



UNIVERSITÄT ZUM BEISPIEL
INSTITUT FÜR BEISPIELE

Monitoring der AUTOSAR Timing Extensions mittels TeSSLa

*Monitoring of the AUTOSAR Timing Extensions
with TeSSLa*

Bachelorarbeit

im Rahmen des Studiengangs
Informatik
der Universität zu Lübeck

vorgelegt von
Hendrik Streichhahn

ausgegeben und betreut von
Prof. Dr. Martin Leucker

mit Unterstützung von
Martin Sachenbacher und
Daniel Thoma

Lübeck, den 1.1. 1970

Erklärung

Ich erkläre hiermit an Eides statt, dass ich diese Arbeit selbständig verfasst und keine anderen als die angegebenen Quellen und Hilfsmittel benutzt habe.

(Hendrik Streichhahn)
Lübeck, den 1.1. 1970

Kurzfassung Abstract Deutsch

Abstract Kurzfassung Englisch.

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Timing Constraints	3
2.1. AUTOSAR Timing Extensions	3
2.2. TADL2	9
2.2.1. Parenthesis - Simple and Flexible Timing Constraint Logic . .	10
2.2.2. TADL2-Timing Constraints	12
2.2.3. Comparison TADL2 - AUTOSAR Timing Extension	29
3. Related work and basics	35
3.1. Runtime Verification	35
3.2. TeSSLa	35
3.3. Finite Transducers	36
4. Monitorability of properties on infinite Streams	37
4.1. Finite Monitorability	37
4.1.1. Timestamps	37
4.1.2. Finite Monitorability	37
4.1.3. Finite Monitorability with Delay	39
4.1.4. Non-Finite Monitorability	40
5. Analysis of the Monitorability of the TADL2 Timing Constraints	43
5.1. DelayConstraint	43
5.2. StrongDelayConstraint	44
5.3. RepeatConstraint	44
5.4. RepetitionConstraint	45
5.5. SynchronizationConstraint	46
5.6. StrongSynchronizationConstraint	47
5.7. ExecutionTimeConstraint	47
5.8. OrderConstraint	47
5.9. ComparisonConstraint	48
5.10. SporadicConstraint	48
5.11. PeriodicConstraint	48
5.12. PatternConstraint	48
5.13. ArbitraryConstraint	48

Contents

5.14. BurstConstraint	49
5.15. EventChain	49
6. Implementierungen	51
6.1. Implementierungen	51
7. Zusammenfassung und Ausblick	53
A. Anhang	55
A.1. Abschnitt des Anhangs	55

Liste der Todos

1. Introduction

Timing behavior is one of the most important properties of computer systems. Especially in safety-critical applications, a wrong timed reaction of the system can have disastrous consequences, for example in the Electronic Stability Control of a vehicle. The *AUTOSAR* (**AUT**omotive **O**pen **S**ystem **AR**chitecture) standards are used by almost all car manufacturers in their software development processes to standardize components and therefore increase the interoperability and exchangeability.

To describe the timing behavior of soft- and hardware components of cars, the *AUTOSAR Timing Extensions* were developed. The goal of this thesis is to implement a monitoring tool for the timing constraints defined in this standard.

A major drawback of this standard is that the definitions are written in an informal way and can be misunderstood. Therefore, the timing constraints defined in *TADL2* (**T**iming **A**ugmented **D**escription **L**anguage **V**ersion **2**) are used as basis for the monitoring tool. The TADL2 timing constraints are comparable and partly compatible to the AUTOSAR Timing Extensions, as most of the constraints defined in the AUTOSAR standard can be described as equivalent combination of TADL2 timing constraints.

The monitoring tool is written in *TeSSLa* (**T**emporal **S**ream-based **S**pecification **L**anguage), which is made for stream runtime verification and is capable of non-intrusive observation and can be run as Java program or on specialized embedded hardware, like FPGAs.

In the first part of this thesis, an overview over the AUTOSAR Timing Extensions and an example about the informal and ambiguous definitions will be given. Next, the TADL2 timing constraints will be listed and the relations between these constraints and the AUTOSAR Timing Extensions will be described. In the next chapter, TeSSLa, its fundamental functionality and other prerequisites, which are needed for understanding the theoretical part of this thesis, will be explained. The term of *finite monitorability* is introduced, which insures, that a property on infinite streams can always be monitored with finite resources. Then, each of the TADL2 timing constraint is checked, if it finite monitorable or not. After that, the TeSSLa implementations of these constraints is described and evaluated in a theoretical and practical way.

In the end an overview of the accomplished is given and ideas for further work will be discussed.

2. Timing Constraints

2.1. AUTOSAR Timing Extensions

AUTOSAR is a development partnership in the automotive industry. As stated before, the main goal is to define a standardized interface and increasing interoperability, exchangeability and re-usability of parts and therefore simplifying development and production. Three different layers are defined in the specification. *Basic Software* is an abstraction layer from components, like network or diagnostic protocols, or operating systems. *AUTOSAR-Software* defines the methods, how applications have to be build. For Basic Software and AUTOSAR Software, there are definitions for standardized Interfaces to enable the communication via the *AUTOSAR Runtime Environment*. It works as middleware, in which the *virtual function bus* is defined [AUT17]. The AUTOSAR Timing Extension are describing timing constraints for actions and reactions of components, that are communicating via the Virtual Function Bus. They are defined via *events*, which consists of a time and a data value, the type of the time and data value is arbitrary, the only restriction is, that the time values are strictly increasing. To describe the logical relationship between groups of events, *event chains* are defined, which consist of a *stimulus* and *response* event. The *response* event is understood as the answer to the *stimulus* event.

The AUTOSAR Release 4.4.0 ([AUT18]) is used for this thesis, there are 12 timing constraints defined in this version of the AUTOSAR Timing Extensions

1. The subset of 5 **EventTriggeringConstraints** are describing, at which points in time specific events may occur.
 - 1 The **PeriodicEventTriggering** defines repetitions of event with the same time distance and offers the possibility to set an allowed deviation from this pattern. Also the minimal distance between two subsequent events can be defined.
 - 2 The **SporadicEventTriggering** specifies sporadic event occurrences by defining the minimal and maximal distance between subsequent events. Optionally, periodic repetitions and allowed deviations from the period can be described.

2. Timing Constraints

- 3 With the **ConcreteEventTriggering**, offsets between a set of subsequent events in a time interval can be described. These intervals may not overlap, and periodic repetitions of them can be defined optionally.
- 4 The **BurstPatternEventTriggering** describes not overlapping event clusters with a minimal and maximal number of events and optionally periodic repetitions of these clusters.
- 5 The **ArbitraryEventTriggering** defines the distance between subsequent event by defining *ConfidenceIntervals*, which describe the probability, in which time interval the following event will occur.
2. The **LatencyTimingConstraint** specifies the minimal, nominal and maximal time distance between the stimulus and response events of an event chain.
3. The **AgeConstraint** is a simpler form of the *LatencyTimingConstraint* by defining minimal and maximal age a event may have at the point of time, when it is processed.
4. The **SynchronizationTimingConstraint** is used for describing events of different kinds, that occur synchronized in a time interval of a specific length.
5. The **SynchronizationPointConstraint** defines two sets of executables and events. Every element of the first set must have finished or occurred, before the first element of the second set may start or occur.
6. The **OffsetTimingConstraint** specifies the minimal and maximal time distance between corresponding *source* and *target* events.
7. The **ExecutionOrderConstraint** offers the possibility to define a list of executables, which must start and finish in the order given in the list.
8. The **ExecutionTimeConstraint** defines the minimal and maximal runtime of an executable, including or excluding the runtime of external functions and interruptions.

In this simplified form, some constraints are redundant. The semantic differences will be shown in section 2.2.3.

Problematic with the AUTOSAR Timing Extensions is, that the definitions are not very formal and have room left for interpretation. As example, the *BurstPattern-EventTriggering* will be analyzed in the following. This constraint describes events clusters, with events that occur with short time distances, with larger time distances between the clusters. The following attributes are needed:

- ***maxNumberOfOccurrences*** (positive integer)
Maximal number of events per burst




Figure 2.1.: BurstPatternEventTriggering Period-Jitter **accumulating**

- ***minNumberOfOccurrences*** (positive integer)
Minimal number of events per burst (optional)
- ***minimumInterArrivalTime*** (time value)
Minimal distance between subsequent events
- ***patternLength*** (time value)
Length of each burst
- ***patternPeriod*** (time value)
Time distance between the starting points of subsequent burst(optional)
- ***patternJitter*** (time value)
Maximal allowed deviation from the periodic pattern (optional)

As example, we set:

- $maxNumberOfOccurrences = 3$
- $minNumberOfOccurrences = 1$
- $minimumInterArrivalTime = 1$
- $patternLength = 3$
- $patternPeriod = 3.5$
- $patternJitter = 1.5$

The combination of *patternPeriod* and *patternJitter* can be interpreted in an accumulating as seen in 2.1 or non-accumulating way as seen in 2.2 way. In the accumulating interpretation, the reference for the periodic occurrences is only the start point of the previous burst. In the non-accumulating way, there is an global reference point for the periodic repetitions.

2. Timing Constraints



Figure 2.2.: BurstPatternEventTriggering Period-Jitter **non-accumulating**

With the definition of *patternLength* ("time distance between the beginnings of subsequent repetitions of the given burst pattern") you would think, that the accumulating variant is meant. Against that, the period attribute in *PeriodicEventTriggering-Constraint* is defined as "distance between subsequent occurrences of the event" in the text, hence it is also understandable the accumulating way, but there is the formal definition

$$\exists t_{reference} \forall t_n : t_{reference} + (n+1) * period \leq t_n \leq t_{reference} + (n-1) * period + jitter,$$

where t_n is the time of the n -th Event and $t_{reference}$ is a reference point, from which the periodic pattern starts, so the *PeriodicEventTriggering-Constraint* is meant to be understood in the non-accumulating way. It remains unclear, in which way the *BurstPatternEventTriggering* is meant to be understood.

Another problem of the AUTOSAR Timing Extensions is, that they were made for design purposes, monitoring them can be difficult, as they may need continuously growing time and memory resources, which makes online monitoring unsuitable in nearly all scenarios (more on monitorability in 4). As example, we will use the burst pattern again, this time using the attributes

- *maxNumberOfOccurrences* = *INT_MAX*
- *minNumberOfOccurrences* = 1
- *minimumInterArrivalTime* = 0
- *patternLength* = 3
- *patternPeriod* unused
- *patternJitter* unused

Figure 2.3 shows the application of the *BurstPatternEventTriggering* constraint with the given parameters on a stream with events at the timestamps 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5. The development of possible the burst cluster with ongoing time is visualized. The gray

bars show, where the burst cluster can lay, the black lines show, where they definitely are. In timestamp 3 with only one event so far, only one burst has to be considered and it can lay between timestamp 0 and 6, the only limitation is, that it must include timestamp 3 with the event in that point. In Timestamp 3.5, there are two events (at 3 and 3.5) so far and there are two possibilities for burst placements. The first possibility with only one burst with both events in it, and the second possibility, where the events are in different bursts. The third graphic shows the trace in timestamp 4 with three different events so far (3, 3.5, 4) and three different possibilities for burst placements to consider. One possible burst contains all three events, the second possibility has one burst with the event at timestamp 3 and one burst with the events at 3.5 and 4 and the third possibility has one Burst with the events at 3 and 3.5 and one burst with the event at 4. The possible bursts in graphic 4 are analog to the third graphic, one possibility with one burst containing all 4 events and 3 possibilities with the first burst containing the first event, the first and second event or the first, the second and the third event and the second burst containing the remaining events.

In this Example, we see, that it is possible to create an unlimited number of possibilities for burst placements within one burst length, when the *minimumInterArrivalTime*-attribute is 0, which results in an infeasible resource consumption, as unlimited memory and time is needed to check the constraint in following events. Therefore, online monitoring this constraint is unsuitable in most cases.

2. Timing Constraints




Figure 2.3.: BurstPatternEventTriggering Possible bursts, \uparrow shows the current time

2.2. TADL2

As timing extension to EAST-ADL(**E**lectronics **A**rchitecture and **S**oftware **T**echnology-**A**rchitecture **D**escription **L**anguage), the TIMMO (**T**iming **M**odel) project, and its successor TIMMO2USE, were initiated. EAST-ADL has similar goals as AUTOSAR, but the definitions are written in a more formalized fashion. The definitions of the AUTOSAR Timing Extensions are only textually described often, the TADL2-Definitions are defined in a more formal way, as they offer a formal definition of each constraint in a timing constraint logic [BFL⁺12]. EAST-ADL is much less used in the automotive industry, but the EAST-ADL Timing Constraints are partly compatible to the AUTOSAR Timing Extensions, as they are sub- or supersets of each other. Many of the AUTOSAR Timing Extensions can be defined via a combination of TADL2 Constraints, as explained in section 2.2.3.

The timing constraints are defined on events or event chains, similar to the AUTOSAR Timing Extensions. In TADL2, all events of an event chain have a color attribute, which shows the logical connection of these events. This attribute is defined as abstract and possibly infinite datatype. The only restriction is, that an equality test on these color values must exist. TADL2 offers 18 timing constraints, which will briefly explained in the following:

- The **StrongDelayConstraint** defines the minimal and maximal time distance of the events from two event sets (*source* and *target*).
- The **DelayConstraint** is a less strict variant of the **StrongDelayConstraint**, because it allows additional events in *target*.
- The **RepeatConstraint**, **RepetitionConstraint**, **PeriodicConstraint**, **SporadicConstraint** and **ArbitraryConstraint** are describing the time distance between subsequent events, whereby they are having small semantic differences. An exact distinction between these constraints will be given in section 2.2.2.
- The **SynchronizationConstraint** and **StrongSynchronizationConstraint** define groups of event sets, whose events occur in common time intervals. The **SynchronizationConstraint** allows more than one event of each group per interval, the **StrongSynchronizationConstraint** does not.
- The **ExecutionTimeConstraint** is used to set a minimum and a maximum for the runtime of a task, not considering interruptions in the execution.
- The **OrderConstraint** defines that the n^{th} event of one event set must occur before or at the n^{th} event of a second event set.
- The **ComparisonConstraint** is used to describe ordering relations of timestamps.

- The **PatternConstraint** defines the time distance between periodic points in time to several events.
- The **BurstConstraint** regulates the maximum number of events in time intervals of a specific length.
- The **ReactionConstraint** describes the minimal and maximal time a response event must occur after the associated stimulus event. Additional response events are allowed, additional stimulus events not.
- The **AgeConstraint** is similar to the ReactionConstraint, but it is defined the other way around. Therefore, it describes the minimal and maximal time a stimulus event must occur before the associated response event. Additional stimulus events are allowed, additional response events not.
- The **OutputSynchronizationConstraint** is used to describe groups of event chains, which all have the same response events. The response events of the event chain must occur in common time intervals, like in the SynchronizationConstraint. In the **InputSynchronizationConstraint**, the roles of the stimulus and response events are swapped.

2.2.1. Parenthesis - Simple and Flexible Timing Constraint Logic

The formal definition of the TADL2 timing constraint are written in *Timing Constraint Logic* (short: *TiCL*), which was developed as part of the TIMMO-2-USE project. TiCL was formally introduced in [LN12], for better understanding the key aspects of this article will be explained in the following.

The main goal of TiCL is to be formal and expandable and offering the possibility of defining finite and infinite behaviors of events. In TiCL, only points in time, when events occur, are considered, therefore an events only consists of a real number as timestamp, without the possibility of adding a data value. There are 7 syntactic categories in TiCL

\mathbb{R} (arithmetic constants)
Avar(arithmetic variables)
AExp(arithmetic expressions)

Svar(set variables)
SExp(set expressions)

TVar(time variables)
CExp(constraint expressions)




Figure 2.4.: Graphical example of $\lambda(E)$, $\lambda(F)$ and $\lambda(E \setminus F)$

Arithmetic expressions can be defined as arithmetic constants, arithmetic variables, application of $+$, $-$, $*$, $/$ on arithmetic expressions, application of the cardinality operator on a set ($|E|$, $E \in SExp$) or as measure $\lambda(E)$ ($E \in SExp$). $\lambda(E)$ is defined as Lebesgue measure, which is figuratively speaking, the length of all continuous intervals of E . In figure 2.4 an example of the measure operator λ is visualized. The set E contains all Events between the timestamps 1 and 9, the set F contains the events at the timestamps between 2 and 4 and 6 and 7, therefore $E \setminus F$ contains the events at the timestamps $\{1, 1.5, 4.5, 5, 5.5, 7.5, 8, 8.5, 9\}$. E consists of one continuous interval from timestamp 1 to 9 with the length of 8, F consists of two continuous intervals from 2 to 4 with the length of 2 and from 6 to 7 with the length of 1, therefore $\lambda(F) = 3$. $E \setminus F$ consists of three continuous intervals, the first from 1 to 1.5 (length = 0.5), the second from 4.5 to 5.5 (length = 1) and the last from 7.5 to 9 (length = 1.5), so the total length of the continuous intervals of $E \setminus F$ is 3.

Set expressions can be defined as set variables, or as set of time variables that fulfill a given constraint expression.

Constraint expressions can be defined as application of the \leq -operator on time or arithmetic expressions, the \in operator on time variables and set expressions, the logical conjunction on constraint expressions, the negation of constraint expressions and the \forall -Quantifier on arithmetic, set and time variables over an constraint expression.

As extension to this definition, well known syntactic abbreviations like $true \equiv 0 \leq 1$ or the \exists -quantifier will be used, but there are also some TiCL-specific syntactic abbreviations, like interval constructors, which will be defined and explained in the following.

Interval Constructors

Let $x, y \in Tvar$ and $E, F \in SExp$.

The constructor $[x \leq]([x <])$ is defined as $\{y : x \leq y\}(\{y : x < y\})$, therefore the interval contains all points in time laying behind of x , possibly containing x .

$[\leq x]([< x])$ is defined as complement of $[x <]([x \leq])$ and contains all timestamps laying before x .

$[x..y]$ is defined as $[x \leq] \cap [< y]$, so all points of time after x and before y , including x but not y , are part of this interval.

$[E \leq]$ is defined as $\{y : \exists x \in E : x \leq y\}$, this interval contains all point of time at and after the first timestamp in E . $[E <]$ is equal to $\{y : \forall x \in E : x < y\}$, therefore it defines the interval containing all timestamps after the latest point of time in E . $[\leq E] ([< E])$ is defined as $[E <]^C ([E \leq]^C)$, analogous to the operators on time variables.

$[E]$ is equal to $[E \leq] \cap [\leq E]$. It defines the time interval between the first and last element of E , including these points in time.

$E_{x<} (E_{<x})$ is defined as $E \cap [x <] (E \cap [< x])$. This operators filters the timestamps in E so that only the points in time before (after) remain.

$[x..E]$ equals $[x \leq] \cap [< (E_{x<})]$. The interval begins at x and ends right before the first element of E after x .

$[E..F]$ is defined as $\{x : \exists y \in E : x \in [y..F]\}$ and describes the intervals, where the previous operator is applied on every element of E .

2.2.2. TADL2-Timing Constraints

For better understanding of the following chapters, the TADL Constraints will be presented next. As abbreviation and unification, all timing expressions are defined as set \mathbb{T} , which are understood as real numbers but expanded with ∞ and $-\infty$ in this chapter, but other value ranges for time expressions are possible and will be used in other parts of this thesis.

We define an event as a time value, possibly combined with an data value. The range of the data values are arbitrary, infinite data types are possible, also as empty data types, when only the point in time is relevant for the event. All TADL constraints are defined with attributes, which can be events, timing or arithmetic expressions or sets of them. Also, *EventChains* can be used as attributes. An *EventChain* consists of two sets of events (*stimulus* and *response*), which are causally related. All events in an *EventChain* must have a color value in their data field. This color possibly has an infinite type and an equality check on this must be defined. It is used to check, which events of an *EventChain* are directly related.




Figure 2.5.: Example DelayConstraint - $lower = 2$, $upper = 3$

DelayConstraint

The *DelayConstraint* has 4 attributes

<i>source</i>	event set
<i>target</i>	event set
<i>lower</i>	\mathbb{T} (time expression)
<i>upper</i>	\mathbb{T}

and is defined as

$$\forall x \in source : \exists y \in target : lower \leq y - x \leq upper.$$

For all events x in *source*, there must be an y event in *target*, so that y lays between *lower* and *upper* after x . Note, that *lower* and *upper* can have negative values and that additional events in *target*, without an associated *source* event are allowed.

Figure 2.5 shows a visualized example of the *DelayConstraint* with the attributes $lower = 2$, $upper = 3$, $source = \{1, 5, 6\}$ and $target = \{2, 3.5, 5, 7, 8.2, 9\}$. The first element of source at timestamp 1 results in a required event in target between the timestamp 3 and 4 that is fulfilled by the event at 3.5. The second event of source requires an target event between 7 and 8, fulfilled by the event at 7. The last event of source is satisfied by the target event at 8.2 and 9.

StrongDelayConstraint

The *StrongDelayConstraint* has 4 attributes

<i>source</i>	event set
<i>target</i>	event set
<i>lower</i>	\mathbb{T}

2. Timing Constraints



Figure 2.6.: Example StrongDelayConstraint - $lower = 2$, $upper = 3$

$upper \quad \mathbb{T}$

and is defined as

$$|source| = |target| \wedge \forall i : \forall x : x = source(i) \Rightarrow \exists y : y = target(i) \wedge lower \leq y - x \leq upper.$$

The *StrongDelayConstraint* is a stricter version of the *DelayConstraint*, as it requires a bijective assignment between the source and target events, therefore additional events in target without matching source event are not allowed. Figure 2.6 shows an example of the *StrongDelayConstraint*. The example is the same as in the previous constraint, but without the additional target events at 2, 5 and 8.2.

RepeatConstraint

The *RepeatConstraint* also has 4 attributes

$event$ event set
 $lower$ \mathbb{T}
 $upper$ \mathbb{T}
 $span$ integer

and is defined as

$$\forall X \leq event : |X| = span + 1 \Rightarrow lower \leq \lambda([X]) \leq upper.$$

As reminder, the $A \leq B$ -operator over two sets of events A, B describes, that A is a sub-sequence of B , the $\lambda(A)$ -function calculates the total length of all continuous intervals in A and the $[A]$ returns the time interval between the oldest and newest event in A .



Figure 2.7.: Example RepeatConstraint - $lower = 2$, $upper = 2$, $span = 1$




Figure 2.8.: Example RepeatConstraint - $lower = 4$, $upper = 5$, $span = 2$

The definition specifies that the length of each time interval containing $span + 1$ consecutively events must be between $upper$ and $lower$.

The idea behind this constraint is to define repeated occurrences of events, with the possibility of overlapping, specified by the $span$ attribute. After any event x , there are $span - 1$ events and then the next event must be between $lower$ and $upper$ after x .

Figure 2.7 shows an example of the RepeatConstraint with the attributes $event = \{3, 5, 8, \dots\}$, $lower = upper = 2$ and $span = 1$. Because $lower$ is equal $upper$ and $span$ is 1, the events are following a strictly periodic pattern after the first event. Figure 2.8 shows a more complex example with events at $\{0, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, \dots\}$, $lower = 4$, $upper = 5$ and $span = 2$. The $span$ -attribute is 2, so the time distance between all subsequent events with an even index are considered, just like the subsequent events with an uneven index.

RepetitionConstraint

The *RepetitionConstraint* has 5 attributes

<i>event</i>	event set
<i>lower</i>	\mathbb{T}
<i>upper</i>	\mathbb{T}

2. Timing Constraints




Figure 2.9.: Example RepetitionConstraint - $lower = 4$, $upper = 5$, $span = 2$, $jitter = 1$

$span$ integer
 $jitter$ \mathbb{T}

and is defined via the *RepeatConstraint* and the *StrongDelayConstraint* as

$$\exists X : RepeatConstraint(X, lower, upper, span) \wedge \\ StrongDelayConstraint(X, event, 0, jitter)$$

where X is a set of arbitrary time stamps, that follow the structure of the *RepeatConstraint* (various($span$) loose periodic repetitions). The actual points in time of $event$ lay between the timestamps of X and $jitter$ after that. For each point of time there is one, and only one, corresponding timestamp in X . Figure 2.9 shows an example of the *RepetitionConstraint* with the attributes $event = \{0.5, 3.3, 4.7, 7.6, 9.9, \dots\}$, $lower = 4$, $upper = 5$, $span = 2$ and $jitter = 1$. The shown timestamps of X are only one possibility and may change due to later elements of $event$.

SynchronizationConstraint

The *SynchronizationConstraint* has 2 attributes

$event$ set of event sets, $|event| \geq 2$
 $tolerance$ \mathbb{T}

and is defined via the *DelayConstraint* as

$$\exists X : \forall i : DelayConstraint(X, event_i, 0, tolerance) \wedge \\ DelayConstraint(event_i, X, -tolerance, 0)$$

X is a set of arbitrary point in time and there must be at least one timestamp in




Figure 2.10.: Example SynchronizationConstraint - $tolerance = 1$

each set of *event*, that is between an element of *X* and *tolerance* after that. Also, for each element in any set of *event*, there must be a matching element of *X*.

In figure 2.10 is an example of the *SynchronizationConstraint* with the attributes $event = \{\{0.5, 3, 7, 7.5\}, \{0.7, 2.5, 7.3, 7.8\}, \{1.2, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 7.6, 8.4\}\}$ and $tolerance = 1$. The first points in time of each element of *event* form the first cluster, the corresponding element of *X* can be between 0.2 and 0.5. For simplification, only the latest possible value for the element of *X* are shown, which is the first event of the synchronization cluster. In the second cluster of events it can be seen that multiple timestamps from one element of *event* can be associated with a single element of *X*. The third and fourth cluster show, that overlapping is also possible.

StrongSynchronizationConstraint

The *StrongSynchronizationConstraint* has the same two attributes as the *SynchronizationConstraint*

event set of event sets, $|event| \geq 2$
tolerance \mathbb{T}

and is defined as

$$\exists X : \forall i : StrongDelayConstraint(X, event_i, 0, tolerance)$$

The *StrongSynchronizationConstraint* is a stricter variant of the *SynchronizationConstraint*, as it requires a bijective assignment between the elements of *X* to one element of each set of *event*. For every $x \in X$, only one corresponding timestamp per set in *event* is allowed, like seen in figure 2.11, which shows the same example as the one for the *SynchronizationConstraint*, but the excess time stamps at 3.2 and 3.3 have been removed.

2. Timing Constraints




Figure 2.11.: Example StrongSynchronizationConstraint - $tolerance = 1$

ExecutionTimeConstraint

The *ExecutionTimeConstraints* takes 6 attributes

<i>start</i>	set of events
<i>stop</i>	set of events
<i>preempt</i>	set of events
<i>resume</i>	set of events
<i>lower</i>	\mathbb{T}
<i>upper</i>	\mathbb{T}

and is defined as

$$\forall x \in start : lower \leq \lambda([x..stop] \setminus [preempt..resume]) \leq upper$$

The interval constructor $\forall x \in start : [x..stop]$ defines the time interval between each point in time of *start* until the next element of *stop*, excluding the *stop* timestamp. $[preempt..resume]$, which is removed from the considered interval length, defines the intervals between each element of *preempt* until the next timestamp of *resume*. The Idea behind this constraint is to test the run time of a task, without counting interruptions.

Figure 2.12 shows an example of the *ExecutionTimeConstraints* with $start = \{1\}$, $end = \{7\}$, $preempt = \{2, 5\}$ and $resume = \{3, 6.5\}$. Therefore, $[start..end]$ spans the interval from time 1 to 7 with the length of 6 and $[preempt..resume]$ spans two intervals, 2 to 3 and 5 to 6.5 with the length 1 and 1.5. As result, $\lambda([x..stop] \setminus [preempt..resume])$ for $x = 1$ is 3.5 and the constraint is fulfilled, if, and only if, *lower* is equal or *lower* than 3.5 and *upper* is greater than that.



Figure 2.12.: Example ExecutionTimeConstraint



Figure 2.13.: Example OrderConstraint

OrderConstraint

The *OrderConstraint* takes two attributes

source set of events
target set of events

and is defined as

$$|source| = |target| \wedge \forall i : \exists x : x = source(i) \Rightarrow \exists y : y = target(i) \wedge x < y$$

This constraint ensures the order of events, so that the i -th event of *target* is after the i -th event of *source*. Also, the number of events in *source* and *target* must be equal.

Figure 2.13 visualizes an example of the *OrderConstraint* with $source = \{1, 4, 6, 7\}$ and $target = \{3, 5, 9, 9.5\}$. The constraint is fulfilled, because the number of elements is equal and each i -th timestamp in *target* is later than the i -th timestamp of *source*.

ComparisonConstraint

The *ComparisonConstraint* is significant different to all previous and following constraints, as it does not describe the behavior of events and only compares two time expressions. It takes 3 attributes

<i>leftOperand</i>	T
<i>rightOperand</i>	T
<i>operator</i>	comparisonOperator($\in \{LessThanOrEqual, LessThan, GreaterThanOrEqual, GreaterThan, Equal\}$)

The definition is pretty straight forward as it only applies the given operator to the operands:

<i>ComparisonConstraint(leftOperand, rightOperand, LessThanOrEqual)</i>
$\Leftrightarrow leftOperand \leq rightOperand$
<i>ComparisonConstraint(leftOperand, rightOperand, LessThan)</i>
$\Leftrightarrow leftOperand < rightOperand$
<i>ComparisonConstraint(leftOperand, rightOperand, GreaterThanOrEqual)</i>
$\Leftrightarrow leftOperand \geq rightOperand$
<i>ComparisonConstraint(leftOperand, rightOperand, GreaterThan)</i>
$\Leftrightarrow leftOperand > rightOperand$
<i>ComparisonConstraint(leftOperand, rightOperand, Equal)</i>
$\Leftrightarrow leftOperand = rightOperand$

Due to the simplicity of this constraint, no explicit example is given.

SporadicConstraint

The *SporadicConstraint* takes 5 attributes

<i>event</i>	set of events
<i>lower</i>	T
<i>upper</i>	T
<i>jitter</i>	T
<i>minimum</i>	T

and is defined as combination of the *RepetitionConstraint* and the *RepeatConstraint* as




Figure 2.14.: Example SporadicConstraint - $lower = 2$, $upper = 2.5$, $jitter = 1$, $minimum = 2$

$RepetitionConstraint(event, lower, upper, 1, jitter)$
 $\wedge RepeatConstraint(event, minimum, \infty, 1)$

The second part of the definition, using the *RepeatConstraint*, ensures that all events in *event* lay at least *minimum* apart. The application of the *RepetitionConstraint* generates a set of events *X*, that lay between *lower* and *upper* apart from each other. For each point in time in *X*, there must be exactly one timestamp in *event*, that is not before the corresponding element of *X* and not later than *jitter* after that.

Figure 2.14 shows a possible application of the *SporadicConstraint* with the attributes $lower = 2$, $upper = 2.5$, $jitter = 1$, $minimum = 2$ and $event = \{1, 3.5, 6, 8.2, 10.5, \dots\}$. Like in the *RepetitionConstraint*, the exact position of the timestamps in *X* is variable and may need to be changed due to later entries in *event*.

PeriodicConstraint

The *PeriodicConstraint* takes 4 attribute

<i>event</i>	set of events
<i>period</i>	\mathbb{T}
<i>jitter</i>	\mathbb{T}
<i>minimum</i>	\mathbb{T}

and defines a specialized form of the *SporadicConstraint*

$SporadicConstraint(event, period, period, jitter, minimum)$

The variable timestamps in the set *X* are now following a strictly periodic pattern, where subsequent elements of this set lay exactly *period* apart. Each element of *event* lays between one element of *X* and *jitter* after that. Again, there must be

2. Timing Constraints




Figure 2.15.: Example PeriodicConstraint - $period = 3$, $jitter = 1$, $minimum = 2.5$

bijective mapping between the elements of *event* and *X*.

In figure 2.15, the *PeriodicConstraint* with the attributes $period = 3$, $jitter = 1$, $minimum = 2.5$ and $event = \{1.2, 4.0, 8, 10.6, \dots\}$ is visualized. The timestamps of *X* lay exactly *period* apart and the *events* behind that in the previously described way. Also, the minimum time distance between all points of time in *event* is *minimum*.

PatternConstraint

The *PatternConstraint* takes 5 attributes

<i>event</i>	set of events
<i>period</i>	\mathbb{T}
<i>offset</i>	set of \mathbb{T}
<i>jitter</i>	\mathbb{T}
<i>minimum</i>	\mathbb{T}

and is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \exists X : & \text{PeriodicConstraint}(X, period, 0, 0) \\ & \wedge \forall i : \text{DelayConstraint}(X, event, offset_i, offset_i + jitter) \\ & \wedge \text{RepeatConstraint}(event, minimum, \infty, 1) \end{aligned}$$

This constraint can be understood as a modification of the *PeriodicConstraint*, as it describes periodic behavior, but not from single events, but from groups of $|offset|$ subsequent events, that follow specific time distances (specified by *offset*) after the strictly periodic timestamps of *X*.

Figure 2.16 shows an application of the *PeriodicConstraint* with attributes $period = 5$, $offset = \{1, 2, 2.5\}$, $jitter = 0.5$, $minimum = 0.5$ and $event = \{1.2, 2.2, 2.8, 6, 7, 8, 11.5, 12, 12.5, \dots\}$. Like in the previous describes constraint, the exact position of all points in time of *X* may change due to later timestamps of *event*.




Figure 2.16.: Example PatternConstraint - $period = 5$, $offset = \{1, 2, 2.5\}$, $jitter = 0.5$, $minimum = 0.5$

ArbitraryConstraint

The *ArbitraryConstraint* takes 3 attributes

event set of events
minimum set of \mathbb{T}
maximum set of \mathbb{T}

where $|minimum| = |maximum|$. It is defined as

$$\forall i : RepeatConstraint(event, minimum_i, maximum_i, i)$$

The Idea behind the *ArbitraryConstraint* is to describe the time distance between each event and several following events. The first entry of *minimum* and *maximum* define the distance between every event and its direct successor. The second entries, where the *span* attribute of the *RepeatConstraint* is 2, set the distance between one event and its next but one successor and so on.

Figure 2.17 shows an example of the *ArbitraryConstraint* with the attributes $minimum = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $maximum = \{5, 6, 7\}$ and $event = \{1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, \dots\}$. The time distances between subsequent events with 0, 1 and 2 skipped events are shown in table 2.1, the relevant distances are written in **bold** font. Apparently, the time distances are matching the ranges, given by the *minimum*- and *maximum* attribute.

	1	2	3	5	8	10
1	0	1	2	4	7	9
2		0	1	3	6	8
3			0	2	5	7
5				0	3	5
8					0	2
10						0

Table 2.1.: Time distances as seen in figure 2.17




Figure 2.17.: Example ArbitraryConstraint - *period* = 5, *offset* = {1, 2, 2.5}, *jitter* = 0.5, *minimum* = 0.5




Figure 2.18.: Example *BurstConstraint* - $length = 5$, $maxOccurrences = 3$
 $minimum = 0.8$

BurstConstraint

The *BurstConstraint* takes 4 attributes

<i>event</i>	set of events
<i>length</i>	\mathbb{T}
<i>maxOccurrences</i>	integer
<i>minimum</i>	\mathbb{T}

and is defined as

$$RepeatConstraint(event, length, \infty, maxOccurrences) \\
\wedge RepeatConstraint(event, minimum, \infty, 1)$$

The idea of this constraint is to describe the maximum number of events that may occur in a time interval of the given *length*. Additionally all subsequent event must be at least *minimum* apart. Therefore, the intuition is different to the AUTOSAR *BurstPatternEventTriggering*, where clusters of events are described. A complete comparison of these constraints will be done in section 2.2.3.

In figure 2.18 the *BurstConstraint* with the attributes $length = 5$, $maxOccurrences = 3$, $minimum = 0.8$ and $event = \{1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9\}$ is visualized. In every interval of the length 5, there are three or less events, also all subsequent events lay at least 0.8 apart. Therefore, the constraint is fulfilled.

ReactionConstraint

The *ReactionConstraint* takes 3 attributes

<i>scope</i>	<i>EventChain</i>
<i>minimum</i>	\mathbb{T}
<i>maximum</i>	\mathbb{T}

2. Timing Constraints




Figure 2.19.: Example ReactionConstraint - $minimum = 1$, $maximum = 3$

and is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \forall x \in scope.stimulus : \exists y \in scope.response : \\
 & x.color = y.color \\
 & \wedge (\forall y' \in scope.response : y'.color = y.color \Rightarrow y \leq y') \\
 & \wedge minimum \leq y - x \leq maximum
 \end{aligned}$$

The definition says, that after every event x of $scope.stimulus$, there is an event y in $scope.response$ with the same color. The time distance between these events must be at least $minimum$ and at most $maximum$. Additional events with the same color as y in $scope.response$ are allowed, if they lay behind y . The definition implies, that additional events with other colors are allowed in $scope.response$, but not in $scope.stimulus$ and every color is only allowed once in $scope.stimulus$.

A visualized example with the attributes $minimum = 1$, $maximum = 3$, $scope.stimulus = \{(1, red), (5, green), (5.5, purple), (8, orange)\}$ and $scope.response = \{(0.8, blue), (2.1, red), (4.5, blue), (6.6, purple), (6.7, purple), (9.5, purple), (7.5, green), (10, orange)\}$ can be seen in figure 2.19. The red *stimulus*-event is followed by the red *response*-event at 2.1, the green *stimulus* event at 5 by the *response* event at 7.5 and so on. The blue *response* events at 1 and 4.5 are additional events without an associated stimulus event. The purple events at 6.7 and 9.5 are the second and third event of this color in $scope.response$ and therefore, their time distance to the *stimulus* event with the same color is irrelevant.

AgeConstraint

The *AgeConstraint* takes 3 attributes

<i>scope</i>	<i>EventChain</i>
<i>minimum</i>	\mathbb{T}
<i>maximum</i>	\mathbb{T}




Figure 2.20.: Example AgeConstraint - $minimum = 1$, $maximum = 3$

and is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\forall y \in scope.response : \exists x \in scope.stimulus : \\
 &\quad x.color = y.color \\
 &\quad \wedge (\forall x' \in scope.stimulus : x'.color = x.color \Rightarrow x' \leq x) \\
 &\quad \wedge minimum \leq y - x \leq maximum
 \end{aligned}$$

The *AgeConstraint* is a turned around counterpart to the *ReactionConstraint*. For every event of *scope.response*, there must be an event with the same color in *scope.stimulus*, that is between *minimum* and *maximum* older than the *response* event. Additional events are only allowed in *scope.stimulus*, and only before the event that matches with a *response* event.

Figure 2.20 shows an application of the *AgeConstraint* with the attributes $minimum = 1$, $maximum = 3$, $scope.stimulus = \{(0.8, blue), (1, red), (2, green), (4.5, green), (5, green), (5.5, purple), (8, orange)\}$ and $scope.response = \{(3.5, red), (7.5, green), (6.6, purple), (10, orange)\}$. The blue timestamps are additional events without matching events in *scope.response*.

OutputSynchronizationConstraint

The *OutputSynchronizationConstraint* takes 2 attributes

scope Set of *EventChain*
tolerance \mathbb{T}

where all elements of *scope* have the same *stimulus*. It is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\forall x \in scope_1.stimulus : \exists t : \forall i : \exists y \in scope_i.response : \\
 &\quad x.color = y.color \\
 &\quad \wedge (\forall y' \in scope_i.response : y'.color = y.color \Rightarrow y \leq y')
 \end{aligned}$$

2. Timing Constraints




Figure 2.21.: Example OutputSynchronizationConstraint - $tolerance = 1$

$$\wedge 0 \leq y - t \leq tolerance$$

The definition says, that after each event x in $scope_1.stimulus$, there must be a interval with the length of $tolerance$, in which every $scope_i.response$ must have an event y with the same color as x . Additional response events with this color are only allowed after y . Figure 2.21 shows an example of the *OutputSynchronizationConstraint* with the attributes $tolerance = 1$,

$scope[1].stimulus = scope[2].stimulus = scope[3].stimulus = \{(1, red), (4, green), (5, purple)\}$,
 $scope[1].response = \{(2, red), (6, purple), (6.2, purple), (8.2, green)\}$,
 $scope[2].response = \{(2.6, red), (6.2, purple), (8, green), (10.5, green)\}$,
 $scope[3].response = \{(2.3, red), (6.5, purple), (8.5, green)\}$.

InputSynchronizationConstraint

The *InputSynchronizationConstraint* takes 2 attributes

$scope$ Set of *EventChain*
 $tolerance$ \mathbb{T}

where all elements of $scope$ have the same *response*. It is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \forall y \in scope_1.response : \exists t : \forall i : \exists x \in scope_i.stimulus : \\ & x.color = y.color \\ & \wedge (\forall x' \in scope_i.stimulus : x'.color = x.color \Rightarrow x \leq x') \\ & \wedge 0 \leq x - t \leq tolerance \end{aligned}$$

The *InputSynchronizationConstraint* is a counterpart of the *OutputSynchronizationConstraint*, as the *stimulus* events must be synchronized, not the *response* events.




Figure 2.22.: Example InputSynchronizationConstraint - *tolerance* = 1

Figure 2.22 contains an example of the *InputSynchronizationConstraint* with the attributes *tolerance* = 1

scope[1].stimulus = {(1, red), (1.5, green), (4.6, green), (8, purple)}

scope[2].stimulus = {(1.2, red), (4, green), (8.3, purple), (8.5, purple)}

scope[3].stimulus = {(1.5, red), (4, green), (8.9, purple)}

scope[1].response = *scope[2].response* = *scope[3].response* = {(2.5, red), (6, green), (10, purple)}

2.2.3. Comparison TADL2 - AUTOSAR Timing Extension

As said before, the *TADL2 Timing Constraints* and the *AUTOSAR Timing Extension* are compatible in parts and many of the *AUTOSAR Timing Extension* can be expressed as equivalent combinations of the *TADL2 Timing Constraints*. In [BFL⁺12], the relation between these constraints is shown, but this comparison is based on an outdated version of the AUTOSAR Timing Extensions and some of the constraints have been updated, therefore each of the *AUTOSAR Timing Extensions* will be listed in this chapter and it will be explained, if and how they can be expressed using *TADL2 Timing Constraints*.

The types used in the AUTOSAR Timing Extension are similar to the ones in TADL2. TADL2 *Events* are called *TimingDescriptionEvent* in AUTOSAR, the same goes for *EventChains*, which are called *TimingDescriptionEventChains*. A larger difference can be seen in the definition of time. While TADL2 defines time as real numbers, the time definition used in the AUTOSAR Timing Extension can also be multidimensional, for example when the real time and the angle of the crankshaft is regarded. For simplification, all timestamps are considered as real numbers in the following, but an extension to multidimensional time stamps is possible, as AUTOSAR requires a strict order between all time stamps. *Executable entities* as defined in the AUTOSAR Timing Extension describe things, that can be

2. Timing Constraints

executed, for example a function. For the timing constraints, only striking point in times of these entities are relevant, for example the start or end points. It should be noted, that the set of TADL2 timing constraints are not equal to the AUTOSAR Timing Extension and that there are constraint, that cannot be expressed using the corresponding counterpart.

PeriodicEventTriggering

The *PeriodicEventTriggering* defined in AUTOSAR with the attributes (*event*, *period*, *jitter*, *minimumInterArrivalTime*) is equivalent to the *TADL2 PeriodicConstraint* with the same attributes.

SporadicEventTriggering

AUTOSARs *SporadicEventTriggering* with the attributes (*event*, *jitter*, *maximumInterArrivalTime*, *minimumInterArrivalTime*, *period*) is equivalent to the *TADL2 SporadicConstraint*, but the names of the attributes are different:

lower = *period*

upper = *maximumInterArrivalTime*

jitter = *jitter*

minimum = *minimumInterArrivalTime*

ConcretePatternEventTriggering

The idea behind the *ConcretePatternEventTriggering* from AUTOSAR is the same as behind TADL2s *PatternConstraint*, but subtleties are different. Both define a periodic behavior and offsets, that describe time distances between the periods and the actual events. The main difference is the *jitter* attribute. In AUTOSARs *ConcretePatternEventTriggering*, the *patternJitter* attribute defines the allowed deviation of the start points of the periodic repetitions, as in TADL2 the *jitter* value describes the deviation between the offsets and the actual event.

The *ConcretePatternEventTriggering* from AUTOSAR additionally defines an *patternLength* attribute, which describes the length of the intervals, in which the clusters of events will occur. It is constrained by

$$0 \leq \max(\text{offset}) \leq \text{patternLength}$$

$$\wedge \text{patternLength} + \text{patternJitter} < \text{patternPeriod}$$

The *patternLength* attribute can not be described with TADL2 timing constraints,

as it would require to determine the distance of filtered events, which is not possible with the TADL2 constraints.

TADL2 defines the *minimum* attribute for the *PatternConstraint* that describes the minimal time distance between subsequent events. In AUTOSAR, this must be described by using the *ArbitraryEventTriggering*, where *minimumDistance₁* is *minimum* and *maximumDistance₁* is ∞ .

BurstPatternEventTriggering

The *BurstPatternEventTriggering* as defined in AUTOSAR and TADL2s *BurstConstraint* share the same target, as they define a maximum number of events that may occur in a specific time interval, but the *BurstPatternEventTriggering* is way more complex. Additionally to the attributes of TADL2s *BurstConstraint*, that define the *length* of the time interval, the *maxOccurrences* of the event in this interval and the minimal time between subsequent events, the *BurstPatternEventTriggering* allows to define the minimal number of events in the interval and periodic repetitions of the burst interval.

Every set of attributes fulfilling the TADL2 *BurstConstraint* fulfill the AUTOSAR *BurstPatternEventTriggering*, when the attributes are renamed to the AUTOSAR equivalents (*length* \rightarrow *patternLength*, *maxOccurrences* \rightarrow *maxNumberOfOccurrences*, *minimum* \rightarrow *minimumInterArrivalTime*). This does not work the other way around, even if the attributes, that exist in the *BurstPatternEventTriggering* and not in the *BurstConstraint* are unused. The reason for this is, that the observed interval must start at an event in the TADL2 *BurstConstraint*, in the *BurstPatternEventTriggering* those can start in any point of time.

ArbitraryEventTriggering

AUTOSARs *ArbitraryEventTriggering* is similar to the *ArbitraryConstraint* as defined in TADL2, but *ArbitraryEventTriggering* allows to set a list of *ConfidenceIntervals*, to describe the probability, how far the events may lay apart. These probabilities can not be expressed in TADL2.

LatencyTimingConstraint

The *LatencyTimingConstraint* of AUTOSAR takes 5 attributes, a latency type *latencyConstraintType* $\in \{age, reaction\}$, three time values *maximum*, *minimum* and *nominal* and an event chain *scope*, consisting of the stimulus and response events. The *nominal*-value is not relevant for a formal definition of the Constraint, therefore there is no counterpart to this in the TADL2 Constraints. If the

2. Timing Constraints

latencyConstraintType of the *LatencyTimingConstraint* is *age*, it can be expressed with *AgeConstraint* defined in TADL2. The *LatencyTimingConstraint* with the *latencyConstraintType* *reaction* is equivalent to the *reactionConstraint*.

AgeConstraint

The goal of the *AgeConstraint* in AUTOSAR is to define a minimal and maximal age of an event at the point in time, when it is processed. There is no counterpart to this in the TADL2 constraints, because the point in time, when the event is processed, is unknown. If this point in time is known, AUTOSARs *AgeConstraint* can be expressed using TADL2s *AgeConstraint*, but in that case, it could also be expressed using AUTOSARs *LatencyTimingConstraint*.

SynchronizationTimingConstraint

The *SynchronizationTimingConstraint* is similar to the *SynchronizationConstraint*, the *StrongSynchronizationConstraint*, the *OutputSynchronizationConstraint*, the *InputSynchronizationConstraint* or combinations of them, depending on the attributes. Table 2.2 shows, with which attributes the *SynchronizationTimingConstraint* is equivalent to which TADL2 Constraint(s).

SynchronizationPointConstraint

The *SynchronizationPointConstraint* describes, that a list of executables and a set of events or executable entities, defined in *sourceEec* and *sourceEvent*, must finish and occur, before the executables and events in *targetEec* and *targetEvent* will start or occur. There is no counterpart to this in the TADL2 constraints.

OffsetTimingConstraint

The *OffsetTimingConstraint*, defined in AUTOSAR Timing Extensions, is semantically the same as the TADL2 *DelayConstraint*, just some attributes are named differently. The *maximum* attribute of the *OffsetTimingConstraint* is named *upper* and the *minimum* attribute *lower* in the *DelayConstraint*.

event Occurrence- Kind	scope/ scopeEvent	synchronization- ConstraintType	tolerance	TADL2 Constraints
multiple Occurrences	scopeEvent	<i>not set</i>	tolerance	SynchronizationConstraint (scopeEvent, tolerance)
single Occurrences	scopeEvent	<i>not set</i>	tolerance	StrongSynchronizationConstraint (scopeEvent, tolerance)
multiple Occurrences	scope	response Synchronization	tolerance	OutputSynchronizationConstraint (scope, tolerance) \wedge SynchronizationConstraint (scope.response, tolerance)
single Occurrences	scope	response Synchronization	tolerance	OutputSynchronizationConstraint (scope, tolerance) \wedge StrongSynchronizationConstraint (scope.response, tolerance)
multiple Occurrences	scope	stimulus Synchronization	tolerance	InputSynchronizationConstraint (scope, tolerance) \wedge SynchronizationConstraint (scope.stimulus, tolerance)
single Occurrences	scope	stimulus Synchronization	tolerance	InputSynchronizationConstraint (scope, tolerance) \wedge SynchronizationConstraint (scope.stimulus, tolerance)

Table 2.2.: SynchronizationTimingConstraint \Leftrightarrow TADL2 Constraints

ExecutionOrderConstraint

The goal of *ExecutionOrderConstraint* of the AUTOSAR Timing Extensions is used to describe the order of events or the execution order of executable entities, defined as *orderedElement* attribute. There is no constraint in TADL2 that describes exactly this, but if the *ExecutionOrderConstraint* is used to describe only the order of events, it can be described as

$$\begin{aligned} &OrderConstraint(orderedElement_1, orderedElement_2) \\ &\wedge \dots \wedge \\ &OrderConstraint(orderedElement_{n-1}, orderedElement_n) \end{aligned}$$

If the *ExecutionOrderConstraint* is used for executable entities, each executable entity must be turned into one or more events to be described via TADL2 Constraints, depending on the other attributes. For example, if the attribute *executionOrderConstraintType* is set to *ordinaryEOC*, the start and finish points of the entities define the observed events.

ExecutionTimeConstraint

The idea behind the *ExecutionTimeConstraint* is similar in AUTOSAR and TADL2. Both describe the minimal and maximal allowed run time of an executable entity, not counting interruptions. AUTOSARs *ExecutionTimeConstraint* is defined directly on an executable entity and the TADL2 constraint on events describing the *start*, *stop*, *preemption* and *resume* timestamps. Therefore the executable entity must be turned into these events to express the AUTOSAR *ExecutionTimeConstraint* via TADL2 constraints. The start and stop points of the executable must be turned into these events, the start and stop points of the interruptions must be turned into the events in the *preempt* and *resume* event sets. If external calls should be excluded from the run time, they must also be transferred into the *preempt* and *resume* event sets.

3. Related work and basics

3.1. Runtime Verification

Monitoring the AUTOSAR Timing Extensions is the goal of this thesis. As monitoring plays a major role in runtime verification, a short overview of this will be given. The definitions of [LS09] are used, in which *Runtime Verification* is a technique that can detect deviations between the run of a system and its formal specification by checking correctness properties. A *run*, which might also be called *trace*, is sequence of the system states, which might be infinite and an *execution* is a finite prefix of this run. A *monitor* reads the trace and decides, whether it fulfills the correctness properties or violates them.

A distinction is made between *offline* and *online* monitoring. Offline monitoring is using a stored trace, that has been recorded before. Therefore, the complete trace (or the complete part of the trace, that should be analyzed) is known in the analysis. Online monitoring checks the properties, while the system is running, which means that the analysis must be done incrementally. Because of memory and time limitations, not all previous states can be read again in online monitoring, more detailed contemplations on the limitations of online monitors will be given in chapter 4.

3.2. TeSSLa

TeSSLa (**T**emporal **S**tream-based **S**pecification **L**anguage) is a functional programming language, build for runtime verification of streams. In TeSSLa, **streams** are defined as traces of events, each event consists of one data value from a data set \mathbb{D} and a time value from a time domain \mathbb{T} , which is a *totally ordered semi-ring* $(\mathbb{T}, 0, 1, +, *, \leq)$, that is not negative.

This time domain needs a total order and subsequent timestamps must have increasing time values. A TeSSLa Specification can have several streams with different data sets, but each of these streams must use the same time domain \mathbb{T} , which timestamps are increasing over all streams. Each stream can have only one event per timestamp, but it is possible to have events on different streams at the same timestamp.

A distinction between synchronous and asynchronous streams is made. A set of synchronous streams have events in the exact same time stamps, events in asynchronous streams do not have this restriction. It is easy to see, that synchronous streams are a subset of the asynchronous ones, therefore we will only use asynchronous streams from now on.

In TeSSLa, calculations are done, when new events are arriving. Based on the specification, output streams are generated with events on the same timestamps as the used input streams, but filtering is possible, where not all input events produce output events. With the *delay*-operator, it is possible to create new timestamps. This possibility will take a large role in this thesis, more on that later.

At the timestamps, in which events arrived and calculations are done, you only have direct access to the youngest event of each stream, but with the use of the *last*-operator, which can be used recursively, the event before that can be accessed. The *lift*-operator applies a function, which is defined on data values \mathbb{D} , on each event of one or more streams. Similar to this, the *slift*-operator (signal lift) first applies the given function, when there was at least one event of each input stream. The *time*-operator returns the time value of an event.

3.3. Finite Transducers

4. Monitorability of properties on infinite Streams

The goal of this paper is to implement an online monitor for TADL2 Timing Constraint on possibly infinite streams using embedded hardware, like FPGAs or small ARM based computers. Because of finite resources, several constraints must be fulfilled, to get correct results in a reasonable time in every case. Therefore, the term of *Finite Monitorability* will be introduced, which ensures that monitoring is possible using the mentioned setting.

4.1. Finite Monitorability

4.1.1. Timestamps

As we consider streams that can be infinite, the time value of events can also grow into infinity. This is problematic, because it leads to infinite memory and runtime requirements, which cannot be met, especially not in the context of online monitoring. Therefore, the time domain \mathbb{T} must be restricted by the following constraints:

- \mathbb{T} must be discrete.
- The first used timestamp has the value $t_0 = 0$
- All used timestamps must be smaller than t_{max} .
 t_{max} must be big enough, so it is not reached in practical use ¹.
- The distance between two subsequent time values is small enough to observe the wanted constraints.

4.1.2. Finite Monitorability

For the definitions of streams and functions defined on them, TeSSLa-like syntax is used. Also, some standard TeSSLa functions are used in the definitions.

¹for example, a 64-bit unsigned integer variable is enough, to cover nanoseconds for 584.55 years




Figure 4.1.: Overview Finite Monitorability - with or without *delay*

Input Streams

Let S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n be input streams with
 $\forall i : S_i = (\mathbb{T} \cdot \mathbb{D}_i)^\omega \cup (\mathbb{T} \cdot \mathbb{D}_i)^+ \cup (\mathbb{T} \cdot \mathbb{D}_i)^* \cdot (\mathbb{T}_\infty \cup \mathbb{T} \cdot \{\perp\})$ and
 All types D_i have a finite size.

State Stream

Let S_{state} with
 $S_{state} = (\mathbb{T} \cdot \mathbb{D}_{state})^+ \cup (\mathbb{T} \cdot \mathbb{D}_{state})^*$
 be a state stream, where \mathbb{D}_{state} has a finite size.
 Further let $f : S_1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_n \times S_{state} \rightarrow S_{state} \times \mathbb{T}$ a state transition function,
 which defines the state stream in an incremental fashion:
 $\forall t \in \mathbb{T} \exists i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} : S_i(t) \in \mathbb{D}_i$
 $\rightarrow S_{state}(t) = f(S_1(t), S_2(t), \dots, S_n(t), last(S_{state}, merge(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n))(t))$
 The runtime of f is in $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

Output Stream

Let $S_{output} = (\mathbb{T} \cdot \{true_{until}, false\})^+ \cup (\mathbb{T} \cdot \{true_{until}, false\})^*$
 be the output stream, which is defined via a function

$g : \mathbb{D}_{state} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \{true_{until}, false\} \times \mathbb{T}$

The runtime of g is in $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

Evaluation

A property of a set of streams is called *Finite Monitorable*, if a function f with type \mathbb{D}_{state} and a function g exist, which fulfill the characteristics called above, and which outputs $true_{until}$, as long as the property is fulfilled and $false$, in any other case. It should be noted that these definitions are *timestamp conservative*, because the streams S_{state} and S_{output} can only change their data value at the timestamps of input events.

Equivalences

4.1.3. Finite Monitorability with Delay

Not all of the TADL2 constraints can be monitored in a *timestamp conservative*. For example, the *RepeatConstraint* with the attributes $lower = upper = 4$ and $span = 1$ expects subsequent events to have a time distance of 4. If one event is missing, the output of a timestamp conservative monitor would still be $true_{until}$, until the next input event arrives. Therefore, the monitor cannot not check the constraint correctly. Because of this problem, the definition of *Finite Monitorability* is expanded by the ability of introducing new timestamps. To ensure the finiteness of the monitor, only one new timestamp can be introduced, more on that in 4.1.3.

Input Streams

The definition of the input streams are unchanged.

State Stream

The function f remains unchanged, but the state stream S_{state} is expanded by an *timeout* value, which is inserted after a specific period of time, in which no input event has arrived.

Delay

A *Delay Generator* is inserted into the definition. It has two tasks, first it copies each input it gets from the state transition function f to its output. At the timestamp where an input is copied, a timer, which length depends on the state of the monitor, is started. If the next input comes before the timer runs out, the timer is resetted and started again. If the timer runs out, the Delay Generator outputs the *timeout* signal, which is repeated at every following input. After the timer has run out once, it is not started again.

Output Stream

The output function g is expanded by the *timeout* value:

$$g : (\mathbb{D}_{state} \cup \{timeout\}) \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \{true_{until}, false\} \times \mathbb{T}$$

The definition of the output stream S_{output} remains unchanged.

Evaluation

A property of a set of streams is called *Finite Monitorable with Delay*, if a function f with type \mathbb{D}_{state} , a delay generator and a function g exist, which fulfill the characteristics called above, and which outputs *true_{until}*, as long as the property is fulfilled and *false*, in any other case.

4.1.4. Non-Finite Monitorability

Not all TADL2 constraints are finite monitorable, because a monitor would require infinite memory and/or time resources. In a theoretical view, this makes online monitoring on infinite traces impossible, because a machine with infinite resources does not exist in the real world. In a practical view, many of these problems are solved by using a system with finite memory, with the hope that this finite resources would be enough, to cover the inputs of the "real world". In these cases, a distinction is useful, as some constraints have resource requirements, that grow continuously with every input event. These constraints will be called *always Non-Finite Monitorable*. Others constraints only require infinite resources in worst case scenarios, therefore these will be called *worst case Non-Finite Monitorable*. Obviously, the constraints with continuous resource requirement growth cannot be monitored infinitely, but the constraints, that only need infinite resources, can be monitored in many cases.

In the next chapter, each of the TADL2 constraints will be classified into *Finite Monitorable*, *Finite Monitorable with Delay* and *Non-Finite Monitorability*. For the last class, it will be demonstrated, if the constraint is non-finite monitorable in any cases or just in worst case scenarios.

5. Analysis of the Monitorability of the TADL2 Timing Constraints

5.1. DelayConstraint

The *DelayConstraint* is defined as

$$\forall x \in source : \exists y \in target : lower \leq y - x \leq upper.$$

and describes that in the time interval between *lower* and *upper* after any *source* event, there is an *target* event. Therefore, the state that need to be stored to monitor the *DelayConstraint* is the set of *source* events, that did not have a matching *target* event. Updates to this state and outputs of the monitor are done at *source* and *target* events and at delay timestamps *upper* after *source* events, if there hasn't been a matching *target* event.

The maximal required storage size of the state depends on the number of *source* events, which can possibly occur in any time interval of the length *upper*. An example of this worst case situation can be seen in figure 5.1. The attributes in this example are $lower = upper = 5$, $source = \{1, 1.1, \dots, 5.9\}$ and $target = \{6, 6.1, \dots, 11\}$. At timestamp 6, all 49 *source* events must be stored, as they are all required to generate the correct output in this and the following timestamps. At this timestamp, the oldest *source* event can be removed from the storage, as the matching *target* event occurs in this timestamp. With every following *target*, the oldest event can be removed from the storage, until every *source* had its matching *target* event at timestamp 11.

Because the time domain is understood as real numbers in TADL2, a possibly infinite number of events can be placed in any interval of the length *upper*, therefore the required storage space can grow infinitely. Because the *source* events are removed from the state, when a matching *target* event occurs, the required storage space does not grow continuously and infinite resources are only required in worst case scenarios. Therefore, the *DelayConstraint* is *worst case Non-Finite monitorable*.




Figure 5.1.: *DelayConstraint* or *StrongDelayConstraint* with $lower = upper = 5$

5.2. StrongDelayConstraint

The difference between the *DelayConstraint* and the *StrongDelayConstraint* is, that for every *source* event, there must be exactly one matching *target* event in the *StrongDelayConstraint*. Therefore, the state of the monitor is nearly the same, as every *source* event, that did not have a matching *target* event yet, must be stored. Therefore, the only difference is, when these *source* events can be removed from state and the *StrongDelayConstraint* is *worst case Non-Finite monitorable*, like the *DelayConstraint*.

5.3. RepeatConstraint

The *RepeatConstraint* defines the time distance between each event and its $span^{th}$ successor. Therefore, the state, that must be stored, consists of the timestamps of the $span + 1$ latest events. The state is updated at every event, the oldest stored event is removed and the timestamp of the current event is placed in the storage. The output function checks, if the time distance between the oldest stored event and the current timestamp is between *lower* and *upper*. To monitor this constraint, a single delay is required, because a missing event, or an event that occurs too late, would not be determined in the right timestamp.

As the memory requirements are fix ($span + 1$ timestamps must be stored) and the state transition and output function can be programmed in a way that they are in $\mathcal{O}(1)$, the *RepetitionConstraint* is finite monitorable with delay.

5.4. RepetitionConstraint

The *RepetitionConstraint* is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{RepetitionConstraint}(s, lower, upper, span, jitter) \\ & \equiv \exists X \subset \mathbb{T} : \text{RepeatConstraint}(X, lower, upper, span) \\ & \wedge \text{StrongDelayConstraint}(X, s, 0, jitter) \end{aligned}$$

The elements of set X follow the RepeatConstraint and the events, which should be monitored, are following in an interval of the length *jitter* after the elements of X . For each element of X , there is exactly one event and vice versa.

The monitoring algorithm for this constraint, which will be explained in detail in 6, stores the upper and lower bounds for the next *span* elements of X . These borders are stored in a list and calculated by

$$\begin{aligned} lowerBound &:= \text{List_append}(\text{last}(\text{List_tail}(\text{LowerBound}), s), lowerBoundNow + lower) \text{ for the lower bound and} \\ upperBound &:= \text{List_append}(\text{last}(\text{List_tail}(\text{UpperBound}), s), upperBoundNow + upper). \end{aligned}$$

The oldest item in these lists (the head of these lists) are removed and the newly calculated bounds for the *span* next element of X is inserted. *lowerBoundNow* and *upperBoundNow* are the describing the limitations of the element of X right before the current event. They are calculated using the list mentioned above and the timestamp of the current event by the following definition:

$$\begin{aligned} lowerBoundNow &:= \max(\text{List_head}(\text{last}(\text{LowerBoundX}, s)), \text{time}(s) - jitter) \\ upperBoundNow &:= \min(\text{List_head}(\text{last}(\text{UpperBoundX}, s)), \text{time}(s)) \end{aligned}$$

If the timestamp of the current event is between *lowerBoundNow* and *upperBoundNow*, the output of the monitor is *true*, in any other case, or when the delay ran out, it is *false*.

The size of these lists has a fixed upper limit (*span*) and the state transition and output functions are in $\mathcal{O}(1)$, therefore the *RepetitionConstraint* is finite monitorable with delay.




Figure 5.2.: *SynchronizationConstraint* or *StrongSynchronizationConstraint* with *tolerance* = 5

5.5. SynchronizationConstraint

The *SynchronizationConstraint* describe groups of event sets, which events occur in common clusters. Each of these sets must have at least one event in each of these intervals. Any events, that lay outside of these intervals are prohibited.

Figure 5.2, which is similar to the example for the *DelayConstraint*, shows an example of this constraint, which is an worst case scenario in terms of monitoring. The *tolerance* interval is 5 timestamps long, the event set s_1 contains the events $\{1, 1.1, \dots, 5.9\}$ and s_2 is containing $\{6, 6.1, \dots, 11\}$. Each of the events of s_1 must be stored until the end of the *tolerance* interval, otherwise it would be impossible to check the constraint correctly. Like described in chapter 5.1, an infinite number of events can be placed in this interval, therefore infinite memory resources are needed. Because the required storage space is not growing continuously, as the stored events can be removed at the end of the *tolerance* interval, the *SynchronizationConstraint* is worst case Non-Finite monitorable.

It should be noted, that the illustration of the constraint in figure 5.2 may be misleading, because the *tolerance* intervals are only shown after the events of s_1 , not after the events of s_2 . Every implementation of a monitor for this constraint must also store the events of s_2 for the length of *tolerance*, as they could be important for events following after them.

5.6. StrongSynchronizationConstraint

The difference between the *StrongSynchronizationConstraint* and the *SynchronizationConstraint* is, that in the *StrongSynchronizationConstraint*, only one event per event set is allowed in each synchronization cluster. Therefore, this constraint can be classified as worst case Non-Finite monitorable with the same argumentation as the previous constraint.

5.7. ExecutionTimeConstraint

The *ExecutionTimeConstraint* ensures that the time distance between *stop* and *start* events, not counting interruptions (which are specified by *preempt* and *resume* events).

Under the assumption that the input events are in logical order (every execution is started by an *start* event and finished by an *stop* event, every *preempt* event is directly followed by an *resume* event and no *preempt* or *resume* events occur outside of the intervals spanned by *start* and *stop* events), three time values must be stored, to monitor this constraint. First, the timestamp of the latest *start* event. Second, the sum of the timestamps of the *preempt* events, reseted by every *start* event and third, the sum of the timestamps of the *resume* events, also reseted by every *start* event.

For the output function, the run time can be calculated by

$$runtime = time(now) - start - (sum(resume) - sum(preempt)).$$

At any event, this value must smaller or equal to *upper* and at *stop* events, additionally the runtime must be greater or equal to *upper*.

Therefore the required storage space is fixed, also the runtime of the state transition and output function is in $\mathcal{O}(1)$, therefore the *ExecutionTimeConstraint* is finite monitorable with delay.

5.8. OrderConstraint

The *OrderConstraint* describes, that an i^{th} *target* event must exist, if an i^{th} *source* event exists and that the i^{th} *target* event occurs after the i^{th} *source* event. Because it is possible that an arbitrary large number of *source* events occur before the first *target* occurs, a possibly infinite large number must be stored, which requires infinite memory resources. As this is only a worst case scenario and the size of the stored number can be decreased, when a *target* event occurs, the *OrderConstraint* is worst case non-finite monitorable.

5.9. ComparisonConstraint

The *ComparisonConstraint* defines an ordering relation between two single timestamps. Therefore, no additional storage is needed and as the relations (\leq , $<$, \geq , $>$, $=$) can be decided in constant time for discrete timestamps, this Constraint is finite monitorable.

5.10. SporadicConstraint

The *SporadicConstraint* is defined via the *Repetition-* and *RepeatConstraint* without introducing any new timestamps in the definition of the *SporadicConstraint*. These Constraints are finite monitorable with delay, therefore the *SporadicConstraint* is also finite monitorable with delay.

5.11. PeriodicConstraint

The *PeriodicConstraint* is special application of the *SporadicConstraint*, therefore it is also finite monitorable with delay.

5.12. PatternConstraint

5.13. ArbitraryConstraint

The *ArbitraryConstraint* is defined as combination of the *RepeatConstraint*:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ArbitraryConstraint}(\text{event}, \text{minimum}_1, \dots, \text{minimum}_n, \text{maximum}_1, \dots, \text{maximum}_n) \\ & \Leftrightarrow \forall i \in 1, \dots, n : \text{RepeatConstraint}(\text{event}, \text{minimum}_i, \text{maximum}_i, i). \end{aligned}$$

The *RepeatConstraint* is finite monitorable with delay, therefore the *ArbitraryConstraint* is also finite monitorable with delay.




Figure 5.3.: Color attribute

5.14. BurstConstraint

The *BurstConstraint* is defined as combination of the *RepeatConstraint*:

$$\text{RepeatConstraint}(\text{event}, \text{length}, \infty, \text{maxOccurrences}) \\ \wedge \text{RepeatConstraint}(\text{event}, \text{minimum}, \infty, 1)$$

The *RepeatConstraint* is finite monitorable with delay, therefore the *BurstConstraint* is also finite monitorable with delay.

5.15. EventChain

EventChains, which are required for the following constraints, are defined as sets of *stimulus* and *response* events. The events have an color attribute, which describes the causal connection individual events of *stimulus* and *response*. It is required, that any *stimulus* event with a specific color must occur before the first *response* event with the same color. The datatype of this attribute is not specified, except that it may be infinite and an equality test exist.

Monitoring this property is difficult, because it is required to store every color which has occurred in *response*. The reason for this can be seen in figure 5.3. In the interval between the timestamps 1 and 2, there are 5 events of different colors in *stimulus*. Their counterparts in *response* occur in the interval between 4 and 5. In timestamp 6, there is an event in *response* with a color, that hasn't been used in *stimulus* before, therefore this color may not be used in *stimulus* anymore. To check this for further events in *stimulus*, it is required to know any color that previously occurred in *response*.

The memory consumption to monitor this is growing continuously with any event that introduces a new color in *response*, therefore any constraint, that requires the color attribute (*ReactionConstraint*, *AgeConstraint*, *OutputSynchronizationConstraint*, *InputSynchronizationConstraint*) is always non-finite monitorable.

6. Implementierungen

In der Evaluierung wird das Ergebnis dieser Arbeit bewertet. Eine praktische Evaluation eines neuen Algorithmus kann zum Beispiel durch eine Implementierung geschehen. Je nach Thema der Arbeit kann sich natürlich auch die gesamte Arbeit eher im praktischen Bereich mit einer Implementierung beschäftigen. In diesem Fall gilt es am Ende der Arbeit insbesondere die Implementierung selber zu evaluieren. Wesentliche Fragen dabei können sein:

- Was funktioniert jetzt besser als vor meiner Arbeit?
- Wie kann das praktisch eingesetzt werden?
- Was sagen potenzielle Anwender zu meiner Lösung?

6.1. Implementierungen

Wenn Implementierungen umfangreich beschrieben werden, ist darauf zu achten, den richtigen Mittelweg zwischen einer zu detaillierten und zu oberflächlichen Beschreibung zu finden. Eine Beschreibung aller Details der Implementierung ist in der Regel zu detailliert, da die primäre Zielgruppe einer Abschlussarbeit sich nicht im Detail in den geschriebenen Quelltext einarbeiten will. Die Beschreibung sollte aber durchaus alle wesentlichen Konzepte der Implementierung enthalten. Gerade bei einer Abschlussarbeit am Institut für Softwaretechnik und Programmiersprachen lohnt es sich, auf die eingesetzten Techniken und Programmiersprachen einzugehen. Ich würde in einer solchen Beschreibung auch einige unterstützende Diagramme erwarten.

7. Zusammenfassung und Ausblick

Die Zusammenfassung greift die in der Einleitung angerissenen Bereiche wieder auf und erläutert, zu welchen Ergebnissen diese Arbeit kommt. Dabei wird insbesondere auf die neuen Erkenntnisse und den Nutzen der Arbeit eingegangen.

Im anschließenden Ausblick werden mögliche nächste Schritte aufgezählt, um die Forschung an diesem Thema weiter voranzubringen. Hier darf man sich nicht scheuen, klar zu benennen, was im Rahmen dieser Arbeit nicht bearbeitet werden konnte und wo noch weitere Arbeit notwendig ist.

A. Anhang

Dieser Anhang enthält tiefergehende Informationen, die nicht zur eigentlichen Arbeit gehören.

A.1. Abschnitt des Anhangs

In den meisten Fällen wird kein Anhang benötigt, da sich selten Informationen ansammeln, die nicht zum eigentlichen Inhalt der Arbeit gehören. Vollständige Quelltextlisting haben in ausgedruckter Form keinen Wert und gehören daher weder in die Arbeit noch in den Anhang. Darüber hinaus gehören Abbildungen bzw. Diagramme, auf die im Text der Arbeit verwiesen wird, auf keinen Fall in den Anhang.

List of Figures

2.1. BurstPatternEventTriggering Period-Jitter accumulating	5
2.2. BurstPatternEventTriggering Period-Jitter non-accumulating	6
2.3. BurstPatternEventTriggering Possible bursts, \uparrow shows the current time	8
2.4. Graphical example of $\lambda(E)$, $\lambda(F)$ and $\lambda(E \setminus F)$	11
2.5. Example DelayConstraint - <i>lower</i> = 2, <i>upper</i> = 3	13
2.6. Example StrongDelayConstraint - <i>lower</i> = 2, <i>upper</i> = 3	14
2.7. Example RepeatConstraint - <i>lower</i> = 2, <i>upper</i> = 2, <i>span</i> = 1	15
2.8. Example RepeatConstraint - <i>lower</i> = 4, <i>upper</i> = 5, <i>span</i> = 2	15
2.9. Example RepetitionConstraint - <i>lower</i> = 4, <i>upper</i> = 5, <i>span</i> = 2, <i>jitter</i> = 1	16
2.10. Example SynchronizationConstraint - <i>tolerance</i> = 1	17
2.11. Example StrongSynchronizationConstraint - <i>tolerance</i> = 1	18
2.12. Example ExecutionTimeConstraint	19
2.13. Example OrderConstraint	19
2.14. Example SporadicConstraint - <i>lower</i> = 2, <i>upper</i> = 2.5, <i>jitter</i> = 1, <i>minimum</i> = 2	21
2.15. Example PeriodicConstraint - <i>period</i> = 3, <i>jitter</i> = 1, <i>minimum</i> = 2.5	22
2.16. Example PatternConstraint - <i>period</i> = 5, <i>offset</i> = {1, 2, 2.5}, <i>jitter</i> = 0.5, <i>minimum</i> = 0.5	23
2.17. Example ArbitraryConstraint - <i>period</i> = 5, <i>offset</i> = {1, 2, 2.5}, <i>jitter</i> = 0.5, <i>minimum</i> = 0.5	24
2.18. Example BurstConstraint - <i>length</i> = 5, <i>maxOccurences</i> = 3 <i>minimum</i> = 0.8	25
2.19. Example ReactionConstraint - <i>minimum</i> = 1, <i>maximum</i> = 3	26
2.20. Example AgeConstraint - <i>minimum</i> = 1, <i>maximum</i> = 3	27
2.21. Example OutputSynchronizationConstraint - <i>tolerance</i> = 1	28
2.22. Example InputSynchronizationConstraint - <i>tolerance</i> = 1	29
4.1. Overview Finite Monitorability - with or without <i>delay</i>	38
5.1. <i>DelayConstraint</i> or <i>StrongDelayConstraint</i> with <i>lower</i> = <i>upper</i> = 5	44
5.2. <i>SynchronizationConstraint</i> or <i>StrongSynchronizationConstraint</i> with <i>tolerance</i> = 5	46
5.3. Color attribute	49

List of Tables

2.1. Time distances as seen in figure 2.17	24
2.2. SynchronizationTimingConstraint \Leftrightarrow TADL2 Constraints	33

Quelltextverzeichnis

Abkürzungsverzeichnis

TDO zu erledigen *To Do*

Bibliography

- [AUT17] AUTOSAR: *Virtual Functional Bus, 4.3.1*. https://www.autosar.org/fileadmin/user_upload/standards/classic/4-3/AUTOSAR_EXP_VFB.pdf. Version: December 2017
- [AUT18] AUTOSAR: Specification of Timing Extensions / AUTOSAR. 2018 (4.0). – Forschungsbericht
- [BFL⁺12] BLOM, Hans ; FENG, Dr. L. ; LÖNN, Dr. H. ; NORDLANDER, Dr. J. ; KUNTZ, Stefan ; LISPER, Dr. B. ; QUINTON, Dr. S. ; HANKE, Dr. M. ; PERALDI-FRATI, Dr. Marie-Agnès ; GOKNIL, Dr. A. ; DEANTONI, Dr. J. ; DEFO, Gilles B. ; KLOBEDANZ, Kay ; ÖZHAN, Mesut ; HONCHAROVA, Olha: TIMMO2USE Language syntax, semantics, metamodel V2 / ITEA2. 2012 (1.2). – Forschungsbericht
- [LN12] LISPER, Björn ; NORDLANDER, Johan: A Simple and flexible Timing Constraint Logic. In: *In 5th International Symposium On Leveraging Applications of Formal Methods, Verification and Validation (ISoLA), 15-18 October 2012, Amirandes, Heraklion, Crete*. (2012)
- [LS09] LEUCKER, Martin ; SCHALLHART, Christian: A brief account of runtime verification. In: *The Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming* 78 (2009)