

CP-NCBF: A Conformal Prediction-based Approach to Synthesize Verified Neural Control Barrier Functions

Manan Tayal*, Aditya Singh*, Pushpak Jagtap, and Shishir Kolathaya

Abstract—Control Barrier Functions (CBFs) are a practical approach for designing safety-critical controllers, but constructing them for arbitrary nonlinear dynamical systems remains a challenge. Recent efforts have explored learning-based methods, such as neural CBFs (NCBFs), to address this issue. However, ensuring the validity of NCBFs is difficult due to potential learning errors. In this letter, we propose a novel framework that leverages split-conformal prediction to generate formally verified neural CBFs with probabilistic guarantees based on a user-defined error rate, referred to as CP-NCBF. Unlike existing methods that impose Lipschitz constraints on neural CBF—leading to scalability limitations and overly conservative safe sets—our approach is sample-efficient, scalable, and results in less restrictive safety regions. We validate our framework through case studies on obstacle avoidance in autonomous driving and geo-fencing of aerial vehicles, demonstrating its ability to generate larger and less conservative safe sets compared to conventional techniques.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ensuring safety is a fundamental challenge in control systems, particularly in autonomous systems where real-time safety guarantees are critical. Safety violations can lead to catastrophic consequences, making it imperative to design control strategies that prioritize safety while maintaining operational efficiency.

Various safety paradigms have been developed to address this challenge. Constrained Reinforcement Learning (CRL) [1] methods aim to learn safe policies by formulating safety constraints within a reinforcement learning framework. While these approaches enable data-driven safety enforcement, they do not provide strict guarantees and may result in unsafe behaviors due to exploration-based learning. Hamilton-Jacobi (HJ) reachability analysis [2], [3], on the other hand, provides rigorous, worst-case safety assurances by computing backward-reachable sets, ensuring that a system remains within a safe operating domain. However, its high computational cost renders it impractical for real-time applications, particularly for high-dimensional systems.

In contrast, control barrier functions (CBFs) [4]–[6] provide a promising strategy to address safety concerns. CBF-based quadratic programs (CBF-QP) have emerged as a real-time safety filtering mechanism, ensuring safety by modulating control inputs in a computationally efficient manner.

While control barrier functions have been successfully applied in real-time safety-critical systems, synthesizing valid

CBFs for complex nonlinear dynamics remains a significant challenge. To address this, Neural Control Barrier Functions (NCBFs) have emerged as a scalable alternative, leveraging neural networks’ universal approximation properties to model valid barrier functions across a broader range of systems. Several approaches have been proposed for the training of NCBFs, including learning from expert demonstrations [7], SMT-based techniques [8], [9], and mixed-integer programming formulations [10]. Additionally, loss functions tailored for NCBF training have been explored in [11]. However, learning-based CBF synthesis introduces inherent errors that can compromise safety. Some existing methods mitigate this issue using robust optimization techniques that enforce Lipschitz continuity constraints on the learned CBF [12]–[14]. While these methods improve reliability, they are highly conservative, require dense state-space sampling, and often result in overly restrictive safe regions that hinder system performance.

To overcome these limitations, we introduce CP-NCBF, a novel framework that synthesizes formally verified neural CBFs with probabilistic guarantees. Our approach leverages split-conformal prediction [15], a statistical framework that provides high-confidence bounds on model predictions, enabling us to quantify and correct learning errors in a sample-efficient manner. Unlike prior methods that require strict Lipschitz constraints and dense sampling, our approach allows for training on a limited set of data points while ensuring probabilistic safety guarantees. By systematically refining the learned CBF, CP-NCBF constructs larger and less conservative safe sets, enhancing both safety and operational flexibility.

To summarize, the overall contributions of this letter are as follows.

- We introduce a novel safety quantification framework that leverages conformal prediction to provide probabilistic guarantees on the validity of neural CBFs.
- We propose a sample-efficient training scheme for synthesizing robust neural CBFs with a probabilistic guarantee on their validity.
- Our approach enables systematic tuning of CBF conservatism based on safety requirements. Furthermore, the proposed framework scales to high-dimensional systems, unlike grid-based methods.
- We validate our approach through case studies on a 3D mobile robot and a 6D aerial vehicle, demonstrating reduced conservatism and improved scalability.

This work was supported in part by PMRF, Government of India.

All the authors belong to Cyber-Physical Systems, Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bengaluru. {manantayal, adityasingh, pushpak, shishirk}@iisc.ac.in

* denotes equal contribution.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Notations

In this work, we begin by defining the functions that will be used throughout the paper. A continuous function $\kappa : [0, d) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, where $d > 0$, is said to belong to *class- \mathcal{K}* if it is strictly increasing and satisfies $\kappa(0) = 0$. When the same function is extended to the interval $\kappa : (-b, d) \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty)$ with $b > 0$ (possibly $b = \infty$), it is referred to as an *extended class- \mathcal{K}* function. For a set \mathcal{A} , we denote its indicator function by $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$, which is equal to 1 if $x \in \mathcal{A}$ and 0, otherwise. The ceiling function, $\lceil \cdot \rceil$, returns the smallest integer greater than or equal to the input, while the floor function, $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$, returns the largest integer less than or equal to the input. Furthermore, we define the regularized incomplete beta function as follows:

$$\mathcal{I} : (c, a, b) \mapsto \mathcal{I}_c(a, b) = \frac{\int_0^c t^{a-1}(1-t)^{b-1} dt}{\int_0^1 t^{a-1}(1-t)^{b-1} dt} \quad \forall a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}. \quad (1)$$

B. System Description

We consider a control-affine nonlinear system with state $x \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and control input $u \in \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, governed by the following equation:

$$\dot{x} = f(x) + g(x)u, \quad (2)$$

where the functions $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ are assumed to be locally Lipschitz continuous. We define the safe set \mathcal{C} as the super-level set of a continuously differentiable function $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} &= \{x \in \mathcal{X} : h(x) \geq 0\}, \\ \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{C} &= \{x \in \mathcal{X} : h(x) < 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The interior and boundary of \mathcal{C} are given by $\text{Int}(\mathcal{C}) = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : h(x) > 0\}$ and $\partial\mathcal{C} = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : h(x) = 0\}$, respectively. A Lipschitz continuous control policy $\mu : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ maps the state trajectory $x(t)$ to a control input $u(t)$.

Definition 1 (Safety): A dynamical system is said to be safe if the set $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is positively invariant under the control policy μ , i.e., if $x(0) \in \mathcal{C}$ and $u(t) = \mu(x(t))$, then $x(t) \in \mathcal{C}$ for all $t \geq 0$.

C. Control Barrier Functions

A key requirement in safety-critical control is to design a control policy that ensures the system state remains within the safe set \mathcal{C} . Control barrier functions (CBFs) [5] are a popular tool for achieving this goal.

Definition 2 (Control Barrier Function (CBF)): Given a control-affine system $\dot{x} = f(x) + g(x)u$, the set \mathcal{C} defined by (3), with $\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in \partial\mathcal{C}$, the function h is called the control barrier function (CBF) defined on the set \mathcal{X} , if there exists an extended *class- \mathcal{K}* function κ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$:

$$\sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \left[\underbrace{\mathcal{L}_f h(x) + \mathcal{L}_g h(x)u}_{h(x,u)} + \kappa(h(x)) \right] \geq 0, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_f h(x) = \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} f(x)$ and $\mathcal{L}_g h(x) = \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} g(x)$ are the Lie derivatives.

As shown in [4], [5], if a Lipschitz continuous control law $\mu(x)$ satisfies the condition $\mathcal{L}_f h(x) + \mathcal{L}_g h(x)\mu(x) \geq 0$, then the system is safe when $x(0) \in \mathcal{C}$, and if $x(0)$ lies outside \mathcal{C} , this condition ensures that the system state converges asymptotically to \mathcal{C} .

D. Safe Controller Synthesis using CBFs

Often, a reference controller $u_{\text{ref}}(x)$ is designed to optimize performance, but it may not satisfy the safety requirements. To reconcile performance with safety, a minimal modification of the reference controller is made using a CBF-based Quadratic Program (CBF-QP):

$$\begin{aligned} u^*(x) &= \arg \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \|u - u_{\text{ref}}(x)\|^2, \\ \text{s.t. } \mathcal{L}_f h(x) + \mathcal{L}_g h(x)u + \kappa(h(x)) &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

This formulation adjusts the control input as little as possible while enforcing the safety constraint, as detailed in [5].

E. Neural CBFs

Manually designing a CBF can be difficult for high-dimensional or complex systems. Neural Control Barrier Functions (NCBFs) address this challenge by using a deep neural network, $h_\theta(x)$, parameterized by θ , to approximate a valid CBF. Due to the absence of an NCBF initially, we lack access to the safe set \mathcal{C} . Hence, we start with the initial safe and unsafe sets $\mathcal{X}_s \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{X}_u \subseteq \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{C}$, respectively, such that any trajectory starting in \mathcal{X}_s never enters \mathcal{X}_u . To enforce the desired safety properties during training, we employ a loss function that penalizes violations of the CBF conditions over the training data:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^3 \max(\zeta_i(x), 0), \quad (6)$$

where the individual penalties are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_1(x) &= -h_\theta(x) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}, \quad \zeta_2(x) = (h_\theta(x) + \delta) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}}, \\ \zeta_3(x) &= -\left(\mathcal{L}_f h_\theta(x) + \mathcal{L}_g h_\theta(x)u + \kappa(h_\theta(x))\right), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

with $\delta > 0$ ensuring strict inequalities, and where \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{D} denote sets of safe, unsafe and state space samples sampled from $\mathcal{X}_s, \mathcal{X}_u$ and \mathcal{X} , respectively.

Running example: Consider an autonomous mobile robot navigating while avoiding a circular obstacle of radius R centered at the origin. The system dynamics are:

$$\dot{x}_1 = v \cos(\phi), \quad \dot{x}_2 = v \sin(\phi), \quad \dot{\phi} = u, \quad (8)$$

where $[x_1, x_2, \phi]^T \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ represents the robot's position and orientation, with velocity v and control input u . The goal is to learn a neural CBF, $h_\theta(x)$, such that the resulting safe set \mathcal{C} excludes any states that lead to the unsafe region,

$$\mathcal{X}_u = \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} \leq R\}. \quad (9)$$

The objective is to synthesize $h_\theta(x)$ and a control policy $\mu(x)$, ensuring \mathcal{C} remains positively invariant under closed-loop dynamics, keeping the robot safe from collisions.

Note that due to learning inaccuracies and the use of finitely many points for training, the resulting neural CBF might not satisfy the desired conditions over the entire state space [13]. In the following sections, we propose a split-conformal prediction framework to quantify and correct these learning errors, thereby providing probabilistic guarantees on the validity of the learned neural CBF.

III. SAFETY QUANTIFICATION OF NEURAL CBF USING CONFORMAL PREDICTION

Neural CBFs, like other learning-based methods, are susceptible to learning errors, potentially leading to safety violations that restrict their use in safety-critical applications. Therefore, verifying their validity is essential. This section introduces a conformal prediction-based verification framework that offers probabilistic guarantees on their validity. It builds upon Split Conformal Prediction, a widely recognized technique in the machine learning community for quantifying uncertainty [15]. To lay the foundation for our methodology, we first introduce Split Conformal Prediction:

Lemma 1 (Split Conformal Prediction [15]):

Consider a set of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) calibration data, denoted as $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, along with a new test point $(X_{\text{test}}, Y_{\text{test}})$ sampled independently from the same distribution. Define a score function $s(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}$, where higher scores indicate poorer alignment between x and y . Compute the calibration scores $s_1 = s(X_1, Y_1), \dots, s_n = s(X_n, Y_n)$. For a user-defined confidence level $1 - \alpha$, let \hat{q} represent the $\lceil (n+1)(1-\alpha) \rceil / n$ quantile of these scores. Construct the prediction set for the test input X_{test} as:

$$\mathcal{C}(X_{\text{test}}) = \{y : s(X_{\text{test}}, y) \leq \hat{q}\}.$$

Assuming exchangeability, the prediction set $\mathcal{C}(X_{\text{test}})$ guarantees the marginal coverage property:

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{\text{test}} \in \mathcal{C}(X_{\text{test}})) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

Remark 1: The coverage of conformal prediction, conditioned on the calibration set, is a random variable. Running the algorithm with different calibration sets results in varying coverage over an infinite validation set. While Lemma 1 ensures coverage is at least $1 - \alpha$ on average, it deviates for any fixed calibration set. However, increasing n reduces these fluctuations, and the coverage distribution follows an analytic form, as derived by Vladimir Vovk in [16]:

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{\text{test}} \in \mathcal{C}(X_{\text{test}})) \sim \text{Beta}(n+1-l, l), \quad (10)$$

where $l = \lfloor (n+1)\alpha \rfloor$.

Now, we can provide probabilistic safety quantification of the learned neural CBF $h_\theta(x)$ using split conformal prediction. We first sample N independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) states from \mathcal{X} for verification and define an error rate α . We provide the following theorem for the Conformal Prediction based quantification of the learned neural CBF:

Theorem 1 (Safety quantification of Neural CBF):

Consider a continuous time control system (2) for which we obtain a Neural CBF $h_\theta(x)$ parameterized by θ . We sample N i.i.d. samples from \mathcal{X} . For a user-specified level α , let \hat{q} be the $\lceil \frac{(N+1)(1-\alpha)}{N} \rceil$ th quantile of the conformal scores, $s_j = \max_{i \in \{1,2,3\}}(\zeta_i(x_j))$, on the N state samples. Select a safety violation parameter $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and a confidence parameter $\beta \in (0, 1)$ such that:

$$\mathcal{I}_{1-\epsilon}(N-l+1, l) \leq \beta, \quad (11)$$

where $l = \lfloor (N+1)\alpha \rfloor$ and \mathcal{I} is the regularized incomplete beta function. Then, with the probability of at least $1 - \beta$, the following holds:

$$\mathbb{P}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\max_{i \in \{1,2,3\}} (\zeta_i(x)) \leq \hat{q} \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon. \quad (12)$$

Proof: Using Lemma 1, we define the input as $X = x$ and the corresponding output as $Y = \max_{i \in \{1,2,3\}}(\zeta_i(x))$. The conformal scoring function is then given by $s(X, Y) := \max_{i \in \{1,2,3\}}(\zeta_i(x))$, where higher scores correspond to greater misalignment between x and y , or equivalently, indicate higher violations in our setting.

Accordingly, the prediction set for a test input $X_{\text{test}} = x$ is defined as:

$$\mathcal{C}(X_{\text{test}} = x) = \{y : \max(\zeta_i(x)) \leq \hat{q}\}, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Now, using eq (10), we get

$$\mathbb{P}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\max_{i \in \{1,2,3\}} (\zeta_i(x)) \leq \hat{q} \right) \sim \text{Beta}(N+1-l, l).$$

Define E as:

$$E := \mathbb{P}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\max_{i \in \{1,2,3\}} (\zeta_i(x)) \leq \hat{q} \right).$$

Here, E is a Beta-distributed random variable. Using properties of CDF, we assert that $E \geq 1 - \epsilon$ with confidence $1 - \beta$ if the following condition is satisfied:

$$\mathcal{I}_{1-\epsilon}(N-l+1, l) \leq \beta, \quad (13)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_x(a, b)$ is the regularized incomplete Beta function and also serves as the CDF of the Beta distribution.

Thus, if Equation (13) holds, we can conclude with probability $1 - \beta$ that:

$$\mathbb{P}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\max_{i \in \{1,2,3\}} (\zeta_i(x)) \leq \hat{q} \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon. \quad \blacksquare$$

For sufficiently high confidence level $(1 - \beta)$ and safety level $(1 - \epsilon)$, \hat{q} provides a means to quantify the safety of a neural CBF with very high confidence. A positive \hat{q} indicates the presence of safety violations, with its magnitude quantifying the severity of these violations. The procedure to quantify this safety is detailed in Algorithm 1.

Fig. 1 shows the variation in conformal scores (\hat{q}) with the number of training samples used to learn the neural CBF for our running examples in (8). The scores are computed for $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$ and $\beta = 10^{-10}$, corresponding to a 99.99%

Algorithm 1 Safety Quantification of Neural CBF

Require: f, g (dynamics), N, α .
 $D \leftarrow$ Sample N IID states from $\{x : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$
for $i = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$ **do**
 $S_i \leftarrow s_i(0, D)$
end for
 $S \leftarrow S$ sorted in decreasing order
 $l \leftarrow \lfloor (N + 1)\alpha \rfloor$
 $\beta, \epsilon \leftarrow N, l$ ▷ From eq. (11)
 $\hat{q} \leftarrow S_l, \beta, \epsilon$ ▷ From eq. (12)
return \hat{q}, β, ϵ

safety level with a confidence of $1 - 10^{-10} \approx 1$. As expected, the conformal scores decrease with more training data, reflecting improved neural CBF learning. Hence, using the proposed safety quantification, we can quantify the safety of the learned neural CBF.




Fig. 1: Conformal Scores of the neural CBFs learned for ground vehicle vs number samples they were trained on, at 99.99% safety level.

However, the above procedure focuses solely on quantifying the safety of NCBFs without addressing potential corrections. In the next section, we introduce a methodology to correct these learning errors while still training on finitely many sample points.

IV. CONFORMAL NEURAL CBF

Before introducing our methodology, we describe the existing work on training robust neural CBFs.

A. Existing work on training a robust neural CBF

To address this challenge, it becomes crucial to verify the learned CBF and introduce a robustness margin to counter potential learning errors and ensure safety throughout the state space. Recent studies [13], [14] have proposed a Scenario Optimization Problem (SOP) based on the CBF conditions (3), and (4), formulated as follows:

$$\text{SOP} : \begin{cases} \min_{\psi, \theta} & \psi \\ \text{s.t.} & \max(\zeta_i(x_j)) \leq \psi, \forall x_j \in \mathcal{D}, \\ & \psi \in \mathbb{R}, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

With an infinite number of data samples, the solution to the above SOP, ψ^* , would yield a valid CBF. However,

with a finite number of samples, a smaller $\psi < \psi^* \leq 0$ is needed to ensure validity. Hence, introducing a uniform margin ψ (where $\psi < \psi^*$) enables the recovery of a provably safe set that satisfies CBF conditions at all points, ensuring safety across the state space. Once a suitable value of this robustness parameter, ψ , that ensures validity is determined, the loss function is modified as follows to train a robust neural CBF with completeness guarantees:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^3 \max(\zeta_i(x) - \psi, 0). \quad (15)$$

From Equation (15), it can be observed that the choice of ψ directly impacts the neural CBF. If $\psi > \psi^*$, violations occur, rendering the CBF incomplete, whereas $\psi \ll \psi^*$ results in excessive conservatism. [13] proposed estimating ψ^* by constraining the neural network’s Lipschitz constant and deriving an upper bound on ψ^* from training data. However, this approach treats the Lipschitz constant as a hyperparameter, where a small value risks incompleteness and a large value leads to conservatism. Additionally, its reliance on grid-based sampling limits its applicability to low-dimensional systems.

B. Conformal prediction aided training of robust NCBFs

To ensure that the learned neural CBF adheres to safety guarantees, we introduce a systematic methodology to approximate the robustness parameter, ψ , leveraging conformal prediction. The objective is to set ψ such that the conformal score of the robustly trained NCBF reduces to zero, thereby ensuring the probabilistic validity of the learned safety function.

For the preselected values for the safety violation threshold ϵ and the confidence level $1 - \beta$, we first compute the quantile \hat{q} as shown in Theorem 1, which captures the severity of the observed safety violations. To directly counteract these violations, we uniformly shift the NCBF by setting the robustness parameter as $\psi := -\hat{q}$. This corrective offset is then incorporated into the loss function (15), ensuring that the training-induced inaccuracies are systematically mitigated. Consequently, by enforcing this adjustment, we guarantee that the adjusted NCBF satisfies the safety conditions with at least $1 - \beta$ confidence, namely,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\max_{i \in \{1, 2, 3\}} \zeta_i(x) \leq 0 \right) \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon. \quad (16)$$

The parameter ψ effectively acts as a corrective margin, which can be systematically adjusted based on the required safety confidence level. A stricter safety requirement (i.e., lower ϵ) leads to a higher \hat{q} and, consequently, a more conservative NCBF, while a relaxed safety requirement results in a less restrictive barrier function. This approach provides a scalable and principled way to trade off conservatism with operational flexibility, overcoming the limitations of existing methods reliant on Lipschitz constraints and grid-based sampling. We detail the procedure to evaluate ψ in Algorithm 2.




Fig. 2: Visualization of learned NCBFs for autonomous ground vehicle at $\phi = 0$ using 20K training samples: (Left) Unverified NCBF (without robust loss), (Center) CP-NCBF (our method with 99.99% safety guarantee), and (Right) Verified NCBF [13]. Bold black ovals denote the zero-level sets. Both CP-NCBF and Verified NCBF avoid overlapping the unsafe region, while the Unverified NCBF does not; additionally, CP-NCBF yields a larger safe region than the Verified NCBF.

Algorithm 2 Training Robust Neural CBFs with probabilistic safety assurances

Require: Data Sets: $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{D}$, Dynamics: f, g, N, α

- 1: $x_i \leftarrow \text{Sample}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{D})$
- 2: Compute $\hat{q}(N, \alpha)$ using Algorithm 1.
- 3: $\psi \leftarrow -\hat{q}$
- 4: Obtain $\mathcal{L}(\theta)$ using ψ . ▷ From eq. (15)
- 5: **while** $\mathcal{L}(\theta) > 0$ **do**
- 6: $h_\theta \leftarrow \theta$
- 7: $\mathcal{L}(\theta) \leftarrow (h_\theta, f, g, x_i, \psi)$
- 8: $\theta \leftarrow \text{Learn}(\mathcal{L}_\theta, \theta)$
- 9: **end while**
- 10: **return** h_θ

V. CASE STUDIES

In this section, we will demonstrate the efficacy of our methodology on two different case studies: autonomous ground vehicle collision avoidance and geo-fencing of an aerial vehicle. For all the experiments, we used 11th Gen Intel Core i9-11900K CPU, 128 GB RAM, and NVIDIA GeForce RTX 4090 GPU. For the class \mathcal{K} function in the CBF inequality (4), we chose $\kappa(h) = \gamma h$, where $\gamma = 1$. We perform Conformal Prediction on $N = 300k$ test points for all our case studies.

A. Autonomous Ground Vehicle Collision Avoidance

We continue our running example of an autonomous ground vehicle collision avoidance problem with dynamics governed by (8). The state space is defined as $\mathcal{X} = [-2, 2]^2 \times [-\pi, \pi]$, with the safe region given by $\mathcal{X}_s = \mathcal{X} \setminus [-1.5, 1.5]^2 \times [-\pi, \pi]$ and the unsafe region as $\mathcal{X}_u = [-0.2, 0.2]^2 \times [-\pi, \pi]$. We train a neural CBF using a single hidden layer with 64 neurons and the Softplus activation function, $\log(1 + \exp(x))$.

Figure 2 illustrates the zero-level set of the proposed CP-NCBF with 99.99% safety guarantees (center), an unverified NCBF trained without robust loss (left), and a verified NCBF trained using the approach from [13] (right), at $\phi = 0$. All methods are trained on 20K training samples. It can be

observed that both the CP-NCBF and the verified NCBF avoid overlap with the unsafe region, while the unverified NCBF exhibits overlap due to learning errors. This highlights the necessity of verification in neural CBF design to ensure safety. Furthermore, the proposed CP-NCBF yields a larger safe set compared to the verified NCBF from [13], demonstrating that our approach reduces conservatism while maintaining high safety guarantees.

B. Geo-Fencing of Autonomous Aerial Vehicle

For our next case study, we consider the problem of geo-fencing an autonomous aerial vehicle. The control-affine dynamics of a 2D quadrotor are given as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \ddot{x}_1 \\ \ddot{x}_2 \\ \dot{\phi} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -g \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{m} \sin \phi & -\frac{1}{m} \sin \phi \\ \frac{1}{m} \cos \phi & \frac{1}{m} \cos \phi \\ \frac{1}{LJ} & -\frac{1}{LJ} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

where $[x_1, x_2, \phi, \dot{x}_1, \dot{x}_2, \dot{\phi}]^T \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^6$ represents the state vector comprising the position (x_1, x_2) and orientation ϕ of the vehicle. The inputs u_1 and u_2 correspond to the thrusts generated by the right and left motors, respectively, with mass m , moment of inertia J , and motor separation length $2L$. The gravitational constant is g . We normalize the parameters to $m = 1$ and $1/LJ = 1$ for simplicity.

The state space is defined as $\mathcal{X} = [-2, 2]^2 \times [-\pi, \pi] \times [-2, 2]^3$. The safe region is $\mathcal{X}_s = [-0.8, 0.8]^2 \times [-\pi, \pi] \times [-2, 2]^3$, while the unsafe region is $\mathcal{X}_u = \mathcal{X} \setminus [-1, 1]^2 \times [-\pi, \pi] \times [-2, 2]^3$. We train a neural CBF (NCBF) with two hidden layers of 128 neurons each and Softplus activation.

Figure 3 illustrates the performance of CP-NCBF at varying safety levels, compared to an unverified NCBF trained without a robust loss (left) at $\phi, \dot{x}_1, \dot{x}_2, \dot{\phi} = 0$, using 20K training samples. Notably, the verified NCBF proposed in [13] could not be implemented due to sample inefficiency and restrictive Lipschitz constraints, highlighting the scalability of our approach to high-dimensional autonomous systems. Consistent with the ground vehicle case, the zero-level set of CP-NCBF does not intersect the unsafe region, whereas such overlap is observed for the unverified NCBF.




Fig. 3: Visualization of learned NCBFs for the aerial vehicle at $\phi, \dot{x}_1, \dot{x}_2, \dot{\phi} = 0$ using 20K training samples: (Left) Unverified NCBF (without robust loss), (Center) CP-NCBF (with 99.5% safety guarantee), and (Right) CP-NCBF (with 99.99% safety guarantee). Bold black lines denote the zero-level sets.




Fig. 4: Conformal scores of the learned (unverified) NCBF for an aerial vehicle with different numbers of training samples at varying safety levels.

Figure 4 illustrates the conformal scores of the learned NCBF with varying numbers of training samples and safety levels. Consistent with the ground vehicle case, the conformal scores decrease as the sample size increases and rise when stricter safety guarantees are imposed. These results demonstrate the proposed framework’s ability to synthesize less conservative Neural CBFs in a sample-efficient and scalable manner, unlike existing verified NCBFs [13], which suffer from sample inefficiency and limited scalability.

VI. CONCLUSION

We propose CP-NCBF, a framework for synthesizing neural CBFs with probabilistic safety guarantees via split conformal prediction. Our method bridges the gap between learning-based synthesis and formal safety verification, enabling the construction of less conservative safe sets with improved sample efficiency. Case studies on autonomous driving and aerial vehicle geo-fencing tasks validate that our method achieves real-time safety and broadens the safe operational domain compared to existing approaches. Future work will extend this framework to more complex, high-dimensional systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Achiam, D. Held, A. Tamar, and P. Abbeel, “Constrained policy optimization,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 22–31.
- [2] S. Bansal, M. Chen, S. Herbert, and C. J. Tomlin, “Hamilton-Jacobi reachability: A brief overview and recent advances,” in *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2017.
- [3] M. Tayal, A. Singh, S. Kolathaya, and S. Bansal, “A physics-informed machine learning framework for safe and optimal control of autonomous systems,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.11057*, 2025.
- [4] A. D. Ames, X. Xu, J. W. Grizzle, and P. Tabuada, “Control barrier function based quadratic programs for safety critical systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 8, pp. 3861–3876, 2017.
- [5] A. D. Ames, S. Coogan, M. Egerstedt, G. Notomista, K. Sreenath, and P. Tabuada, “Control barrier functions: Theory and applications,” in *18th European control conference (ECC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 3420–3431.
- [6] P. Jagtap, S. Soudjani, and M. Zamani, “Formal synthesis of stochastic systems via control barrier certificates,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 7, pp. 3097–3110, 2020.
- [7] A. Robey, H. Hu, L. Lindemann, H. Zhang, D. V. Dimarogonas, S. Tu, and N. Matni, “Learning control barrier functions from expert demonstrations,” in *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2020, pp. 3717–3724.
- [8] H. Zhao, X. Zeng, T. Chen, and Z. Liu, “Synthesizing barrier certificates using neural networks,” in *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on hybrid systems: Computation and control*, 2020, pp. 1–11.
- [9] A. Abate, D. Ahmed, A. Edwards, M. Giacobbe, and A. Peruffo, “Fossil: A software tool for the formal synthesis of Lyapunov functions and barrier certificates using neural networks,” in *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, 2021, pp. 1–11.
- [10] Q. Zhao, X. Chen, Z. Zhao, Y. Zhang, E. Tang, and X. Li, “Verifying neural network controlled systems using neural networks,” in *25th ACM International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, 2022, pp. 1–11.
- [11] C. Dawson, Z. Qin, S. Gao, and C. Fan, “Safe nonlinear control using robust neural Lyapunov-barrier functions,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 1724–1735.
- [12] M. Anand and M. Zamani, “Formally verified neural network control barrier certificates for unknown systems,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 2431–2436, 2023.
- [13] M. Tayal, A. Zhang, P. Jagtap, A. Clark, and S. Kolathaya, “Learning a formally verified control barrier function in stochastic environment,” in *2024 IEEE 63rd Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2024, pp. 4098–4104.
- [14] M. Tayal, A. Singh, P. Jagtap, and S. Kolathaya, “Semi-supervised safe visuomotor policy synthesis using barrier certificates,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12616*, 2024.
- [15] A. N. Angelopoulos and S. Bates, “A gentle introduction to conformal prediction and distribution-free uncertainty quantification,” 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.07511>
- [16] V. Vovk, “Conditional validity of inductive conformal predictors,” 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1209.2673>