


Work Package 4: "Validation & Verification Strategy"

openETCS Validation & Verification Plan

Version 00.04

Marc Behrens and Hardi Hungar and Stephan Jagusch

19 July 2013



Funded by:



Federal Ministry
of Education
and Research



Région de
Bruxelles-
Capitale



GOBIERNO
DE ESPAÑA

MINISTERIO
DE INDUSTRIA, ENERGÍA
Y TURISMO

This page is intentionally left blank

Work Package 4: “Validation & Verification Strategy”

OETCS/WP4/D4.1V00.03

19 July 2013

openETCS Validation & Verification Plan

Version 00.04

Marc Behrens and Hardi Hungar

DLR

Lilienthalplatz 7

38108 Brunswick, Germany

eMail:{hardi.hungar,marc.behrens}@dlr.de

Stephan Jagusch

AEbt Angewandte Eisenbahntechnik GmbH

Adam-Klein-Str. 26

90429 Nürnberg, Germany

eMail: Stephan.Jagusch@AEbt.de

Deliverable

Prepared for openETCS@ITEA2 Project

Abstract: This document describes strategy and plan of the verification and validation activities in the project openETCS. As the goals of the project include the selection, adaption and construction of methods and tools for a FLOSS development in addition to performing actual development steps, differing from the plan for a full development project, the plan covers also activities evaluating the suitability of methods and tools, and it makes provisions for incorporation of V&V of partial developments which are actually done.

The overall strategy is to support the design process as specified in D2.3 and its partial instantiations within openETCS. In accordance with the project approach, V&V shall be done in a FLOSS style, and it has to suit a model-based development. A further main consideration shall be to strive for conformance with the requirements of the standards (EN 50128 and further). This means that the contribution of all activities to a complete verification and validation shall be defined and assessed.

The plan details how to perform verification & validation for a complete development which follows the process sketch from D2.3, so that the result conforms to the requirements of the standards for a SIL 4 development. This includes a definition of activities, the documentation to be produced, the organisation structure, roles, a selection of methods and tools, a format for describing design artifacts subject to V&V, and a feedback format for the findings during V&V.

As D2.3 gives only a rough description of the development steps and not yet a complete list of design artifacts, nor one of methods applied and formats to be used, this first version of the V&V plan will also lack detail which will be added in later revisions as these informations become more concrete.

Besides the usual purpose of verification & validation activities, namely evaluating and proving the suitability of design artifacts, V&V in openETCS will also generate information on the suitability of the methods and tools employed. For that purpose, a format for describing methods and tools to be used in V&V and one for summarizing the findings about the suitability are defined.

The plan also contains partial instantiations of V&V which match partial developments that are realised within openETCS.

Disclaimer: This work is licensed under the "openETCS Open License Terms" (oOLT) dual Licensing: European Union Public Licence (EURL v.1.1+) AND Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 – (cc by-sa 3.0)

THE WORK IS PROVIDED UNDER openETCS OPEN LICENSE TERMS (oOLT) WHICH IS A DUAL LICENSE AGREEMENT INCLUDING THE TERMS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION PUBLIC LICENSE (VERSION 1.1 OR ANY LATER VERSION) AND THE TERMS OF THE CREATIVE COMMONS PUBLIC LICENSE ("CCPL"). THE WORK IS PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT AND/OR OTHER APPLICABLE LAW. ANY USE OF THE WORK OTHER THAN AS AUTHORIZED UNDER THIS OLT LICENSE OR COPYRIGHT LAW IS PROHIBITED.

BY EXERCISING ANY RIGHTS TO THE WORK PROVIDED HERE, YOU ACCEPT AND AGREE TO BE BOUND BY THE TERMS OF THIS LICENSE. TO THE EXTENT THIS LICENSE MAY BE CONSIDERED TO BE A CONTRACT, THE LICENSOR GRANTS YOU THE RIGHTS CONTAINED HERE IN CONSIDERATION OF YOUR ACCEPTANCE OF SUCH TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>
<http://joinup.ec.europa.eu/software/page/eupl/licence-eupl>

Table of Contents

Figures and Tables.....	v
Document Control.....	vi
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Purpose	1
1.2 Document Structure.....	2
1.3 Plan for Completing this Document	2
1.4 Background Information.....	4
1.4.1 Definitions.....	4
2 Document Evolution	6
3 Verification & Validation in the Design Process	7
4 Verification & Validation Strategy	8
4.1 Verification & Validation Strategy for a Full Development	8
4.1.1 Verification Strategy for a Full Development.....	8
4.1.2 Validation Strategy for a Full Development	8
4.2 Verification & Validation Strategy for openETCS.....	8
5 Verification & Validation Plan for a Full Development	9
5.1 Verification & Validation Plan Overview	10
5.2 Requirements Base	10
5.3 Verification & Validation Methods and Tools	11
5.3.1 Model Based Testing Method	11
5.3.2 Characterisation of Formal Methods	17
5.3.3 Formal Analysis Methods	17
5.3.4 Verification with Formal Methods.....	18
5.3.5 Verification with Model-Based Simulation	25
5.4 Verification for a Full Development	26
5.4.1 DASV Verification	26
5.4.2 SSRS Verification (1c)	26
5.4.3 SFM Verification (2c)	27
5.5 Structure of the Verification Report.....	27
5.6 Validation for a Full Development.....	28
5.6.1 DASV Validation	29
5.6.2 SFM Validation (3d).....	29
5.6.3 Final Validation (tbd).....	29
5.7 Implementation of Verification & Validation	30
6 Verification & Validation Plan for openETCS	31
6.1 Verification Plan for openETCS	31
6.1.1 Formal Verification of Real-Time Aspects based on Timed Automata (TWT)	31
6.1.2 Verification with Model-Based Simulation using SystemC (TWT, URO)	32
6.2 Validation Plan for openETCS	32

Appendix A: Requirements on Verification & Validation 33

 A.1 Requirements on Verification & Validation from D2.9 33

 A.2 General Requirements on Verification 34

 A.3 Glossary 36

Appendix: References 37

Figures and Tables

Figures

Figure 1. openETCS Process (rough view)..... 7

Figure 2. Compositionnal Testing 22

Figure 3. First (faulty) version of a timed automaton for processing emergency messages 24

Figure 4. Corrected version of the timed automaton for processing emergency messages 24

Tables

Document Control

Document information	
Work Package	WP4
Deliverable ID or doc. ref.	D4.1
Document title	openETCS Validation & Verification Plan
Document version	00.04
Document authors (org.)	Marc Behrens (DLR), Cecile Braunstein (U Bremen), Cyril Cornu (All4Tec), Jens Gerlach (Fraunhofer), Christophe Gaston (CEA), Hardi Hungar (DLR), Stephan Jagusch (AEbt), Virgile Prevosto (CEA) Stefan Rieger (TWT)

Review information	
Last version reviewed	–
Main reviewers	–

Approbation			
	Name	Role	Date
Written by	Hardi Hungar	WP4-T4.1 Task Leader	June 2013
Approved by	–	–	

Document evolution			
00.01	11/06/2013	H. Hungar	Document creation based on draft by S. Jagusch
Version	Date	Author(s)	Justification
00.02	14.06.2013	J. Gerlach, H. Hungar	Completed one requirement table from draft, added detail to V&V plan for full dev.,
00.03	20.06.2013	J. Gerlach, H. Hungar	Major revisions and additions
00.04	19.07.2013	C. Braunstein, C. Cornu, C. Gaston, V. Prevosto, S. Rieger	Additions to Sec. 5.3

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this document is to define the verification & validation activities in the project openETCS.

This document describes strategy and plan of the verification and validation activities in the project openETCS. As the goals of the project include the selection, adaption and construction of methods and tools for a FLOSS development in addition to performing actual development steps, differing from the plan for a full development project, the plan covers also activities evaluating the suitability of methods and tools, and it makes provisions for incorporation of V&V of partial developments which are actually done.

WP4-T1-G: A useful plan for WP 4, that is, one that defines a way to achieve the goals of WP 4:

WP4-G1: Identify and demonstrate methods and tools to handle the V&V of a FLOSS development of the EVC software

WP4-G2: Perform as much of V&V on the DAS2Vs produced in the project as possible

Detailed Goals and Means

WP4-T1-G1: The plan shall give an overview of and a structure to the things required from V&V for an openETCS (FLOSS-) development.

WP4-T1-M1: Identifies all (most) of the activities which have to be made for a full development according to the standards, in a form relevant to the approach of openETCS (FLOSS, participants). This may include alternatives.

WP4-T1-G2: The plan shall provide a framework into which the V&V activities which will be performed within the project do fit.

WP4-T1-M2-1: Design formats for collecting information about DAS2Vs (V&V tasks), about the results of V&V activities, about activities of V&V method and tool development, about the results of evaluations of V&V methods and tools. Sketch how all of the information is to be gathered and finally incorporated into the final V&V report (D4.4).

WP4-T1-M2-2: Identify potential variants of partial implementations of V&V processes which are likely going to be performed within the project. These may be (?should be?) related to design activities within the project which produce DAS2Vs.

WP4-T1-G3: The plan shall delineate means for V&V within openETCS

WP4-T1-M3-1: A partial V&V process (see WP4-T1-M2 above) consists of a set of related DASVs and V&V steps to be applied to them. A V&V step is described by input and output (result, purpose) with V&V methods and means.

WP4-T1-M3-2: The plan will prepare the selection of adequate methods and means (tools) by providing evaluation criteria and incorporating available evaluation results.

WP4-T1-M3-2-1: Definition of an evaluation format for tools and methods.

WP4-T1-G4: The plan shall incorporate currently available information on openETCS development process and means and be amendable to future changes and additions.

WP4-T1-M4-1: Use D2.3 in instantiating the general requirements laid down in the standards.

WP4-T1-M4-2: Use D2.1 for tools.

WP4-T1-M4-3: Identify open points and include delineations for things which are useful for a complete V&V but not yet planned or detailed by project activities already performed.

This document describes which verification and validation activities are needed for a full FLOSS development of the EVC software. It describes how the work performed within the project openETCS is to be organised to contribute to such a task, and how to demonstrate that it can be realised.

The document is only valid in conjunction with the Quality Assurance plan [1104G13-QA-plan]. It is supplemented by the safety plan, which focuses on the safety aspect. Verification and validation play an important role in the safety case. This document identifies the V&V activities which do contribute and refers to the safety plan for further details on the additional requirements to be met and a precise statement of what has to be established.

1.2 Document Structure

This document comprises both verification and validation plan, as these activities share some of their methods and tools, and in some case are applied to the same design artifacts. Nevertheless, these activities are intended to be and remain independent.

There are three main issues which make this plan different from an ordinary V&V plan for a software to develop. First, openETCS is not only concerned with the software part of the EVC. As part of the activities, a semi-formal model for SS 026 is to be developed and to be verified. As the SS 026 covers parts of the ETCS system beyond the software, also process steps on the system (not just software) level are to be performed. And in particular the design does not start with a clearly defined set of requirements on the software.

As a second point, openETCS will not only do development, but shall also be concerned with processes, methods and tools with the goal of being able to propose a complete SIL 4 compliant approach. As part of this, it has to be defined how to handle verification and validation. This is done in the sections addressing a “full development”. Due to the limited resources of the project, actually performing such a full development is out of the project’s scope. Instead, only some functions will be implemented, and only partial lines of development will be realised. V&V related to these activities is to be planned in the specific sections dedicated to “openETCS”.

1.3 Plan for Completing this Document

Terminology

DAS2V: *Design Artifact Subject to Verification or Validation*

G: *Goal*

M: *Means*

F: *Finding/Result/Action*

Detailed Goals and Means

WP4-T1-G1: *The plan shall give an overview of and a structure to the things required from V&V for an openETCS (FLOSS-) development.*

WP4-T1-M1: *Identify all (most) of the activities which have to be made for a full development according to the standards, in a form relevant to the approach of openETCS (FLOSS, participants). This may include alternatives.*

WP4-T1-G2: *The plan shall provide a framework into which the V&V activities which will be performed within the project do fit.*

WP4-T1-M2-1: *Design formats for collecting information about DAS2Vs (V&V tasks), about the results of V&V activities, about activities of V&V method and tool development, about the results of evaluations of V&V methods and tools. Sketch how all of the information is to be gathered and finally incorporated into the final V&V report (D4.4).*

WP4-T1-M2-2: *Identify potential variants of partial implementations of V&V processes which are likely going to be performed within the project. These may be (?should be?) related to design activities within the project which produce DAS2Vs.*

WP4-T1-G3: *The plan shall delineate means for V&V within openETCS*

WP4-T1-M3-1: *A partial V&V process (see WP4-T1-M2 above) consists of a set of related DASVs and V&V steps to be applied to them. A V&V step is described by input and output (result, purpose) with V&V methods and means.*

WP4-T1-M3-2: *The plan will prepare the selection of adequate methods and means (tools) by providing evaluation criteria and incorporating available evaluation results.*

WP4-T1-M3-2-1: *Definition of an evaluation format for tools and methods.*

WP4-T1-G4: *The plan shall incorporate currently available information on openETCS development process and means and be amendable to future changes and additions.*

WP4-T1-M4-1: *Use D2.3 in instantiating the general requirements laid down in the standards.*

WP4-T1-M4-2: *Use D2.1 for tools.*

WP4-T1-M4-3: *Identify open points and include delineations for things which are useful for a complete V&V but not yet planned or detailed by project activities already performed.*

Concrete First Steps (in SCRUM terminology: the backlog)

%%To Be Defined%% outdated—update tbd

WP4-T1-S1: *Assess the input material*

WP4-T1-S1-1: *Assess sketch of the V&V plan (partly done)*

WP4-T1-F1-1-1: *The current format is .doc*

WP4-T1-F1-1-2: *The plan currently lists mainly the requirements on the plan and does not yet detail much of the plan itself.*

WP4-T1-F1-1-3:

WP4-T1-S1-2: *Assess D2.3 “Process Definition” with definition of DAS2Vs and V&V steps*

WP4-T1-F1-2-1: *DAS2Vs and verification & validation steps defined on a high level*

WP4-T1-S1-3: *Assess D2.9 “Requirements for Verification & Validation”*

WP4-T1-F1-3-1: *very high-level, requirements included in the appendix for reference in further completion in relevant for future steps*

WP4-T1-S1-4: *Assess D2.1 (“Report on Existing Methodologies”)*

WP4-T1-F1-4-1: *Seems very sketchy*

WP4-T1-S1-5: *Assess development and V&V activities planned or already on the way for taking them into account in the V&V plan*

WP4-T1-S1-5-1: *Ask a lot of people (or the right people)*

WP4-T1-S1-5-1-1: *Design a query email (to be backed up by phone or personal inquiries)*

WP4-T1-S2: *Organize the writing*

WP4-T1-S2-1: *Make a detailed work plan*

WP4-T1-S2-1-1: *Transform the sketch to .tex*

WP4-T1-S2-1-2: *Revise the structure according to what is expected to be done - accommodating the info on the process (D2.3 -WP4-T1-S1-2) and on ongoing activities (WP4-T1-S1-5).*

WP4-T1-S2-1-3: *References to the requirements (D2.9 - WP4-T1-S1-3) are to be included*

WP4-T1-S2-1-4: *Tools and methods*

WP4-T1-S2-1-4-1: *Format for evaluation (formulate evaluation criteria, D4.1a)*

WP4-T1-S2-1-5: *Result collection*

WP4-T1-S2-1-5-1: *Sketch all the formats (purpose)*

WP4-T1-S2-1-5-2: *Sketch the process of information collection (T4.2 and T4.3 will have to do that)*

WP4-T1-S2-1-6: *Include section on V&V plan revision*

WP4-T1-S2-2: *Find contributors*

WP4-T1-S2-3: *Distribute the work*

WP4-T1-S3: *Do the work*

1.4 Background Information

%%Further Info, perhaps put the project context here %%

1.4.1 Definitions

Verification

Verification is an activity which has to be performed at each step of the design. It has to be verified that the design step achieved its goals. This consists at least of two parts:

- that the artifacts produced in the step are of the right type and contain all the information they should. E.g., that the SSRS identifies all components addressed in SS 026, specifies their interfaces in sufficient detail and has allocated the functions to the components (this should just serve an example and is based on a guess what the SSRS should do)
- that the artifact correctly implements the input requirements of the design step. These typically include the main output artifacts of the previous step. “Correctly implements” includes requirement coverage (tracing). This can and should be supported by some tools. Adequacy of such tools depends on things like format compatibility, degree of automation, functionality (e.g., ability to handle m-to-n relations). Depending on the design step (and the nature of the artifacts) different forms of verification will complement requirement coverage, with different levels of support. The step from SS 026 to the SSRS will mainly consist of manual activities besides things like coverage checks. Verifying a formal (executable) model against the SSRS can be supported by animation or simulation to e.g. execute test cases which have been designed to check compliance with the SSRS. Even formal proof tools may be employed to check or establish properties. Model-to-code steps offer far more options (and needs) for tool support. And tools or tool sets for unit test will support dynamic testing for requirement or code coverage. This may include test generation, test execution with report generation, test result evaluation and so on. Also, code generator verification (or qualification) may play a role, here. Integration steps mandate still other testing (or verification) techniques.

Summarizing, one may say that verification subsumes highly diverse activities, and may be realized in very many different forms.

Validation

Validation is name for the activity by which the compliance of the end result with the initial requirements is shown. In the case of openETCS, this means that the demonstrator (or parts of it) are checked against the SS 026 or one of its close descendants (i.e., SSRS), taking also further sources of requirements from operational scenarios and TSIs into account. This will consist of testing the equipment according to a test plan derived from the requirements and detailed into concrete test cases at some later stage. Tool support for validation will thus mainly concern test execution and evaluation, perhaps supplemented by test derivation or test management. Ambitious techniques like formal proof are most likely not applicable here.

Thus, the tool support for validation will not differ substantially from that for similar verification activities.

One might also consider “early” validation activities, e.g. “validating” an executable model against requirements from the SS 026. These are not mandated by the standards and can per se not replace verification of design steps. They may nevertheless be worthwhile as means for early defect detection.

Further (mostly complementary) information on V&V can be found in the report on the CEN-ELEC standards (D2.2).

2 Document Evolution

The verification and validation plan shall be revised in the course of the project as the design progresses and gets detailed and experiences with verification and validation are made. This is in accordance with the EN 50128, where it is required that the plan shall be maintained throughout the development cycle.

V01, T0+13: First version of the plan

V02, T0+17: First revision, based on the 1st V&V interim reports on applicability of the V&V approach to model and implementation/code (D4.2.1, D4.2.2)

V03, T0+25: Second revision, based on the internal reports on the applicability of the V&V approach to prototypes of design models and code

V04, T0+36: Final version as part of the final V&V report (D4.4)

3 Verification & Validation in the Design Process

Name the design stages and associated V&V steps, both for the ideal development (openETCS vision) and project realisation (where we end with a demonstrator).

D2.3 defines the openETCS process on an abstract level. It already defines the main steps. A slightly more detailed picture than the one given in D2.3 is given in Fig. 1.




Figure 1. openETCS Process (rough view)

The figure needs to be detailed to include all the main design steps. E.g., the integration activities are subsumed within “3e) V&V on code”. For instance, the integration into the demonstrator should be made visible. In the end, the figure shall define merely the “full” development, this will be of more help than “openETCS implementation” of it.

4 Verification & Validation Strategy

Contributors to this chapter:

DLR Overall coherence, Safety interface

All4Tec aspects of model-based development, FLOSS, safety. Mainly in Sec. 4.1 (Full Development).

SQS ¿Contributions to all sections?

TUBS Safety interface

DB, SNCF, NS Operator role (scenarios, validation goals)

The overall strategy is to support the design process as specified in D2.3 and its partial instantiations within openETCS. In accordance with the project approach, V&V shall be done in a FLOSS style, and it has to suit a model-based development. A further main consideration shall be to strive for conformance with the requirements of the standards (EN 50128 and further). This means that the contribution of all activities to a complete verification and validation shall be defined.

4.1 Verification & Validation Strategy for a Full Development

Here, the ideal shall be described: What we would like to do in openETCS but cannot, because we do not know the right methods and tools yet

4.1.1 Verification Strategy for a Full Development

Define the strategy for verifying a full development of the EVC software from the requirements source (ss 026+TSIs+...). This ends with the verification of the software/hardware integration. The API is currently the best description of the interface

4.1.2 Validation Strategy for a Full Development

Classical validation starts after SW/HW integration. Sketch how this should look like for the openETCS architecture approach (with SSRS and API). Ideal would be a description of how a full openETCS EVC software could be taken up by some manufacturer and brought to life in a product (validation aspect only, of course). Validation will use tests covering operational scenarios. Not-so-classical validation can start earlier when executable models become available. If a model can be animated to run an operational scenario (perhaps with some additional environment/rest-of-system modeling), design defects may get unveiled before the real validation.

4.2 Verification & Validation Strategy for openETCS

The project will only perform part of the development, and thus also only a part of the V&V activities. These need to be defined and planned, of course.

5 Verification & Validation Plan for a Full Development

Contributors to this chapter:

DLR Overall coherence, revise structure of the Verification Report

All4Tec Role of model-based testing, ¿hopefully more?

SQS tbd

CEA Tools and methods Sec. 5.3)

U Bremen Tools and methods (model based testing, bounded model checking Sec. 5.3),
V&V process steps

Fraunhofer Tools and methods Sec. 5.3)

TUBS Safety Interface, general tool list

TWT, URO Tools and methods Sec. 5.3)

DB, SNCF, NS operator role (end user scenarios, validation requirements and contribution)

Institut Telecom Methods and Tools Sec. 5.3)

%%detail%%

Instantiate the generic Verification & Validation plan from the standard (and the draft) to openETCS. That is, provide the requirements, define the design steps, identify verification & validation activities to be performed and documents to be produced.

The plan details how to perform verification & validation for a complete development which follows the process sketch from D2.3, so that the result conforms to the requirements of the standards for a SIL 4 development. This includes a definition of activities, the documentation to be produced, the organisation structure, roles, a selection of methods and tools, a format for describing design artifacts subject to V&V, and a feedback format for the findings during V&V.

As D2.3 gives only a rough description of the development steps and not yet a complete list of design artifacts, nor one of methods applied and formats to be used, this first version of the V&V plan will also lack detail which will be added in later revisions as these informations become more concrete.

Besides the usual purpose of verification & validation activities, namely evaluating and proving the suitability of design artifacts, V&V in openETCS will also generate information on the suitability of the methods and tools employed. For that purpose, a format for describing methods and tools to be used in V&V and one for summarizing the findings about the suitability are defined.

The plan also contains partial instantiations of V&V which match partial developments that are realised within openETCS.

5.1 Verification & Validation Plan Overview

%%A list of all steps, with input and output from Jagusch, adapted to D2.3 steps%%

A short overview of the activities (Verification or Validation) which happen at the respective development steps, to be detailed in the subsequent sections. The numbering (e.g. 2e) refers to Fig. 1.

SSRS—Verification (1c): verification that the SSRS the requirements consistently extends the requirements base.

SSRS—Validation (1c): Deriving a sub-system test specification

SFM—Verification (2c): Verification that the model formalises the requirements

SFM—Validation (2c): Detailing the test specification, perhaps validating the model (e.g. via animation)

SW-SFM—Verification (3d): Verifying the SW-HW architecture definition (should be somewhere) and the software model

SW-SFM—Validation (3d): Perhaps validation of the software model

SW-FFM—Verification (3d): verification, employing also formal methods/tools

SW-FFM—Validation (3d): validation, may e.g. employ model checkers

Code—Verification (3e): verification depends on the code generation method (manual, generated, generated with validated tool), unit test requirements have to be met, afterwards code integration tests

Code—Validation (3e): no specific activities foreseen

The following steps need some coherent concept. A viable solution might look simpler / different.

EVC Software—Verification (tbd): Perform software system verification

EVC Software—Validation (tbd): Validation against user requirements/scenarios

SW/HW integration (tbd): ¿Use the API?

Final Validation (tbd): User requirements and scenarios (based on sub-system test specification)

5.2 Requirements Base

The requirements on the EVC software origin in the SS-026 and TSI specifications.

%%detail this, add references%%

5.3 Verification & Validation Methods and Tools

The project shall select / develop / describe a chain of methods and tools for doing verification & validation in a full development. Some will be suitable for both, verification & validation, tasks. Each proposal shall be labeled accordingly.

In common language, the notion “*formal*” is often used in a broad sense, meaning everything that can be described by rules, even if they are rather vague. Contrary to that, we use “*formal*” in the narrow sense of EN-50128 [1, Section D.28], meaning strictly mathematical techniques and methods. Since the Aerospace Standard DO-178C [2] follows a similar understanding, but gives more elaborate explanation in its supplementary document devoted to formal methods [3], our presentation closely follows the terminology of the latter.

Formal methods are mathematically based techniques for the specification, development, and verification of software aspects of digital systems. The mathematical basis of formal methods consists of formal logic, discrete mathematics, and computer-readable languages. The use of formal methods is motivated by the expectation that, as in other engineering disciplines, performing appropriate mathematical analyses can contribute to establishing the correctness and robustness of a design.

[3, Section 1.0, p.1]

5.3.1 Model Based Testing Method

5.3.1.1 Model Based Testing Strategy - generalities

Testing consists in executing the System Under Test (SUT) for some particular inputs and in assessing whether or not the corresponding SUT executions conform to some requirements. Whatever the testing technique used is, one has to define test cases to be submitted to the SUT and associate to them a decision procedure called oracle. The oracle allows the tester to compute verdicts according to what the executions of SUT (resulting from the test case submission) reveal about its correctness. This correctness is measured with respect to requirements. Model based testing is a particular kind of testing technique in which requirements are described by models which are executable specifications. Their execution traces (or “traces” for short) are sequences of stimulations of the SUT and resulting observations of the SUT reactions. Test cases are sequences of stimulations that are selected from the test model. A sequence corresponding to an input test data can be obtained by considering a trace of the model and “forgetting” all observations occurring in it. For functional testing, SUT is considered as a black bbox: the tester (a human or a test bench) can only stimulate the SUT and observe its reactions. Interactions between the tester and the SUT result on the definition of traces. Therefore, a SUT can be seen as a set of traces that is not known (since SUT is a black box) but the tester may discover some of those traces by interacting with SUT. The oracle is based on a so called conformance relation. A conformance relation is a mathematical relation between the set of traces of the SUT and the set of traces of the model. When these sets of traces fulfill the relation we say that the SUT conforms to the model. The oracle takes as inputs traces representing an interaction between the tester and the SUT and compute verdicts. Whatever the testing technique is, the set of possible verdicts always contain the verdict Fail which is emitted whenever the trace taken as input demonstrates that the SUT does not conform to the model. Depending on the testing technique used there may be different verdicts emitted when Fail is not emitted. These different verdicts reflect different traceability information related to interaction trace taken as input. In this section we briefly discuss two model based testing tools that we will use conjointly in the OpenETCS project.

Start Uni Bremen****

The model based testing (MBT) may apply at different level during the lifecycle:

- Integration testing
- (Object) code verification

Model-Based System Integration Testing

The objectives of MBT on system integration level are to

- validate the correctness and completeness of the development model,
- verify that the generated code components cooperate correctly on the target HW, in order to achieve the system-level capabilities.

The first objective implies that the *test model* and the original development model are separate entities; otherwise the system integration test would just validate that all logical errors still residing in the openETCS development model are really implemented in the code. Even in presence of a formally validated development model, in which high confidence can be placed, we prefer to create a separate test model, because

- the test model may use a higher level of abstraction since only the SUT behaviour visible at the system interfaces is relevant,
- the test model may specify different interfaces to the SUT, depending on the observable interfaces in a test suite; the observation level ranges from black-box (only the “real” SUT system interfaces are visible) to grey-box level (some global variables may be monitored or even manipulated by the testing environment, some task or object communications may be observed etc.),
- the development model may contain errors that are only revealed during HW/SW integration (for example, calculations failing due to inadequate register word size, or deadlines missed due to insufficient CPU resources).

Model-Based Generated Code Testing

The second application of MBT is for the objective of code verification. If model-to-text and text-to-text transformations are not formally verified, it is necessary to verify the outcome of each transformation. Since the transformation source is a model M (recall that also high-level code is regarded as a model, represented, for example, by its control flow graphs), MBT suites can be derived automatically from this model to show that the generated code conforms to M .

Observe that in contrast to system-level MBT no redundant model is used for this objective, but the same model M used for code generation can be used: we just have to verify the consistency between code and M , without validating M 's correctness and completeness. The latter task is separately performed by means of

- property checking or

- simulation.

The model-based testing (MBT) approach can be used to create test suites conforming to the highest criticality level of the applicable CENELEC standards, in order to justify that the generated code is consistent to its model [4, 5, 6]. Furthermore, the generated result may be formally verified against the model. This formal verification task is easier than proving the correctness of a generator or compiler as a whole, because now just one concrete artefact (the generated code) has to be checked against the transformation source. The theoretical foundations of object code verification, as well as its proof of concept have been established in [7]. In [8, 9] these concepts have been refined and applied to the railway domain.

A main advantage of this approach in comparison to performing V&V for generators and compilers is that the latter do not have to be re-verified after improvements and extensions. Therefore we advocate the test-based code verification approach to be applied in openETCS for verifying generated high-level source code or object code of SIL-4 applications.

End Uni Bremen****

5.3.1.2 Model Based Testing applied to Open ETCS V&V

According to the previous activity on defining the project process, the Open ETCS process is based on 3 main inputs for methodology and product lifecycle: the SCRUM methodology, the Model Driven Design and the Cenelec software development V cycle. Traditionally, system requirements are directly translated into formal specifications on which verification and proof techniques are applied. The use of formal specifications and formal language allows then to derive the models using dedicated languages (B for instance) in order to guaranty conservation of properties along the design process. The main difficulty in this context is to be sure that the interpretation of rules has correctly been captured in the formalized specification which is not easy to check by the regulators. For this reason, the model based testing has been chosen as testing and verification technique within the V&V activities of the OpenETCS project.

Start Uni Bremen****

Moreover, we suggest to create test models on the basis of the ETCS standard (subset 026) and the existing high-level test suites made available in subset 076. The latter test cases should be feasible computations of the test model, so that the test model really creates a *superset* of the existing test suite from subset 076.

End Uni Bremen****

This technique application will be explained in the following paragraphs through the description of different model-based testing tools: MaTeLo, Diversity and RT-tester.

5.3.1.3 Matelo Model Based Testing solution

MaTeLo purpose is to generate test cases for systems whose expected usage and behavior are described by a probabilistic model. MaTeLo tool is based on its own test model called "usage model" and uses, among other characteristics, usage profiles for test case generation. This usage model describes the possibilities regarding the use of the soft (in our case; operating scenario) during its whole lifecycle. This usage model is performed thanks to a Matelo specific

modeler, it allows to generate test cases that will then be plugged to the SUT which will be the software semi-formal model realized in the frame of WP3 activities. MaTeLo has three main functionalities: test modeler, test cases generator and test campaign analyser. Even if MaTeLo is mainly a test case generation tool, we can consider that this tool performs also analysis for different reasons:

- A test model can be considered as a development artifact the same way as a system model for example. So analysis on it could identify some ambiguous or erroneous points in test model (i.e. in the future test campaign) or in the specifications (because MaTeLo mode l is built from system specifications).
- Even whether test campaign analysis is mainly based on testing activities, analysis techniques have to be used as well. The limit between a model to perform test and a model to perform analysis is not so obvious.

Because its test case generation is based on a model, MaTeLo belongs to the family of Model-Based Testing solutions. MaTeLo model basically uses Markov Chains to describe the test model of the SUT implemented for "Black Box Testing" in all xIL steps (MIL, SIL, PIL, HIL). MaTeLo Usage Model edition facility allows for implementing test models that describe the use cases of the SUT completed with the tester point of view, and then, Matelo testing facility can generate automatically the test cases generated by the tool. Thanks to the numerous validation steps, MaTeLo Test Campaign Analysis provides information such as test coverage (requirements, model) or reliability of the SUT. Once the MaTeLo test model is performed and the testing strategy is defined with MaTeLo profiles facilities, MaTeLo generates test cases. For that, MaTeLo Testor contains several test generation algorithms that can be used for different purposes. Different test case generators are based on a Usage profile approach, considering the occurrence probability of each model transition. Other are deterministic (most probable execution path, or all the transitions are covered). In the case of Open ETCS project, the SUT model is an on-board EVC, designed according to the SRS Subset 026. This specification itself is not sufficient to cover all functional aspects, and tests depend strongly on the operating rules to be considered on the observed track. The principle for the MaTeLo model would be to encompass all the possible states and transitions that can be considered in a well-defined perimeter (based on Subset026, signaling and exploitation rules to consider). Then, the test could be precisely defined by the usage profile to adapt it to a track oriented testing campaign.

5.3.1.4 Diversity Model Based Testing solution

DIVERSITY is a model based testing tool developed at CEA LIST. Its underlying technology is symbolic execution. Symbolic execution has been first defined for programs. The goal of this technique is to identify, for each possible execution of the program, the constraints to be satisfied in order to follow it. The main idea consists in executing the program, not for concrete numerical values but for symbolic parameters, and to characterize constraints on these parameters at each step of the execution. In that sens, DIVERSITY is a white box testing tool. In the frame of the openETCS project we plan to use DIVERSITY to extract test cases from models defined in the first phases of the system design. Our goal is to extract test cases dedicated to abstract safety requirements. More precisely we focus on safety requirements dealing with communication between sub systems. For that purpose we will use the language of sequence diagrams extended with timing constraints to specify such requirements. With sequence diagrams, one may describe execution scenarios in terms of partially ordered message passing between subsystems. Message passing can be structured thanks to operators expressing sequencing, parallelism, choice, loop... It is possible to automatically analyze sequence diagrams with DIVERSITY in order to extract

test cases. The originality is that, thanks to projection mechanisms, it is possible to extract test cases, not only for the entire system, but also for any sub systems composing it. Because of this mechanism, sub systems can be tested as soon as they are implemented, even though the entire system is not yet implemented. In such a process we perform a particular kind of unitary testing in which unit test cases are built according to the usage that will be made of the sub system in the entire system. In the frame of OpenETCS, this functionality could be useful in order to realize the unitary and modular tests. The first step consists in defining a requirement model in the form of a sequence diagram or a Matelo Test scenario. The requirement model is analyzed with DIVERSITY in step 2. This analysis results on a so-called symbolic tree, where each path denotes a possible (symbolic) execution of the sequence diagram. Such trees may be theoretically infinite due to the possible occurrences of the "loop" operator of sequence diagrams. Therefore, DIVERSITY uses various stopping criteria to stop the computation (typically based on message coverage notions). The symbolic tree computed in step 2 characterizes executions of the whole system model. However, because testing the whole system may be complicated in terms of testing architecture, or simply because one wants to test some sub systems before the whole system is implemented, we offer a mechanism to extract symbolic trees for each distinguished sub system. This is based on so-called projection techniques. This operation is realized in step 3. In step 4, each identified sub system is tested thanks to a real time off-line testing algorithm. Then, we can relate correctness of sub systems and correctness of the whole system by using a compositionality theorem. The compositionality theorem expresses that, the conformance of each subsystems to all their projections guarantees the conformance of the whole system to the sequence diagram. A direct consequence is that any faults of the whole system can be discovered as a fault of at least one of its sub systems. This implies that testing the whole system mainly comes to test each of its sub systems after a short test integration phase testing that each sub system is correctly connected. We believe that such an approach will be very useful for ETCS systems which are by nature very distributed and thus hardly observable and controllable as a whole. The share of OBU EVC kernel in sub-system is the role of the SSRS model, and this refinement to diversity will be possible once this functional decomposition of the EVC will be released.

5.3.1.5 Complementary use of the DIVERSITY and MaTeLo

The use of the two tools can be done in a complementary way that would allow a more efficient test case set generation. MaTeLo would start from the test model, and generate automatically all the use cases that can be encountered in CBTC use. MaTeLo tool analyses the models as black box, and generates tests according to a stochastic approach. DIVERSITY will analyze these scenarios, based on a symbolic execution of the semi-formal SysML model (white box testing), in order to filter the tests generated by MaTeLo and to reduce the test case set. As discussed in previous Sections, the two tools DIVERSITY and MaTeLo handle different kinds of models. The version of DIVERSITY that we will use in the project handles high level models in the form of sequence diagrams. Such models can be used to specify requirements on communication scenario between subsystems of a reference system under test. Models handled in MaTeLo are automata labeled by transfer functions and probabilities. Such models are useful to describe executable behaviors very close to the actual implementation, and based on operating scenarios. Clearly these two levels of modeling are useful in design processes of safety critical applications such as ETCS implementations, and can be combined in different ways for improving the test coverage of our EVC Software kernel. Indeed, ETCS systems have such a level of complexity, that it is difficult to describe them in a model straight from the requirements. Therefore, the refinements provided by two modeling levels are very helpful. Moreover, it is mandatory to maintain a good traceability between these two levels of modeling, in order to fulfill the safety requirements. The complementarity of these tools takes place in some refinement processes in

which high level requirements can be implemented into executable models. However, it is crucial to assess whether executable models correctly implement requirements. In practice this may be a difficult question because it requires to efficiently explore the executable model, which by nature is generally huge because it represents in a precise manner the functional behaviors of the actual implementation. In order to overcome this problem we plan to take benefits from the fact that executable models of ETCS will be described in the form of communicating executable models. This fact permits to see the model as a collection of communicating subsystems. This permits to take benefits of the compositional result described in the Diversity, and use it for white box testing (the internal behavior of functional modules and blocks defined in the kernel can then be precisely tested)..

5.3.1.6 The RT-tester

Start Uni Bremen****

The RT-Tester test automation tool, made by Verified [10], performs automatic test generation, test execution and real-time test evaluation. It supports different testing approach such as unit testing, software integration testing for component, hardware/software integration testing and system integration testing. The RT-Tester version follows the model-based testing approach [11] and it provides the following features :

- Automated Test Case Generation
- Automated Test Data Generation
- Automated Test Procedure Generation
- Automated Requirement Tracing
- Test Management system

Starting from a test model design with UML/SYML, the RT-tester fully automatically generates test cases. They are then specified as test data (sequences of stimuli with timing constraints) and used to stimulate the SUT and run concurrently with the generated test oracles. The test procedure is the combination of the test oracles and the SUT that can be compiled and executed.

The tool supports test cases/data generation for structural testing. It automatically generates reach statement coverage, branch coverage and modified condition/decision coverage (MC/DC) as far as this is possible. The test cases may all be linked to requirements ensuring a complete requirement traceability. Additionally RT-tester may produce test cases/data from a LTL formula, since a LTL formula describes a possible run of the model.

Taking advantage of SysML requirements diagram, the test cases and test procedures are directly linked to the requirements. It is then possible to perform test campaign guided by requirements.

Finally the tool may produce the documentation of tests for certification purposes. For each test cases the following document are produced :

- *Test procedure*: that specifies how one test case can be executed, its associated test data produced and how the SUT reactions are evaluated against the expected results.
- *Test report*: that summarizes all relevant information about the test execution.

In [12], a general approach on how to qualify model-based testing tool according to the standard ISO 26262 and RTCA DO178C has been proposed and applied with success to the RT-tester tool. Following the same approach compatibility with the CENELEC EN50128 may be easily done.

End Uni Bremen****

5.3.2 Characterisation of Formal Methods

Based on rigorous mathematical notions, formal methods may be used to describe software systems' requirements in an unambiguous way, thus supporting precise communication between engineers. Formally specified requirements can be checked for consistency and completeness by appropriate tools; also, compliance between different representation levels of specification can be verified. Formal methods allow one to check software properties like:

- Freedom from exceptions
- Freedom from deadlock
- Non-interference between different levels of criticality
- Worst case resource usage (execution time, stack, ...)
- Correct synchronous or asynchronous behaviour, including absence of unintended behaviour
- absence of run-time error

In order to subsume this variety of applications under a single paradigm, the DO-178C considers a formal method to consist in applying a formal *analysis* to a formal *model*. Both analysis and model differs depending on the particular method. For most methods, the model is just identical to the source code; however, it may also be e.g. a tool-internally generated abstract state space (used in the Abstract Interpretation method, cf. Section 5.3.3.1 below). For most methods, analysis tools need human advice; however, they may also be fully automatic (e.g. for Abstract Interpretation or Model Checking, cf. 5.3.3.3).

5.3.3 Formal Analysis Methods

In this section we present the three most common methods for formal analysis. The foundation of these analysis methods are well understood and they have been applied to many practical problems.

5.3.3.1 Abstract Interpretation

The abstract interpretation method [13] builds at every point of a given program a conservative¹ abstraction of the set of *all* possible states that may occur there during any execution run. Such a representation is also called an *over-approximation*, in the sense that it captures all possible concrete behaviours of the program, while the abstraction might lead to consider states that cannot occur in a concrete execution. Abstract interpretation determines particular effects of the program relevant for the properties to be analysed, but does not actually execute it. This allows one to statically determine dynamic properties of infinite-state programs. The main application is

¹i.e. guaranteeing soundness

to check the absence of runtime errors, like e.g. dereferencing of null-pointers, zero-divides, and out-of-bound array accesses. While conventional ad-hoc static analysis tools such as PCLint or QAC++ are well-tailored for quick, but incomplete analyses, abstract-interpretation based tools while requiring more computation time, are *safe* in the sense that they guarantee that *all* potential runtime errors are detected. On the other hand, such a tool might report spurious warnings, related to states that are included in the abstraction but do not correspond to concrete executions. Such *false alarms* can be avoided to some extent by increasing the precision of the abstraction [14], at the expense of the computation time of the analysis. However, human intervention is often required to improve the approximation accuracy w.r.t. those program points where *false alarms* have to be removed.

5.3.3.2 Deductive Verification

Deductive methods [15] [16] perform mathematical proofs to establish formally specified properties of a given program, thus providing rigorous evidence. Its primary use is to verify functional properties of the program. This method is based on the Hoare logic [17, 18], or axiomatic semantics, in which functions are seen as predicate transformers. In summary, a function f is given a state described by a given predicate P and transforms it into a new state, described by another predicate $f(P)$. In this context, the specification of f is given by a *contract*, which defines the predicate R that f requires from its callers and the predicate E that it ensures upon return. Verifying the implementation against such a specification amounts to proving that for each P such that $P \Rightarrow R$ (i.e. that satisfies the requirement of f), then $E \Rightarrow f(P)$ (i.e. the concrete final state is implied by what f ensures).

Tools based on deductive verification usually extract proof obligations from program code and property specifications and attempt to prove them, either automatically or interactively. Some tools are tightly coupled to a given theorem prover, while other such as Why3 [19] promote a cooperation across a wide range of provers. In addition to the contracts of the function, it is often required to provide additional annotations in order to be able to use deductive verification. In particular, for each loop in the code, a suitable *loop invariant* has to be provided. A loop invariant is a property that is true when encountering the loop for the first time and, if true at the beginning of a loop step, stays true at the end of this step. From both hypotheses, it is then possible to inductively conclude that the invariant is true for any number of step, and in particular at the end of the loop. While it is possible to synthesize automatically loop invariant in some simple cases, in particular thanks to abstract interpretation, this activity must most of the time be done manually.

Similarly, some proof obligations are too complicated to be handled by automated theorem provers, and must be discharged interactively via proof assistants [20, 21]. Deductive verification is thus much less automated than abstract interpretation. On the other hand, it is much more flexible for functional properties verification, in the sense that it can be used to prove any property that can be expressed in the specification language of the tool (usually any first-order logic property), while abstract interpretation is limited to the properties that fit within the abstract setting that has been chosen.

5.3.3.3 Model Checking

Model checking [22] explores all possible behaviours of a program to determine whether a specified property is satisfied. It is applicable only to programs with reasonable small state spaces; the specifications are usually about temporal properties. If a property is unsatisfied, a counter-example can be generated automatically, showing a use case leading to property violation.

5.3.4 Verification with Formal Methods

In the railway domain, the standard EN 50128 highly recommends use of formal methods in requirements specification ([1, Table A.2]), software architecture (A.3), software design and implementation (A.4), verification and testing (A.5), data preparation (A.11), and modelling (A.17) for Safety Integrity Level SIL 3 and above. However, functional/black-box testing is still mandatory in verification; this constraint may be considered as discouraging from the use of formal methods.

Until recently, the situation was quite similar in the aerospace domain. J. Joyce, a member of the RTCA standardisation committee SC-205, described Airbus' problems in certifying their "unit-proof for unit-test" approach:

"Formal methods were used for certification credit in development of the A380, but apparently it was not a trivial matter to persuade certification authorities that this was acceptable even with the reference to formal methods in DO-178B as an alternative method."

Such experiences eventually caused the more detailed treatment of formal method issues in the revision C of DO-178 that appeared in late 2011. The DO-178C considers formal methods as special cases of reviews and analyses; thus incorporating them without major structural changes of the software development recommendations. For an employed formal method, the standard requires to justify its unambiguity, its soundness², and any additional assumptions³ needed by the method. The DO-178C admits formal property verification on object code as well as on source code, the latter additionally needing evidence about property preservation of the source-to-object code compiler. However, *"functional tests executed in target hardware are always required to ensure that the software in the target computer will satisfy the high-level requirements"* [3, FM.12.3.5].

As a consequence of subsuming formal methods under general reviews and analyses, no deviating special rules to qualify tools are necessary: *"Any tool that supports the formal analysis should be assessed under the tool qualification guidance required by DO-178C and qualified where necessary."* [3, FM.1.6.2]. Of course, for the railway domain, the rules of EN 50128 for supporting software tools and languages must be taken into account [1, Section 6.7].

During the last 15 years, formal methods have grown out of academic playgrounds and become practically relevant in several applications domains. Below, we sketch a few different tools, also to indicate the variety of issues formal methods can be applied for. Many of the tools mentioned below provide formal verification for programs written in C. There is currently insufficient support for the programming language C++, which is predominantly used in Thales' RBC product. A list of free software tools for formal verification can be found at [24]. The list is not meant to be complete. It is structured by tool purpose, and each tool is briefly introduced.

5.3.4.1 The Frama-C Source Code Analysis Suite

Frama-C [25] is a suite of tools from CEA LIST and INRIA Saclay, dedicated to the analysis of C source code. Frama-C gathers several static analysis techniques in a single collaborative framework. Frama-C also features a formal specification language, ACSL [26], in which the

²i.e., that the method never asserts a property to be true when it actually may be not true

³e.g. data range limits

contract of each function of the program can be written (see section 5.3.3.2), as well as assertions that are supposed to hold at a given program point.

Frama-C's kernel as well as many analysis plug-ins are available under the LGPL Open-Source licence from [27]. Other plug-ins have been developed by third-party developers, either in an academic [28] or an industrial [16] background. The remainder of this section only deals with the plugins that are released with Frama-C's kernel and are the most relevant for OpenETCS.

Value Analysis

Value analysis is based on abstract interpretation (section 5.3.3.1). This plugin analyses a complete application, starting from a given entry point, and gives at each program point an over-approximation of the values that can appear in each memory location at this point. For each operation, Value also checks that whether the abstract value of the operands guarantees that the operation is safe. If this is not the case, it emits an alarm, in the form of an ACSL assertion, and attempts to reduce its abstract state to represent only safe concrete values. If all concrete values are unsafe, then either the corresponding branch of the code is dead (and was only taken because of the over-approximation), or there is a real error in the code. Otherwise, the analysis resumes with the reduced state. Conversely, if no alarm is emitted by Value, the analysed code is guaranteed not to lead to a run-time error.

Value can also be used to check whether ACSL annotations hold or not. However, it is restricted to the subset of the ACSL language that fits well within the abstract representation that is used.

Finally, Value can be tweaked in various ways to increase the precision of the results (leading to fewer false alarms), generally at the expense of the computation time and amount of memory used by the analysis. These options are described in more detail in Value's reference manual [29].

WP

WP is a plugin dedicated to deductive verification (see section 5.3.3.2). It uses different models to represent C memory states in the logic. More abstract models lead to easier proof obligations, but cannot be used in presence of low-level pointer arithmetic, while more concrete ones are able to deal with any C construction, at the expense of far more complex proof obligations.

WP has two native interfaces to discharge proof obligations. The first one calls the Alt-Ergo [30] automated theorem prover, while the second let the user do the proof within the Coq [20] interactive proof assistant. In both cases, the original formulas are first run through an internal simplifier, that can directly discharge the simplest proof obligations, without the need for a call to an external tool. In addition, WP can also call the Why3 [19] back-end, through which it has access to a variety of automated provers. Alt-Ergo, Coq and Why3 are available under Open-Source licences (Cecill-C and LGPL). The various possible settings of WP are described in its user manual [31].

While WP's primary usage is to prove functional properties expressed as function contracts, it can also be used to prove the absence of runtime error, either by discharging the alarms emitted by Value Analysis, or by generating proof obligations for all operations that might lead to a runtime error (without having to use Value first). The latter case is done through the use of the *RTE* plugin, that generates an ACSL assertion for each potentially dangerous operation. WP can then generate proof obligations for these assertions as usual.

Aorai

While Value and WP are used to verify program properties, the Aorai plugin is dedicated to generate ACSL specifications (which can then be proved by Value or WP). More precisely, it takes as input an automaton describing the sequence of function calls that are allowed during the execution of a program (from a given entry point). From that automaton, Aorai instruments the code and provides ACSL contract for each function so that if all the contracts hold, then the code is behaving according to the automaton.

Transitions of the automaton can be guarded by conditions over the state of the program at a given call point. Full syntax of Aorai's input language is described in [32].

5.3.4.2 The Diversity Symbolic Execution Tool

DIVERSITY is a symbolic execution tool developed at CEA – LIST. Its underlying technology is *symbolic execution*. Symbolic execution has been first defined for programs [33, 34, 35]. The goal of this technique is to identify, for each possible execution of the program, the constraints to be satisfied in order to follow it. The main idea consists in executing the program, not for concrete numerical values but for symbolic parameters, and to characterize constraints on those parameters at each step of the execution. For instance let us consider that at a given step of an execution the next instruction *ins* to be executed is $if(x > 14)x := x + 1$. Moreover let us suppose that from the previous steps we have computed a couple $(x \rightarrow a, a < 45)$ meaning that before the execution of *ins*, the value of x is represented by the symbolic parameter a , with the constraint that $a < 45$. Executing *ins* results on a new context $(x \rightarrow a + 1, a < 45 \wedge a > 14)$ taking into account both the constraints so that the instruction is executable (x has to be greater than 14 and since x value is a it means that a has to be greater than 14) and the variable updates induced by the instruction (the result of the execution of $x := x + 1$ is that x value is now $a + 1$). $a < 45 \wedge a > 14$ is called a *path condition*. Generating test data to follow some executions comes the to use solvers to find values satisfying such path conditions. Symbolic execution has been later adapted to modeling formalisms like *Input Output Symbolic Transition Systems* ([36, 37]), later to timed version of *Input Output Symbolic Transition Systems* ([38, 39]) and also to various industrial modeling languages like the sequence diagrams of the *UML* ([40]). Those symbolic execution adaptations have been used in model based testing contexts. System under test are compared to their models by means of two conformance relations namely *ioco* ([41]) and its timed extension *tioco* ([42]). Those two conformance relations are among the most widely accepted conformance relations. Several testing algorithms were defined based on those conformance relations ([43, 38, 39]).

In the frame of the openETCS project we plan to use DIVERSITY to extract test cases from models defined in the first phases of the system design. Our goal is to extract test cases dedicated to abstract safety requirements. More precisely we focus on safety requirements dealing with communication between sub systems. For that purpose we will use the language of sequence diagrams extended with timing constraints to specify such requirements. With sequence diagrams, one may describe execution scenarios in terms of partially ordered message passing between subsystems. Message passing can be structured thanks to powerful operators expressing sequencing, parallelism, choice, loop... In [40] we show how to automatically analyze such sequence diagrams with DIVERSITY in order to extract test cases. The originality is that is that, thanks to projection mechanisms, it is possible to extract test cases, not only for the entire system, but also for any of its distinguished sub systems. Thanks to this mechanism, sub systems can be tested as soon as they are implemented, even though the entire system is not yet implemented. In such a process we perform a particular kind of unitary testing in which unit test cases are




Figure 2. Compositionnal Testing

built according to the usage that will be made of the sub system in the entire system. Faults identified with such an approach are very relevant because we know that they will be activated in the system. The process is illustrated in Figure 2. The first step consists in defining a requirement model in the form of a sequence diagram. The requirement model is analyzed with DIVERSITY in step (2). This analysis results on a so-called *symbolic tree*, whose each path denotes a possible (symbolic) execution of the sequence diagram. Such trees may be theoretically infinite due to the possible occurrences of the "loop" operator of sequence diagrams. Therefore, DIVERSITY uses various stopping criteria to stop the computation (typically based on message coverage notions). The symbolic tree computed in step (2) characterizes executions of the whole system model. However because testing the whole system may be complicated in terms of testing architecture, or simply because one wants to test some sub systems before the whole system is implemented, we offer a mechanisms to extract symbolic trees for each distinguished sub system. This is based on so-called *projection* techniques ([44, 38]). This operation is realized in step (3). In step (4) Each identified sub system is tested thanks to a real time off-line testing algorithm ([39]). Thanks to a compositionality theorem ([45]) we can relate correctness of sub systems and correctness of the whole system (see step 5). The compositionality theorem expresses that, the conformance of each subsystems to all their projections guarantees the conformance of the whole system to the sequence diagram. A direct consequence is that any faults of the whole system can be discovered as a fault of at least one of its sub systems. This implies that testing the whole system mainly comes to test each of its sub systems regardless of a very simple test integration phase in which one only tests that each sub system is correctly connected. We believe that such an approach will be very useful for ETCS systems which are by nature very distributed and thus hardly observable and controllable as a whole. We plan to identify with experts how to partition them into several sub systems that will be more easily observable and controllable at the testing phase.

5.3.4.3 Microsoft's Verifier for Concurrent C (VCC)

VCC is a tool from Microsoft Research to prove correctness of annotated concurrent C programs. It was mainly developed to verify Microsoft's *Hyper-V* hypervisor. It supports an own annotation language providing e.g. contracts, pre- and postconditions, and type invariants. It uses the Boogie tool to generate proof obligations, and the automatic prover Z3 to prove them. If an obligation is violated, the Model Viewer tool can generate a counter-example use case. VCC is available for non-commercial use from [46].

5.3.4.4 The Proof Assistants Coq and Isabelle

Coq is an interactive theorem prover and proof checker, developed at INRIA, and based on higher-order logic and the natural deduction calculus. It provides the formal language *Gallina*, in which mathematical definitions can be expressed as well as executable algorithms and theorems. The supporting tool for tactics-based semi-interactive development of proofs is available from [20].

Isabelle, maintained at Cambridge University, and its predecessor *HOL*⁴, are similar tactic-oriented interactive theorem provers. *Isabelle* is available from [21]. While *Isabelle* is not yet supported in the Frama-C environment, *Coq* is.

5.3.4.5 The Model Checker NuSMV

*SMV*⁵ has been the first model checker based on binary decision diagrams. *NuSMV* is a reimplementation by the Fondazione Bruno Kessler that is in addition capable of performing SAT-based model-checking. It supports both Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) and Computation Tree Logic (CTL). *NuSMV*'s source code is available under an LGPL license from [47].

5.3.4.6 Formal Verification of Real-Time Aspects based on Timed Automata

===== Start TWT =====

Verifying system properties involving time is difficult with traditional model checking methods. Commonly used *temporal logics*, such as LTL or CTL catch discrete and qualitative aspects of time and allow to formulate properties such as⁶

- X** At the next point in time a property holds.
- F** At some future point in time a property holds.
- G** Always/generally (now and at any future point in time) a property holds.
- U** A property *p* holds until a property *q* holds.

While it is possible to state properties that must be satisfied at individual (discrete) points in time, continuous and quantitative aspects of time as in the safety requirement

“The delay between receiving an emergency message and the issuing of a brake order is less than 1 second.”

are a real challenge. The problem does not stem from discrete vs. continuous time, as any physical realisation of a real-time system is inherently discretised by its clock. Instead, an operator for expressing arbitrary temporal quantities or differences is missing. Thus, for LTL and a clock of 1 kHz, it would be required to use the operator **X** 1000 times. This notation is rather unhandy, as it enforces to express a functional property relative to a particular system.

This lack of expressivity is not merely a matter of notation, i.e., LTL or CTL, but also of the underlying semantics. Before introducing a better suited logic we will first consider a formalism that serves as this logic's semantics – namely *timed automata*.

⁴Higher Order Logic

⁵Symbolic Model Verifier

⁶The prefixes are the corresponding linear time operators.




Figure 3. First (faulty) version of a timed automaton for processing emergency messages




Figure 4. Corrected version of the timed automaton for processing emergency messages

Timed Automata

Timed automata [48] are essentially finite automata extended with a finite set of clocks that all proceed at the same rate. Clocks may be individually reset to zero. Clock variables can be part of constraint expressions that may be used as transition guards. A transition can only be taken if its guard is fulfilled. Similarly, it is possible to specify an invariant for a state that must be satisfied when the automaton is in this state. Thus, we can enforce time constraints for the runs of the automaton.

An Example

The timed automaton in Figure 3 depicts an automaton representing an over-simplified version of an OBU subsystem processing emergency messages. It has three states, one clock x and three actions, *emg_msg* (reception of an emergency message), *proc_msg* (processing the message, e.g. raising an alarm) and *brake* (issuing the brake order). Upon receiving an emergency message the clock x is reset. The *proc_msg*-transition is guarded by the clock constraint $x < 1$ preventing the transition to be taken if $x \geq 1$. The same holds for the *brake*-transition.

One might think that the automaton from Figure 3 thus fulfills the safety requirement stated above. Due to the operational semantics of timed automata this is not true: a timed automaton in a given state can either take a transition or wait for an arbitrary amount of time. Thus, if automaton waits in state *rcvd* and x exceeds one second, the system will deadlock as the next transition is guarded by the constraint $x < 1$. A run of the automaton that could serve as counterexample is, e.g.

$$(\text{wait}, 0) \rightarrow (\text{wait}, 0.5) \rightarrow (\text{rcvd}, 0.5) \rightarrow (\text{rcvd}, 2) \rightarrow \text{DEADLOCK}$$

A solution to this problem is to force the automaton to proceed by placing *progress* constraints on the states. This has been done in Figure 4. The transition guards have been omitted as they are not necessary anymore. Now the safety property “The delay between receiving an emergency message and the issuing of a brake order is less than 1 second.” is fulfilled.

UPPAAL

UPPAAL is a tool for modelling and verifying timed automata developed by the universities of Uppsala and Aalborg [49]. This toolkit is under constant development and comes with an academic as well as a commercial licence. Moreover, there is a comparably large body of literature featuring UPPAAL, providing introductory and industrial examples.

UPPAAL extends timed automata with synchronisation enabling concurrent, communicating automata representing different parts of a system. In addition, variables other than clocks are supported making the modelling language more powerful. The logic used for expressing real-time properties is a subset of TCTL (Timed Computation Tree Logic). Nesting of temporal operators is not supported leading to a restriction in expressiveness.

From SysML/UML to Timed Automata

Timed automata and statecharts in SysML/UML are both based on the concept of finite automata. Thus, it seems reasonable to extract timed automata from existing statecharts which is addressed in the literature [50, 51, 52]. In this way, safety properties – formalised as TCTL formulae – can be verified in an automated fashion for a given statechart. However, there remain challenges:

- Translating hierarchical states to timed automata is not straight-forward and complicates matters significantly. If an hierarchical state-chart is flattened, structural information is lost and makes the timed automaton more difficult to read and understand. Thus, it is advisable to retain some kind of hierarchy, possibly by using synchronisation mechanisms.
- Special statechart features, such as history nodes that have a partially undefined semantics according to the current SysML/UML standard [53], introduce problems. As they are not used very often, they can possibly left out in a first iteration.

===== End TWT =====

5.3.5 Verification with Model-Based Simulation

===== Start URO (first draft) =====

This section addresses verification based on simulation. By building an executable model of system components its real-time behaviour can be analysed and evaluated before actually building the entire system.

5.3.5.1 Modelling with SysML and SystemC

Specifications in natural language are difficult to handle. Breaking down an overall system description into small comprehensible parts reduces complexity and eases interdisciplinary communication to be more efficient in performing development tasks.

SysML, developed by the OMG (Object Management Group), is a simple but powerful general-purpose graphical modeling language that does not directly support executable models. However, there is a variety of tools for code generation from UML/SysML, especially for the Eclipse platform and the Papyrus framework that will be used in the project.

To enable model execution and especially real-time simulation it is considered to generate semi-formal SystemC code from that abstract SysML models. It has to be investigated whether the the SysML model have to be adapted to a domain or language specific version. Concrete analysis will show whether this is feasible.

SystemC is a C++ library providing an event-driven simulation interface suitable for electronic system design at various abstraction levels (from high level down to individual hardware components). It enables a system designer to simulate concurrent processes. SystemC processes can communicate in a simulated real-time environment, using channels of different datatypes (all C++ types and user defined types are supported). SystemC supports hardware and software synthesis (with the corresponding tools). SystemC models are executable.

5.3.5.2 Model execution and simulation

The aim of the execution of an SystemC model is to ensure that the working capacity (performance) of the underlying hardware system is sufficient to meet the system requirements. It has to be analysed which hardware resources will be needed for the OBU to avoid excessive delays and to ensure adequate response times in critical situations. Because of the integrated simulation environment, SystemC enables scheduling analysis for average and worst-case conditions and provides analyses of process resources for individual system functions.

In addition, by creating an executable system model from SysML or UML, the (real time) behaviour of the system can be analysed which is not feasible at the SysML level.

==== End URO =====

5.4 Verification for a Full Development

for each of the verification steps identified in the plan overview, the following has to be instantiated:

5.4.1 DASV Verification

5.4.1.1 Task

5.4.1.2 Documents to Be Produced

5.4.1.3 Phase Specific Activities

5.4.1.4 Techniques and Measures

Here the verification plan begins

5.4.2 SSRS Verification (1c)

5.4.2.1 Task

The SSRS (sub-system requirement specification) outlines the subsystem which is going to be modeled within the project. The SSRS describes the architecture of the subsystem (functions and their I/O) and the requirements allocated to these functions. If necessary, the requirements are rewritten in order to address the I/O and to correspond to the allocation. It also provides the

classification into vital and non vital requirements and data streams. The architecture part is described in a semi-formal language, and the requirements are described in natural language.

The SSRS is to be viewed as a supplement to the SS-026 and the TSIs and is not intended to replace them. The verification has to check that a complete and consistent set of functionalities have been identified and that the architecture is adequate.

%%Verify hazard analysis too?%%

5.4.2.2 Documents to Be Produced

SSRS verification report.

5.4.2.3 Phase Specific Activities

5.4.2.4 Techniques and Measures

Due to the informal nature of the SSRS, mainly manual techniques are to be applied.

¿Review?

5.4.3 SFM Verification (2c)

5.4.3.1 Task

5.4.3.2 Documents to Be Produced

5.4.3.3 Phase Specific Activities

5.4.3.4 Techniques and Measures

%%further verification phases%%

5.5 Structure of the Verification Report

%%To Be Defined%% the following is a draft which is to be adapted to the *The verification and validation plan covers the following central topics:*

Header *containing all information to identify, this report, the authors, the approbation and reviewing entities.*

Executive Summary *giving an overview of the major elements from all sections.*

Problem Statement *describing the challenges to be answered by Verification & Validation as well as the decisions to be taken based on the V&V results as well as how to cope with potentially faulty output. It further describes the accreditation scope based on the risk assessment done on V&V-level.*

V&V Requirements Traceability Matrix *links every V&V artifact back to the requirements to measure e.g. test coverage and to directly link V&V results to the requirements.*

Acceptability Criteria, *describing the criteria for acceptance of the artifact into the Verification & Validation process e.g. as the direct translation of the requirements into metrics to measure success, are used e.g. for burndown charts within the process.*

Assumptions *that are identified during the design of the verification and validation strategy and how these assumptions have an impact on the verdict by listing capabilities and limitations.*

Risks and Impacts *that come across the execution of V&V tasks together with the impacts foreseen.*

V&V Design *states how the V&V process builds up including data preparation, execution and evaluation.*

V&V Methodologies *giving a step-by-step walkthrough of all possible V&V activities including the assumptions, and verdict-relevant limitations and criteria for, e.g., model verification, model-to-code verification, unit testing, integration testing and final validation (according to the standard, this involves running the software on the target hardware).*

V&V Issues *describing unsolved V&V issues and their impact on the affected proof or verdict.*

Peer Reviews *going into details on how the community can take part and how official bodies and partners are integrated into the development and review process.*

Test Plan Definition *going into the details of testing by describing among other things:*

Title *as a unique identifier to the test plan.*

Description *of the test and the test-item giving information about version and revision.*

Features *to be tested and not to be tested in combination are listed together with information background.*

Entry Criteria *which have to be met by the EVC before a test can be started, e.g. that the EVC has to be in level 3 limited supervision with the order to switch to level 2.*

Suspension criteria and resumption requirements *are the central key to a smooth automation of the tests covering topics like when exiting this test before step 10, which entry criteria does it comply to or which resumption sequence has to be executed to continue testing.*

Walkthrough *covering a step-by-step approach of the test plan.*

Environmental requirements *going into the details of what is needed concerning the test environment, e.g. tools, adapter, data preparation.*

Discrepancy Reports *identifying the defects.*

Key Participants *describing the assignment and task for each role involved.*

Accreditation of Participants *describing who was accredited to which role during the Verification & Validation phase.*

V&V Participants *listing the partners participating in V&V activities,*

Other participants *including other interest groups such as reviewer by affiliate partners⁷.*

Timeline *giving the timeline for the baselines as input to the V&V process and identifying when each artifact should be created.*

5.6 Validation for a Full Development

for each of the validation steps identified in the plan overview, the following has to be instantiated:

⁷affiliate partners are non-funded companies who signed the project cooperation agreement and with it get read access to the repositories starting from incubation phase to contribute e.g. by reviewing

5.6.1 DASV Validation

5.6.1.1 Task

5.6.1.2 Documents to Be Produced

5.6.1.3 Phase Specific Activities

5.6.1.4 Techniques and Measures

5.6.2 SFM Validation (3d)

5.6.2.1 Task

The formalisation of the requirements in form of a semi-formal model enables a systematic check of the completeness and consistency of the system test specification.

The model itself can perhaps be animated (depending on the concrete form which is not yet fixed). This offers the chance to an early (preliminary) validation of the design.

5.6.2.2 Documents to Be Produced

1. Revised System Test Specification
2. SFM validation report

5.6.2.3 Phase Specific Activities

%%To Be Defined%%

5.6.2.4 Techniques and Measures

%%To Be Defined%%

5.6.3 Final Validation (tbd)

5.6.3.1 Task

The final validation shall ascertain that the end result of the development—the EVC software in its specified environment—behaves as required.

5.6.3.2 Documents to Be Produced

1. System Test Definition (based on System Test Specification)
2. System Validation Report

5.6.3.3 Phase Specific Activities

Testing the software against the user requirements.

5.6.3.4 Techniques and Measures

¿Testing in a validated testbed (including API animation/simulation)?

5.7 Implementation of Verification & Validation

The verification & validation has to be performed in cooperation with WP 3, which produces DAS2Vs (models and code), and with WP 7, where methods and tools are defined and developed.

To exchange information with WP 3, formats are needed for collecting information about DAS2Vs (V&V tasks) and for giving back information about the results of V&V activities. Similarly, with WP 7 communication shall use formats to describe V&V methods and tools (input from WP 7) and the results of evaluations of V&V methods and tools.

%%Formats, activity organisation%%

6 Verification & Validation Plan for openETCS

Contributions to this chapter

DLR overall coherence, lab test description

U Bremen RT Tester application, ¿more?

Siemens Application story (to be detailed)

SQS tbd

CEA Application story (to be detailed)

All4Tec Application story (to be detailed)

DB, SNCF, NS Validation requirements

%%Describe how to proceed in openETCS to achieve the most. Include all partial V&V instantiations with their re

- *verification & validation for partial developments*
- *evaluation*
- *demonstration story of capabilities*

6.1 Verification Plan for openETCS

6.1.1 Formal Verification of Real-Time Aspects based on Timed Automata (TWT)

This section describes our the plans regarding the verification of real-time aspects by employing timed automata and the UPPAAL tool within the project. In Section 5.3.4.6 (page 23) we have given an introduction to and described the principles of verification based on timed automata.

TWT's work will be based on the following action items:

1. We will analyze whether/how UML/SysML statecharts⁸ can be transformed to timed automata in a sensible manner while retaining as much structural information as possible.
2. Parts of the ETCS specification where timing plays a vital role will be analysed and veried based on timed automata by employing the transformation mechanism. Here we assume that the corresponding parts of the specification have already been modelled in SysML as will be done within WP3. In the case that a direct, automatic transformation is not feasible for now, we will manually create timed automata models to conduct our analyses.
3. We will provide documentation and feedback to WP3 and WP4 about our results to align our efforts with the other partners.

⁸The statecharts in UML and SysML are actually the same.

4. We will investigate, how our approach can be integrated in the Eclipse environment and develop such integration if feasible with our efforts.
5. We plan to publish our results on action item 1.

Please note that the above list may be subject to future change.

6.1.2 Verification with Model-Based Simulation using SystemC (TWT, URO)

In Section 5.3.5 (page 25) the basics of SystemC and the SysML/SystemC joint approach have been described. TWT and the University of Rostock (URO) will work on this concept based on the following action items:

1. TWT will analyse methods for generating SystemC code from SysML models. In first investigations the Acceleo tool (Eclipse plugin, based on OMG standard) seems to be a promising candidate for model-to-text transformation.
2. URO will build a modular and executable SystemC model for braking curves that is suitable for real-time simulation. An accompanying high-level SysML model will be constructed as well and will be means to test the transformation methods to be developed in the context of action item 1.
3. TWT and URO plan to investigate which other parts of the ETCS specification can benefit from real-time simulation and build models accordingly.
4. URO will investigate whether performance analysis based on the underlying hardware system is feasible within the openETCS project. This will allow to scale the hardware resources of the OBU system accordingly.
5. In addition, using the results from action item 1, TWT and URO plan to transform existing SysML models (to be developed in WP3) to SystemC for real-time simulation.
6. Evaluation (and possibly implementation) of an Eclipse integration

Please note that the above list may be subject to future change.

6.2 Validation Plan for openETCS

Appendix A: Requirements on Verification & Validation

%%Explain the requirement chapter.%%

- *Requirements from D2.9.*
- *Take the lists from the draft from 121207, retain the structure (at least preliminarily).*

A.1 Requirements on Verification & Validation from D2.9

%%Adapt the intro text%%

The already provided requirements require a safety plan compliant to the CENELEC EN 50126, 50128 and 50129. This pulls a number of requirements on V&V, including Verification and Validation plans. On the topic of compliance to EN 50128, one shall also refer to the D2.2 document.

R-WP2/D2.6-02-061 A Verification plan shall be issued and complied with.

R-WP2/D2.6-02-061.01 The verification plan shall provide a method to demonstrate the requirements covering all the development artifacts.

R-WP2/D2.6-02-061.02 The verification plan shall state all verification activities required for each of these development artifacts.

R-WP2/D2.6-02-062 A Validation Plan shall be issued and complied with.

R-WP2/D2.6-02-062.01 The validation plan shall provide a method to validate all functional and safety requirements over all development artifacts.

R-WP2/D2.6-02-062.02 The validation plan shall state all validation activities required for each of these development artifacts.

R-WP2/D2.6-01-021 The test plan shall comply the mandatory documents of the SUBSET-076, restricted to the scope of the OpenETCS project.

Justification. It will possibly be difficult to model all the tests in the course of the project, but the test plan should at least be complete.

R-WP2/D2.6-02-063 Each design artifact needs a reference artifact which it implements (e.g. code to detailed model, SFM to SSRS model. . .)

R-WP2/D2.6-02-063.01 The implementation between them relation shall be specified in detail.

e.g. for state machine and a higher level state machine mapping of interfaces, states and transition is required. This includes additional invariants, input assumptions and further restrictions. This information is the basis for verification activities.

R-WP2/D2.6-02-063.02 The design of the artifacts shall be made such to allow verifiability as far as possible.

R-WP2/D2.6-02-064 The findings from the verification shall be traced, and will be adequately addressed (taken into consideration, or postponed or discarded with a justification).

A.2 General Requirements on Verification

%%To Be Defined%% Reformulate text taken from the EN 50128 to avoid copyright infringements.

Excerpt from EN 50128:2011 [N01]	Requirement	Project Relevance
5.3.2.7	For each document, traceability shall be provided in terms of a unique reference number and a defined and documented relationship with other documents.	fully applicable
5.3.2.8	Each term, acronym or abbreviation shall have the same meaning in every document. If, for historical reasons, this is not possible, the different meanings shall be listed and the references given.	
5.3.2.9	Except for documents relating to pre-existing software (see 7.3.4.7), each document shall be written according to the following rules: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it shall contain or implement all applicable conditions and requirements of the preceding document with which it has a hierarchical relationship; it shall not contradict the preceding document. 	
5.3.2.10	Each item or concept shall be referred to by the same name or description in every document.	
6.5.4.14	Traceability to requirements shall be an important consideration in the validation of a safety-related system and means shall be provided to allow this to be demonstrated throughout all phases of the lifecycle.	

Excerpt from EN 50128:2011 [N01]	Requirement	Project Relevance
6.5.4.15	<p>Within the context of this European Standard, and to a degree appropriate to the specified software safety integrity level, traceability shall particularly address</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) traceability of requirements to the design or other objects which fulfil them, b) traceability of design objects to the implementation objects which instantiate them. c) traceability of requirements and design objects to the tests (component, integration, overall test) and analyses that verify them. <p>Traceability shall be the subject of configuration management.</p>	
6.5.4.16	In special cases, e.g. pre-existing software or prototyped software, traceability may be established after the implementation and/or documentation of the code, but prior to verification/validation. In these cases, it shall be shown that verification/validation is as effective as it would have been with traceability over all phases.	This requirement does not apply to the project.
6.5.4.17	Objects of requirements, design or implementation that cannot be adequately traced shall be demonstrated to have no bearing upon the safety or integrity of the system.	

Excerpt from EN 50128:2011 [N01]	Requirement
6.1.4.1	Tests performed by other parties such as the Requirements Manager, Designer or Implementer, if fully documented and complying with the following requirements, may be accepted by the Verifier.
6.1.4.2	Measurement equipment used for testing shall be calibrated appropriately. Any tools, hardware or software, used for testing shall be shown to be suitable for the purpose.
6.1.4.3	Software testing shall be documented by a Test Specification and a Test Report, as defined in the following.
6.2.4.2	A Software Verification Plan shall be written, under the responsibility of the Verifier, on the basis of the necessary documentation.
6.2.4.3	The Software Verification Plan shall describe the activities to be performed to ensure proper verification and that particular design or other verification needs are suitably provided for
6.2.4.4	During development (and depending upon the size of the system) the plan may be subdivided into a number of child documents and be added to, as the detailed needs of verification become clearer.
6.2.4.5	The Software Verification Plan shall document all the criteria, techniques and tools to be used in the verification process. The Software Verification Plan shall include techniques and measures chosen from Table A.5, Table A.6, Table A.7 and Table A.8. The selected combination shall be justified as a set satisfying 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10
6.2.4.6	The Software Verification Plan shall describe the activities to be performed to ensure correctness and consistency with respect to the input to that phase. These include reviewing, testing and integration.

Excerpt from EN 50128:2011 [N01]	Requirement
6.2.4.7	In each development phase it shall be shown that the functional, performance and safety requirements are met.
6.2.4.8	The results of each verification shall be retained in a format defined or referenced in the Software Verification Plan.
6.2.4.9	<p>The Software Verification Plan shall address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the selection of verification strategies and techniques (to avoid undue complexity in the assessment of the verification and testing, preference shall be given to the selection of techniques which are in themselves readily analysable); b) selection of techniques from Table A.5, Table A.6, Table A.7 and Table A.8; c) the selection and documentation of verification activities; d) the evaluation of verification results gained; e) the evaluation of the safety and robustness requirements; f) the roles and responsibilities of the personnel involved in the verification process; g) the degree of the functional based test coverage required to be achieved; h) the structure and content of each verification step, especially for the Software Requirement Verification (7.2.4.22), Software Architecture and Design Verification (7.3.4.41, 7.3.4.42), Software Components Verification (7.4.4.13), Software Source Code Verification (7.5.4.10) and Integration Verification (7.6.4.13) in a way that facilitates review against the Software Verification Plan.

%%Insert other tables.%%

A.3 Glossary

DAS2V: Design Artifact Subject to Verification or Validation

EVC European Vital Computer

Appendix: References

- [1] CENELEC, European Committee for Electrotechnical Standardization. EN 50128: Railway applications - Communication, signalling and processing systems - Software for railway control and protection systems, June 2011.
- [2] RTCA SC-205. *Software Considerations in Airborne Systems and Equipment Certification (DO-178C)*. Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics (RTCA Inc.), Washington/DC, Dec 2011.
- [3] RTCA SC-205. *Formal Methods Supplement to DO-178C and DO-278A (DO-333)*. Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics (RTCA Inc.), Washington/DC, Dec 2011.
- [4] Jan Peleska, Elena Vorobev, and Florian Lapschies. Automated test case generation with smt-solving and abstract interpretation. In Bobaru et al. [54], pages 298–312.
- [5] Jan Peleska, Artur Honisch, Florian Lapschies, Helge Löding, Hermann Schmid, Peer Smuda, Elena Vorobev, and Cornelia Zahlten. A real-world benchmark model for testing concurrent real-time systems in the automotive domain. In Burkhart Wolff and Fatiha Zaidi, editors, *Testing Software and Systems. Proceedings of the 23rd IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference, ICTSS 2011*, volume 7019 of *LNCS*, pages 146–161, Heidelberg Dordrecht London New York, November 2011. IFIP WG 6.1, Springer.
- [6] Helge Löding and Jan Peleska. Timed moore automata: test data generation and model checking. In *Proc. 3rd International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST'10)*. IEEE Computer Society, 2010.
- [7] A. Pnueli, O. Shtrichman, and M. Siegel. The code validation tool CVT: Automatic verification of a compilation process. *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer*, 2(2):192–201, 1998.
- [8] J Peleska, J. Feuser, and A. E. Haxthausen. *Railway Safety, Reliability and Security: Technologies and Systems Engineering*, chapter The Model-Driven openETCS Paradigm for Secure, Safe and Certifiable Train Control Systems, pages 22–52. In Flammini [55], 2012.
- [9] Anne Elisabeth Haxthausen, Jan Peleska, and Sebastian Kinder. A formal approach for the construction and verification of railway control systems. *Formal Asp. Comput.*, 23(2):191–219, 2011.
- [10] Verified Systems International GmbH. Verified :: Products. <http://www.verified.de/en/products>.
- [11] Jan Peleska, Elena Vorobev, and Florian Lapschies. Automated test case generation with smt-solving and abstract interpretation. In Mihaela Bobaru, Klaus Havelund, GerardJ. Holzmann, and Rajeev Joshi, editors, *NASA Formal Methods*, volume 6617 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 298–312. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011.
- [12] Jörg Brauer, Jan Peleska, and Uwe Schulze. Efficient and trustworthy tool qualification for model-based testing tools. In Brian Nielsen and Carsten Weise, editors, *Testing Software and Systems*, volume 7641 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 8–23. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012.
- [13] P. Cousot and R. Cousot. Static determination of dynamic properties of programs. In *Proc. 2nd Int. Symp. on Programming*, pages 106–130, Paris, 1976. Dunot.
- [14] Jean Souyris and David Delmas. Experimental Assessment of Astrée on Safety-Critical Avionics Software. In *Proc. Int. Conf. Computer Safety, Reliability, and Security, SAFECOMP 2007*, volume

- 4680 of *LNCs*. Springer, September 2007.
- [15] Bernhard Beckert and Claude Marché, editors. *Formal Verification of Object-Oriented Software - International Conference, FoVeOOS 2010, Paris, France, June 28-30, 2010, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 6528 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 2010.
 - [16] Dillon Pariente and Emmanuel Ledinot. *Formal Verification of Industrial C Code using Frama-C: A Case Study*, pages 205–219. Volume 6528 of Beckert and Marché [15], 2010.
 - [17] C. A. R. Hoare. An axiomatic basis for computer programming. *Communications of the ACM*, 12(10):576–580 and 583, October 1969.
 - [18] C.A.R. Hoare and Niklaus Wirth. An axiomatic definition of the programming language Pascal. *Acta Informatica*, 2:335 – 355, 1973.
 - [19] <http://why3.lri.fr>.
 - [20] <http://coq.inria.fr>.
 - [21] <http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/research/hvg/isabelle>.
 - [22] Edmund M. Clarke and Bernd-Holger Schlingloff. Model checking. In Robinson and Voronkov [23], pages 1637–1790.
 - [23] Alan Robinson and Andrei Voronkov, editors. *Handbook of Automated Reasoning*. Elsevier, 2001.
 - [24] http://gulliver.eu.org/free_software_for_formal_verification.
 - [25] Pascal Cuoq, Florent Kirchner, Nikolai Kosmatov, Virgile Prevosto, Julien Signoles, and Boris Yakobowski. Frama-C: a Software Analysis Perspective. In *Proceedings of Software Engineering and Formal Methods (SEFM)*, volume 7504 of *LNCs*, pages 233–247. Springer, 2012.
 - [26] Patrick Baudin, Jean-Christophe Filliâtre, Claude Marché, Benjamin Monate, Yannick Moy, and Virgile Prevosto. *ACSL: ANSI/ISO C Specification Language*, 1.7 edition, April 2013. available at <http://frama-c.com/download/acsl.pdf>.
 - [27] <http://frama-c.com/>.
 - [28] A. Bouajjani, C. Dragoi, C. Enea, and M. Sighireanu. On inter-procedural analysis of programs with lists and data. In *Proceedings of Programming Languages Design and Implementation (PLDI)*, 2011.
 - [29] Pascal Cuoq, Boris Yakobowski, and Virgile Prevosto. *Frama-C's value analysis plug-in*. CEA LIST, fluorine-20130601 edition, June 2013. available at <http://frama-c.com/download/frama-c-value-analysis.pdf>.
 - [30] <http://alt-ergo.lri.fr>.
 - [31] Patrick Baudin, Loïc Correnson, and Zaynah Dargaye. *WP Plugin*. CEA LIST, 0.7 for fluorine-20130601 edition, 2013. available at <http://frama-c.com/download/frama-c-wp-manual.pdf>.
 - [32] Nicolas Stouls and Virgile Prevosto. *Aorai Plugin Tutorial*. INSA Lyon and CEA LIST, 2013. Available at <http://frama-c.com/download/frama-c-aorai-manual.pdf>.
 - [33] J.-C. King. A new approach to program testing. *Proceedings of the international conference on Reliable software, Los Angeles, California*, 21-23:228–233, April 1975.

- [34] L.-A. Clarke. A system to generate test data and symbolically execute programs. *IEEE Transactions on software engineering*, 2(3):215–222, September 1976.
- [35] C.-V. Ramamoorthy, S.-F. Ho, and W.-T. Chen. On the automated generation of program test data. *IEEE Transactions on software engineering*, 2(4):293–300, September 1976.
- [36] N. Rapin, C. Gaston, A. Lapitre, and J.-P. Gallois. Behavioral Unfolding of Formal Specifications Based on Communicating automata. In *Proceedings of the 1st workshop on Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis (ATVA)*, 2003.
- [37] C. Gaston, M. Aiguier, and P. Le Gall. Algebraic Treatment of Feature-oriented Systems. In *Language Constructs for Describing Features*. Springer LNCS, 2000.
- [38] J.P. Escobedo, C. Gaston, and P. Le Gall. Timed Conformance Testing for Orchestrated Service Discovery. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Formal Aspects of Component Software (FACS)*. Springer LNCS, 2011.
- [39] B. Bannour, J.P. Escobedo, C. Gaston, and P. Le Gall. Off-line test case generation for timed symbolic model-based conformance testing. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Testing Software and Systems (ICTSS)*. Springer LNCS, 2012.
- [40] B. Bannour, C. Gaston, and D. Servat. Eliciting unitary constraints from timed Sequence Diagram with symbolic techniques: application to testing. In *Proceedings of the 18th Asian-Pacific Software Engineering Conference (APSEC)*. IEEE Computer Society, 2011.
- [41] J. Tretmans. Conformance Testing with Labelled Transition Systems: Implementation Relations and Test Generation. *Computer Networks and ISDN Systems*, 29:49–79, 1996.
- [42] M. Krichen and S. Tripakis. Black-box time systems. In *Proc. of Int. SPIN Workshop Model Checking of Software*. Springer, 2004.
- [43] C. Gaston, P. Le Gall, N. Rapin, and A. Touil. Symbolic execution techniques for test purpose definition. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Testing Communicating Systems (TestCom)*. Springer LNCS, 2006.
- [44] A. Faivre, C. Gaston, and P. Le Gall. Symbolic Model Based Testing for Component Oriented Systems. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Testing Communicating Systems (TestCom/FATES)*. Springer LNCS, 2007.
- [45] B. Bannour. *Symbolic analysis of scenario based timed models for component based systems: Compositionality results for testing*. PhD thesis, CEA LIST / École Centrale Paris, 2012. <http://www.cti.ecp.fr/~bannourb/PhDthesis.pdf>.
- [46] <http://research.microsoft.com/en-us/projects/vcc>.
- [47] <http://nusmv.fbk.eu>.
- [48] Rajeev Alur and David L. Dill. A theory of timed automata. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 126(2):183–235, April 1994.
- [49] Gerd Behrmann, Alexandre David, and Kim G. Larsen. A tutorial on UPPAAL. In Marco Bernardo and Flavio Corradini, editors, *Formal Methods for the Design of Real-Time Systems: 4th International School on Formal Methods for the Design of Computer, Communication, and Software Systems, SFM-RT 2004*, number 3185 in LNCS, pages 200–236. Springer-Verlag, September 2004.
- [50] Alexandre David, M.Oliver Möller, and Wang Yi. Formal verification of uml statecharts with real-time extensions. In Ralf-Detlef Kutsche and Herbert Weber, editors, *Fundamental Approaches to Software Engineering*, volume 2306 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 218–232. Springer,

2002.

- [51] Alexander Knapp, Stephan Merz, and Christopher Rauh. Model checking - timed uml state machines and collaborations. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Symposium on Formal Techniques in Real-Time and Fault-Tolerant Systems: Co-sponsored by IFIP WG 2.2, FTRTFT '02*, pages 395–416, London, UK, UK, 2002. Springer.
- [52] Karsten Diethers and Michaela Huhn. Voodoo: Verification of object-oriented designs using uppaal. In Kurt Jensen and Andreas Podelski, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, volume 2988 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 139–143. Springer, 2004.
- [53] Harald Fecher, Jens Schönborn, Marcel Kyas, and Willem-Paul de Roever. 29 new unclarities in the semantics of UML 2.0 state machines. In Kung-Kiu Lau and Richard Banach, editors, *Formal Methods and Software Engineering*, number 3785 in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 52–65. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, January 2005.
- [54] Mihaela Gheorghiu Bobaru, Klaus Havelund, Gerard J. Holzmann, and Rajeev Joshi, editors. *NASA Formal Methods - Third International Symposium, NFM 2011, Pasadena, CA, USA, April 18-20, 2011. Proceedings*, volume 6617 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 2011.
- [55] Francesco Flammini, editor. *Railway Safety, Reliability and Security: Technologies and Systems Engineering*. Information Science Reference, 2012.