國立臺灣大學電機資訊學院電子工程學研究所 博士論文

Graduate Institute of Electronics Engineering
College of Electronical Engineering and Computer Science
National Taiwan University
Doctor Thesis

賽局上的合作時序邏輯的模型驗證以及密集錯誤回復力 Model Checking for Temporal Cooperation Logic and Resilience against Dense Errors on Game Graph

> 黄重豪 Chung-Hao Huang

指導教授:王凡博士 Advisor: Farn Wang, Ph.D.

> 中華民國 105 年 1 月 January, 2016

所電子工程學研究國 立臺灣大學

博士論文

誤回復力賽局上的合作時序邏輯的模型驗證以及密集錯

黄重豪 撰

Abstract

This thesis is composed of 3 parts. In the first part, I introduce an algorithm to calculate the highest degree of fault tolerance a system can achieve with the control of a safety critical systems. Which can be reduced to solving a game between a malicious environment and a controller. During the game play, the environment tries to break the system through injecting failures while the controller tries to keep the system safe by making correct decisions. I found a new control objective which offers a better balance between complexity and precision for such systems: we seek systems that are k-resilient. A system is k-resilient means it is able to rapidly recover from a sequence of small number, up to k, of local faults infinitely many times if the blocks of up to k faults are separated by short recovery periods in which no fault occurs. kresilience is a simple abstraction from the precise distribution of local faults, but I believe it is much more refined than the traditional objective to maximize the number of local faults. I will provide detail argument of why this is the right level of abstraction for safety critical systems when local faults are few and far between. I have proved, with respect to resilience, the computational complexity of constructing optimal control is low. And a demonstration of the feasibility through an implementation and experimental results will be in following chapters. The second part is to create an logic which can describe the different purposes of each player such as environment, controller, user, and etc in a system. I propose an extension to ATL (alternating-time logic), called BSIL(basic strategy-interaction logic), for the specification of strategies interaction of players in a system. BSIL is able to describe one system strategy that can cooperate with several strategies of the environment for different requirements. Such properties are important in practice and I show that such properties are not expressible in ATL*, GL (game logic), and AMC (alternating μ-calculus). Specifically, BSIL is more expressive than ATL but incomparable with ATL*, GL, and AMC in expressiveness. I show that, for fulfilling a specification in BSIL, a memoryful strategy is necessary. I also show that the model-checking complexity of BSIL is PSPACE-complete and is of lower complexity than those of ATL*, GL, AMC, and the general strategy logics. Which may imply that BSIL can be useful in closing the gap between large scale real-world projects and the time consuming game-theoretical results. I then show the feasibility of our techniques by implementation and experiment with our PSPACE model-checking algorithm for BSIL. The final part is an extension to BSIL called temporal cooperation logic(TCL). TCL allows successive definition of strategies for agents and agencies. Like BSIL the expressiveness of TCL is still incomparable with ATL*, GL and AMC. However, it can describe deterministic Nash equilibria while BSIL cannot. I prove that the model checking complexity of TCL is EXPTIME-complete. TCL enjoys this relatively cheap complexity by disallowing a too close entanglement between cooperation and competition while allowing such entanglement leads to a non-elementary complexity. I have implemented a model-checker for TCL and shown the feasibility of model checking in the experiment on some benchmarks.

Key words:

Contents

Al	bstrac	et		i
Co	onten	ts		iii
1	Intr	oduction		1
2	Soft	ware Resilience against Dense	Errors	2
	2.1	Two-player concurrent game s	tructures	. 3
	2.2	Motivation		. 3
		2.2.1 Background		. 3
		2.2.2 Resilience in a Nutshe	11	. 3
	2.3	Safety resilience games		. 3
	2.4	Alternating-time μ -calculus w	ith events	. 3
		2.4.1 Syntax		. 3
		2.4.2 semantics		. 3
	2.5	Resilience level checking algo	rithm	. 3
		2.5.1 High-level description	of the algorithm	. 3
		2.5.2 Realization with AMO	E model-checking	. 3
		2.5.3 Complexity		. 3
	2.6	Tool implementation and expe	rimental results	. 3
		2.6.1 Benchmarks		. 3
		2.6.2 Modeling of the fault-	tolerant systems	. 3
		2.6.3 Performance data		. 3

	2.7	Relate	d works	3
3	Basi	c Strate	egy-interaction Logic	4
	3.1	Existe	d Logics about Game and Strategy	5
		3.1.1	Prior to Strategy Logics	5
		3.1.2	With Strategy Logics	5
	3.2	Runnii	ng Example	5
		3.2.1	Trying to Write Down a Correct Formal Specification	5
		3.2.2	Resorting to General Strategy Logics for a Correct Specification .	5
		3.2.3	BSIL: New Strategy Modalities Expressive Enough for the Spec-	
			ification	5
		3.2.4	Symbolic Strategy Names and Path Obligations	5
		3.2.5	Passing Down the Path Obligations While Observing the Restric-	
			tions Among S-Profiles	5
		3.2.6	Finding Finite Satisfying Evidence for a Formula in a Computa-	
			tion Tree	5
	3.3	Game	Graphs	5
		3.3.1	Concurrent Games	5
		3.3.2	Turn-Based Games	5
	3.4	BSIL .		5
		3.4.1	Syntax	5
		3.4.2	semantics	5
		3.4.3	ATL+	5
		3.4.4	Memory	5
	3.5	Expres	ssive Power of BSIL	5
		3.5.1	Comparison with GL	5
		3.5.2	Comparison with AMC	5
	3.6	Algori	thm and Complexity	5
		3.6.1	Computing Path Obligations and Passing Them Down the Com-	
			putation Tree	5

	4.3	4.2.1 4.2.2 Compl 4.3.1 4.3.2	Comparison with CTL* and LTL	6 6 6 6 6 6
	4.3	4.2.1 4.2.2 Compl 4.3.1	Comparison with CTL* and LTL	6 6 6
	4.3	4.2.1 4.2.2 Compl	Comparison with CTL* and LTL	6 6 6
	4.3	4.2.1 4.2.2	Comparison with CTL* and LTL	6
		4.2.1	Comparison with CTL* and LTL	6
		-		
		1	SSIVE TOWER OF TELL	6
	4.2	2 Expressive Power of TCL		_
		4.1.2	semantics	6
		4.1.1	Syntax	6
	4.1	TCL .		6
4	Tem	emporal Cooperation Logic		
		3.9.3	Discussion of the Experiments	5
		3.9.2	Benchmarks and Their Experiment Report	5
		3.9.1	Implementation	5
	3.9	Experi	iment	5
	3.8		Satisfiability	5
		3.7.2	Model Checking with AAs	5
		3.7.1	Alternating Automata	5
	3.7	Autom	nata for BSIL Model Checking	5
		3.6.5	Lower Bound and Completeness	5
		3.6.4	Complexities of the Algorithm	5
		3.6.3	Correctness Proof of the Algorithm	5
			Procedures for Checking BSIL Properties	

Introduction

The organization of this thesis is as follows. In chapte ??, the theoretical background and definition of surface plasmon will be included [?]. Chapte ?? contains description of experiment methods such as atomic force microscopy and scanning electron microscopy.

Software Resilience against Dense

Errors

2.1	Two-player	concurrent	game	structures
	I II O PIM, CI	Concarrence		DUI MEUMI C

- 2.2 Motivation
- 2.2.1 Background
- 2.2.2 Resilience in a Nutshell
- 2.3 Safety resilience games
- 2.4 Alternating-time μ -calculus with events
- **2.4.1** Syntax
- 2.4.2 semantics
- 2.5 Resilience level checking algorithm
- 2.5.1 High-level description of the algorithm
- 2.5.2 Realization with AMCE model-checking

Basic Strategy-interaction Logic

- 3.1 Existed Logics about Game and Strategy
- 3.1.1 Prior to Strategy Logics
- 3.1.2 With Strategy Logics
- 3.2 Running Example
- 3.2.1 Trying to Write Down a Correct Formal Specification
- 3.2.2 Resorting to General Strategy Logics for a Correct Specification
- 3.2.3 BSIL: New Strategy Modalities Expressive Enough for the Specification
- 3.2.4 Symbolic Strategy Names and Path Obligations
- 3.2.5 Passing Down the Path Obligations While Observing the Restrictions Among S-Profiles
- 3.2.6 Finding Finite Satisfying Evidence for a Formula in a Computation Tree 5

Temporal Cooperation Logic

- **4.1** TCL
- **4.1.1** Syntax
- 4.1.2 semantics
- 4.2 Expressive Power of TCL
- 4.2.1 Comparison with CTL* and LTL
- 4.2.2 Comparison with AMC, ATL* and GL
- 4.3 Complexity
- 4.3.1 TCL Model-checking
- 4.3.2 TCL Satisfiability
- 4.4 Experiment

Conclusions