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BACKGROUND
UTILITY OF FORMAL METHODS IN REAL-WORLD SOFTWARE HAS BEEN SHOWN

**Software-Based Crypto Device**
- FM's used in certification of security
- EAL6+ Common Criteria evaluation
- Formal security model, formal verif., demo that C code satisfies formal model

**Weapons Control Panel**
- Large complex program (~30KLOC)
- Contractor software req. spec: 250+ vars
- Translated into a formal model in 2 wks.
- Model checking showed that all six safety properties violated!

**International Space Station**
- Failure Detection, Isolation & Recovery in Thermal Radiator Rotary software module
- Translating semiformal req. documents into a formal spec exposed two serious errors!

**Lockheed Martin**
- Since 1999, SCR tools used by 3 sites
- “We currently are supporting close to 1500 models…and have found SCR Tool suite to be…invaluable…in finding requirements defects, as well as validating the functional behaviour of our software requirements.”
DEVELOPING CORRECT SOFTWARE IS BECOMING EVEN MORE CHALLENGING

• Prior focus of FMs: Embedded Systems
  - An **embedded system** is immersed in a physical system that it monitors and controls
  - Focus in development is on the embedded system only

• New Challenge for FMs: Cyber Physical Systems
  - A **cyber physical system** combines a digital system performing computation with physical processes
  - **Problem:** Managing the dynamics, timing and concurrency in both the digital system and physical processes

• Imp. Class of CPSs: (Intelligent) Unmanned/Autonomous Systems

Problem for Unmanned Systems: Human Mistrust of Automation/Autonomy

- **Two kinds of trust needed***
  - **System Trust**: Human confidence that system behaves as intended
  - **Operational Trust**: Human confidence that system helps him/her perform the assigned tasks

- **To achieve system trust**
  - Need **high assurance** that system satisfies its requirements
    - **formal modeling, formal verification**

- **To achieve operational trust**
  - Need well-designed HCI *and human validation* that the designed autonomy will help
    - **formal modeling, model-based simulation**

*Dan Zwillinger, Ratheon, S5, 2014.
A SOLID BASIS FOR OBTAINING SYSTEM & OPERATIONAL TRUST: A FORMAL MODEL

BENEFITS OF A FORMAL SYSTEM MODEL

- Can be verified to satisfy the required system properties ⇒ system trust
- Can be validated to show that it captures the intended behavior ⇒ operational trust

PROBLEM IN CURRENT SOFTWARE PRACTICE

- Formal system/requirements models are rare
  - Practitioners regard formal notations as difficult to understand and apply; don’t think that formal models scale, are cost-effective*
- When they do exist, formal models are often
  - Ambiguous: Rep’d in languages w/o a formal semantics
  - Expressed at a low level of abstraction

OBTAINING A FORMAL MODEL: A PROMISING APPROACH

- Synthesize a formal model from scenarios

SCENARIO-BASED
FORMAL MODEL
SYNTHESIS
Already significant research on this problem

- Most research based on Message Sequence Charts (MSCs)
  - Many practitioners use MSCs to specify requirements
  - Natural therefore to develop methods which synthesize formal models from MSCs

- Why Introduce Yet Another Method?
  - The SCR notation scales, is expressive and understandable by practitioners
  - SCR tools have already been used successfully 1) to detect errors in and 2) to verify both models and source code
  - While developers have difficulty creating tabular specs, they can readily extend & modify models expressed as tables
  - A model generated from scenarios is inherently incomplete; the SCR CC automatically finds incompleteness in a model
  - SCR makes available a wide range of tools for formal model analysis and validation, test generation, code generation, etc.
A Moded Scenarios Description (MSD) has three components

- A set of Event Sequence Charts (ESCs)
  - Inspired by MSCs
  - Look like MSCs
- A Mode Diagram
- A Scenario Constraint
  - Defines initial variable values
  - Specifies assumptions and properties (e.g., safety and security)
  - Defines constants, and state invariants

Numeric Labels link the Mode Diagram with the ESCs

Ref. [1] presents our new scenario language, a mathematical model that defines its semantics, and two algorithms for generating definitions of the dependent variables from elements of the MSD

Formal Model Synthesis from a MSD: Event Sequence Chart

Agent-Control

1. $m_{UAV_i} = \text{unsafe}$

6. $m_{OpFix_i} = \text{False}$
   - $t_{Fixated_i} = \text{False}$

7. $m_{dist2haz_i} \leq \text{minD}$
   - WHEN $t_{Fixated_i} = \text{False}$

8. $m_{UAV_i} = \text{safe}$

$d_{UAV_i} = \text{unsafe}$

$d_{NewWP_i} = x$

$c_{NewWP_i} = x$

$d_{UAV_i} = \text{safe}$
Formal Model Synthesis from a Modeled Scenarios Description

Scenarios specified as ESCs

Mode Diagram

FORMAL MODEL

Scenario Constraint
Formal System Model Synthesis: Method

1. Scenarios
2. Modes
3. Mode Transitions
4. Monitored Vars & Their Types
5. Controlled Vars & Their Types
6. Events triggering changes in controlled variables

- Functions defining controlled variable values:
  - $F_X : M \times E \rightarrow M$
  - $F_{c_1} : M \times E \rightarrow TY(c_1)$
Formal System Model Synthesis: Method

1. Scenarios
2. Modes
3. Mode Transitions
4. Monitored Vars & Their Types
5. Controlled Vars & Their Types
6. Events triggering changes in controlled variables
7. Synthesized Formal Model
8. Consistency Checker

- Manual
- Totally Automated

- Functions defining controlled variable values
- Functions defining mode transitions
- Detect violations of completeness, disjointness,...
• If two UAVs are on a collision course, the system notifies the operator within 0.5 s.
• If a UAV has no assigned target, the system notifies the operator within 1 s.

Formal System Model Synthesis: Method

1. Scenarios
2. Monitored Vars & Their Types
3. Controlled Vars & Their Types
4. Events triggering changes in controlled variables
5. Functions defining controlled variable values
6. F(c₁): M x E -> TY(c₁)
7. Synthesized Formal Model
8. Properties
9. • If two UAVs are on a collision course, the system notifies the operator within 0.5 s.
   • If a UAV has no assigned target, the system notifies the operator within 1 s.
   • ...
Synthesized Formal Model: Provides Basis for Validation

1. Scenarios

2. Monitored Vars & Their Types
   - $m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_k$
   - $t(m_1), t(m_2), \ldots, t(m_k)$

3. Controlled Vars & Their Types
   - $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_l$
   - $t(c_1), t(c_2), \ldots, t(c_l)$

4. Events triggering changes in controlled variables
   - $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_v$

5. Events triggering mode transitions
   - $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_u$

6. Functions defining controlled variable values
   - $F(c_1): M \times E \rightarrow TY(c_1)$

7. Synthesized Formal Model

8. Modes
   - $\mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_n$
   - $(\mu_1, \mu_2)$
   - $(\mu_1, \mu_3)$
   - $(\mu_{n-1}, \mu_n)$

9. Transitions
   - $t(m_1), t(m_2), \ldots, t(m_k)$
   - $t(c_1), t(c_2), \ldots, t(c_l)$

10. Validate Model & Assumptions
    - Manual
    - Totally Automated

Assumption is/is not valid
Our Tool’s Representation of a Moded Scenario Description

Template defining initial values of variables

Template containing a single assertion

Mode Diagram
The Formal Model Synthesized from the MSD
3-D Simulator
Simulators Based on a Formal Model

Many just have textual displays

A few (e.g., SCR, Statemate) allow creation of custom 2D GUIs

Logs each state change and notifies user when violations of assumptions or specified properties occur

Simple features such as buttons, switches, and dials

Limitations

No 3D, discrete computation only, no continuous movement
Two Types of Simulators: Formal Model Based vs Application-Specific

Approach: Integrate a formal model based simulator with an application-specific simulator

Process

1. **Choose an appropriate application/domain simulator:** Represents system’s physical aspects and its operational environment

2. **Use two simulators:** E.g.,
   - a customized formal model based simulator as the system controller and
   - the application-specific simulator to represent the dynamic behavior of the system environment

3. **Integrate the two simulators:** Allows communications between the two at appropriate points during execution

Benefits of Integration

- From application-specific simulator: more realistic simulation
- From formal model tools (including simulator): formal foundation that allows notification of property violations during simulation
eBotworks*: An Application-Specific Simulator for UGVs (Unmanned Ground Vehicles)

- Simulator and testbed for autonomy software for command and control of unmanned systems
- Built to support locomotion and path planning
- Wheeled UGV is the choice of vehicle we selected
- Using eBotworks, we built a simulated world containing landmarks (e.g., roads) and objects (e.g., packages, vehicles)

Integrating eBotworks with the SCR Simulator

- User inputs (e.g., commands to perform a task and changes in trust measure) given via SCR simulator and passed to eBotworks
- eBotworks performs actions associated with commands, sending information about vehicle status and location back to SCR
- Integration via shared files

System Controller: Customized GUI
Front-End for the SCR Simulator

eBotworks: Displays system environment, vehicle location & motion, path planning
Validation of UGV Model: Property Checking During Simulation Exposed an Error

Task: Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)

Bringing explosive ordnance home = UNWANTED SYSTEM BEHAVIOR

Unloading explosive ordnance before coming home = INTENDED SYSTEM BEHAVIOR
SUMMARY AND
FUTURE WORK

● **Benefit of Formal Methods Tools: High Assurance**

● **Two Important Gaps in Formal Methods Tools**

  1. Getting an initial model
     - Addressed by synthesizing model from scenarios
  2. Simulating 3D, motion, continuous behavior
     - Addressed by integrating formal methods simulator with application-specific simulator

● **Future Work:**
  - Improved tool support for specifying scenarios and model synthesis
  - Develop SCR simulator interface to facilitate future integrations
  - Integrate SCR simulator with other application-specific simulators with more capabilities
    - AV2 Ground Vehicle
    - Unmanned Cargo Transport Helicopter
Role of Formal Methods in Developing “Intelligent” Autonomous Systems

- Needed research “ranges from economics, law, and philosophy to computer security [and] formal methods”

- “As autonomous systems become more prevalent in society, it becomes increasingly important that they robustly behave as intended. The development of autonomous vehicles, …autonomous weapons, etc., has therefore stoked interest in high-assurance systems where strong robustness guarantees can be made”

- “…society will reject autonomous agents unless we have some credible means of making them safe”

- **Formal verification and validation are critical…**

1“Research priorities for robust and beneficial artificial intelligence,” Future of Life Institute, Jan. 2015
2“Benefits and risks of artificial intelligence,” T. G. Dietterich, President, AAAI, Jan. 2015