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A Vision of Collaborative Verification-Driven Engineering of Hybrid Systems

Stefan Mitsch 1 and Grant Olney Passmore 2 and André Platzer 3

Abstract. Hybrid systems with both discrete and continuous dynamics are an important model for real-world physical systems. The key challenge is how to ensure their correct functioning w.r.t. safety requirements. Promising techniques to ensure safety seem to be model-driven engineering to develop hybrid systems in a well-defined and traceable manner, and formal verification to prove their correctness. Their combination forms the vision of verification-driven engineering. Despite the remarkable progress in automating formal verification of hybrid systems, the construction of proofs of complex systems often requires significant human guidance, since hybrid systems verification tools solve undecidable problems. It is thus not uncommon for verification teams to consist of many players with diverse expertise. This paper introduces a verification-driven engineering tooset that extends our previous work on hybrid and arithmetic verification with tools for (i) modeling hybrid systems, (ii) exchanging and comparing models and proofs, and (iii) managing verification tasks. This toolset makes it easier to tackle large-scale verification tasks.

1 Introduction

Motivation. Computers that control physical processes, thus forming so-called cyber-physical systems (CPS), are today pervasively embedded into our lives. For example, cars equipped with adaptive cruise control form a typical CPS, responsible for controlling acceleration on the basis of distance sensors. Further prominent examples can be found in many safety-critical areas, such as in factory automation, medical equipment, automotive, aviation, and railway industries. From an engineering viewpoint, CPSs can be described in a hybrid manner in terms of discrete control decisions (the cyber-part, e.g., setting the acceleration of a car) and in terms of differential equations modeling the entailed physical continuous dynamics (the physical part, e.g., motion) [28]. More advanced models include aspects of distributed hybrid systems [32] or stochasticity [31], but are not addressed in this paper.

Challenge. The key challenge in engineering hybrid systems is the question of how to ensure their correct functioning in order to avoid incorrect control decisions w.r.t. safety requirements (e.g., a car with adaptive cruise control will never collide with a car driving ahead). Especially promising techniques to ensure safety seem to be model-driven engineering (MDE) to incrementally develop systems in a well-defined and traceable manner and formal verification to mathematically prove their correctness, together forming the vision of verification-driven engineering (VDE) [20]. Despite the remarkable progress in automating formal verification of hybrid systems, still many interesting and complex verification problems remain that are hard to solve in practice with a single tool by a single person.

Because hybrid systems are undecidable, hybrid systems verification tools work over an undecidable theory, and so verifying complicated systems within them often requires significant human guidance. This need for human guidance is true even for decidable theories utilized within hybrid systems verification [5], such as the first-order theory of nonlinear real arithmetic (also called the theory of real closed fields or RCF), a crucial component of real-world verification efforts. Though decidable, RCF is fundamentally infeasible (it is worst-case doubly exponential in the number of variables [6]), which poses a problem for the automated verification of hybrid systems. Much expertise is often needed to discharge arithmetical verification conditions in a reasonable amount of time and space, expertise requiring the use of deep results in real algebraic geometry. It is thus not uncommon for serious hybrid systems verification teams to consist of many players, some with expertise in control theory and dynamical systems, some in software engineering, some in mathematical logic, some in real algebraic geometry, and so on. Hence, well-established project management techniques to coordinate team members are crucial to achieve effective collaborative large-scale verification of hybrid systems. Successful examples of team-based large-scale verification of non-hybrid systems include the operating system kernel seL4 [19] in Isabelle/HOL and the Flyspeck project [15], and show, that indeed collaboration is key for proving large systems.

Vision. This paper introduces a VDE toolset (including a backend deployment for project management and collaboration support) and sketches our vision on further enhancing this toolset. It applies proof decomposition in-the-large across multiple verification tools. Basing on the completeness of differential dynamic logic (dL [28, 33]), which is a real-valued first-order dynamic logic for hybrid programs, a program notation for hybrid systems. The VDE toolset 
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paring models and proofs via a central source repository, and (iii) exchanging knowledge and tasks through a project management backend.

**Structure of the paper** In the next section, we give an overview on related work. In Sect. 3 we introduce our architecture of a verification-driven engineering toolset, and describe implementation and features of its components, including a vision of further work. Section 4 introduces an autonomous robotic ground vehicle as application example. Finally, in Sect. 5 we conclude the paper with an outlook on real-world application of the toolset.

## 2 Related Work

Model-driven engineering in a collaborative manner has been successfully applied in the embedded systems community. Efforts, for instance, include transforming between different UML models and SysML [16], modeling in SysML and transforming these models to the simulation tool Orchestra [2], integration of modeling and simulation in Cosmic/Cadena [13], or modeling of reactive systems and integration of various verification tools in Sysympy [10].

Recent surveys on verification methods for hybrid systems [1], modeling and analysis of hybrid systems [8], and modeling of cyber-physical systems [9], reveal that indeed many tools are available for modeling and analyzing hybrid systems, but in a rather isolated manner. Supporting collaboration on formal verification by distributing tasks among members of a verification team in a model-driven engineering approach has not yet been the focus. Although current verification tools for hybrid systems (e.g., PHAvEr [11], SpaceEx [12]), as well as those for arithmetic (e.g., Z3 [7]) are accompanied by modeling editors of varying sophistication, they are not yet particularly well-prepared for collaboration either. Developments in collaborative verification of source code by multiple complementary static code checkers [4], modular model-checking (e.g., [22]), and extreme verification [17], however, indicate that this is indeed an interesting field. Most notably, usage of online collaboration tools in the Polymath project has led to an elementary proof of a special case of the density Hales-Jewett theorem [14].

## 3 The VDE Toolset $\Sigma_{\Phi_{\mathcal{L}}}^{\mathcal{L}}$

In order to integrate different modeling and verification tools, the verification-driven engineering toolset $\Sigma_{\Phi_{\mathcal{L}}}^{\mathcal{L}}$ proposed in this paper follows a model-driven architecture: metamodels for different modeling and proof languages form the basis for manipulating, persisting, and transforming models. The notion of a model here denotes an instance of a metamodel, i.e., it comprises models, proofs, and strategies. Following the definition of the OMG\(^2\), a metamodel defines a language to formulate models: one example for a metamodel is the grammar of $\mathcal{L}$, which, among others, defines language elements for non-deterministic choice, sequential composition, assignment, repetition, and differential equations. An example for a model is given in Sect. 4: it is a set of formulas, differential equations, and other $\mathcal{L}$ language elements. It conforms to the grammar of $\mathcal{L}$, and thus is an instance of the $\mathcal{L}$ metamodel. Figure 1 gives an overview of the toolset architecture. As can be seen, the $\mathcal{L}$, KeY, arithmetic, and arithmetic proof metamodels represent interfaces between tools and to the backend.

- **$\mathcal{L}$ metamodel** The hybrid modeling components (textual and graphical editors for $\mathcal{L}$, as well as model comparison) manipulate models that conform to the $\mathcal{L}$ metamodel. A transformation runtime transforms between models in $\mathcal{L}$ and their textual form read by KeYmaera.

- **KeY proof metamodel** The proof comparison component reads proofs that conform to the KeY proof metamodel. These proofs may either be closed ones (completed proofs, nothing else to be done) or partial proofs (to be continued). A transformation runtime transforms between proofs in KeY and their textual form as generated by KeYmaera.

- **Arithmetic metamodel** Arithmetic editors (not yet implemented) manipulate arithmetic models. Again a transformation runtime transforms between models expressed in terms of the arithmetic metamodel and the corresponding textual input (e.g., SMT-LIB syntax [3]) as needed by arithmetic tools, such as RAHD, MetiTarski, or Z3.

- **Arithmetic proof metamodel** Finally, the proof comparison component reads arithmetic proofs expressed in terms of the arithmetic proof metamodel, and transformed to and from the arithmetic tool’s (textual) format by a transformation runtime.

Let us exemplify the toolset with a virtual walk-through a collaborative verification scenario. We begin with modeling a hybrid system using textual and graphical $\mathcal{L}$ editors. As both operate on the same model, changes in either editor are reflected instantly in the other. The resulting model, which conforms to the $\mathcal{L}$ metamodel, is transformed on-the-fly during editing by the transformation runtime to a textual input file, and loaded into KeYmaera. In KeYmaera, we apply various strategies for proving safety of our hybrid system model, but may get stuck at some difficult arithmetic problem. We mark the corresponding node in the partial proof and save it in KeYmaera’s textual output format. The proof collaboration tool transforms the partial proof text file into a model of the partial proof. We persist the hybrid model and the model of the partial proof in the model and proof repository, respectively. Then we create a request for arithmetic verification (ticket) in the project management repository using the task planning component. The assignee of the ticket accesses the linked partial proof, and extracts an arithmetic verification model from the marked proof node. Then a transformation runtime creates the textual input for one of the arithmetic verification tools. In this tool, a proof for the ticket can be created, along with a proof strategy that documents the proof. Such a proof strategy is vital for replaying the proof later, and for detecting whether or not the arithmetic proof still applies if the initial model changed. Both proof and proof strategy, are imported into the proof collaboration tool and persisted to the corresponding repository. The ticket is closed, together with the node on the original proof (if the arithmetic proof is complete; otherwise, the progress made is reported back). We fetch the new proof model version from the repository and inspect it using the proof comparison component. Then we transform the proof model into its textual form, load KeYmaera and continue proving our hybrid system from where we left off, but now with one goal closed. In case the corresponding arithmetic prover is connected to
KeYmaera, we could even load the proof strategy from the strategy repository and repeat it locally.

3.1 KeYmaera: Hybrid System Verification

KeYmaera\(^3\) [36] is a verification tool for hybrid systems that combines deductive, real algebraic, and computer algebraic prover technologies. It is an automated and interactive theorem prover for a natural specification and verification logic for hybrid systems. KeYmaera supports differential dynamic logic (\(\text{dL}\)) [28, 29, 30, 33], which is a real-valued first-order dynamic logic for hybrid programs, a program notation for hybrid systems. KeYmaera supports hybrid systems with nonlinear discrete jumps, nonlinear differential equations, differential-algebraic equations, differential inequalities, and systems with nondeterministic discrete or continuous input.

For automation, KeYmaera implements a number of automatic proof strategies that decompose hybrid systems symbolically in differential dynamic logic and prove the full system by proving properties of its parts [30]. This compositional verification principle helps scaling up verification, because KeYmaera verifies a big system by verifying properties of subsystems. Strong theoretical properties, including relative completeness results, have been shown about differential dynamic logic [28, 33] indicating how this composition principle can be successful.

KeYmaera implements fixedpoint procedures [34] that try to compute invariants of hybrid systems and differential invariants of their continuous dynamics, but may fail in practice. By completeness [33], this is the only part where KeYmaera’s automation can fail in theory. In practice, however, also the decidable parts of dealing with arithmetic may become infeasible at some point, so that interaction with other tools or collaborative verification via \(\text{Spro}\)x is crucial.

At the same time, it is an interesting challenge to scale to solve larger systems, which is possible according to completeness but highly nontrivial. For systems that are still out of reach for current automation techniques, the fact that completeness proofs are compositional can be exploited by interactively splitting parts of the hybrid systems proof off and investigating them separately within \(\text{Spro}\)x. If, for instance, a proof node in arithmetic turns out to be infeasible within KeYmaera, this node could be verified using a different tool connected to \(\text{Spro}\)x.

KeYmaera has been used successfully for verifying case studies from train control [37], car control [24], air traffic management [35], and robotic surgery [21]. These verification results illustrate how some systems can be verified automatically while others need more substantial user guidance. The KeYmaera approach is described in detail in a book [30].

In order to guide domain experts in modeling discrete and continuous dynamics of hybrid systems, the case studies, further examples, and their proofs are included in the KeYmaera distribution. When applying proof strategies manually by selection from the context menu in the interactive theorem prover, KeYmaera shows only the applicable ones sorted by expected utility. Preliminary collaboration features include marking and renaming of proof nodes, as well as extraction of proof branches as new subproblems. These collaboration features are used for interaction with the arithmetic verification tools and the collaboration backend described below.

3.2 Arithmetic Verification

Proofs about hybrid systems often require significant reasoning about multivariate polynomial inequalities, i.e., reasoning within the theory of real closed fields (RCF). Though RCF is decidable, it is fundamentally infeasible (hyper-exponential in the number of variables). It is not uncommon for hybrid system models to have tens or even hundreds of real variables,
and RCF reasoning is commonly the bottleneck for nontrivial verifications. Automatic RCF methods simply do not scale, and manual human expertise is often needed to discharge a proof’s arithmetical subproblems.

RCF infeasibility is not just a problem for hybrid systems verification. Real polynomial constraints are pervasive throughout the sciences, and this has motivated a tremendous amount of work on the development of feasible proof techniques for various special classes of polynomial systems. In the context of hybrid systems verification, we wish to take advantage of these new techniques as soon as possible.

Given this fundamental infeasibility, how might one go about deciding large RCF conjectures? One approach is to develop a battery of efficient proof techniques for different practically useful fragments of the theory. For example, if an $\exists \text{RCF}$ formula can be equisatisfiable transformed into an $\land \lor$-combination of strict inequalities, then one can eliminate the need to consider any irrational real algebraic solutions when deciding the formula. Tools such as RAHD, Z3 and MetiTarski exemplify this heterogeneous approach to RCF, and moreover allow users to define proof strategies consisting of heuristic combinations of various specialised proof methods. When faced with a difficult new problem, one works to develop a proof strategy which can solve not only the problem at hand but also other problems sharing similar structure. Such strategies, though usually constructed by domain experts, can then be shared and utilised as automated techniques by the community at large.

3.3 Modeling and Proof Collaboration

In order to interconnect the variety of specialized verification procedures introduced above, Sfpx follows a model-driven engineering approach: it introduces metamodels for the included modeling and proof languages. These metamodels provide a clean basis for model creation, model comparison, and model engineering approach: it introduces metamodels for the included modeling and proof languages. These metamodels provide a clean basis for model creation, model comparison, and model verification. Real polynomial constraints are pervasive throughout the sciences, and this has motivated a tremendous amount of work on the development of feasible proof techniques for various special classes of polynomial systems. In the context of hybrid systems verification, we wish to take advantage of these new techniques as soon as possible.

Given this fundamental infeasibility, how might one go about deciding large RCF conjectures? One approach is to develop a battery of efficient proof techniques for different practically useful fragments of the theory. For example, if an $\exists \text{RCF}$ formula can be equisatisfiable transformed into an $\land \lor$-combination of strict inequalities, then one can eliminate the need to consider any irrational real algebraic solutions when deciding the formula. Tools such as RAHD, Z3 and MetiTarski exemplify this heterogeneous approach to RCF, and moreover allow users to define proof strategies consisting of heuristic combinations of various specialised proof methods. When faced with a difficult new problem, one works to develop a proof strategy which can solve not only the problem at hand but also other problems sharing similar structure. Such strategies, though usually constructed by domain experts, can then be shared and utilised as automated techniques by the community at large.

3.3.1 Differential Dynamic Logic

For specifying and verifying correctness statements about hybrid systems, we use differential dynamic logic $\mathcal{DL}$ [28, 30, 33], which supports hybrid programs as a program notation for hybrid systems. The syntax of hybrid programs is summarized together with an informal semantics in Table 1; it reflects the metamodel introduced in Figure 2. The sequential composition $\langle\alpha; \beta\rangle$ expresses that $\beta$ starts after $\alpha$ finishes (e.g., first let a car choose its acceleration, then drive with that acceleration). The non-deterministic choice $\langle\alpha \cup \beta\rangle$ follows either $\alpha$ or $\beta$ (e.g., let a car decide non-deterministically between accelerating and braking). The non-deterministic repetition operator $\langle\alpha^*\rangle$ repeats $\alpha$ zero or more times (e.g., let a car choose a new acceleration arbitrarily often). Discrete assignment $\langle x := \theta \rangle$ instantaneously assigns the value of the term $\theta$ to the variable $x$ (e.g., let a car choose a particular acceleration), while $\langle x := \ast \rangle$ assigns an arbitrary value to $x$ (e.g., let a car choose any acceleration). $\langle x' = \theta & F \rangle$ describes a continuous evolution of $x$ within the evolution domain $F$ (e.g., let the velocity of a car change according to its acceleration, but always be greater than zero). The test $\langle ?F \rangle$ checks that a particular condition expressed by $F$ holds, and aborts if it does not (e.g., test whether or not the distance to a car ahead is large enough). A typical pattern that involves assignment and tests, and which will be used subsequently, is to limit the assignment of arbitrary values to known bounds (e.g., limit an arbitrarily chosen acceleration to the physical limits of a car, as in $x := \gamma; \exists x \geq 0$). The deterministic choice $\langle \text{if}(F) \text{ then } \alpha \text{ else } \beta \rangle$ executes $\alpha$ if $F$ holds, and $\beta$ otherwise (e.g., let a car accelerate only when it is safe; brake otherwise).

Finally, $\langle \text{while}(F) \text{ do } \alpha \text{ elsehw} \rangle$ is a deterministic repetition that executes $\alpha$ as long as $F$ holds.

To specify the desired correctness properties of the hybrid programs, differential dynamic logic ($\mathcal{DL}$) provides modal operators $[\alpha]$ and $\langle \alpha \rangle$, one for each hybrid program $\alpha$. When $\phi$ is a $\mathcal{DL}$ formula (e.g., a simple arithmetic constraint) describing a safe state and $\alpha$ is a hybrid program, then the $\mathcal{DL}$ formula $[\alpha]\phi$ states that all states reachable by $\alpha$ satisfy $\phi$. Dually, $\mathcal{DL}$ formula $\langle \alpha \rangle\phi$ expresses that there is a state reachable by the hybrid program $\alpha$ that satisfies $\mathcal{DL}$ formula $\phi$. The set of $\mathcal{DL}$ formulas is generated by the following EBNF grammar (where $\sim \in \{<, \leq, =, \geq, >\}$ and $\theta_1, \theta_2$ are arithmetic expressions in $+, -, \cdot, /$, over the reals):

\[
\phi ::= \theta_1 \sim \theta_2 \mid \neg \phi \mid \phi \land \psi \mid \forall x \phi \mid \exists x \phi \mid [\alpha] \phi \mid \langle \alpha \rangle \phi
\]

Thus, besides comparisons ($<, \leq, =, \geq, >$), $\mathcal{DL}$ allows one to express negations ($\neg \phi$), conjunctions ($\phi \land \psi$), universal ($\forall x \phi$) and existential quantification ($\exists x \phi$), as well as the already mentioned state reachability expressions ($[\alpha] \phi$, $\langle \alpha \rangle \phi$).

3.3.2 Creating Models

For creating models of hybrid and cyber-physical systems, Sfpx currently includes $\mathcal{DL}$ as generic modeling language. The concrete textual syntax and $\mathcal{DL}$ editor created from the $\mathcal{DL}$ metamodel is shown in Figure 3, together with a concrete graphical syntax and the KeYmaera prover attached through the console. In order to facilitate creation of textual models in $\mathcal{DL}$, Sfpx includes templates of common model artifacts (e.g., ODEs of linear and circular motion). These templates, when
For modeling hybrid systems, an interesting opportunity for inspecting the behavior of such a system prior to verification is provided by Mathematica\(^5\), which is able to simulate and plot hybrid system behavior. Specifically, hybrid systems behavior can be plotted using a combination of NDSolve and WhenEvent. We envision transforming corresponding excerpts of dL to Mathematica for visualizing plots of the dynamic behavior and their hybrid programs over time in S\(\phi\)nx.

3.3.3 During the Proof

Collaboration support in S\(\phi\)nx currently comprises model as well as proof comparison, both locally and with the model and proof repositories maintained in a central source code repository. For this, not only textual comparison is implemented, but also structural comparison of models expressed in terms of the dL metamodel, as well as of proofs expressed in terms of the KeY metamodel is supported (cf. Figure 4). Especially for collaboration, exchanging proofs and inspecting updates on partial proofs is vital. For example, highlighted changes between different versions of a partial proof lets one easily spot and adopt proof progress made by other team members, go back and forth between versions, and detect conflicts.
on verification problems and tasks within a working group. Exchange of models and proofs may then be conducted either by attaching files to tickets, or by linking tickets directly to models and proofs in the source code repository. In the latter case, one benefits from the model and proof comparison capabilities of S\textsubscript{\phi}n. Verification tools (currently KeYmaera), are linked to the modeling tool by implementing extensions to the Eclipse launch configuration. These extensions hook into the context menu of Eclipse (models in d\textsubscript{C} and proof files in KeY in our case) and, on selection, launch an external program.

As a vision of extending collaboration support, it is planned to integrate Wikis and other online collaboration tools (currently, we use Redmine both as project management repository and for knowledge exchange) for exchanging knowledge on proof tactics. Additionally, collaboration with experts outside the own organization can be fostered by linking to Web resources, such as MathOverflow\textsuperscript{11} and Amazon Mechanical-Turk\textsuperscript{12}. Especially interesting, in this respect, is the possibility to create a social-network-like expert platform. In such a platform, requests could be forwarded to those experts whose knowledge matches the verification problem best.

4 Application Example

With the increased introduction of autonomous robotic ground vehicles as consumer products—such as autonomous hovers and lawn mowers, or even accepting driverless cars on regular roads in California—we face an increased need for ensuring product safety not only for the good of our consumers, but also for the sake of managing manufacturer liability. One important aspect in building such systems is to make them scrutable, in order to mitigate unrealistic expectations and increase trust [38]. In the design stage of such systems, formal verification techniques ensure correct functioning w.r.t. some safety condition, and thus, increase trust. In the course of this, formal verification techniques can help to make assumptions explicit and thus clearly define what can be expected from the system under which circumstances.

We discuss a model of an autonomous robotic ground vehicle and its proof (to increase trust), and describe how we can derive bounds on the behavior of that vehicle. The sample autonomous robotic ground vehicle used in this paper operates on predefined tracks and, thus, cannot steer freely (i.e., single wheel drive with angular velocity zero). The control options of such vehicles are limited to choosing the value of acceleration and result in sequences of straight lines as trajectories. The trajectories are thus akin to those produced by our previous car models [23], [24].

In this example, navigation of autonomous robotic ground vehicles is considered safe, if such vehicles are able to stay within their assigned area (e.g., on a track) and do not actively crash with obstacles. Since we cannot guarantee reasonable behavior of obstacles, however, autonomous ground vehicles are allowed to passively crash (i.e., while obstacles might run into the robot, the robot will never move into a position where the obstacle could not avoid a collision).


---

\textsuperscript{11} mathoverflow.net  \textsuperscript{12} www.mturk.com
either forwards or backwards (the test?), we may choose to remain in its current spot and may or may not change its orientation while doing so, cf. (5). This is expressed by the acceleration $v_o$ which is then restricted to any value from the interval $(-b, A)$.

For always remaining safely inside its area, the robot must fulfill the requirement as an invariant that we want to hold at all times, cf. (8). Finally, if the robot is stopped, it may choose to remain in its current spot and may or may not change its orientation while doing so, cf. (9).

### 4.1 Modeling

Model 1 shows the model of a hybrid system comprising the control choices of an autonomous robotic ground vehicle, the control choices of a moving obstacle, and the continuous dynamics of the system. The system represents the common controller-plant model: it repeatedly executes control choices followed by dynamics, cf. (1). The control of the robot is executed in parallel to that of the obstacle, cf. (2).

The robot has three options: It is always allowed to brake, as expressed by cf. (3) having no test condition. If its current state is safe (defined by (6)), then the robot may accelerate with any rate within its physical bounds, cf. (4). For this, we utilize the modeling pattern introduced above: we assign an arbitrary value to the robot’s acceleration state ($a_r := *$), which is then restricted to any value from the interval $(-b, A)$ using a test ($?-b < a_r < A$). Finally, if the robot is stopped, it may choose to remain in its current spot and may or may not change its orientation while doing so, cf. (5). This is expressed again by arbitrary assignment with subsequent test: this time, the test $?o^2 = 1$, however, restricts the orientation value to either forwards or backwards ($o_r \in \{1, -1\}$).

For always remaining safely inside its area, the robot must account for (i) its own braking distance ($\frac{v_o^2}{2b}$), (ii) the distance it may travel with its current velocity ($v_o$) until it is able to initiate braking, and (iii) the distance the obstacle needs to compensate the acceleration $A$ that may have been chosen in the worst case, cf. (6).

### 4.2 Verification

We verify the safety of acceleration and orientation choices as modeled in Model 1 above, using a formal proof calculus for dC [28, 30]. The robot is safely within its assigned area and at a safe distance to the obstacle, if it is able to brake to a complete stop at all times. The following condition captures this requirement as an invariant that we want to hold at all times during the execution of the model:

$$r \text{ stoppable } (o, b) \equiv ||x_r - x_o|| \geq \frac{v_o^2}{2b} + \frac{v_r V}{b}$$

The formula states that the distance between the robot to both the obstacle and the bounds is safe, if there is still enough distance for the robot to brake to a complete stop before it reaches either. Also, the robot must drive with positive velocity, the chosen directions of robot and obstacle must be either forwards ($o_r = 1$) or backwards ($o_r = -1$), and the obstacle must use only positive velocities up to $V$.

### Theorem 1 (Safety of single wheel drive)

If a robot is inside its assigned area and at a safe distance from the obstacle’s...
position $x_o$ initially, then it will not actively collide with the obstacle and stay within its area while it follows the $swd$ control model (Model 1), as expressed by the provable $\Delta C$ formula:

$$r \text{  stoppable} (o,b) \rightarrow \{svd((v > 0 \rightarrow \|p_r - p_o\| > 0)$$
$$\land x_o < x_r < x_p)\}$$

We proved Theorem 1 using KeYmaera. With respect to making autonomous systems more verifiable, such a proof may help in a twofold manner: on the one hand, it may increase trust in the implemented robot (given the assumption that the actual implementation can be traced back to the abstract model). On the other hand, it makes the behavior of the robot more understandable. In this respect, the most interesting properties of the proven model are the definition of $safe$ and the invariant, which allow us to analyze design trade-offs and tell us what is always true about the system regardless of its state. As an example, let us consider the distance between the robot and the obstacle that is considered safe: the distance can be interpreted as the minimum distance that the robot’s obstacle detection sensors are required to detect and offs and tell us what is always true about the system regarding safety, to specify a safe operation environment given a parameter $o$.

$$r \text{  stoppable} (o,b) \rightarrow \{svd((v > 0 \rightarrow \|p_r - p_o\| > 0)$$
$$\land x_o < x_r < x_p)\}$$

We proved Theorem 1 using KeYmaera. With respect to making autonomous systems more verifiable, such a proof may help in a twofold manner: on the one hand, it may increase trust in the implemented robot (given the assumption that the actual implementation can be traced back to the abstract model). On the other hand, it makes the behavior of the robot more understandable. In this respect, the most interesting properties of the proven model are the definition of $safe$ and the invariant, which allow us to analyze design trade-offs and tell us what is always true about the system regardless of its state. As an example, let us consider the distance between the robot and the obstacle that is considered safe: the distance can be interpreted as the minimum distance that the robot’s obstacle detection sensors are required to detect and offs and tell us what is always true about the system regarding safety, to specify a safe operation environment given a parameter $o$.

Assumed starting direction, orientation by disjunction

In the first variant, the robot is assumed to start in a known direction, specified in the antecedent of $o_r = 1 \ldots \rightarrow \{svd((x_b < x_r < x_p))\}$. Also, the orientation of the robot is explicitly distinguished by disjunction in $safe \equiv (v \leq 1 \land x_r + \ldots < x_r) \lor (o_r = -1 \land x_r < x_p - \ldots)$, and the robot had an explicit choice on turning during stand-still ($?v_r = 0; o_r := o_r; \ldots) \cup (?v_r = 0; \ldots)$.

Orientation by arithmetic

In the second variant, we kept the assumed starting direction of the first variant. However, the orientation by disjunction in the definition of $safe$ was replaced by using $o_r$ as discriminator value encoded in the arithmetic, as in $safe \equiv x_r - \frac{1}{2} (\ldots) < x_r < x_2 + \frac{1}{2} (\ldots)$.

Arbitrary starting direction by disjunction

The third variant relaxes the assumption on the starting direction by introducing a disjunction of possible starting directions in the antecedent of the provable formula ($o_r = 1 \lor o_r = -1 \ldots \rightarrow \{svd((x_b < x_r < x_p))\}$.

Arbitrary starting direction by arithmetic

The fourth variant replaces the disjunction in the antecedent by stating the two orientation options as $o_r^x = 1$ in $o_r^x = 1 \ldots \rightarrow \{svd((x_b < x_r < x_p))\}$.

Replace non-deterministic choice with arithmetic

Finally, we replace the non-deterministic turning choice with ($?v_r = 0; o_r := o_r; ?o_r^x = 1; \ldots)$.

Table 2 summarizes the proof structures of the five variants. Unsurprisingly—when considering the rules of the $\Delta C$ proof calculus [29] as listed in Table 2—disjunctions in the antecedent ($\lor$) or in tests of hybrid programs, as well as non-deterministic choices ($\{\}$) increase the number of proof branches and with it the number of manual proof steps. The number of proof branches can be reduced, if we can replace disjunctions in the antecedent (but also conjunctions in the consequent) or non-deterministic choices in the hybrid program by an equivalent arithmetic encoding. Conversely, this means that some arithmetic problems can be traded for easier ones with additional proof branches.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we gave a vision of a verification-driven engineering toolset including hybrid and arithmetic verification tools, and introduced modeling and collaboration tools with the goal of making formal verification of hybrid systems accessible to a broader audience. The current implementation features textual and graphical modeling editors, integration of KeYmaera as a hybrid systems verification tool, model and proof comparison, and connection to various collaboration backend systems. The VDE toolset is currently being tested in a collaborative verification setting between Carnegie Mellon University, the University of Cambridge, and the University of Edinburgh.
Table 2: Nodes, branches, and manual proof steps of variants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Nodes</th>
<th>Branches</th>
<th>Manual steps</th>
<th>Avoids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Assumed starting direction, orientation by disjunction</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(vl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Orientation by arithmetic</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Arbitrary starting direction by disjunction</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Arbitrary starting direction by arithmetic</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(vl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Replace non-deterministic choice</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(<a href="yr">lu</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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