

openETCS Toolchain WP Description of Work

September 28, 2012

Contents

1	Core Tool Chain Analyses and Recommendations	2
1.1	Identify and define the potential modelling languages	3
1.2	Identify and compare existing tools	4
1.3	Identify the tool platform	4
1.4	Identify Development Method, including Elicitation Techniques	5
2	Supporting Tools Analyses and Recommendations	6
2.1	Verification Tools	6
2.1.1	Functional properties	7
2.1.2	Non Functional properties	8
2.1.3	Safety properties	8
2.2	Code Generation Strategy	8
2.3	Model Transformation	9
2.4	Schedulability	9
2.5	Capture Additional Requirements	9
3	Define and Develop Tool Chain	10
3.1	Overall Tool Architecture	10
3.2	Development Infrastructure	10
3.3	Decomposition and Distribution of work	10
4	Develop Open Source Ecosystem	10

This Work Package will provide the tool chain that is necessary to formalize the ETCS system specification . The formal specification will be used further for verification and code generation. The tool chain must support the following tasks:

MPA: I think it should be: formalize the system specification and implement the software specification

1. Support the writing of the formal ETCS system specification including modeling languages, graphical or textual editors, version management,

2. Support the writing of a formal ETCS software specification (while the ETCS specification describes the *problem*, the software specification describes the *solution*).
3. Support code generation from the software specification.
4. Support execution, debugging and simulation of the software specification.
5. Support test case generation from a software test specification.
6. Support the verification and validation of the various artefacts, including the formal ETCS specification against the textual ETCS specification.
7. Comply with the EN 50128 requirements to tools.
8. Support requirements tracing across all tools and build steps.
9. Provide seamless integration of the tools into one tool chain.

The tool chain definition will benefit from other R&D projects and off-the-shelves tools. The semantics of the modelling languages shall be carefully studied.

The first goal of this WP is to identify sets of consistent languages and tools enabling the design of the system. This will be done in close collaboration with WP2.

In order to be able to progress without depending too much on WP2 requirements and other deliverables, the subtasks shall make use of prototyping in order to gain knowledge regarding the possible modelling languages and tool platforms.

1 Core Tool Chain Analyses and Recommendations

The first task is the core tool chain analyses and recommendations. It is concerned with the language itself, the tool for authoring, as well as the method used for formalising the specification.

The core tool will be complemented by supporting tools, as outlined in Section 2. Specific attention shall be paid to the semantics and the traceability of each part of the chain.

All4TEC ALL4TEC has already experienced tools at several levels of critical railways system and software developments. In order to verify the work, tools like CORE (Vitech) could be used for system technical specifications elaboration (it is a kind of SysML approach leading to definition of

(All4TEC) Several models could be successively performed from system to software level, and at the software level, at least two models could be necessary one for functional specification and one of design.

(All4TEC) The software test cases should be scheduled at each step of software development life cycle (e.g.: unit test, integration test, final validation test)

MPA: should be defined, what are its relation to the system specification that is the requirement for the software specification. It should either be part of it as requirements for the software, or be derived from it (All4TEC) Compliance with standards as CENELEC or 50128 could have a significant impact in terms of workload. Moreover it should be included at the beginning of the tools development in the Development Plan or in a Safety or Quality Plan.

MPA: We should state that it should allow to design the system/software safety case

MPA: should be plural as several languages will probably be required to express all the concerns

MPA: Should also be plural as there will be several tools and associated methods

the system functional and physical architectures). In on other way Safety Architect could be used for safety studies on various models at diverse levels of definition (system, software, functional, organic etc.).

The following tool chains have been experienced for software testing: For Unitary Test (UT): MATLAB SIMULINK / DESIGN VERIFIER For Validation: MATELO /TESTAND /VERISTAND

1.1 Identify and define the potential modelling languages

The objective of this subtask is the identification of the modeling language (or multiple languages), based on the analysis from WP2, by prototyping. For each candidate, a small subset of the ERTMS specification will be modelled. The languages may have to be adapted in the process. The completed prototypes are subsequently evaluated against the requirements from WP2.

This work is based on merit: If a suitable language is identified, but no partner steps up to model the prototype, it will simply not be considered.

Given that different levels of abstraction have to be addressed in the design phase, several languages may be necessary to handle all design phases. Here, the semantics of the languages is the key point; it shall be accurately adapted to the level of description required in each phase of the design.

(ALL4TEC)
ALL4TEC is candidate
to contribute for
modeling on the basis
of Subset 026 for
example ...

C. Braunstein, J. Peleska (Uni Bremen) All tools should support the model based development paradigm. It implies that the modelling tools should support meta modelling for domain-specific languages. Hence, the underlying meta-metamodel has to be sufficiently expressive to allow designing adequate ETCS formalisms covering all properties identified in the ERTMS standard.

Input:	WP2: List of suitable languages (based on State of the Art Analysis)	Oct-12
Input:	WP2: Small subset of ERTMS requirements that is representative	Oct-12
Input:	Those WP2 Requirements that are sufficient to evaluate a target language	Jan-13
Output:	Formal Model representing the sample spec, one for each candidate	Feb-13
Output:	Documentation of the changes to each language used (if any)	Feb-13
Output:	Evaluation of the models against the WP2 requirements	Mar-13
Output:	Decision on the final language choice(s)	Apr-13

1.2 Identify and compare existing tools

Corresponding to Section 1.1, the objective of this subtask is the identification of the target tool, based on the analysis from WP2, by using it for the prototyping described in Section 1.1.

The experience with the tools will be recorded, and the tools will be evaluated against the requirements from WP2.

Input:	WP2: List of suitable tools (based on State of the Art Analysis)	Oct-12
Input:	Those WP2 Requirements that are sufficient to evaluate the tool	Jan-13
Output:	Experience report for each candidate tool	Feb-13
Output:	Documentation of the changes to each tool (if any)	Feb-13
Output:	Evaluation of the tools against the WP2 requirements	Mar-13
Output:	Decision on the final tool choice(s)	Apr-13

1.3 Identify the tool platform

There is a distinction between tool (Section 1.2) and tool platform: The tool is the core that processes the language, and typically also has an editor. The tool platform is language independent, but provides mechanisms to integrate various tools. For example, Eclipse is a tool platform. The Java Development Tools (JDT) are an extension to Eclipse that allows working with the Java programming language.

As the toolchain will consist of many tools that must work together seamlessly, it should be analysed independently from the tool. A tool will typically suggest a certain tool platform. The aim of this task is the identification of a tool platform for each candidate tool from Section 1.2.

irit-laas we could stress that there are several levels of interoperability that can be supported by the toolchain. Taking the example of Eclipse, the most basic level provides support for plugins (OSGi); that is the ability to have several tools inside a common platform. In the project, we will also need support for interoperability at the data level, which can be found in the Eclipse world with the Modeling Framework; that is the ability to have tools that converse/interact using a standardized (low-level) syntax. Finally, we could also require interoperability at a “semantical” level—for example with support for linking objects in different modeling languages—or ask for more basic services, such as serialization and versioning. We believe that, for the project, we at least need interoperability at the data level.

(ALL4TEC) an interface facility should be examined to facilitate the data exchange between the tools constituting the tool chain (e.g.: XML definition)

Input:	List of target platforms, based on the tools being evaluated (1.2)	Oct-12
	Those WP2 Requirements that are sufficient to evaluate a target language	Dec-12
Output:	Evaluation of each tool platform against WP2 requirements, independent of target tool	Feb-13
Output:	Evaluation of tool platform in the context of specific target tools	Mar-13
Output:	Selection of Tool Platform (and reasoning)	Apr-13

1.4 Identify Development Method, including Elicitation Techniques

Analyse requirement elicitation techniques in order to define a strategy to derive OpenETCS formal model requirements from ERTMS SRS

Without a suitable method, most tools have only limited use. Formalising a specification of the size of ETCS requires a suitable method. The method is probably relatively independent from the language used.

The objective of this subtask is the identification of suitable methods and their evaluation while prototyping.

Christophe GASTON A classical modelling process starts by defining high level models of systems that shall be refined step by steps in order to make implementation choices. From a syntactical point of view, the model transformation techniques described below are good technological candidates. However, at the semantical level, refining a model into a more concrete one requires first to define a refinement correctness relation in order to ensure properties preservation. Moreover, systems that will be considered in the project will be based on concepts of interacting processes (since those systems are distributed). Therefore we need to identify techniques allowing us to start from system level properties (*i.e.* specifying global behaviors) and to deduce what properties each process should satisfy (*i.e.* what behavior should have each process) so that the global cooperation of all processes realize the system properties. In this subtask we will identify potential solutions to that problem.

irit-laas we are also in favor of removing this subtask. One drawback of mandating a specific method for developing the models (e.g. refinement or compositional) is that you could rule out some of the tools identified in Sect. 1.2.

More generally, we believe (based on our previous experiences in other domains) that we will end up with several formalisms, targeting different

(SP) I would suggest to remove that subtask. - This belongs to WP2. - Requirement elicitation technique is not a tool, and moreover - ERTMS SRS (Subset-026) already include the requirements.

(ALL4TEC) Christophe Gaston comments address several previous chapters of the DOW. It could be useful to re dispatch them.

aspect of the specification. We think that we should keep in mind an approach based on modeling different aspects of the problem with languages supporting different viewpoints and that could work at different level of abstractions. With this kind of approach—concerning the verification of the final artifacts—we will also need to check the compatibility of the semantics of the modeling languages that address overlapping viewpoints. There are two problems here. First, when dealing with an heterogeneous specification, we need a common semantical basis to check the compatibility of the models. More pragmatically, when we deal with two models (expressed in a different language) that describe the same part of the system, we need to show that they are consistent with each other.

Input:	WP2: List of suitable methods (based on State of the Art Analysis)	Oct-12
Input:	Those WP2 Requirements that are sufficient to evaluate a target method	Jan-13
Output:	Experience Report on applying the method while prototyping (1.1)	Feb-13
Output:	Evaluation of the methods against the WP2 requirements	Mar-13
Output:	Decision on the final method	Apr-13
Output:	Documentation of adapted method	ongoing

2 Supporting Tools Analyses and Recommendations

The languages and tools of choice have to be complemented to support a number of activities that are crucial for the project.

2.1 Verification Tools

Old: (CEA): we propose to aggregate in this section several subsection related to the kinds of properties which are treated. We tried to identify subsections following this intuition. The idea would be to talk about technologies (*e.g.* static analysis, model-checking etc...) that could address the verification of each sort of property. (irit-laas): we agree with the proposal from CEA and their choice of subsections.

In the development of a safety-critical rail system like the ETCS OBU, several kinds of verification and validation activities have to be performed. One the one hand, the relevant standards require the verification of the *safety aspect* of every major design step. They also list constraints on methods (and tools) which may be used for these purposes. On the other hand, any viable development process for a complex real-time system like the OBU needs early validation of design artifacts. This concerns for instance functionality and real-time properties beyond the safety-related issues. The formalisa-

tion of design artifacts which comes with a model-based process offers the possibility to employ tools to a substantial degree for these activities.

The purpose of this subtask is to compose a list of tools which may be used in performing or supporting V&V activities, analyze their suitability and propose a selection for inclusion in the openETCS tool basis. This has to be coordinated with both

- the core tool chain selection (suitable V&V tools should be available), and
- the definition of the overall development process, as that defines the steps to be performed.

The flow of information in the coordination is bidirectional—e.g., the process steps should ideally be tailored towards realizability with good support by available tools. Techniques complementing the tool-supported steps must be included in the process description.

Old: (DLR) Verification tools resp. techniques are very important in the development of a safety-critical system like the ETCS OBU. According to the relevant standards (most prominently the EN 50128 of the CENELEC family), every design step has to be verified. Assuming that models will constitute artifacts of the development—and are not just used for explanatory purposes—it is necessary to be able to establish the correctness of each refinement step. Or, to put it differently, the tool chain needs a concept for seamless verification, preferably tool-based, to be fit for its purpose.

(DLR) Which WP is concerned with the global picture, i.e. who takes care of the coherency of the proposed parts of the openETCS ecosystem, who defines the process and assigns potential roles to tools?

I think, this must be taken into account already early in the definition process. Therefore, while it might not be the first thing to consider (without modeling, there is no verification of models), it should definitely not be the last.

Old: (ALLTEC) Notice: CENELEC verification activities cannot be systematically addressed with test and tool. For example, source code review could be required to check safety properties of code. Old: (Stanislas Pinte) I agree with Hardi. In my opinion, the model should include the tests of the model, so that it could be verifiable in a "model-in-the-loop" fashion. It doesn't have to be model proving (that I think belongs more to other WPs) rather model testing. Inside our <http://www.ertmsolutions.com/ertms-formalspecs/> approach, we assume the following:

- Model tests are part of the model
 - Model should be 100% covered by tests (proved by model coverage reports)
 - Toolchain must support developing, executing and debugging tests
- Model verification also includes:
- verifying that the model corresponds to the original requirements specifications (in our case, UNISIG Subset-026 BL3). ERTMSFormalSpecs also supports marking model artifacts as "verified" against source requirements.
 - verifying that 100% of source requirements are traced against one or more model artifacts (proven by traceability reports)

I would think that such verifications are indeed in the critical path...i.e. if not implemented we shall not be able to have a fully functional model.

2.1.1 Functional properties

First, we have to show that all of the components of the system behave as they are intended. This includes at least proving that low-level requirements meet high-level requirements, and in turn that the code meet these low-level specifications.

(DLR) Some further rewriting of this subsection and the following is needed in order to get a consistent description. Concerning the current text, one could broaden the scope of functional verification, including early design steps.)

One possibility is to use a completely certified toolchain up to code generation. Failing that (*i.e.* if not all the code is generated and/or if the generation cannot be trusted), we will need to have formal specifications and to verify the code against them. Hoare logic-based tools seem like a good approach in this case, as well as of course test cases generation according to a suitable coverage criterion.

2.1.2 Non Functional properties

Such properties include all aspects that are related to the nominal behavior of the components. In particular, this concerns the following points:

- schedulability and Worst Case Execution Time (WCET)
- data dependencies between outputs and inputs

Schedulability can be done on the models, based on hypotheses for the WCET of single tasks, but verifying these hypotheses require a full knowledge of the code, the underlying hardware, and the compilation toolchain.

Data dependencies can also be assessed on the models, but as in the previous subsection, some verification on the code itself might be required. Static analyzers should be able to handle that.

2.1.3 Safety properties

This must ensure that components are always able to perform their work. It includes in particular:

- Absence of runtime error (again if the code generation does not guarantee it by construction. Static analysis can be employed there also).
- Fault tolerance against unexpected input

Input:	WP2 Requirements	???
Output:	Verification tool choice	???

2.2 Code Generation Strategy

Analyse the code generation strategy.

Stanislas Pinte In my opinion, the code generation strategy should be handled in T3.3 Modelling of ETCS specification, that is part of WP3b.

@Fabien, could you confirm WP3b point of view about this?

Additionally, prototypes should be developed for each candidate modelling language, and for each candidate target language.

C. Braunstein, J. Peleska (Uni Bremen) The code generation should be compatible with a domain framework including, for example, the designated operating system API to be applied in openETCS. This should be decide within the tool chain.

Another issue is that code generation should be covered down to binary code, so that V&V arguments may be applied down to the level of binary code.

A more detailed view of these issues may be find in the PositionPaper directory (Uni_Bremen_proposed_Workflow.pdf).

Input:	WP2 Requirements	???
Output:	Code Generation Strategy	???

2.3 Model Transformation

Analyse model transformation techniques and tools in order to refine the specification from one description level to another.

Stanislas Pinte In our product ERTMSFormalSpecs (<http://www.ertmssolutions.com/ertms-formalspecs/>) we use a single, unified model, that is supporting complete Subset-026 logic, with full traceability. If that approach works, why do we need several specification levels?

irit-laas we propose to merge sections 2.2 and 2.3 since they are basically the same kind of activity. It could have the added benefit to balance the “size” with respect to the verification activities in Sect. 2.1

Input:	WP2 Requirements	???
Output:	Model Transformation Strategy	???

2.4 Schedulability

Analyse schedulability tools.

Input:	WP2 Requirements	???
Output:	Schedulability Strategy	???

2.5 Capture Additional Requirements

Capture wishes/requirements on how to support the designer in their activities.

Input:	Designer Wishes and Requirements	ongoing
Output:	Captured and organised designer requirements	???

CEA: this section could disappear and the content would be dispatched in subsection “non functional properties” of Section “Verification” (ALL4TEC) We agree with the remark on schedulability (e.g.: should be removed).
irit-laas: Should we add something about scheduling “synthesis” to the subsection on schedulability? Maybe the scheduling method/startegy is mandated by the SRS? Same remark for adding WCET analysis to section 2.4.

3 Define and Develop Tool Chain

The second subtask defines and develops the tool chain and the infrastructure enabling its evolution and maintenance. First of all, a "make or reuse" decision about the components of the tool chain has to be made. Then a common development infrastructure has to be defined or chosen in order to integrate all the tools (Eclipse like infrastructure). Finally, the subtask achieves the development and the integration of the tools.

(mj) I see "make" not as an option. Considering the resources available for this project, we will tailor (and extend) an existing tool platform.

3.1 Overall Tool Architecture

Once language, tool and tool platform have been identified, the architecture can be defined using that as the foundation. Note that this may not be that much work: A tool platform like Eclipse essentially defines the overall architecture already. Further, using an agile approach, it is perfectly acceptable if the system changes over time (i.e. APIs change, etc.), as long as the proper mechanisms are in place, like automated testing.

3.2 Development Infrastructure

To allow robust distributed development, care must be taken in setting up a functioning infrastructure. This includes a continuous automated build system and more. The effort for this must not be underestimated.

3.3 Decomposition and Distribution of work

Another major task is the robust decomposition of the tool and distribution and tracking of the various components. Specifically, robust integration tests and version management are crucial.

4 Develop Open Source Ecosystem

The goal of this task is the development of an open-source ecosystem for the toolchain under development and all its components as well as for the implementation of the ETCS system. This ecosystem defines the license model to be used, the project infrastructure, usage and contributions of existing open-source projects and the process to coordinate the development efforts from different partners. Additionally as part of this task, suggestions and guidelines for the projects infrastructure are developed. The goal of the ecosystem is to facilitate the collaboration of the industrial partners and enable long-term maintenance of the outcome of the development. For the ecosystem, well-established open source ecosystems, such as the Eclipse ecosystem shall be used as templates.

As the development of an ecosystem needs to react on the on-going project and adapt to needs, the ecosystem has to evolve over the project duration. As a first output, this task will produce initial proposals for the license model, the process, as well as the infrastructure. Subsequently, these proposals can be adapted based on the feedback from all project partners.

As the license model and the open source process have high impact on the overall project, the task will only propose solutions. Final decisions in this area have to be made by WP1.

Input:	Feedback from project partners (All WPS)	continuously
Input:	WP1: Legal decisions	continuously
Output:	Initial proposal for license model	Aug-30
Output:	Initial proposal for open source development process	Aug-30
Output:	Initial proposal for infrastructure and tools	Aug-30
Output:	Adaptation of license model	continuously
Output:	Adaptation of open source development process	continuously
Output:	Adaptation of infrastructure and tools	continuously