

Verification

Lecture 22

Bernd Finkbeiner



UNIVERSITÄT
DES
SAARLANDES

Plan for today

- ▶ Timed model checking

REVIEW: Timed CTL

Syntax of TCTL state-formulas over AP and set C :

$$\Phi ::= \text{true} \mid a \mid g \mid \Phi \wedge \Phi \mid \neg \Phi \mid E \varphi \mid A \varphi$$

where $a \in AP$, $g \in ACC(C)$ and φ is a path-formula defined by:

$$\varphi ::= \Phi U^J \Phi$$

where $J \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is an interval whose bounds are naturals

Forms of J : $[n, m]$, $(n, m]$, $[n, m)$ or (n, m) for $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \leq m$

for right-open intervals, $m = \infty$ is also allowed

REVIEW: Semantics of TCTL

For state $s = \langle \ell, \eta \rangle$ in $TS(TA)$ the satisfaction relation \models is defined by:

$s \models \text{true}$

$s \models a$ iff $a \in L(\ell)$

$s \models g$ iff $\eta \models g$

$s \models \neg \Phi$ iff not $s \models \Phi$

$s \models \Phi \wedge \Psi$ iff ($s \models \Phi$) and ($s \models \Psi$)

$s \models E \varphi$ iff $\pi \models \varphi$ for some $\pi \in Paths_{div}(s)$

$s \models A \varphi$ iff $\pi \models \varphi$ for all $\pi \in Paths_{div}(s)$

path quantification over time-divergent paths only

REVIEW: Semantics of TCTL

For time-divergent path $\pi \in s_0 \xrightarrow{d_0} s_1 \xrightarrow{d_1} \dots$:

$$\pi \models \Phi \text{ U }^J \Psi$$

iff

$$\exists i \geq 0. s_i + d \models \Psi \text{ for some } d \in [0, d_i] \text{ with } \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} d_k + d \in J$$

and

$$\forall j \leq i. s_j + d' \models \Phi \vee \Psi \text{ for every } d' \in [0, d_j] \text{ with } \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} d_k + d' \leq \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} d_k + d$$

TCTL-semantics for timed automata

- ▶ Let TA be a timed automaton with clocks C and locations Loc
- ▶ For TCTL-state-formula Φ , the satisfaction set $Sat(\Phi)$ is defined by:

$$Sat(\Phi) = \{s \in Loc \times Eval(C) \mid s \models \Phi\}$$

- ▶ TA satisfies TCTL-formula Φ iff Φ holds in all initial states of TA :

$$TA \models \Phi \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \forall \ell_0 \in Loc_0. \langle \ell_0, \eta_0 \rangle \models \Phi$$

where $\eta_0(x) = 0$ for all $x \in C$

Timed CTL versus CTL

- ▶ Due to ignoring time-convergent paths in TCTL semantics, possibly:

$$\underbrace{TS(TA) \models_{\text{TCTL}} A \varphi}_{\text{TCTL semantics}} \quad \text{but} \quad \underbrace{TS(TA) \not\models_{\text{CTL}} A \varphi}_{\text{CTL semantics}}$$

- ▶ CTL semantics considers all paths, timed CTL only time-divergent paths
- ▶ For $\Phi = AG(on \rightarrow AF off)$ and the light switch

$$TS(\text{Switch}) \models_{\text{TCTL}} \Phi \quad \text{whereas} \quad TS(TA) \not\models_{\text{CTL}} \Phi$$

- ▶ there are time-convergent paths on which location *on* is never left

Characterizing timelock

- ▶ TCTL semantics is also well-defined for TA with timelock
- ▶ A state is timelock-free if and only if it satisfies **EG true**
 - ▶ some time-divergent path satisfies $G \text{ true}$, i.e., there is ≥ 1 time-divergent path
 - ▶ note: for fair CTL, the states in which a fair path starts also satisfy $EG \text{ true}$
- ▶ TA is timelock-free iff $\forall s \in \text{Reach}(TS(TA)): s \models EG \text{ true}$
- ▶ Timelocks can thus be checked by model checking

TCTL model checking

- ▶ TCTL model-checking problem: $TA \models \Phi$ for non-Zeno TA

$$\underbrace{TA \models \Phi}_{\text{timed automaton}} \quad \text{iff} \quad \underbrace{TS(TA) \models \Phi}_{\text{infinite state graph}}$$

- ▶ Idea: consider a finite region graph $RG(TA)$
- ▶ Transform TCTL formula Φ into an “equivalent” CTL-formula $\widehat{\Phi}$
- ▶ Then: $TA \models_{\text{TCTL}} \Phi$ iff $\underbrace{RG(TA)}_{\text{finite state graph}} \models_{\text{CTL}} \widehat{\Phi}$

Eliminating timing parameters: TCTL \diamond

- ▶ Eliminate all intervals $J \neq [0, \infty)$ from TCTL formulas
 - ▶ introduce a fresh clock, z say, that does not occur in TA
 - ▶ $s \models EF^J \Phi$ iff reset z in $s \models F(z \in J \wedge \Phi)$
- ▶ Formally: for any state s of $TS(TA)$ it holds:

$$s \models E \Phi U^J \Psi \quad \text{iff} \quad \underbrace{s\{z := 0\}}_{\text{state in } TS(TA \oplus z)} \models E((\Phi \vee \Psi) U(z \in J) \wedge \Psi)$$

$$s \models A \Phi U^J \Psi \quad \text{iff} \quad \underbrace{s\{z := 0\}}_{\text{state in } TS(TA \oplus z)} \models A((\Phi \vee \Psi) U(z \in J) \wedge \Psi)$$

- ▶ where $TA \oplus z$ is TA (over C) extended with $z \notin C$

Clock equivalence

Impose an equivalence, denoted \cong , on the clock valuations such that:

- (A) Equivalent clock valuations satisfy the same clock constraints g in TA and Φ :

$$\eta \cong \eta' \Rightarrow (\eta \models g \text{ iff } \eta' \models g)$$

- ▶ no diagonal clock constraints are considered
 - ▶ all the constraints in TA and Φ are thus either of the form $x \leq c$ or $x < c$
- (B) Time-divergent paths originating from equivalent states are equivalent
- ▶ this property guarantees that equivalent states satisfy the same path formulas
- (C) The number of equivalence classes under \cong is finite

First observation

- ▶ $\eta \models x < c$ whenever $\eta(x) < c$, or equivalently, $\lfloor \eta(x) \rfloor < c$
 - ▶ $\lfloor d \rfloor = \max\{c \in \mathbb{N} \mid c \leq d\}$ and $\text{frac}(d) = d - \lfloor d \rfloor$
 - ▶ $\eta \models x \leq c$ whenever $\lfloor \eta(x) \rfloor < c$ or $\lfloor \eta(x) \rfloor = c$ and $\text{frac}(\eta(x)) = 0$
- $\Rightarrow \eta \models g$ only depends on $\lfloor \eta(x) \rfloor$, and whether $\text{frac}(\eta(x)) = 0$
- ▶ Initial suggestion: clock valuations η and η' are equivalent if:

$$\lfloor \eta(x) \rfloor = \lfloor \eta'(x) \rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad \text{frac}(\eta(x)) = 0 \text{ iff } \text{frac}(\eta'(x)) = 0$$

- ▶ **Note:** it is crucial that in $x < c$ and $x \leq c$, c is a natural

Second observation

- ▶ Consider location ℓ with $inv(\ell) = \text{true}$ and only outgoing transitions:
 - ▶ one guarded with $x \geq 2$ (action α) and $y > 1$ (action β)
- ▶ Let state $s = \langle \ell, \eta \rangle$ with $1 < \eta(x) < 2$ and $0 < \eta(y) < 1$
 - ▶ α and β are disabled, only time may elapse
- ▶ Transition that is enabled next depends on $x - 1 < y$ or $x - 1 \geq y$
 - ▶ e.g., if $frac(\eta(x)) \geq frac(\eta(y))$, action α is enabled first
- ▶ Suggestion for strengthening of initial proposal for all $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$ by:

$$frac(\eta(x)) \leq frac(\eta(y)) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad frac(\eta'(x)) \leq frac(\eta'(y))$$

Final observation

- ▶ So far, clock equivalence yield a denumerable though not finite quotient
 - ▶ For $TA \models \Phi$ only the clock constraints in TA and Φ are relevant
 - ▶ let $c_x \in \mathbb{N}$ the largest constant with which x is compared in TA or Φ
- ⇒ If $\eta(x) > c_x$ then the actual value of x is irrelevant
- ▶ constraints on \cong so far are only relevant for clock values of x (y) up to c_x (c_y)

Clock equivalence

Clock valuations $\eta, \eta' \in \text{Eval}(C)$ are equivalent, denoted $\eta \cong \eta'$, if:

- (1) for any $x \in C$: $(\eta(x) > c_x) \wedge (\eta'(x) > c_x)$ or
 $(\eta(x) \leq c_x) \wedge (\eta'(x) \leq c_x)$
- (2) for any $x \in C$: if $\eta(x), \eta'(x) \leq c_x$ then:

$$\lfloor \eta(x) \rfloor = \lfloor \eta'(x) \rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad \text{frac}(\eta(x)) = 0 \text{ iff } \text{frac}(\eta'(x)) = 0$$

- (3) for any $x, y \in C$: if $\eta(x), \eta'(x) \leq c_x$ and $\eta(y), \eta'(y) \leq c_y$, then:

$$\text{frac}(\eta(x)) \leq \text{frac}(\eta(y)) \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{frac}(\eta'(x)) \leq \text{frac}(\eta'(y)).$$

$$s \cong s' \quad \text{iff} \quad \ell = \ell' \quad \text{and} \quad \eta \cong \eta'$$

Regions

- ▶ The clock region of $\eta \in Eval(C)$, denoted $[\eta]$, is defined by:

$$[\eta] = \{ \eta' \in Eval(C) \mid \eta \cong \eta' \}$$

- ▶ The state region of $s = \langle \ell, \eta \rangle \in TS(TA)$ is defined by:

$$[s] = \langle \ell, [\eta] \rangle = \{ \langle s, \eta' \rangle \mid \eta' \in [\eta] \}$$

Number of regions

The number of clock regions is bounded from below and above by:

$$|C|! * \prod_{x \in C} c_x \leq \underbrace{\left| \text{Eval}(C) / \cong \right|}_{\text{number of regions}} \leq |C|! * 2^{|C|-1} * \prod_{x \in C} (2c_x + 2)$$

where for the upper bound it is assumed that $c_x \geq 1$ for any $x \in C$

the number of state regions is $|Loc|$ times larger