Validation and Verification of Time Properties of the Functional Level of Autonomous Vehicles

Félix Ingrand (Mohammed Foughali, Anthony Mallet) LAAS-RIS

October 10, 2017



© Félix Ingrand, LAAS/CNRS, 2017

Autonomous Vehicle and Software



Software represents a large part of the development of Autonomous Vehicle, yet, most of it is not V&V...

...while it is for some of these complex systems:



Robotic Software Architecture





© Félix Ingrand, LAAS/CNRS, 2017

Robotic Software Architecture







Robotic Software Architecture







What do robotic software developers want?

- Check that the autonomous bus drives safely — Stop in time when an obstacle has been detected
- The door does no open while moving
- Speed command is produced "timely"
- ---- Path following remain in bound
- Check that the robot has a consistant perception/ action loop
- Laser scan/freq and range
- speed control (freq and value)
- Time for an emergency stop





What do robotic software developers want?

- Check that the drone flies safely
 - Tasks are scheduled as specified
- Control laws are properly run
- ---- Propeller velocity command is produced "timely"
- Consistant perception/action loop
- Localisation properly "merged"
- Time taken for an emergency stop (hover in the current place)
 - No deadlock upon start





Software Validation and Verification

- Require formal models and "checking" techniques
- either with models directly "verifiable" (e.g., Petri nets, timed automata, etc)
- or with models which can be obtained or "translated" from specifications



Different Situations w.r.t. Using Formal Models on Autonomous Robots

Already model based (decisional : planning, monitoring, FDIR, observing)

Directly using formal framework (e.g. synchronous approaches: Esterel/Lustre/Signal) (Mihaela's talk)

No model at all (checking the code after "formalizing" what it does or the properties it should satisfy)

Partial models (software engineering models: e.g. GenoM; specification models: UML, RobotML, etc; components based: BCM)





Different Situations w.r.t. Using Formal Models on Autonomous Robots

Already model based (decisional : planning, monitoring, FDIR, observing)

Directly using formal framework (e.g. synchronous approaches: Esterel/Lustre/Signal) (Mihaela's talk)

No model at all (checking the code after "formalizing" what it does or the properties it should satisfy)

Partial models (software engineering models: e.g. GenoM; specification models: UML, RobotML, etc; components based: BCM)





Our Approach

- Functional level : GenoM
- Modules
 - Services (control flow)— Ports (data flow)
 - BIP (Verimag)
 - Fiacre/TINA (LAAS/VerTICS)
 - UPPAAL (Uppsala & Aalborg University)



Model-Driven Software Engineering

> Formal Methods/ Frameworks



Our Approach

- Functional level : GenoM
- Modules
 - Services (control flow)— Ports (data flow)
 - BIP (Verimag)
 - Fiacre/TINA (LAAS/VerTICS)
 - UPPAAL (Uppsala & Aalborg University)

LAAS

Model-Driven Software Engineering

> Formal Methods/ Frameworks



GenoM

- To design a typical generic module which will be instantiated according to each specific module
- a module is a program
- a module has I/O

4AS Enrs

- control: requests to start services/reports their results
- data: ports in(to read external data) and out (to write external data)
- it supports a cyclic control task (aperiodic)
- and one or more cyclic tasks, periodic or aperiodic
- it provides services (fast and slow) to which we will associate C/C++ code
 - in the control task
 - and the executions task(s)
- the slow one can have different steps (automata) to perform their processing
- services share a common data structure for the need of their computation (parameters, computed values, internal state variables, etc)
- execution tasks may have a permanent activity
- there may be exceptions, and incompatible services (they cannot run at the same time)



GenoM

- Specify components
 - IDS
 - Ports
 - Tasks
 - Services
 - Attribute, function and activity (automata)
 and attached codels...



GenoM .gen & codels (example)



GenoM .gen & codels (example)

Why are GenoM specifications good for V&V?

- Codel granularity (better parallelism specification)
- Internal and external shared data access is <u>fully specified</u> (ports, IDS, and nothing else)
- Automata specification provides execution sequence and time/period management
 - Task are clearly specified (how many, periodic, sporadic)
 - **Template mechanism...**

Three V&V frameworks

—— BIP (Verimag)

TINA/Fiacre (LAAS/Vertics)

UPPAAL (Uppsala & Aalborg University)

© Félix Ingrand, LAAS/CNRS, 2017

© Félix Ingrand, LAAS/CNRS, 2017

GenoM to BIP

man

Functional Level

robmotion

Task:

Init GotoPosition

Stop

robloco

odo 50ms

Services:

InitPort

GetPos

OdoStart

OdoStop

pos

Task:

Services:

motion 500ms

speed

Task[.]

track 50ms

Services:

TSStart

TSStop

A template that produces the BIP model of any GenoM specification for the PocoLibs implementation

example:

/* plan timer */

atom type TIMER_plan_robmotion() clock c unit millisecond export port Port tick() place loop initial to loop

> on tick from loop to loop provided (c>=500.0) do { c = 0; }

end

robmap

Task:

map 50ms Services:

FuseMap StopFuse

scan

roblaser

Init

Task:

scan 50ms

Services:

StartScan

Fiacre example

```
process sender [mbuff: out packet, abuff: in packet] is
   states idle, send, waita
   var ssn, n: seqno := false // ssn is current sequence number
   from idle
       /* should also retrieve data from user */
        to waita
   from send
       mbuff! ssn:
       to waita
   from waita
     select
        abuff? n;
        if n = ssn
        then ssn := not ssn
        end;
        to idle
        [] wait ]4,5];
        /* resend */
        to send
      end
```


ABP FIACRE example automatically translated to Time Petri Net (TINA)

GenoM to Fiacre

robmap

Init

Fus

Task:

map 50ms Services:

stopFuse

Functional Level

robmotion

Task: motion 500ms

Init GotoPosition

Stop

Services:

A template that produces the Fiacre model of any GenoM specification for the PocoLibs implementation

example:

TINA (GotoPosition Service Automata)

The complete model for RobMotion

- 250 places
- 506 transitions

GenoM to UPPAAL

A template that produces the UPPAAL model of any GenoM specification **Functional Level** robmap robmotion Task: Task: for the PocoLibs implementation map 50ms motion 500ms Services: Services: map Init Init GotoPosition FuseMap StopFuse Stop example: speed \bigcirc robloco x:=0, mutex_robmotion[5]:= tru Task: Task[.] odo 50ms track 50ms Task: Services: Services: scan 50ms TSStart InitPort Services: pos GetPos TSStop Init OdoStart StartScan OdoStop -=0 m StopScan MonitorArea finished_plan_robmoti mutex robmotion[6]:= false lock pla an robmotion.name == GotoPosition robmotion && motion:- tru bmotion.inst == instance && finished plan robmotion = true ion.status == STOP rol on[9]:= false bmotion) lock_plan_robi finished_plan_ mutex robr f(10) = falseImutex lock plan robmotion:= false $x \le 0.0$ path blocked 2 irn plan robmotion name -- Co ion.name == GotoPosition_r mutex obmotion[4] notion.inst == instance && it geedRefPort_robmotion[9]:= true motion status == RUN rohmoti robmotion[4 tion:= false, x:= 0 obmotion && utex robmotion[10]:= tru ause_read_ports lock | x:=0, mu write por **Model Checking** AAS x:=0, mu motion[8]:= false

© Félix Ingrand, LAAS/CNRS, 2017

Verification results FIACRE/TINA

✓ Schedulability of execution tasks

property sched is always (navigation/robmap/manager/state manage) => not (navigation/robmap/manager/value tick)

Verification with TINA: FALSE

✓ Progress of activities

property no_block is (navigation/robmap/manager/state manage) leadsto (navigation/robmap/manager/state start)

Verification with TINA: TRUE

\checkmark Position port update bounded in time

Final result 1 second and 274 ms

✓ RobMotion Stop leads to RobLoco stopping the robot

property bounded_stop_1 is (robmotion/control_task/state Stop_req) leadsto (robmotion/GotoPosition/state stop) within [0,0.5] property bounded_stop_2 is (robmotion/GotoPosition/state stop) leads to leave (robloco/TSStart/state update) within [0,0.06]

Verification results FIACRE/TINA

✓ Schedulability of execution tasks

property schedulability_main is always (microkopter/main/state executing ⇒ not (main_period_signal))

Verification with TINA: FALSE

Hold for all tasks with an octo-core but not with a quad-core ODROID-C0

Verification with UPPAAL

- ✓ Overall, similar properties than the one expressed in Fiacre
- ✓ SMC extension to take into account the probability transition in the service automata

codel<start> nhfc_main_start(...) yield init; codel<init> nhfc_main_init(...)yield pause::init, control; codel<control> nhfc_main_control(...)yield pause::control; codel<stop> mk_main_stop(...)yield ether;

nhfc: 1 transitions for main, from nhfc_start to nhfc_init. nhfc: 134679 transitions for main, from nhfc_init to nhfc_pause_init. nhfc: 1 transitions for main, from nhfc_init to nhfc_control. nhfc: 379484 transitions for main, from nhfc_control to nhfc_pause_control. nhfc: 1 transitions for main, from nhfc_stop to nhfc_ether.

nhfc: nhfc_main_start called: 1 times, wcet: 0.000293. nhfc: nhfc_main_init called: 134680 times, wcet: 0.000018. nhfc: nhfc_main_control called: 379484 times, wcet: 0.000035. nhfc: mk_main_stop called: 1 times, wcet: 0.000019.

Current GenoM V&V templates

Middleware

Framework		Offline PocoLibs	Online PocoLibs	Online ROS
	BIP	+ RT D-Finder	++	Under Dev
	FIACRE	++	Under Dev	Proposal
	UPPAAL	+++		
	UPPAAL SMC	++		

- The Fiacre-PocoLibs template is complete and tested on numerous modules (model over multiple modules and ports communication), UPPAAL has a slight performance advantage.
- The **BIP**-PocoLibs model is complete, but has been a disappointment with respect to RT D-Finder

The **BIP**-PocoLibs model for the BIP Engine is complete and functional, but the BIP Engine needs more work

Current state, limit of the approach

- Added the WCET declaration in the .gen specification file, but we are NOT checking codels
 - We are not checking against a model of the environment
- —— Specific scheduling policy (no preemption) and codel non-interruptibility...
 - Still requires good knowledge of GenoM AND the formal framework as to write properties to check, and analyse the results...

Conclusion

We derive a formal model from robotic functional component specification

- We get a very fine grained and low level formal model of the complete functional layer internal code execution and interactions
- Three V&V techniques are considered: model checking (TINA/Fiacre & UPPAAL) and automatic invariant composition and satisfiability (BIP/RT-D-Finder).

BIP and now Fiacre also provide an engine to run the model

Long term research agenda

- Run Time Verification

- Deeper model (codel arguments, SDI, algo, check the codel, etc)

Evolve toward decisional level (Planning/Acting/Monitoring)

— Clarify platform dependent model (scheduling policy, #CPU/#Core)

© Félix Ingrand, LAAS/CNRS, 2017

TO COMPLETE YOUR REGISTRATION, PLEASE TELL US WHETHER OR NOT THIS IMAGE CONTAINS A STOP SIGN: ANSWER QUICKLY-OUR SELF-DRIVING CAR IS ALMOST AT THE INTERSECTION. 50 MUCH OF "AI" IS JUST FIGURING OUT WAYS

Thanks to

TO OFFLOAD WORK ONTO RANDOM STRANGERS.

Verimag: Saddek Bensalem, Jacques Combaz, Souha Ben-Rayana

LAAS/VerTICS: Bernard Berthomieu, Silvano Dal Zilio, Pierre Emanuel Hladik

Mälardalen University: Cristina Seceleanu

Part of this work is funded by the H2020 European project CPSE Labs

