Model Checking of Embedded Systems Using RTCTL
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Abstract—For embedded systems, verifying both real-time properties and logical validity are important. In order to verify real-time properties, we develop a simulator to propose model checking method. The simulator generates timed Kripke structure by dynamic program analysis. We implement the simulator to construct timed Kripke structure including the execution time. Also, we implement model checker in order to verify whether timed Kripke structure satisfies RTCTL formulas.

I. INTRODUCTION
In recent years, embedded systems have been widely used in autonomous car, medical equipment and IoT (Internet of Things). Verifying both real-time properties and logical validity are important for embedded systems.

Recently software model checking [1] and program verification [2] have received widespread attention. S. Yamane and others have developed a verification system [3] for verifying embedded assembly programs. It generates Kripke structure by the simulator (dynamic program analysis) and verifies stack overflow by CTL (Computational Tree Logic) model checking.

In this paper, we will describe model checking using RTCTL (Real-Time CTL) in order to verify whether timed Kripke structure satisfies real-time properties. We develop the simulator to generate timed Kripke structure from assembly program. In our approach, we implement the simulator to construct timed Kripke structure which includes the execution time. Also, we implement model checker in order to verify whether timed Kripke structure satisfies real-time properties. In general, as timed Kripke structure has infinite states, our approach is effective. In our study, to evaluate a proposed method, we conducted experiments with the implementation of the verification system.

II. RELATED WORKS
B. Schlich studied model checking by using static program analysis to verify assembly program, but real-time properties are not verified. B. Schlich can verify the hardware dependency problem by using the assembly program [4].

E. A. Emerson and others proposed RTCTL, and also developed model checking algorithms for RTCTL [5]. But our semantics of RTCTL is quite different from E. A. Emerson’s semantics of RTCTL.
R. Alur and D. L. Dill studied timed automata [6]. Timed automaton is an extension of a finite state automaton, and is a model that describes the system by both discrete event and continuous time lapse according to state transitions. On the other hand, in this study, we develop discrete-time timed Kripke structure for the execution time of assembly program. Our study is different from timed automata.

S. Yamane and others have developed a verification system. The simulator generates Kripke structure, and model checker verifies CTL formulas. The simulator includes clock cycles while generating models, but real-time properties and execution time are not taken into consideration. S. Yamane and others have developed abstraction techniques by using DND (Delayed NonDeterminism) of the bit level. Our proposed method is quite different from [3] as follows: (1) Generating timed Kripke structure including execution time. (2) Using RTCTL formulas to verify real-time properties. (3) Proposing RTCTL model checking algorithm after generating timed Kripke structure.

III. COMPUTATIONAL MODEL OF EMBEDDED ASSEMBLY PROGRAM
As a computational model, we define a timed Kripke structure which extends Kripke structure [7] by time function.

[Definition 3.1] (Timed Kripke structure) Timed Kripke structure is \( M = (S, S_0, R, L, TM) \).

(1) A finite set of states \( S \).

(2) A set of initial states \( S_0 \subseteq S \).

(3) A transition relation \( R \subseteq S \times S \).

(4) A labeling function \( L : S \rightarrow 2^{AP} \). \( L \) is a function which assigns to each state a set of atomic propositions. \( AP \) is atomic proposition.
(5) A time function TM: S → N. TM is a function that assigns the execution time of each instruction to each state. Here N is any natural number.

IV. RTCTL

For model checking of real-time properties, we define Real-Time temporal logic (RTCTL(Real-Time CTL)). We use RTCTL developed by E. A. Emerson [5].

[Definition 4.1] (Syntax of RTCTL) Syntax of RTCTL formulas as follows:
(1) Each atomic proposition AP is a RTCTL formula.
(2) If p, q are RTCTL formulas, similarly p ∧ q and ¬p are RTCTL formulas.
(3) If p, q are RTCTL formulas, similarly E(p U q), A(p U q) and EXp are RTCTL formulas.
(4) If p, q are RTCTL formulas and k is any natural number for execution time, similarly E(p U q), k = 0, A(p U q) and EXp are RTCTL formulas.

Some other RTCTL are defined as follows:
AF≤k p = A(true U≤k q) EF≤k q = E(true U≤k q)
AG≤k p = ¬EF≤k ¬p EG≤k p = ¬AF≤k ¬p

We propose the semantics of RTCTL as follows.

IV. RTCTL

We use RTCTL developed by E. A. Emerson and others [5]. Our semantics of E(p U q) and A(p U q) is quite different from E. A. Emerson’s semantics [5]. When |f′| is the length of the CTL formula f′ obtained from f by deleting time constraint, |f| = |f′| + c and c is the sum of the lengths of the bit strings representing in binary the time constraint of f. Thus, we see that the complexity of executing the entire procedure E(p U q) model check is O(|f| (|S| + |R|)).

Algorithm 1 Algorithm of ModelCheckE(p U≤k q)
1 S := {s | q ∈ L(s)}
2 for s ∈ S do L(s) := L(s) ∪ E(p U≤k q)
3 N := k H := k // initialize N and H
4 while S ≠ ∅ do
5 choose s ∈ S
6 S := S \ {s} // remove s from S
7 N := H // update N by H
8 for all t such that R(t, s) do
9 if E(p U≤k q) \̸∈ L(t) and N ≥ 0 and p ∈ L(t) then
10 H := N - TM(s) // update H
11 L(t) := L(t) \ {E(p U≤k q)}
12 S := S \ {t} // add t to S
13 else if N < 0 and S ≠ ∅ then
14 choose y ∈ S/other path has not checked
15 choose E(p U≤k q) from L(y)
16 choose H from E(p U≤k q)
17 end if
18 end for all
19 if R(t, s) = ∅ then //state s is the initial state
20 H := N - TM(s)
21 if H < 0 and S ≠ ∅ then
22 choose y ∈ S
23 choose E(p U≤k q) from L(y)
24 choose H from E(p U≤k q)
25 else if H ≥ 0 then
26 break
27 end if
28 end if
29 end if
30 end while
31 N := H // update N by H
32 if N ≥ 0
33 return true
34 else return false

[Example 1] We will give an example in order to explain Algorithm 1. We specify verification property
by RTCTL as follows.

\[ E(p \mathcal{U}^{10} q) \]

We verify whether timed Kripke structure in Fig. 2 satisfies \( E(p \mathcal{U}^{10} q) \) according to Algorithm 1 as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
S &= \{s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, s_5\} \\
S_0 &= \{s_1, s_3\} \\
R &= \{(s_1, s_2), (s_2, s_3), (s_3, s_4), (s_4, s_5)\} \\
L(s_1) &= \{p\} \\
L(s_3) &= \{p\} \\
L(s_4) &= \{p\} \\
L(s_5) &= \{q\} \\
TM(s_1) &= 1 \\
TM(s_3) &= 1 \\
TM(s_4) &= 100 \\
TM(s_5) &= 1
\end{align*}
\]

Fig. 2. An example of timed Kripke structure

This formula is obviously satisfied since there is a path \( s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow s_5 \).

To verify the RTCTL formula Algorithm 1 proceeds the following steps. Fig. 3, Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 give snapshots of Algorithm 1 in operation on the timed Kripke structure for the labeling function.

(1) In the first stage:

- Initially, \( S := \{s_5\} \) (line 1) and \( L(s_5) := \{q, E(p \mathcal{U}^{10} q)\} \) (line 2), as shown in Fig. 3. Then \( N := 10, H := 10 \) (line 3).
- Choose and remove \( s_5 \) from \( S \) (line 4, 5, 6).
- Assign \( N := H := 10 \) (line 7).
- There are two states \( s_2 \) and \( s_4 \) that satisfy \( R := \{s_2, s_3\} \) (line 8).
  - Choose \( t = s_2 \) first. Then assign \( H := N - TM(s_2) := 9 \) (line 10). Next add \( E(p \mathcal{U}^{9} q) \) to \( L(s_2) \) (line 11) as shown in Fig. 4, and add \( s_2 \) to \( S \) (line 12).
  - Next, Choose \( t = s_4 \) (line 9). But \( p \notin L(s_4) \), nothing to do here.

(2) In the second stage:

- Now, \( S := \{s_2\} \) (line 4). Similarly choose and remove \( s_2 \) and assign \( N := H := 9 \) (line 7).
- There is one state \( s_1 \) that satisfies \( R := \{s_1, s_2\} \), and choose it (line 8).
  - Then assign \( H := N - TM(s_2) := 8 \) (line 10). Next add \( E(p \mathcal{U}^{8} q) \) to \( L(s_1) \) (line 11) as shown in Fig. 5, and add \( s_1 \) to \( S \) (line 12).

(4) Only in the final stage:

- \( S := \{s_1\} \) (line 4). Similarly choose and remove \( s_1 \). Then assign \( N := H := 8 \) (line 7).
- There is no state \( t \) that satisfies \( R := \{t, s_1\} \) (line 8, line 19).
  - Then update \( H := N - TM(s_1) := 7 \) (line 20).
• Therefore, \( H \geq 0 \), then leave the loop, and update \( N = 7 \) (line 31).
• Due to \( N \geq 0 \), so the verification result becomes true (line 33).

VI. EXPERIMENTS

We used LED program written by H8/3687 microcontroller [8][9]. The size of the program has 64 lines of assembly code.

The execution time is obtained from the execution state number of the assembly instruction. Since the operating frequency of H8/3687 microcontroller is 20 MHz, the execution time per state is as follows.

\[ \frac{1}{20 \text{MHz}} = 0.05\mu s \]

Therefore, we assume the unit time of time constraint \( k \) is 0.05\( \mu \)s.

The experiment was conducted on a laptop as follows:

- CPU : Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-7700HQ processors running at 2.80GHz
- Memory : 16GB main memory
- OS : windows 10
- Simulator is written in a combination of Java and Scala, and Model Checker is written in Scala as follows.
- Java 1.8.0_121 , 15000 lines
- Scala 2.11.8 , 6000 lines

Program 1 (LED program) lights up one LED by a sensor of the microcontroller outputs. The sensor can identify black and white. When the sensor of the microcontroller detects white, it outputs 1 and LED lights up, when it detects black, it outputs 0. Furthermore, we preset the sensor always detected white and it turns off immediately after the LED lights up. For example, \( \text{Total}_{led} \) times LED lights up by \( \text{Total}_{led} \) times the sensor outputs. We specify timing constraints by RTCTL for this experiment as follows:

\[ RTCTL \mathcal{L}: \ EF^{\leq k}(\text{Total}_{led} = n) = E(\text{true} U^{\leq k} (\text{Total}_{led} = n)) \]

\( \text{Total}_{led} \) denotes the total number of lights up times. The \( n \) is the number of lights up times, indicated by the value of the register R0 in the state. The formula intuitively means that LED lights up \( \text{Total}_{led} \) times happen at some state on some path from initial states within the timing constraint \( k \). Besides we preset the specific LED light up number while timing constraint \( k \) is limited within one millisecond (\( k = 20000 \)).

The experimental results are shown in Table I. The first column presents the total number of lights up times. The second column gives the number of states. The third column indicates the number of transition relations. The fourth column presents the total time of simulator and model checking. The fifth column presents execution time of assembly program for some path satisfies \( \text{Total}_{led} \) times lights up LED or the execution time of assembly program for a certain path is only not satisfied time constraint. The last column shows the result which shows satisfiability of RTCTL formula. Execution time is obtained from the total execution time of executed states. The execution time of each state is an execution time of assembly instruction executed in each state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>states</th>
<th>relations</th>
<th>verification time(s)</th>
<th>execution time(ms)</th>
<th>result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.0507</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>0.2207</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2890</td>
<td>2889</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>0.4332</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>5690</td>
<td>5689</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>0.8582</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>6614</td>
<td>6613</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>0.9985</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>8490</td>
<td>8489</td>
<td>149.9</td>
<td>1.2832</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The experimental results showed the effectiveness of the proposed approach. We implement model checker in order to verify whether timed Kripke structure satisfies RTCTL formulas. These resulting data show that it can be verified whether or not lights up \( \text{Total}_{led} \) times within the time constraint \( k \). Moreover, as a result, we showed that the maximum number of LED lights up within the time constraint \( k \). As shown in Table I, if \( n \) increases, the number of states and the number of transition relations polynomially increases. Therefore, the verification time and execution time polynomially increases. Further, when \( n \) becomes 234 or more, the verification result becomes false.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have developed a verification system. Model checker after generating timed Kripke structure by using RTCTL formula verifies whether timed Kripke structure satisfies real-time properties.

In the case of RTCTL model checking after generating timed Kripke structure, when the timed Kripke structure satisfies \( E(p \ U q) \) and does not satisfy time constraint \( k \), we can figure out the execution time of that path by calculation. By doing so, when we repeat the experiment, we can know the time constraint is nearly satisfied with that path.

As future work, we will develop model checking of embedded systems using counterexample-guided abstraction refinement (CEGAR). And we will compare with model checking while after generating all states.

Besides this, we want to detect other properties in embedded systems.
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