

European Space Agency







Catalogue of System and Software Properties (CSSP)

Final Presentation of ESA Contract No. 4000112344/14/NL/FE ESA/ESTEC, December 7, 2016

Panagiotis Katsaros Aristotle Un. of Thessaloniki (GR) Simon Bliudze École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (CH)

Main objective of the CSSP

A model-based requirements specification approach in the System & Software Development Lifecycle.

Early discovery and resolution of design correctness and consistency issues

verification of design models against formal properties derived from the requirements

Ultimate Aim:

2/34

to reduce the high cost of corrective measures applied in the late phases of the lifecycle.

Requirements, properties & design models

3/34

System and software requirements

conditions or capabilities in natural language to be met by the system or a software component under design

Design model

abstract representation of the "physical" system in a modelling language with formal semantics

Each requirement can be formally captured by properties:

specifications for entities and events of a design model that constrain the structure and the behaviour of the system; ensure that the corresponding requirements are properly covered

Example (natural language requirements)

From the CubETH satellite On-Board software:

A. Mavridou, E. Stachtiari, S. Bliudze, A. Ivanov, P. Katsaros, J. Sifakis. *Architecture-based Design:* A Satellite On-board Software Case Study. 13th Int. Conf. on Formal Aspects of Component Software (FACS 2016), Besançon, France, 2016

- The CDMS shall have a Housekeeping activity dedicated to each subsystem (HK-001).
- When line-of-sight communication is possible, housekeeping information shall be transmitted through the COM subsystem (HK-003).
- When line-of-sight communication is not possible, housekeeping information shall be written to the non-volatile flash memory (HK-004).
- A Housekeeping subsystem shall have the following states: NOMINAL, ANOMALY, and CRITICAL_FAILURE (HK-005).
- If a process failure occurs or if the engineering data are not correct, the subsystem shall enter the ANOMALY state (HK-007).
- After MAX seconds in ANOMALY, the subsystem shall enter the CRITICAL_ FAILURE state (HK-008).

Example (contd): design model in BIP

- 5/34
- Design model for the CubETH satellite On-Board software (only the interactions are shown):



Example (contd): requirements & properties

6/34

- Requirements & formal properties in Computational Tree temporal Logic (CTL) from the CubETH satellite On-Board software:
 - When line-of-sight communication is possible, housekeeping information shall be transmitted through the COM subsystem (HK-003).
 AG (HKPL ask I2C TTC → HKPL PSModeMngment inState(TTC))
 - When line-of-sight communication is not possible, housekeeping information shall be written to the non-volatile flash memory (HK-004).

AG (HKPL_mem_write_req → HKPL_PSModeMngment_inState(MEMORY))

Whether line-of-sight communication is (not) possible depends on the satellite's visibility status from the ground.

- TTC mode: line of sight communication is possible
- MEMORY mode: line of sight communication is not possible

Verifiability & abstraction levels

- Design correctness:
 - enforcement of formal properties by construction by applying known solutions to the design model (architectural patterns)
 - a posteriori formal verification of the design model for properties that cannot be enforced
- For the properties to be verifiable, they can refer only to model elements representing valid entities for the current development phase.
- Different abstraction levels of design along the development lifecycle (e.g., system, avionics, software).
 - Properties at a particular level will have to be consistent.
 - Established properties must be preserved at lower abstraction levels.

Catalogue of System & Software Properties (CSSP)











Catalogue of System & Software Properties (CSSP)



BIP design model

Catalogue of System & Software Properties (CSSP)



BIP design model







Catalogue of Requirement Categories

9/34

Guides the engineers throughout the requirements specification per abstraction level.

Proposed by Thales Alenia Space France based on:

- the ECSS standard on Technical Requirements Specification
- empirical evidence from reference satellite projects
 - Sentinel 3, which is a LEO Earth Observation satellite
 - Exomars-TGO, a planetary orbiter with specificities regarding autonomous behaviour and fail-operational modes

Partial classification: only requirements that plausibly influence at lower level those that are relevant to the OBSW.

Categories at four abstraction levels



Categories at four abstraction levels



Reliability, Availability, Maintainability, Safety (RAMS)

Categories at four abstraction levels



Categories at four abstraction levels



Boilerplates language l

11/34

- Boilerplates are requirement patterns with placeholders.
 - instantiated into requirements by replacing placeholders with entities appropriate for the particular system context of the mission under design.
- They are used in order to:
 - eliminate the fuzzy syntax of natural language specifications
 - assign concrete meaning to language constructs in order to avoid diverse interpretations

(e.g. connective words used to determine time, order/ sequence, consequence, comparison, contrast and various types of conjunctions)

Boilerplates language II

12/34

 $\langle boilerplate \rangle ::= \langle prefix \rangle \langle main \rangle \langle suffix \rangle$

Boilerplates language II



Boilerplates language II

ID	Template]
M1	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not] \langle action \rangle$	
M2	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not]$ be $\langle state \rangle$	$\langle boilerplate \rangle ::= \langle prefix \rangle \langle main \rangle \langle suffix \rangle$
M3	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not]$ allow $\langle entity \rangle$ $[of \langle quantity \rangle] [to be \langle state \rangle]$	
M4	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall [not] allow [number] $\langle entity \rangle$ [to be $\langle state \rangle$]] /
M5	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall [not] have [number] $\langle entity \rangle$	
M6	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not]$ be able to $\langle action \rangle$	ID Template
M7	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not]$ support $\langle action \rangle$	P1 If/unless $\langle event \rangle$
M8	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not]$ execute $\langle action-block \rangle$	P2 If/unless/while (state)
M9	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not]$ handle $\langle entity \rangle$	P3 If/unless/while (action)
M10	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not]$ make available $\langle entity \rangle$	10 II/ unless/ while (<i>action</i> /,
M11	$\langle entity \rangle$ shall $[not]$ be defined in $\langle entity \rangle$	
M12	$\langle entity \rangle$ shall $[not]$ allow $\langle entity \rangle$ to $\langle action \rangle$]

Boilerplates language II

ID	Template					
M1	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not] \langle action \rangle$					
M2	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not]$ be $\langle state \rangle$	<i>(boiler</i>)	$rplate \rangle ::= \langle p \rangle$	$refix \rangle \langle mai$	$in \rangle \langle suff$	$ ix\rangle$
M3	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not]$ allow $\langle entity \rangle$ $[of \langle quantity \rangle]$ $[to be \langle state \rangle]$					
M4	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall [not] allow [number] $\langle entity \rangle$ [to be $\langle state \rangle$]			1		
M5	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall [not] have [number] $\langle entity \rangle$			↓		
M6	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not]$ be able to $\langle action \rangle$	ID	Template	•		
M7	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not]$ support $\langle action \rangle$	P1	If/unless (ev	$ ent\rangle$		
M8	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not]$ execute $\langle action-block \rangle$	P2	If/unless/wh	ile $\langle state \rangle$.		
M9	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not]$ handle $\langle entity \rangle$	P3	If/unless/wh	ile (action)		
M10	$\langle subject \rangle$ shall $[not]$ make available $\langle entity \rangle$	10	in/ unicee/ with	lie (action)	,	
M11	$\langle entity \rangle$ shall $[not]$ be defined in $\langle entity \rangle$					
M12	$\langle entity \rangle$ shall $[not]$ allow $\langle entity \rangle$ to $\langle action \rangle$					
ID	Template					1
S 1	$[\langle quantifier \rangle]$ number unit [per time-unit]					
S2	after/before $\langle event \rangle$					
S3	[quantifier] [every/for a period of/within/for at least] number t	ime-un	it [from $\langle event \rangle$]		
S4	without [affecting] $(\langle action \rangle \langle entity \rangle)$					
S5	other than $(\langle action \rangle \langle entity \rangle)$					
S6	in the order $(:\langle entity-list \rangle \langle entity \rangle)$					
S 7	at even intervals					
S 8	using $\langle entity \rangle$					

Requirement categories & boilerplates

13/34

Empirical knowledge from the RB-level of Sentinel 3

Abstraction	Category of Requirements	Used Boilerplates
Level		
RB	Functional > Functional Capability Reqs	main: M9
		main: M1
RB	Functional > Conditional Functional	prefix: P1, main: M1
	Capability Reqs	prefix: P2, main: M1
		prefix: P2, main: M1, suffix: S5
		prefix: P2, main: M1, suffix: S11
RB	Functional > Timed Functional	
	Capability Reqs	prefix: P1, main: M1
RB	Functional > Precedence Constraints	main: M1, suffix: S10
	on Functional Capability Reqs	main: M1, suffix: S6
RB	Functional > Function Mode Definition Reqs	main: M4
RB	Functional > Function Mode Initialization Reqs	prefix: P1, main: M1
RB	Functional > Function Mode Transition Reqs	prefix: P2 and P1, main: M1
		prefix: P1, main: M1
RB	Functional > Algorithmic/Protocol Reqs	main: M1, suffix: S8 and S2
		main: M1, suffix: S8
		prefix: P2, main: M1, suffix: S8
		prefix: P1, main: M1, suffix: S9
RB	Functional > FDIR (Detection) Reqs	prefix: P1, main: M1
		prefix: P1 and P2, main: M1
RB	Functional > FDIR (Handling) Reqs	prefix: P1, main: M1
		prefix: P2, main: M1
		prefix: P1 and P2, main: M1
RB	Performance Reqs	main: M6, suffix: S1
RB	Interface > Commandability Reqs	main: M4, suffix: S8
		main: M10, suffix: S8 and S8 and S3

CSSP Ontology I

- Encodes the conceptual model of the system's domain and the specification language.
 logical relationships and facts for the concepts
 - It is used to:

- avoid indeterminate references (dictionary)
- capture implicit knowledge in requirement specifications
- search into and validate the specifications by ontology-based reasoning
- retrieve the relevant information for the subsequent modelling activities

CSSP Ontology II

- 15/34
- Concepts organized into sub-ontologies with well-defined scope: Ontology Engineers know where to apply the needed changes.
 - Ontology of System & Software Attributes (OoSSA)
 - Domain Specific Ontology (DSO)
 - Requirement Boilerplates (RBLP)
 - Property Patterns (PRP)
- Logical (rule-based) reasoning can infer implicit relationships between system/software entities and requirements.



Example (contd): requirement formalization

16/34

Boilerplate-based representation in the CSSP ontology:



An abstract requirement refers to an abstract entity (class) and implies that the requirement should be fulfilled for all instances of this abstract entity.

Example (contd): requirement formalization

16/34

Boilerplate-based representation in the CSSP ontology:



An abstract requirement refers to an abstract entity (class) and implies that the requirement should be fulfilled for all instances of this abstract entity.

Example (contd): requirement formalization

16/34

Boilerplate-based representation in the CSSP ontology:



An abstract requirement refers to an abstract entity (class) and implies that the requirement should be fulfilled for all instances of this abstract entity.

17/34

Ontology-based Validation

Implemented SPARQL queries:

- Check that there are no missing concrete requirements.
- Find entities for which no requirements have been specified.
- Find entities that do not appear as subject in the specified requirements.
- Check for inconsistent requirement specifications with contradictory parts.

18/34

Property patterns language l

Property patterns: formalism-independent specification abstractions, an input mechanism to capture properties:

- in terms of events and state variables of some design model
- associated with implicit formal representations in a logic language

Property patterns for properties:

- that can be enforced by design, i.e. there is available design solution
- that should be specified in a verifiable form (CTL specification amenable to model checking)

19/34

Property patterns language II

Patterns for property specifications in a verifiable form:

((whenever $\underline{behavior}_{context}$, then) | always) $\underline{behavior}_{result}$

e.g. Whenever <u>telecommand acquisition fails</u>, then <u>a telemetry anomaly</u> <u>report shall be generated</u>.

Patterns for mode management properties (enforced by design):

Pattern MD1: (component) has exclusive modes (mode)+ This pattern is used to enumerate the set of exclusive modes. The set of modes shall be defined so that (a) the system is in one of these modes at an time, otherwise the set is underspecified. (b) not all modes allow the same set of interactions, otherwise the set is overspecified. Natural Language Requirement: TC processing can be either Nominal or Restricted. **Property**: The following exclusive modes exist: (mode : nominal), (mode : restricted) Pattern MD4: Whenever (port) occurs, mode is set to (mode) [, except if (proposition) holds.] This pattern specifies interactions, upon which the mode shall be changed. The change of mode is not effective if an exceptional case holds. Natural Language Requirement: At the end of CSW initialization, the TC processing mode shall be set to Nominal. **Property**: Whenever (*interaction* : CSW.initEnds) occurs, mode is set to (*mode* : nominal)

Behaviour-Interaction-Priority (BIP)



Architecture-based design

21/34



Enforced propertyMutual exclusion

$$\operatorname{AG} \neg (cs_1 \wedge cs_2)$$

Assumed property
 Not in the critical section after *finish*

$$\mathrm{AG}(f_i \to \mathrm{A}[\neg cs_i \ \mathrm{W} \ b_i])$$



Example (contd): Building blocks

- From the CubETH satellite On-Board software:
 - The CDMS shall have a Housekeeping activity dedicated to each subsystem (HK-001).
 - When line-of-sight communication is possible, housekeeping information shall be transmitted through the COM subsystem (HK-003).
 - When line-of-sight communication is not possible, housekeeping information shall be written to the non-volatile flash memory (HK-004).



Example (contd): Client-server

- From the CubETH satellite On-Board software:
 - When line-of-sight communication is possible, housekeeping information shall be transmitted through the COM subsystem (HK-003).
 - When line-of-sight communication is not possible, housekeeping information shall be written to the nonvolatile flash memory (HK-004).



Example (contd): Mode management

- From the CubETH satellite On-Board software:
 - When line-of-sight communication is possible, housekeeping information shall be transmitted through the COM subsystem (HK-003).
 - When line-of-sight communication is not possible, housekeeping information shall be written to the non-volatile flash memory (HK-004).



Example (contd): Failure management

25/34

From the CubETH satellite On-Board software:

- A Housekeeping subsystem shall have the following states: NOMINAL, ANOMALY, and CRITICAL_FAILURE (HK-005).
- If a process failure occurs or if the engineering data are not correct, the subsystem shall enter the ANOMALY state (HK-007).
- After MAX seconds in ANOMALY, the subsystem shall enter the CRITICAL_ FAILURE state (HK-008).



Taxonomy of architecture styles

- 9 architectures identified through case studies
 - Mutual exclusion
 - Client-server
 - Action flow
 - Action flow with abort
 - Failure monitoring
 - Mode management
 - Buffer management
 - Event monitoring
 - Priority management

CSSP Process: High-level view



CSSP Process: Detailed view



CSSP Properties Specification & Verification framework



CSSP tool

30/34

File						
Requirement	t Editing Pro	erty Formalization Dictionary Models				
SystemSpace	ecraft Avior	cs RB TS				
Search all categories Show All Boilerplates DependabilityRequirement No category selected Superclasses: DesignAndConstructionRequirement Choose a category to see its description here MissionRequirement Show these boilerplates OnBoardSoftwareRequirement Show these boilerplates						
Console While * Entity: is * Mode: • TC processing capacity exceeded System: shall * Verb: Entity: Ground TC segmentreception Save Validate Clear			REQ-0061-a Generate Req ID RB Covered Refines Refined By Concreti Concretized			
Search		Ontology Validation				
Req. ID	Status	Text	Category	AbsLevel	Edit	Delete
REQ-0020-afb	•	Event/Action Service Management shall send TCs to TC management	FunctionalCapabilityRequirement	RB	Edit	Delete
REQ-0050-a	•	While TC processing capacity is not exceeded CSW shall acquire all tC segments	ConditionalFunctionalCapabilityRequirement	RB	Edit	Delete
REQ-0060-a	•	If TC Segment reading fails TC Management shall issue a TM(5,4) -medium severity error-anomaly report	FDIRRequirement-Handling	RB	Edit	Delete
REQ-0060-aa	•	If TC processing capacity is is exceeded CSW shall fail to read TC Segments	FDIRRequirement-Handling	RB	Edit	Delete
REQ-0061-a	•	While TC processing capacity is exceeded CSW shall suspend Ground TC segmentreception	ConditionalFunctionalCapabilityRequirement	RB	Edit	Delete

- Catalogue-driven specification guidance
- Boilerplate-based specification of requirements
 - Aid to avoid concepts that are not mapped to the CSSP Ontology
 - Semantic search & validation of requirement/property specifications
 - Guidance for specification of (i) enforceable and (ii) verifiable properties

Pattern-based specification of properties

Correctness-by-construction through BIP model transformations that enforce specified properties

Case studies

31/34

- CubETH satellite On-Board software (internal consortium study)
 - 36 requirements were covered by 38 enforceable properties
 - To increase the confidence in the architecture-based design approach, additional verification was conducted using the nuXmv tool.
- Sentinel 3 Telecommand Management function (provided by Thales Alenia Space)
 - Aim: to validate the CSSP process and framework of tools
 - 27 RB-level requirements covered by 34 properties (2 verifiable properties)
 - State explosion for the complete model
 - Properties were shown to hold for the subsystems
 - They also hold for the complete model (sound abstraction)

The burden of verification is shifted from the final design model to architectures, which are considerably smaller in size and can be reused.

Conclusions

32/34

The design model:

means to ensure design correctness

- requirements that cannot be enforced & verified have to be refined
 - inconsistencies due to specification errors or due to an overly weak assumption for the environment of the involved entities
- baseline for formal design refinement to introduce new requirements (and properties) at a lower abstraction level
 - > two more properties + action refinement are formally checked to ensure consistency

Software properties (TS-level) are allocated on a BIP model of the software component architecture (OSRA) – specifies the software components behaviour.

Future work

- Defining domain models within the DSO to enable effective ontology-based validation.
 - system and software engineers experienced in diverse types of missions (currently working for the AOCS)
 - need to encode various types of implicit assumptions:
 - > general, e.g. mass cannot be negative
 - mission specific, e.g. the temperature within the orbiting range cannot rise above N degrees
- Further develop the existing BIP model of the software component architecture to enable model-based code generation:
 - static architecture (OSRA)
 - dynamic architecture (Ravenscar + semaphore-based task synchronization)
- Improve the tool support to achieve a higher TRL.



Aristotle University Of Thessaloniki - Greece

- Panagiotis Katsaros, Prof.
- Nick Bassiliades, Prof.
- Ioannis Vlahavas, Prof.
- Ioannis Stamelos, Prof.

- Emmanouela Stachtiari, PhD student
- Manolis Rigas, PhD student
- Alexandros Papageorgiou, Student

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE

École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne - Switzerland

- Joseph Sifakis, Prof.
- Simon Bliudze, Researcher
- Anastasia Mavridou, Researcher

Thales Alenia Space France

• Marco Panunzio, On-board software R&D Engineer

Contact: katsaros@csd.auth.gr

http://www.researchgate.net/project/Catalogue-of-System-and-Software-Properties

Catalogue Of System & Software Properties ESA/ESTEC - Dec. 7, 2016