nondeterministic among all the events that are enabled at the requisite moment. They must all be of the right kind (either all mode or all pliant), or else the run aborts.

In more concrete terms, a run of a Hybrid Event-B machine looks like the following. Time \mathcal{T} corresponds with a semi-infinite interval of the reals, e.g. $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. The operational semantics partitions this into a sequence of non-empty, left-closed, right-open intervals $\mathcal{T} \equiv \langle [t_0 \dots t_1), [t_1 \dots t_2), \dots \rangle$. Thus, if t_0 is the initial time point, the state of the machine's variables at t_0 is as specified in the *INITIALISATION* mode event. During $[t_0 \dots t_1)$, i.e. during the set of times $t_0 \leq t < t_1$, the state evolves as specified in the pliant event chosen to execute immediately after *INITIALISATION*. This runs until it is preempted by some mode event which is enabled at time t_1 . At that moment, the mode event executes, and the state changes discontinuously. The mode event's before-state is the left limit of the state evolution at t_1 , and the mode event's after-state is the value at t_1 itself. This pattern repeats. So $[t_1 \dots t_2)$ is the duration of the next pliant event execution, after which a mode event is executed at t_2 , followed by the next pliant event execution. And so on.

To ensure that all executions of a Hybrid Event-B machine take place as described, a (considerable) number of proof obligations (POs) need to be shown to hold. Some of these, particularly concerning mode events, closely resemble their Event-B counterparts. Others, particularly concerning pliant events, contain novel elements. In all cases though, some potentially delicate technicalities connected with continuous behaviour intrude into the formulation of the POs. We do not have space to discuss these here, so we refer to PaperI and PaperIII for details.

3 Hybrid Event-B Refinement

As for all dialects of the B-Method, refinement is an important topic for Hybrid Event-B. Given that Hybrid Event-B pertains to a context in which real world time plays a significant role, there are a number of ways to formulate a refinement notion. Given further that in refinement there has to be an abstract machine and a concrete machine, the most urgent question concerns how the notions of 'real world time' are related to one another in the two machines. We could allow the two notions to be a bit 'elastic' with respect to one another, using something like a Skorokhod metric to measure how far apart the elasticity had stretched abstract and concrete time and behaviour. However, this was felt to be technically too obscure for a formalism like Hybrid Event-B, that was aimed at practical engineering purposes. So, for Hybrid Event-B, a more conservative approach was taken, and it became a matter of principle, that **Hybrid Event-B preserves the notion of real world time through refinement**. In fact, it can be said that, although it is never stated, this is an assumption that also typically applies to Event-B itself, insofar




Figure 3: Illustrating Hybrid Event-B refinement.

as Event-B models are intended to reflect phenomena in the real world. If we add to this principle the desire that Hybrid Event-B refinement does not disturb the essential structural features of Event-B refinement, which amounts to saying that Hybrid Event-B refinement of mode events works as does refinement of events in Event-B, a quite strong set of constraints is generated.

Fig. 3 shows what happens. The closely spaced vertical bars represent the before- and after-states of mode event executions, while the horizontal lines between them represent the continuous state change of pliant event executions. For the moment let us forget the occurrences of $PliEv_$ and pretend that the horizontal lines just represent the passage of time, i.e. that we are dealing with Event-B refinement in a situation in which real world time passes between event executions. The traditional Event-B refinement proof obligations tie together what happens at abstract and concrete levels quite closely. Thus for every abstract event execution, there is a corresponding concrete event execution of its refinement (by Event-B relative deadlock freedom). Conversely, for every event execution of the concrete refinement of an abstract event, there is a corresponding abstract event execution of its abstraction (by Event-B guard strengthening). Between execution occurrences of abstract event refinements, execution occurrences of ‘new’ events, freshly introduced at the concrete level, can appear. These must refine abstract skips (represented by a solid vertical bar in Fig. 3).

Transferring this verbatim to the Hybrid Event-B world says how refinement of mode events works. Fig. 3 thus shows abstract $MoEvA_1$, $MoEvA_2$, $MoEvA_3$, which are refined to $MoEvC_1$, $MoEvC_2$, $MoEvC_3$, at the same moments of time as their abstract counterparts. ‘New’ mode event $MoEvC_{2.1}$ executes at some point between $MoEvC_2$ and $MoEvC_3$.

Pliant events must fit round this. An immediate consequence is that the durations of abstract pliant event executions are equal to, or are partitioned by, suitable concrete pliant event execution durations — the intervals of abstract pliant event executions are related to the intervals of concrete pliant event executions via an inverse function. Beyond this, the natural extension of the principle that abstract mode events are refined by corresponding concrete mode events implies that abstract pliant events are refined by corresponding concrete pliant events too. In Fig. 3 this would imply that $PliEvA_1$ was refined by $PliEvC_1$ and that $PliEvA_2$ was refined by $PliEvC_{2.1}$.

Without ‘new’ concrete events, there would be little more to be said, and new mode events cause little trouble by themselves. It turns out that provided the concrete refinements of abstract events are not

constrained to have the same name, there is no possible distinction between old and new pliant events. Observe that the duration of $PliEvC_{2,1}$ in Fig. 3 is strictly shorter than the duration of $PliEvA_2$. To close the gap in time at the concrete level, some pliant event, $PliEvC_{2,2}$ must execute. There is no alternative to the fact that $PliEvC_{2,2}$ must refine $PliEvA_2$ — both events have an extended duration so there is no counterpart of the ‘refining of skip’ that can apply to mode events. The main attendant issue that arises is the fact that prior to the execution of $MoEvC_{2,1}$, $PliEvA_2$ was executing. And while it was not able to change any mode variables during this period, it certainly was able to change some pliant variables, this being its main purpose. So, by the time the guards of $PliEvC_{2,2}$ need to be checked, the abstract state is, in general, not the same as it was when the execution of $PliEvA_2$ was launched. This, despite the fact that the only event that the guards of $PliEvC_{2,2}$ might be checked against is still $PliEvA_2$. The relevant PO resolves this by making the checking of the *iv* guard of the corresponding abstract event optional. Checking of the abstract *grd* guard works, since *grd* only involves mode variables, which will not have changed during the time since $PliEvA_2$ was launched. Whether it makes sense or not to also check the abstract *iv* guard is highly dependent on the details of $PliEvA_2$ and of the rest of the abstract machine.

As for machines, a large number of proof obligations need to be discharged to ensure that a refinement behaves as just described. Again, we do not have space to discuss these here, so we refer to PaperI and PaperIII for details.

4 Multiple Hybrid Event-B Machines

In today’s engineering landscape, having a design and development methodology that does not cater for separate development of components, is almost inconceivable. Therefore, since Hybrid Event-B is certainly intended for realistic formal system development, the implications of separate development, in the context of all the other constraints that the formalism imposes, must be confronted. Earlier work on combining and decomposing Event-B machines has yielded a number of schemes, based on shared variables, shared events and interfaces [2, 12, 13, 8, 15, 16]. The Hybrid Event-B scheme, investigated in detail in PaperII, is based on ideas from all of these, taking into account the special needs of both mode and pliant events.

When multiple syntactic constructs have to come together to make a bigger whole, a key issue is syntactic visibility: which elements of which entities are visible/readable/writable in which other entities, and what restrictions are in place to control this? This realisation was the key concept behind the introduction of the INTERFACE construct in Hybrid Event-B. An INTERFACE is a container that can hold a number of variables, the invariants that they must satisfy, and their initialisations. It is thus rather like a machine without events (or with one unstated default event simply demanding compliance with the invariants). A machine can access an interface via a CONNECTS clause or a READS clause. This allows the machine’s events to inspect (READS) and update (CONNECTS) the interface’s variables. The interface’s invariants are aggregated with the machine’s during verification. Since more than one machine can do this, we have a mechanism for sharing variables.

In multi-machine Hybrid Event-B, to prevent a verification free-for-all that would impede separate working, invariants are restricted to be of two kinds. There are type I invariants (tIi ’s) which only mention variables from the construct (MACHINE or INTERFACE) that declares them. By themselves these are too restrictive to allow sufficiently expressive multi-machine working, so there are also type II invariants (tIi ’s) which are exclusive to interfaces, and are of the form $U(u) \Rightarrow V(v)$, where u are variables that belong to one interface (the tIi ’s local variables and interface) and v are variables that belong to a different interface (the tIi ’s remote variables and interface). Type II invariants are declared in the in-




Figure 4: Multiple machines and their interfaces.

terface containing the local variables. The remote interface of a tIi is mentioned in the local interface using a READS declaration while the local interface of a tIi is mentioned in the remote interface using a REFERS declaration.

We give a small illustration of these principles in Fig. 4. Small black disks represent variables, while small black squares represent tIi's. Small rectangles represent events. Events and invariants are connected to the variables that mention them by thin lines. Interfaces are large rectangles containing the variables and invariants they encapsulate — there are two in Fig. 4, *Itf1_IF* and *Itf2_IF*. Machines are large rounded rectangles containing their local variables, tIi's and events — again there are two, *MA* and *MB* in the figure. The very short thin line with one end free from an event in *MB*, is an I/O variable connected to the environment. The CONNECTS relationship between a machine and an interface is depicted by a thick dashed line. Finally, tIi's are represented by an arrow from a variable in the local interface to a variable in the remote interface (these containing the local and remote variable subsets of the tIi respectively). The construct that aggregates all the machines and interfaces of a development is the PROJECT construct, which is not indicated in Fig. 4.

Refinement adds some potential complexity to the above. Additional constraints are needed to continue to prevent a verification free-for-all that would impede separate working. It is taken as unquestionable that machines and interfaces should both be capable of being refined. The restriction imposed on the refinement process is that the joint invariant that couples concrete variables to their abstract counterparts in a construct (be it a machine or an interface), should involve only the variables declared in the two constructs, and cannot involve variables declared in any other interface that either construct has access to. It is clear that such a restriction ensures that invariants proved at a high level continue to hold, suitably translated into concrete variables through the joint invariant, at lower levels of abstraction.

In a single Hybrid Event-B machine, mode events and pliant events alternate. Within a single machine context, once the nuances of continuous/discrete behaviour are appreciated, it is fairly easy to work out how POs should be designed that can adequately police the alternation. Things are more complicated in a multi-machine world. We design separate machines on the basis that their activities are expected to be largely (though obviously not totally) independent. What does the alternation between mode events and pliant events amount to in such an environment? The answer requires a design decision about the multi-machine world.

One guiding principle is that every machine, at all times, is executing some event (whether mode or pliant). Another is that in the purely discrete Event-B world, synchronised execution of events in multiple machines is a useful feature in some of the formulations cited above. Accordingly, the decision was taken to permit the synchronised execution of mode events via the introduction of a SYNCHronisation

construct that declares that families of mode events across different machines of the same project are to be scheduled together. Of course the conjunction of the relevant guards has to permit this to be the case.

Synchronised execution of events across multiple machines is of most interest in the context of *decomposition*, in which refinement of a single abstract event has made it too unwieldy for it to be considered as a single indivisible entity any more, and the execution of different parts of it in different machines makes more sense. Decomposition feels like the converse of composition (which is what the multi-machine mechanisms are addressing) but it is not — the event scheduling strategies of (Hybrid) Event-B get in the way. Thus suppose abstract machine M has two mode events EvA and EvB , both simultaneously enabled. Then, the scheduling strategy of M prevents the simultaneous execution of EvA and EvB . Now suppose EvA is decomposed into $EvAX$ and $EvAY$, and EvB is decomposed into $EvBX$ and $EvBY$, and the X parts execute in decomposed machine MX , and the Y parts execute in decomposed machine MY . It is not inconceivable that in a world where the two machines schedule their events independently, $EvAX$ could be scheduled simultaneously with $EvBY$, giving the wrong semantics. It is for that reason that the SYNCH mechanism was introduced in Hybrid Event-B (following analogous mechanisms in Event-B). Decomposition of events requires further thought regarding inputs, outputs and local parameters. The design in PaperII requires that any input or output of a decomposed event is confined to one of the components (rather than being itself a synchronised activity). Local parameters are likewise assigned by one of the components and then shared with the rest, in a conceptually atomic single-writer multiple-readers rendezvous.

Note that we have said nothing of synchronising or decomposing pliant events. Pliant events raise their own issues in a multi-machine world. We recall that pliant events executing in a machine typically get preempted. If there are multiple machines, the preemptions in different machines should be independent, otherwise the different machines are behaving like a single machine. This presents little problem in the real world context, but creates technical complexity for a formal operational semantics which is concerned with constructing a consistent global system trace. At a preemption in machine MA , the non-preempted other machines must be ‘paused’ and their execution resumed after the scheduling choices in machine MA have been resolved. And because this is a strange thing to contemplate for the physical world, the physical world consequences of any such technicalities must be invisible. This affects potential decomposition strategies for pliant events. In the light of these considerations, the strategy adopted for decomposition of pliant events is that it has to be programmed explicitly by the user. If pliant events are required to execute simultaneously in two machines, their guards must be arranged to be the same (and the same as the guards of the parent event if they constitute a decomposition), and to prevent ‘the wrong parts’ of different decompositions from being scheduled simultaneously, no parent events in the same machine that are to be decomposed can ever be enabled simultaneously. Fortunately, it is easy enough to impose static restrictions on event guards that can ensure the conditions required. A full discussion can be found in PaperII.

5 A Small Incident Response Case Study

We illustrate the utility of the multi-machine Hybrid Event-B approach with a small case study. For lack of space we do not cover all aspects in equal depth, but focus on those structural elements which particularly contribute to convenient exploration of distributed and autonomous systems.

The case study concerns an incident response system. This consists of a number of largely independent agents: a controller, three responders that enter a potentially hazardous area to effect some appropriate measures, and two drones, that act as communication intermediaries between the controller

(which is assumed to be ground based) and the responders (which are assumed to be unable to communicate with the controller directly). Since the arena of the incident needing the response is assumed to be hazardous, two drones are provided, and they are expected to keep apart from each other, in case one of them suffers some disabling mishap. Described in such abstract terms, the case study is applicable to situations from natural and industrial disasters, through terrorist attacks, to battlefield warfighting.

Each of these agents is modelled using an individual Hybrid Event-B machine, and there are additionally CONTEXTs and INTERFACEs that organise the means by which the various agents can cooperate. The ability to do this successfully results from the ability to partition the functionality needed into constructs that capture convincingly self-contained subsets, and the adequate flexibility of the cooperation mechanisms, that enables their shared goals to be achieved. These mechanisms have to cope with six independent but cooperating agents in the complete system, each potentially involving independently determined smooth state change.

The essential lesson of the case study is that the design of multi-machine Hybrid Event-B permits the system to be described in such a way that experimentation with different scenarios can be easily achieved by changing just one machine and one context. These are **EnvironmentScenario_Mch** and **IncidentResponse_CTX**.

In the body of this paper we focus on the machines that capture the behaviours of the agents, relegating the contexts and interfaces that contain the static declarations that support these machines to the Appendix. Here and there we take some liberties with Event-B syntax for the sake of readability. Next, we see **EnvironmentScenario_Mch**.

<pre> MACHINE EnvironmentScenario_Mch SEES IncidentResponse_CTX CONNECTS IncidentResponse_IF VARIABLES schedule INVARIANTS schedule : seq(\mathbb{R}) increasing(schedule) EVENTS INITIALISATION STATUS ordinary BEGIN schedule := INITSCHEd END PliTrue STATUS pliant COMPLY INVARIANTS END ... </pre>	<pre> ... AddHazard STATUS ordinary ANY tg,xx,yy,sz,ht WHERE nonempty(schedule) \wedge t = head(schedule) \wedge (tg \mapsto xx \mapsto yy \mapsto sz \mapsto ht) \notin hazards BEGIN hazards := hazards \cup {tg \mapsto xx \mapsto yy \mapsto sz \mapsto ht} schedule := tail(schedule) END TakeHazard STATUS ordinary ANY tg,xx,yy,sz,ht WHERE nonempty(schedule) \wedge t = head(schedule) \wedge (tg \mapsto xx \mapsto yy \mapsto sz \mapsto ht) \in hazards BEGIN hazards := hazards - {tg \mapsto xx \mapsto yy \mapsto sz \mapsto ht} schedule := tail(schedule) END END </pre>
--	--

The **EnvironmentScenario_Mch** machine above contains a *schedule* of interventions into the incident arena. These are restricted to be the introduction and removal of hazardous areas within the arena, and the *schedule* variable is a succession (i.e. sequence) of times at which the interventions take place. Each hazardous area has either a *S*quare footprint or a *C*YLindrical shape. So each is specified using a *SQ* or *CYL* tag *tg*, *x* and *y* coordinates, a size *sz*, and a height *ht*. The **EnvironmentScenario_Mch** machine uses the *AddHazard* event to introduce a fresh hazard when time reaches the first value in *schedule*, with the attributes of the hazard, written in B-Method notation as $(tg \mapsto xx \mapsto yy \mapsto sz \mapsto$

ht), being taken from the formal model's environment using the ANY clause. The *TakeHazard* event removes an existing hazard from the set of current hazards *hazards*. The *schedule* itself is statically defined in the **IncidentResponse_CTX** context. Changing the constants in the context, and the details of the **EnvironmentScenario_Mch** machine is all one needs to do to experiment with different incident management scenarios in this world.

Below, we see the project file, **IncidentResponse_Prj**. Its purpose is to orchestrate all the components of the system. Many specific details are curtailed to save space. The first declared item is the GLOBalINVariantS file **IncidentResponse_GI** which we discuss at the end. After that there is a list of contexts, interfaces and machines. The line 'CONTEXT **Drone1_CTX** IS' instantiates the context as a version of a generic library context for drones, **Drone_CTX**. After the WITH, there is a renaming mapping saying how identifiers in **Drone_CTX** should be replaced to get **Drone1_CTX**. This instantiation allows the two contexts **Drone1_CTX** and **Drone2_CTX** to have different constants *Vdr1* and *Vdr2* for the velocities of the drones **Drone1_Mch** and **Drone2_Mch** that SEE the respective contexts. After the interfaces there are the machines. **Controller_Mch** is discussed below, while **EnvironmentScenario_Mch** was discussed above. After these, there are the two drone instantiations **Drone1_Mch** and **Drone2_Mch**, being instantiations of a generic **Drone_Mch**. We have suppressed the details of the instantiations, which amount to adding '1' or '2' to identifiers in the generic machine.

Beyond instantiations, the project file contains SYNCH lines. These specify collections of mode events across multiple machines that must be scheduled simultaneously (i.e. only when all their guards are simultaneously true). Thus 'SYNCH **ActivateDrone1**' enforces the simultaneous execution of event

<pre> PROJECT IncidentResponse_Prj GLOBINVS IncidentResponse_GI CONTEXT IncidentResponse_CTX CONTEXT Controller_CTX CONTEXT Drone1_CTX IS <i>Drone_CTX</i> WITH <i>Vdr</i> → <i>Vdr1</i> END CONTEXT Drone2_CTX IS <i>Drone_CTX</i> WITH <i>Vdr</i> → <i>Vdr2</i> END CONTEXT Responder_CTX INTERFACE IncidentResponse_IF INTERFACE ControllerDrones_IF INTERFACE ControllerResponder_IF MACHINE Controller_Mch MACHINE EnvironmentScenario_Mch MACHINE Drone1_Mch IS <i>Drone_Mch</i> WITH ●●● END MACHINE Drone2_Mch IS <i>Drone_Mch</i> WITH ●●● END MACHINE Responder1_Mch IS <i>Responder_Mch</i> WITH ●●● END MACHINE Responder2_Mch IS <i>Responder_Mch</i> WITH ●●● END </pre>	<pre> MACHINE Responder3_Mch IS <i>Responder_Mch</i> WITH ●●● END SYNCH ActivateDrone1 <i>Controller_Mch.LaunchDrone1</i> <i>Drone1_Mch.Activate1</i> END SYNCH UpdateDrone1 <i>Controller_Mch.UpdateDrone1</i> <i>Drone1_Mch.Update1</i> END SYNCH DeActivateDrone1 <i>Controller_Mch.RecallDrone1</i> <i>Drone1_Mch.DeActivate1</i> END SYNCH ●●● Drone2 SYNCH ActivateResponder1 <i>Controller_Mch.LaunchResponder1</i> <i>Responder1_Mch.Activate1</i> END SYNCH UpdateResponder1 <i>Controller_Mch.UpdateResponder1</i> <i>Responder1_Mch.Update1</i> END SYNCH DeActivateResponder1 <i>Controller_Mch.RecallResponder1</i> <i>Responder1_Mch.DeActivate1</i> END SYNCH ●●● Responder2 SYNCH ●●● Responder3 END </pre>
---	--

LaunchDrone1 in the **Controller_Mch** machine and of **Activate1** in the **Drone1_Mch** machine. There are similar synchronisations for **Upateing** and for **DeActivateing** the **Drone1_Mch** machine. The analogous synchronisations for the **Drone2_Mch** machine are suppressed. A similar pattern applies to the responders. The details for the **Responder1_Mch** machine are given in full, while those for machines **Responder2_Mch** and **Responder3_Mch** are suppressed.

```


MACHINE Controller_Mch
SEES IncidentResponse_CTX
SEES Controller_CTX
CONNECTS IncidentResponse_IF
CONNECTS ControllerDrone1_IF
CONNECTS ControllerDrone2_IF
CONNECTS ControllerResponder1_IF
CONNECTS ControllerResponder2_IF
CONNECTS ControllerResponder3_IF
VARIABLES
  mode
  ctrhazards
  cyclestart
  drones2comd
  responders2comd
INVARIANTS
  mode : CTRLSTATE
  ctrhazards :  $\mathbb{P}(\text{HAZTYPE} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ 
  cyclestart :  $\mathbb{R}$ 
  drones2comd :  $\mathbb{P}(\{1,2\})$ 
  responders2comd :  $\mathbb{P}(\{1,2,3\})$ 
EVENTS
  INITIALISATION
    STATUS ordinary
    BEGIN
      mode := OFF
      ctrhazards :=  $\emptyset$ 
      cyclestart := 0
      drones2comd :=  $\emptyset$ 
      responders2comd :=  $\emptyset$ 
    END
  PliTrue
    STATUS pliant
    COMPLY
      INVARIANTS
    END
  ActivateController
    STATUS asynch
    WHEN
      mode = OFF  $\wedge$   $0 < t < \delta$ 
    THEN
      mode := DISPATCH
      drones2comd := {1,2}
      responders2comd := {1,2,3}
    END
  LaunchDrone1
    STATUS asynch
    WHEN
      mode = DISPATCH  $\wedge$   $1 \in \text{drones2comd} \wedge t < \delta$ 
    THEN
      drhazards := hazards
      drones2comd :=  $\text{drones2comd} - \{1\}$ 
    END
  LaunchDrone2
    ...
  END
  ...

```

```

... ..
  LaunchResp1
    STATUS asynch
    WHEN
      mode = DISPATCH  $\wedge$ 
       $1 \in \text{resps2comd} \wedge t < \delta$ 
    THEN
      resp1hazards := hazards
      resps2comd :=  $\text{resps2comd} - \{1\}$ 
    END
  LaunchResp2
    ...
  END
  LaunchResp3
    ...
  END
  StartMonitoring
    STATUS asynch
    WHEN
      mode = DISPATCH  $\wedge t = \delta$ 
    THEN
      mode := UPDATEHAZ
      cyclestart :=  $\Delta$ 
    END
  MonitorHazardsNull
    STATUS asynch
    WHEN
      mode = UPDATEHAZ  $\wedge$   $0 < t - \text{cyclestart} < \delta/2 \wedge$ 
      hazards = ctrhazards
    THEN
      cyclestart :=  $\text{cyclestart} + \Delta$ 
    END
  MonitorHazardsUpdate
    STATUS asynch
    WHEN
      mode = UPDATEHAZ  $\wedge$   $0 < t - \text{cyclestart} < \delta/2 \wedge$ 
      hazards  $\neq$  ctrhazards
    THEN
      ctrhazards := hazards
      drones2comd := {1,2}
      resps2comd := {1,2,3}
      cyclestart :=  $\text{cyclestart} + \Delta$ 
    END
  UpdateDrone1
    STATUS asynch
    WHEN
      mode = UPDATEHAZ  $\wedge$   $1 \in \text{drones2comd} \wedge$ 
       $\text{cyclestart} - \Delta + \delta/2 < t < \text{cyclestart} - \Delta + \delta$ 
    THEN
      drhazards := hazards
      drones2comd :=  $\text{drones2comd} - \{1\}$ 
    END
  UpdateDrone2
    ...
  END
  ...

```



Following the project file, there is the most complex machine of the project, the **Controller_Mch** machine, occupying the four panels above. Essentially, it is a finite state machine, perfectly expressible using Event-B alone if need be, except that the availability of real time for scheduling purposes simplifies the state space that would otherwise be needed.

The main job of the controller, once activated (event *ActivateController*) is: to send forth the drones and responders (events *LaunchDrone1*, *LaunchDrone2*, *LaunchResp1*, *LaunchResp2*, *LaunchResp3*), to poll the environment machine to discover changes to the collection of hazards that have been unearthed (events *StartMonitoring*, *MonitorHazardsNull*, *MonitorHazardsUpdate*) and to advise the drones and responders of the same (events *UpdateDrone1*, *UpdateDrone2*, *UpdateResp1*, *UpdateResp2*, *UpdateResp3*), and finally to recall the drones and responders when the work has been completed (events *RecallDrone1*, *RecallDrone2*, *RecallResp1*, *RecallResp2*, *RecallResp3*). Once this is done, the controller is deactivated (event *DeActivateController*). A default *PliTrue* pliant event covers the gaps between state change.

In the above, there are clearly groups of similar events that need to take place periodically (launching, monitoring, updating, recalling) for agents that are largely independent of each other most of the time. Achieving this using a pure finite state machine would entail either a state explosion to accommodate all possible interleavings of individual agent events, or an excessive use of sequentialisation to avoid it. The presence of time as an intrinsic feature in Hybrid Event-B (assumed synchronised across all machines) permits a more economical approach.

A ‘large’ time window Δ is defined along with a ‘small’ window δ . Launching is defined to take place within the first δ of elapsed time, via synchronised events, as described above. Since the main

synchronisation mechanism is the time interval of duration δ , arbitrary orderings of the launching events within that interval are permitted.

The same technique is used for all the other synchronised activities. Monitoring and update take place repeatedly after the elapse of each period of duration Δ . At $t = n\Delta$, the EnvironmentScenario machine potentially updates the *hazards*. Within the next $\delta/2$ period, the controller checks whether *hazards* has changed since the last check, and if so, schedules updates to the drones and responders to update their hazard data and to replan if necessary. To keep the model simple, this is accomplished by setting the *drones2comd* and *resps2comd* variables to the IDs of all the drones and responders. This triggers, in the next $\delta/2$ period, each of them to update it's local copy of the *hazards* variable via a synchronised event such as e.g., the combination of *UpdateDrone1* in the controller together with *Update* in first drone. Once that has happened, the drone or responder can recalculate its trajectory.

<pre> MACHINE Drone_Mch SEES IncidentResponse_CTX SEES Drone_CTX CONNECTS ControllerDrones_IF VARIABLES mode thex , they , thez trajectory INVARIANTS mode : DRONESTATE thex , they , thez : \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R} trajectory : seq($\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$) EVENTS INITIALISATION STATUS ordinary BEGIN mode := OFF thex , they , thez := 0 , 0 , 0 trajectory := $\langle \rangle$ END PliTrue STATUS pliant WHEN mode = OFF COMPLY INVARIANTS END Activate STATUS ordinary WHEN mode = OFF BEGIN mode := SEEK thex , they , thez := drx , dry , drz trajectory := calcCentAvoidTraj(...) END Update STATUS ordinary WHEN mode \in {SEEK , RETURN} BEGIN thex , they , thez := drx , dry , drz trajectory := calcCentAvoidTraj(...) END ... </pre>	<pre> ... Navigate STATUS pliant WHEN mode \in {SEEK , RETURN} \wedge trajectory \neq $\langle \rangle$ SOLVE $\mathcal{D}drx := Vdr \times (\text{first}(trajectory)[1] - thex)$ $\mathcal{D}dry := Vdr \times (\text{first}(trajectory)[2] - they)$ $\mathcal{D}drz := Vdr \times (\text{first}(trajectory)[3] - thez)$ END Waypoint STATUS ordinary WHEN mode \in {SEEK , RETURN} \wedge drx = first(trajectory)[1] \wedge dry = first(trajectory)[2] \wedge drz = first(trajectory)[3] \wedge trajectory \neq $\langle \rangle$ BEGIN thex , they , thez := drx , dry , drz trajectory := rest(trajectory) END Hover STATUS pliant WHEN mode \in {SEEK , RETURN} \wedge trajectory = $\langle \rangle$ COMPLY INVARIANTS END DeActivate STATUS ordinary WHEN mode = SEEK BEGIN mode := RETURN thex , they , thez := drx , dry , drz trajectory := calcCentAvoidTraj(...) END SwitchOff STATUS ordinary WHEN mode = RETURN \wedge drx = dry = drz = 0 BEGIN mode := OFF END END </pre>
--	---

The cycle of updating and recalculating continues until it is time to recall all the drones and responders. This is achieved by the same synchronisation mechanism. In other words, after *DURATION* has elapsed, similar windows of length δ are established and the drones and responders adopt first the *RETURN* mode, and after returning home, the *OFF* mode.

The generic drone machine **Drone_Mch** appears in the two panels on the previous page. Once a drone is activated through the synchronised *Activate* event, it ceases the default *PliTrue* behaviour and instead pursues the *Navigate* behaviour. The preceding mode event occurrence, whether an *Activate* or an *Update* event, caused it to remember its 3D position at that time in variables *thex*, *they*, *thez*, from

<pre> MACHINE Responder_Mch SEES Responder_CTX CONNECTS ControllerResponder_IF VARIABLES mode thex , they trajectory PLIANT resp_x , resp_y INVARIANTS mode : RESPSTATE thex , they : ℝ , ℝ resp_x , resp_y : ℝ , ℝ trajectory : seq(ℝ × ℝ) EVENTS INITIALISATION STATUS ordinary BEGIN mode := OFF thex , they := 0 , 0 resp_x , resp_y := 0 , 0 trajectory := ⟨⟩ END PliTrue STATUS pliant WHEN mode = OFF COMPLY INVARIANTS END Activate STATUS ordinary WHEN mode = OFF BEGIN mode := SEEK thex , they := resp_x , resp_y trajectory := calcTraj(...) END Update STATUS ordinary WHEN mode ∈ {SEEK , RETURN} BEGIN thex , they := resp_x , resp_y trajectory := calcTraj(...) END ... </pre>	<pre> Navigate STATUS pliant WHEN mode ∈ {SEEK , RETURN} ∧ trajectory ≠ ⟨⟩ SOLVE Drespx := Vdr × (first(trajectory)[1] - thex) Drespy := Vdr × (first(trajectory)[2] - they) END Waypoint STATUS ordinary WHEN mode ∈ {SEEK , RETURN} ∧ resp_x = first(trajectory)[1] ∧ resp_y = first(trajectory)[2] ∧ trajectory ≠ ⟨⟩ BEGIN thex , they := resp_x , resp_y trajectory := rest(trajectory) END Arrived STATUS asynch WHEN mode = SEEK ∧ trajectory = ⟨⟩ BEGIN mode := ARRIVED END DoSomethingForAWhile STATUS pliant WHEN mode = ARRIVED COMPLY INVARIANTS END DeActivate STATUS ordinary WHEN mode = ARRIVED BEGIN mode := RETURN thex , they := resp_x , resp_y trajectory := calcTraj(...) END SwitchOff STATUS ordinary WHEN mode = RETURN ∧ resp_x = resp_y = resp_z = 0 BEGIN mode := OFF END END </pre>
--	--

which it can calculate a trajectory towards its goal. The tactic taken is to navigate towards the centroid of the positions of the controller and responders. The two drones need to ensure that they avoid damage in a hazardous area, so if they need to fly close to one, they need to take heed of its geometry, including height. Also, to avoid simultaneous destruction of both the drones through mishap, they need to ensure that they stay far enough apart from each other. This is all done by the *calcCentAvoidTraj(...)* function that they use, except that, in this paper, we abstract away from the detailed calculations that would be needed to achieve this. Evidently, the drones need to share their positions to do all this, so they share a single interface which declares both, which they can use to exchange positions by communicating with each other. For reasons of brevity, in this paper we do not cover this aspect in detail either.

All of this missing detail could be handled via a suitable Hybrid Event-B refinement. For simplicity again, a trajectory calculated by the drone consists of a sequence of line segments between points in three dimensions, which the drones follow, in order. The traversal of each segment is accomplished within the *Navigate* event. This simply increments each of the spatial coordinates, using the drone velocity (which is statically defined in its context) in proportion to the coordinate difference to be traversed. Once a segment is completed, the first segment is deleted from the trajectory in the *Waypoint* event, and the drone follows the next segment, until there is no trajectory left, at which point the drone stays where it is, maintaining distance from its partner.

The last big machine of the development is the generic responder machine **Responder_Mch** which appears on the previous page. This is similar to the drone machine in most respects, notably the technique used for synchronisation with the controller, but with a few essential differences. For example, the responders stay on the ground, so do not need a *z* coordinate. They are also assumed to not need to communicate with each other regarding position, so in our model, each responder can have its own interface. They do not need to fly above hazards, so their trajectory calculations will be different, expressed in the function *calcTraj(...)*. And once arrived, they do some work until they, along with the drones, are recalled by the controller, which is achieved using the customary mechanisms.

6 Verification of Hybrid Event-B Models

The main purpose of the Hybrid Event-B approach is the verification of models expressed within the formalism, in order to derive increased confidence about their dependability. As for its predecessors in the classical B-Method and Event-B, the emphasis is on safety properties, expressed within the invariants declared in the model's syntactic constructs. In the case of Hybrid Event-B, these can be found inside machines and interfaces. At the time of writing, there is no tool support for Hybrid Event-B, so a comprehensive mechanically supported verification exercise cannot be reported on. Nevertheless, the POs that define correctness in Hybrid Event-B have been investigated in detail in the papers cited earlier, so an outline of what would be involved can be given.

Two things deserve to be highlighted. The first is that, as indicated earlier, the design of multi-machine Hybrid Event-B is such that the syntactic scope of all the POs is precisely defined by the rules of construction that models have to conform to. The second is that, the present model has deliberately been designed to be so simple, that the overwhelming majority of POs become rather trivial.

One set of POs concerns feasibility: i.e., is there an after-state for every enabled mode event? The simple assignments to constants in their bodies says yes; likewise for pliant events, which have either trivial *COMPLY INVARIANTS* bodies, or merely specify the following of a linear trajectory. Another major set of POs concerns the preservation of the invariants. Since, by design, these are almost exclusively trivial typing declarations, the answer will again be yes. Such POs can be dealt with by inspection.

Slightly more complicated are POs that deal with correct handover: mode/pliant and pliant/mode. This involves calculating disjunctions of guards, to ensure that when an event completes, an event of the right kind can succeed it. Again, extreme simplicity makes this a task that can be done by hand. So we can be confident our model is as it should be, even if mechanical corroboration would be even better.

The preceding remarks prepare the ground for discussing the last construct of the project, the global invariants **IncidentResponse_GI**. The global invariants offer the possibility of explicitly stating invariants of the system that are properties of the system as a whole, and not merely of some part of it. Clearly such a capability is important when safety properties depend on the safe cooperation of all parts of the system. Global invariants are intended to be derivable from the remaining invariants of a correct model, but this is not a hard constraint. The intention is that global invariants would be checked in the latter stages of a development, once the correctness of the constituent parts of the project is established.

```
GLOBINVS IncidentResponse_GI
SEES IncidentResponse_CTX
CONNECTS IncidentResponse_IF
INVARIANTS
  t ∉ ∪ (ii • ii ∈ dom(INITSCHED) | [INITSCHED(ii) ... INITSCHED(ii) + δ]) ⇒
    ( hazards = ctrhazards ) ∧ ( hazards = drhazards ) ∧
    ( hazards = resp1hazards ) ∧ ( hazards = resp2hazards ) ∧ ( hazards = resp3hazards )
END
```

The **IncidentResponse_GI** construct above contains the following rather simple property of this kind. It states that outside the periods when the individual machines' perceptions of the hazard configurations are being updated (which are the time intervals of length δ following those integral multiples of Δ defined in the *INITSCHED* constant of the IncidentResponse context), they all agree on the hazards.

The conclusion of the invariant is a conjunction of statements each of which is a property of a part of the system. So it cannot be proved before all the pieces have been successfully constructed. A technical detail is that, for simplicity, the individual conjuncts (appropriately guarded) were not included as invariants of the relevant machines above. This itself does not make the global invariant unprovable of course. Global invariants, in particular, underline the connection between the Hybrid Event-B approach to system correctness and the reference to safety properties in this paper's title.

7 Conclusions

In the early part of the paper, we surveyed Hybrid Event-B and how it evolved from Event-B. The inclusion of real time and smooth state change entails considerable additional technical complexity in the semantics, and we discussed the details of this to the extent that space permitted. Multi-machine working brings in a whole raft of additional technical details to worry about, principally concerned with synchronisations and with the interplay of structure and verification needs. We surveyed this as far as possible. The multi-machine Hybrid Event-B approach is particularly suited to the formalisation and verification of autonomous systems, as these systems are seldom isolated, must fend for themselves for long periods of time while nevertheless communicating, but only intermittently, and are often cyber-physical. So modelling them naturally partitions into a constellation of cooperating but largely self-contained Hybrid Event-B machines, supported by suitable syntactic constructs.

The point of all this was to lay the groundwork for a small multi-machine example, to support the case just made. A simple system of intermittently communicating drones, responders and a controller was modelled. It is reasonable to say that this illustrated convincingly the capabilities of multi-machine Hybrid Event-B to fluently capture the kinds of behaviour pattern needed in such systems.

References

- [1] J.-R. Abrial (1996): *The B-Book: Assigning Programs to Meanings*. Cambridge University Press, doi:10.1017/CBO9780511624162.
- [2] J.-R. Abrial (2005): *Event-B: Structure and Laws*. In: Rodin Project Deliverable D7: *Event-B Language*. <http://rodin.cs.ncl.ac.uk/deliverables/D7.pdf>.
- [3] J.-R. Abrial (2010): *Modeling in Event-B: System and Software Engineering*. Cambridge University Press, doi:10.1017/CBO9781139195881.
- [4] R. Banach (2024): *Core Hybrid Event-B III: Fundamentals of a Reasoning Framework*. *Sci. Comp. Prog.* 231, p. 103002, doi:10.1016/j.scico.2023.103002. 54pp.
- [5] R. Banach (2024): *Hybrid Event-B*. In Mery & Singh, editors: *Modelling Software-based Systems, 2 Vols*, ISTE Press. To appear.
- [6] R. Banach, M. Butler, S. Qin, N. Verma & H. Zhu (2015): *Core Hybrid Event-B I: Single Hybrid Event-B Machines*. *Sci. Comp. Prog.* 105, pp. 92–123, doi:10.1016/j.scico.2015.02.003.
- [7] R. Banach, M. Butler, S. Qin & H. Zhu (2017): *Core Hybrid Event-B II: Multiple Cooperating Hybrid Event-B Machines*. *Sci. Comp. Prog.* 139, pp. 1–35, doi:10.1016/j.scico.2016.12.003.
- [8] M. Butler (2009): *Decomposition Strategies for Event-B*. In Leuschel, Wehrheim, editor: *Proc. IFM-09*, 5423, Springer, LNCS, pp. 20–38.
- [9] L. Carloni, R. Passerone, A. Pinto & A. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli (2006): *Languages and Tools for Hybrid Systems Design*. *Foundations and Trends in Electronic Design Automation* 1, pp. 1–193, doi:10.1561/1000000001.
- [10] P.-L. Garoche (2019): *Formal Verification of Control System Software*. Princeton University Press, doi:10.23943/princeton/9780691181301.001.0001.
- [11] E. Geisberger & M. Broy (eds.) (2015): *Living in a Networked World. Integrated Research Agenda Cyber-Physical Systems (agendaCPS)*. http://www.acatech.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Baumstruktur_nach_Website/Acatech/root/de/Publikationen/Projektberichte/acaetch_STUDIE_agendaCPS_eng_WEB.pdf.
- [12] S. Hallerstede & J.-R. Abrial (2010): *Event-B Decomposition for Parallel Programs*. In Frappier, Glässer, Khurshid, Laleau, Reeves, editor: *Proc. ABZ-10*, 5977, Springer, LNCS, pp. 319–333.
- [13] S. Hallerstede & T. Hoang (2012): *Refinement by Interface Instantiation*. In Derrick, Fitzgerald, Gnesi, Khurshid, Leuschel, Reeves, Riccobene, editor: *Proc. ABZ-12*, 7316, Springer, LNCS, pp. 223–237.
- [14] R. Sanfelice (2021): *Hybrid Feedback Control*. Princeton University Press, doi:10.2307/j.ctv131btfx.
- [15] R. Silva & M. Butler (2009): *Supporting Reuse of Event-B Developments through Generic Instantiation*. In Breitman, Cavalcanti, editor: *Proc. ICFEM-09*, 5885, Springer, LNCS, pp. 466–484.
- [16] R. Silva, C. Pascal, T. Hoang & M. Butler (2011): *Decomposition Tool for Event-B*. *Soft. Prac. Exp.* 41, pp. 199–208, doi:10.1002/spe.1002.
- [17] P. Tabuada (2009): *Verification and Control of Hybrid Systems: A Symbolic Approach*. Springer, doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-0224-5.

A Appendix: Contexts, Interfaces and Instantiated Machine Outlines

<pre> CONTEXT IncidentResponse_CTX CONSTANTS SQ , CYL INITSCHED δ , Δ DURATION RESP1dest , RESP2dest , RESP3dest SETS HAZTYPE AXIOMS partition(HAZTYPE, {SQ}, {CYL}) $\delta : \mathbb{R}$, $\delta = 0.1$ $\Delta : \mathbb{R}$, $\Delta = 1$ </pre>	<pre> INITSCHED : seq(\mathbb{R}) INITSCHED = $\langle 12, 30, 55 \rangle$ DURATION : \mathbb{R} DURATION = 79.7 RESP1dest : $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ RESP1dest = $(12.3 \mapsto 15.0)$ RESP2dest : $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ RESP2dest = $(-11.2 \mapsto 14.0)$ RESP3dest : $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ RESP3dest = $(2.1 \mapsto 29.0)$ THEOREMS DURATION > last(INITSCHED) END </pre>
<pre> INTERFACE IncidentResponse_IF SEES <i>IncidentResponse_CTX</i> TIME <i>t</i> VARIABLES hazards </pre>	<pre> INVARIANTS hazards : $\mathbb{P}(\text{HAZTYPE} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$:— sq/cyl, (x,y) coords, size from (x,y), height INITIALISATION t := 0 hazards := \emptyset END </pre>
<pre> CONTEXT Controller_CTX CONSTANTS OFF , DISPATCH , RECALL , UPDATEHAZ SETS CTRLSTATE </pre>	<pre> AXIOMS partition(CTRLSTATE , {OFF} , {DISPATCH} , {UPDATEHAZ} , {RECALL}) END </pre>
<pre> CONTEXT Drone_CTX CONSTANTS OFF , SEEK , RETURN Vdr SETS DRONESTATE </pre>	<pre> AXIOMS partition(DRONESTATE , {OFF} , {SEEK} , {RETURN}) Vdr : \mathbb{R} END </pre>
<pre> INTERFACE ControllerDrones_IF TIME <i>t</i> VARIABLES drhazards PLIANT dr1x , dr1y , dr1z dr2x , dr2y , dr2z </pre>	<pre> INVARIANTS drhazards : $\mathbb{P}(\text{HAZTYPE} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ dr1x , dr1y , dr1z : \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R} dr2x , dr2y , dr2z : \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R} INITIALISATION t := 0 drhazards := \emptyset dr1x , dr1y , dr1z := 0 , 0 , 0 dr2x , dr2y , dr2z := 0 , 0 , 0 END </pre>

```

CONTEXT Responder_CTX
CONSTANTS
  OFF , SEEK , ARRIVED , RETURN
SETS
  RESPSTATE
AXIOMS
  partition(RESPSTATE , {OFF} ,
    {SEEK} , {ARRIVED} , {RETURN})
END
    
```

```

INTERFACE ControllerResponder_IF
TIME t
VARIABLES
  resphazards
INVARIANTS
  resphazards :  $\mathbb{P}(\text{HAZTYPE} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ 
INITIALISATION
  t := 0
  resphazards :=  $\emptyset$ 
END
    
```

```

MACHINE Drone1_Mch
  ...
END
MACHINE Drone2_Mch
  ...
END
...
    
```

```

...
MACHINE Responder1_Mch
  ...
END
MACHINE Responder2_Mch
  ...
END
MACHINE Responder3_Mch
  ...
END
    
```