

Hybrid Control Systems Verification

Steve Miller, Darren Cofer March 4, 2009



© Copyright 2010 Rockwell Collins, Inc. All rights reserved.



What kind of hybrid systems are we interested in?

- Product of model-based design
 - built using Simulink/Stateflow or similar MBD environment

Specific subset of the standard control theoretic definition of HS

- Combines discrete and continuous dynamics
 - state machines, switches, logic
 - linear/non-linear functions and operators
- Often include floating-point types







Research Challenges We Are Looking for Help With

- Floating point types
- Non-linear arithmetic
- Extracting controller requirements
- Combined methods and tools approaches
- Model checking of asynchronous systems
- Trusted verification tools



Research Challenges: Floating-Point Types

• Most Industrial Models Contain Floating-Point Types

- Double is the default type for MATLAB Simulink
- Engineers can use floating-point for simulation and implementation
- Inability to handle floating-point math is becoming a significant barrier to the acceptance of model checking in industry

• Theorem Proving of Models with Floating-Point Types

- Great work done at Intel, AMD on correctness of FP implementations
- Focused on bit-level accuracy & small models
- We are not so concerned with bit-accuracy
 - Prefer to sacrifice completeness rather than soundness
- Scalability of theorem proving is a major concern for us
 - We have much larger models to verify, e.g. Effector Blender: 166 subsystems, 2100+ basic blocks, matrix multiplications, etc.

• Model Checking of Models with Floating-Point Types

- Bit-level integer solvers are impressive and improving: works well for fixed-point numbers
- IEEE 754 provides a clear standard for floating-point math
- Decision procedures for floating-point types should be possible
- Probably technically difficult

Ed Clarke:

Decision procedures for real arithmetic that handle floating point arithmetic



Research Challenges: Non-Linear Arithmetic

• Non-linear Arithmetic is Common in Industrial Models

- Usually appear in conjunction with floating-point types
- We can translate floating point to real numbers for some problems
 - May hide errors caused by floating point approximations
 - Still useful for debugging rather than proof

• Some Uses of Real Numbers Are Appropriate

- Modeling the real world
- Aircraft trajectories, plant models, etc

• Transcendental Functions

- Trigonometric functions are common in navigation
- Need an efficient way to deal with the most common functions sin, arcsin, cos, arcos, tan, arctan, etc.

• Progress is Being Made

- Recent work on non-linear decision procedures for reals [Tiwari]

Ed Clarke:

Decision procedures for real arithmetic that handles floating point arithmetic



Research Challenges: Extracting Controller Requirements

• Determining Requirements for Controllers

- System requirements are often stated as properties of the combined controller and plant model
- The plant model is usually larger than controller model, preventing effective analysis
- Unclear what are the true requirements for the controller model itself

Possible Directions

- Can useful requirements for the controller be automatically derived from the controller/plant model?
- Is there an automated way to produce a conservative abstraction of the plant model?
- Can we use properties proven in the control domain to simplify analysis of the controller?

Rance Cleveland, Patrick Cousot, Bruce Krogh:

- Conservatively approximating plant models.
- Plant discretization for discrete analysis.
- Abstracting the plant for open-loop static analysis of the controller.
- Reactivity properties of the closed discrete/continuous loop.
- Assume-guarantee strategies for plant/controller decomposition.
- Extracting requirements from controller models using machine-learning on test data.



Research Challenges: Combined Approaches

- Abstract Interpretation tools [Cousot ASTREE] are very impressive for well-formedness properties
 - Can Abstract Interpretation be integrated with model checking?
 - E.g., as decision procedures for SMT?

• How do we leverage multiple tools?

- Can theorem proving and model-checking be combined to make the formal verification of complex models tractable?
- Can we use integer/fixed-point model checking results to make claims about a floating-point implementation?
 - Replace floating point types in model F with integer/fixed point types to produce model I
 - Under what conditions does a proof about model I tell us something useful about model F?

Ed Clarke, Patrick Cousot, Scott Smolka:

- Combining model checking and abstract interpretation
- Temporal properties and specifications
- Abstractionrefinement alternatives to counter-example guided abstraction refinement



Research Challenges: Model Checking of Asynchronous Systems

• Many Industrial Systems are Asynchronous

- Components execute synchronously on their own clock
- System consists of components that communicate via buses
- Clocks of the components are not synchronous
- Many systems are quasi-synchronous
 - Nodes have same periods (or multiple of same period)
 - Offset, drift, or jitter may vary between nodes
 - No node can step more than two times before any other node steps once

• What is the Right Computational Model

- Attach clocks to each node?
- Model synchrony, asynchrony, and quasi-synchrony by constraining the clocks?

• What are the Right Verification Engines

- SMV and NuSMV work well for synchronous models
- SPIN works well for some asynchronous models
- Can we choose or tune a model checker based on the type and degree of asynchrony?

Patrick Cousot:

- Extension of Astree for parallel programs running on ARINC 653
- Abstract interpretation for verification of quasisynchronous parallel execution of synchronous programs



Research Challenges: Trusted Verification Tools

• Need Supported Tools

- Open source is fine
- Tool is distinct (separate install) from other tools
- Doesn't become a part of our products
- Our evaluation period may last for years
- Need to be able to license for commercial use

DO-178B/C Qualification

- Major selling point for civil avionics developers
- Not that hard for verification tools
 - Need tool operational requirements
 - Need set of tests that show tool satisfies its requirements
- We know how to do this!

More Formal Paths to Trusted Tools

- Proof checker
- Redundant tools
- Formally verified tools







Background Slides



Outline

- What kind of hybrid systems are we interested in?
- What are we trying to do?
- What can we do now?
- What are the limitations?
- What have we tried?



All rights reserved.

What are we trying to do?

- Detailed model of controller
 - Should correspond closely to implementation
 - Verify model correctness with respect to requirements
- Simple model of plant/environment
 - Provide constraints on input values
 - Limit complexity of analysis
- Verification of software requirements
 - vs. closed-loop behavior of system













Gryphon translation framework

- Supports a wide variety of back end tools and languages
- Straightforward to add new tools (e.g. Prover support: 4 days effort
- Apply "the right tool for the job"





What are the limitations?

Rockwell

• This approach works well for certain classes of systems...

- Very well for discrete types (Booleans, enumerated types)
- Can handle a restricted number of integers
- Real numbers with linear operations

…and scales to very large models

- 16,117 Simulink blocks, 4,295 subsystems, 1.5 10³⁷ reachable states

• But we don't have a general strategy to handle "numerically intensive" hybrid systems

- Analyzing non-linear operations
 - Most industrial models have non-linear operations
 - Most model checkers do not natively support non-linear arithmetic over reals
 - Theorem provers require skilled users and are labor intensive
- Floating-Point math
 - Floats \neq Reals (run-time errors)
 - Floating point arithmetic is notoriously difficult to analyze
- Scaling the analysis
 - Much more difficult to scale model checkers on numeric models



What have we tried?

• Predicate abstraction

- Suitable for models with a handful of non-linear constraints
- Add model invariants to exclude spurious counterexamples
- Offline "counterexample-driven refinement"

Model linearization

- Arbitrary non-linear calculations are difficult
- Need to use piecewise approximation
- Requires significant amount of analysis
- Approximation leads to incompleteness & unsoundness

• Fixed-point representation of data

- Fixed point numbers can be represented as integers
 - same cost as linear integer operations
 (e.g., 2 divide-by-constants, 1 MOD-by-constant, 2 multiplications-by-variable)
- Model checkers allow non-linear operations on bit-level integers
- Pros
 - Can analyze models "as is" without changes
 - Gets around non-linear limitations of decision procedures
 - Can achieve soundness using intervals
- Cons
 - Need bounds for all vars, scalability limits, incomplete (intervals diverge)



Summary

• Our wish list:

- We want to analyze large, non-linear numeric models
- Bit-level accuracy is often not a concern
 - We would rather sacrifice completeness than soundness
 - But, for now, any rigorous analytic tool would be helpful
- Approximations (such as interval arithmetic) will probably be necessary
- Can we have "adjustable" accuracy?
 - Higher accuracy likely means lower performance
- Work on notations and methodologies for control system requirements

• What we can provide:

- Some example problems
- Feedback on proposed tools and algorithms
- Ability to translate Simulink/Stateflow models into a variety of backend notations.
- Experience applying model checkers and theorem provers on industrial-sized problems