

Early Integration of Dependability Studies in the Design of Cyber-Physical Systems

Thuy NGUYEN - EDF R&D Marc BOUISSOU - EDF R&D 19 juin 2019



Summary

- Introduction
- FORM-L and the MODRIO approach
- Figaro
- The Heated Tank Example

Motivation

- Dependability studies are often performed long after design studies
 - By a specialised team that did not participate in the design
- Designers tend to focus on the normal functioning of the system
- They select components and add redundancies without being able to assess the dependability of the whole
- The dependability of cyber-physical systems (CPS) is often influenced by physical conditions
 - In particular during exceptional situations which may be hard to fully understand without physical simulation
 Errors are often revealed only after a prototype or a detailed simulation model is available
- If serious problems are discovered, redesign can result in very high costs and delays



Motivation

Examples

- Extreme ambient conditions (temperature, humidity, pressure) may be determined by the operation of the system and at the same time influence the dependability of its components
- Shocks, vibrations, clogging and wear may also influence the dependability of components





Approach & Principles

 A systems engineering approach that closely integrates dependability with the other design studies

At all stages of requirements elicitation and solutions design and V&V

- Formal specification, using the Form-L language, of requirements and preliminary solutions for the system
 - Including dependability and probabilistic aspects
- Automatic derivation of code to be inserted in
 - Physical simulation models, to check that deterministic requirements are not violated
 - Dependability models, to check compliance with probabilistic requirements
- Use of simulation and analysis at all engineering stages to verify that solutions comply with requirements
 - Dependability studies can guide the design of solutions even at early stages of engineering



Thrifty Modelling

- The engineering of a complex CPS requires the collaboration and coordination of many disciplines and teams
- Each discipline performs many different engineering activities
- Each activity may require its own model(s)
- There is a risk of
 - Inconsistency: models used for different activities could contradict one another
 - Waste of effort: different models could need the same information regarding the system (e.g., its architecture), but each in its own format

Thrifty modelling

- Allows the use of specific disciplinary models
- But avoids unnecessary duplication with the use of coordination models in FORM-L





Summary

- Introduction
- FORM-L and the MODRIO approach
- FIGARO
- The Heated Tank Example

FORM-L (FOrmal Requirements Modelling Language)



Various Forms of Modelling for Dynamic Phenomena

Non-formal or semi-formal modelling

- □ Natural language or drawings → often ambiguous
 - Examples: SADT or SysML
- \Box Limited analysis and simulation capabilities \rightarrow a problem for complex systems
- Individual models tend to address and be useful for only for a limited part of the lifecycle

well defined syntax & semantics

Deterministic formal modelling

- Given initial and boundary conditions, only one possible behaviour Deterministic Model
 - Examples: Modelica or finite elements models for physics, functional block diagrams for I&C, ...
- □ Detailed and accurate → only for downstream engineering activities
- □ In general, specific to a dis pipline
- Constraints-based formal modelling (for CPS: FORM-L)
 - Envelopes of expected behaviours: avoid over-specification, enables simplification and abstraction
 - To model requirements, assumptions and preliminary solutions
 - → for engineering activities along the complete lifecycle
 - Can also represent uncertainties and human variability



Constraints Model

Key Concepts

Variables

- Functions of time
- Booleans, integers, reals, quantities, finite state automata and statecharts, strings

Events

Goals

 Informal statement of what one aims at achieving

Properties

- Formal statement of a constraint (WHAT), a time locator (WHEN), and a spatial locator (WHERE)
- Deterministic vs probabilistic constraints
- Simple properties, objectives (formal statement of what one aims at achieving), requirements, assumptions

Refinement

 Step-by-step transformation of an informal goal into one or more informal or formal subgoals, and formal requirements



Justification

 One or more goals, objectives, requirements and assumptions that justify a refinement



Step-by-Step Refinement & Verification of Solutions



Summary

- Introduction
- FORM-L and the MODRIO approach
- FIGARO
- The Heated Tank Example

Figaro modeling language objectives

- Provide an appropriate formalism for generic descriptions of components
- Be more general than all usual reliability models
- Find the best trade-off between modelling power (or generality) and possibilities for the processing of models
- Be as legible as possible
- Be easily associated with graphic representations
- Have a formally defined semantics support consistency proofs

The Figaro language, developed in 1990, has been validated by hundreds of studies of complex systems



KB3 workbench principles



Benefits of MBSA with KB3

- Studies consistency
- Assumptions traceability and legibility
- Studies quality
- Productivity (40% to 80% time saving)
- Accessibility to non-specialists

• +

In nuclear PSAs, the KB3 models ensure

- □ a consistent coding of events, intermediate gates and top gates
- an easier exploitation of the models
- easy maintenance of models, over tens of years



Summary

- Introduction
- FORM-L and the MODRIO approach
- FIGARO
- The Heated Tank Example



Introduction to the Heated Tank

- The system purpose is to hold a reserve of warm water, with a certain degree of fault tolerance
- The heating device delivers a constant power
- A control system monitors the fluid level in the tank and sends orders to the pumps and the valve to keep the level in the range [6m, 8m]
 - One can consider it is represented by failure modes leading to pumps and valve stuck_on and stuck_off states
 - For the valve, "on" means open and "off" means closed
- The system is not repairable

Names in the models are those of the paper taken here as a reference:

Zhang H., Dufour F., Dutuit Y. and Gonzalez, K. (2009). Piecewise deterministic Markov processes and dynamic reliability. Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part O: *Journal of Risk and Reliability*, volume 222(4), pages 545–551.





FORM-L Model - Class HydroDevice

```
specific to each instance
class HydroDevice
                                                      failure rate depends on temperature
 Duration^-1 lambda hat is specific;
 Duration<sup>-1</sup> lambda is a(theta) * lambda hat;
 private Real a (Temperature t)
   Temperature<sup>-1</sup> b1 is 3.0295/ K;
   Temperature<sup>-1</sup> b2 is 0.7578/ K;
   Temperature<sup>^-1</sup> bc is 0.05756/ K;
   Temperature<sup>-1</sup> bd is 0.2301/ K;
   define value is (b1*exp(bc*(t-20*K)) + b2*exp(-bd*(t-20*K)))/(b1+b2);
 end a;
 automaton state (on, off, stuck on, stuck off)
                                                                             failures
   when t0 ensure value in {on, off};
   during value = on define (next becomes stuck on).rate = lambda;
   during value = on define (next becomes stuck off).rate = lambda;
   during value = off define (next becomes stuck on).rate = lambda;
   during value = off define (next becomes stuck off).rate = lambda;
   after value becomes stuck on define next is value;
   after value becomes stuck off define next is value,
                                                                 — no repair
 end state;
```

FORM-L Model - Pumps & Valve

```
HydroDevice pump_1
lambda_hat is 2.2831e-3/h;
when t0 define state is on; // Initial state
end pump_1;
HydroDevice pump_2
lambda_hat is 2.8571e-3/h;
when t0 define state is off; // Initial state
end pump_2;
HydroDevice valve_1
lambda_hat is 1.5625e-3/h;
when t0 define state is on; // Initial state
end valve_1;
```

```
HydroDevice valve_2
lambda_hat is 1.5625e-3/h;
when t0 define state is off;
end valve 2;
```

Could be added to the model to describe an architecture variant. The FORM-L model is designed to accept any number of pumps and valves (see next slides)



FORM-L Model - Tank 1/2





FORM-L Model - Tank 2/2

water level, defined by initial value and derivative Length level < when t0 define value is 7*m; define derivative is gg*(sum(for all p in input: p.v c)-sum(for all p in output: p.v c)); end level; water temperature, defined by initial value and derivative Temperature theta when t0 define value is 30.9261* C; define derivative is (gg*sum(for all p in input: p.v c)*(theta in-value) + 23.88915* C*m/h)/level; end theta; pumps control for all p in input begin during level <= min level and p.state = off define p.state.next is on; otherwise during level >= max level and p.state = on define p.state.next is off; otherwise ensure no (p.state.next leaves (on, off) towards (on, off)); end; valves control for all p in output begin during level <= min level and p.state = on define p.state.next is off; otherwise during level >= max level and p.state = off define p.state.next is on; otherwise ensure no (p.state.next leaves (on, off) towards (on, off)); end: end tank;

Translation into Figaro

This relatively simple model can be automatically translated into Figaro

- Figaro is dedicated to discrete systems, so the Figaro model will not be as precise as a truly hybrid model
- □ Work is ongoing to develop a translation tool (Form-L \rightarrow Figaro)



Excerpts of the Figaro model (1/2)

Definition of a clock to ensure a *maximum time difference* between two events

STEPS_ORDER

default_step; (* includes updates of continuous variables *) control; (* actions depending on continuous variables *) memorisation; (* derivatives at this instant are memorised *)

CLASS Clock;

CONSTANT time_step DOMAIN REAL DEFAULT 0.5; ATTRIBUTE tick DOMAIN BOOLEAN DEFAULT FALSE; last_event_date DOMAIN REAL DEFAULT 0;

OCCURRENCE IF NOT tick MAY_OCCUR TRANSITION t DIST T_C(time_step) INDUCING tick ;

INTERACTION (* The tick duration is zero *)

STEP memorisation IF tick THEN tick <-- FALSE; STEP memorisation THEN last_event_date <-- CURRENT_DATE ;

SYSTEM_OBJECT C IS_A Clock;

edf

In the class Tank

CLASS Tank;

sets of components in interaction with the tank

INTERFACE input KIND HydroDevice ; output KIND HydroDevice ;

ATTRIBUTE

level (* Height of the water in the tank *) DOMAIN REAL DEFAULT 7; der_level DOMAIN REAL DEFAULT 0; EFFECT level_updated ;

INTERACTION

STEP default_step (* update of level - Euler method *) IF NOT level_updated THEN level <-- level + der_level * (CURRENT_DATE - last_event_date(C)), level_updated; update of the derivative

STEP memorisation of the level THEN der_level <-- gg* (SUM FOR_ALL x AN input OF_TERMS v_c(x) -SUM FOR_ALL y AN output OF_TERMS v_c(y));

Excerpts of the Figaro model (2/2)

Definition of the control by hysteresis (in the Tank)

INTERACTION GIVEN p AN input STEP control IF level <= min_level AND state(p) = 'off' THEN state(p) <-- 'on';

GIVEN p AN input STEP control IF level >= max_level AND state(p) = 'on' THEN state(p) <-- 'off';

GIVEN p AN output STEP control IF level <= min_level AND state(p) = 'on' THEN state(p) <-- 'off';

GIVEN p AN output STEP control IF level >= max_level AND state(p) = 'off' THEN state(p) <-- 'on'; Definition of random failures in the class Hydrodevice

ATTRIBUTE state DOMAIN 'on' 'off' 'stuck_on' 'stuck_off' DEFAULT 'on'; The failure rate lambda is updated at each event (clock or other)

OCCURRENCE IF state='on' MAY_OCCUR_FAULT fail_stuck_on DIST EXP (lambda) INDUCING state <-- 'stuck_on';

IF state='on' MAY_OCCUR FAULT fail_stuck_off DIST EXP (lambda) INDUCING state <-- 'stuck_off';

IF state='off MAY_OCCUR FAULT fail_stuck_on DIST EXP (lambda) INDUCING state <--- 'stuck_on';

IF state='off MAY_OCCUR FAULT fail_stuck_off DIST EXP (lambda) INDUCING state <-- 'stuck_off';

Use of the Figaro model to compare 4 architectures



Simulation time : 6mn on a standard laptop for 10⁵ simulations Probability of the 3 undesirable events at 500 hours

Variant	2P1V	2P2V	1P2V	1P1V
eDryout	0.093	0.246	0.389	0.172
eBoiling	0.164	0.103	0.219	0.340
eOverflow	0.462	0.260	0.100	0.212
Total	0.719	0.609	0.708	0.725

How about deterministic requirements?

A similar approach can be applied with Modelica

- Deterministic requirements can be automatically translated into Modelica
 - Using the ReqSysPro Modelica library
- □ These requirements can then be checked automatically during Modelica simulations



Example of deterministic requirement: starting from the nominal state, whatever the failures, there can not be a shortage of water in less than x hours

ce serait bien de mettre l'exigence en Form-L et en Reqsyspro

Modelica model of the Heated tank



Conclusion

- On the basis of a simple example, we have illustrated the principles of the approach we propose for performing dependability studies very early in the engineering of cyber-physical systems, in close interaction with other engineering disciplines such as architecture design and physical processes studies
- We have also shown how a reference model in FORM-L can be automatically translated into FIGARO for dependability studies
- Translation from Form-L to Modelica has not been addressed in this paper, but other work is ongoing to integrate the requirements expressed in a FORM-L model into a Modelica solution model so that the satisfaction or violation of requirements can be automatically checked during simulation
- This approach saves time in models development and ensures consistency between models used by different disciplines



Thank you for your attention



Any questions?

