

Die Grenzen des MBD bei Entwurf und Validierung komplexer Systeme durch "Contract Based Design (CBD)" überwinden

Getting beyond the limits of MBD in Complex System Design and Validation by "Contract Based Design (CBD)"

MESCONF, München, October 10th 2015

### We are going to talk about ...

- The nature and the features of complexity
- Two examples of fatal accidents caused by complexity effects
- The meaning of MBD in the frame of complex system design
- Why MBD fails in complex system design
- The method of contract based design (CBD)
- The advantage of CBD application to the given examples
- Further benefits of CBD in the frame of complex system design



# The Features of "Complexity"





Page 3

## From mechanical Automaton .....

### Roll controls / air brake of Boeing 737, "Complicated Design"



The functions of roll- and air brake surfaces for any operating case (Rejected Take Off, A/C On Ground, Cruise, ...) purely mechanical design

→ Limited state space → quite easy to validate



Seite 4

## .... to digital Algorithms – "virtual Functions"



### **Aircraft: Intense Interference of Dynamic Functions**

**Complexity** Effects: "Emergence",





### **Emergence, Hidden Links and Dys-Functionality**



### "ARIANE V" Accident by Re-Use of "ARIANE IV" IRS → EMERGENCE

4. Juni1996, Kourou / French Guyana: Maiden Flight of Carrier Rocket Ariane V : Inertial Reference System fault "aligment mode" disconnects Fight control → "format error at "horizontal\_velocity" (64-bit real → 16-bit Integer)

declare

vertical\_veloc\_sensor: float; horizontal\_veloc\_sensor: float; vertical\_veloc\_bias: integer; horizontal\_veloc\_bias: integer;

... bogi

<u>Cité</u> de espac

esa

esa

begin

declare

pragma suppress(numeric\_error, horizontal\_veloc\_bias); begin

sensor\_get(vertical\_veloc\_sensor);

sensor\_get(horizontal\_veloc\_sensor);
vertical\_veloc\_bias := integer(vertical\_veloc\_sensor);

#### exception

when numeric\_error => calculate\_vertical\_veloc();
when others => use\_irs1();

end; end irs2;





IRS #2





### The Warsaw Accident September 14<sup>th</sup> , 1993 → Dys-Functional Operation

on May 26<sup>th</sup> 1991 a Lauda Air Aircraft had been torn into pieces at 24.700ft cruise altitude and crashed, because the engine#1 thrust-reverser unintentionally had been activated. Consequently a logic is installed to all Airbus Aircraft, which prevents the automatic activation of Thrust Reversers and Air Brakes (the "Auto Break" Function), if the Flight Status does not indicate: "A/C on Ground" (weight on both wheels > 12 tons, wheels rotating > 72 kts, altitude below 20ft).

Two years later at Warsaw: Strong cross-wind, heavy rain, slippery runway, length 2.800 meter. Bank angel landing: right MLG wheel touch-down at 770 m, left MLG wheel late at 1525 m. "Auto-Brake" selected. Aquaplaning (no wheel speed) and weight only on one wheel indicate: "A/C in Flight". The Automatic consequently does not release the brakes until both wheels get weight and rotate. Despite full braking (wheels, air brakes, thrust reverser), the aircraft overrun the runway.



### The Expectation Gap at the End of the "classical" V-Model

### Effect of incomplete state space prognosis and constraint definition



misperceptions, unforeseen states,

"hidden" links → in short: Wrong Models



### Model Based Design (MBD): State Space Anticipation Aid



# Anticipation by (Co-)Simulation



"Essentially all models are wrong, but some models are useful" - George E. P. Box, 1919 - 2013

### **CO-SIMULATION** (e.g. RODON)



#### Analysis: Prediction of

- Context-behavior
- Diagnosability of "arbitrary" component-fault-combinations
- Applicable for "analogue" and "discrete" Systems.
- Can be automated
- "Terra Incognita" smaller, however

#### confined to steady state behavior



# From V to W: Models in the Design Process



## Shrink the Expectation Gap through state limitation



# From V by W to Contract Based Design



"Total and large scale state-space-interoperability prognosis" can be achieved if the quantity of possible (admissible) states is kept low.

A "Contract" reduces the No. of states by translating Component Features into "Assumptions" vs. "Promises" Relations and by "Information Hiding"



Page 15

# **CONTRACT BASED DESIGN**



# The Idea behind Contract Based Design

A system is composed of components, which mutually exchange / provide data and services – however, only under distinct conditions and constraints. I.e. each component feature an ASSUMPTION → PROMISE relation, just like a legal contract



Contracts only reference ports. The component internal mechanisms, which make-up the contract are irrelevant. We call this "INFORMATION HIDING". This rule considerably reduces the No. of states to be considered



Page 17

## **Contract Example**



A S E S Advanced Systems Engineering Solutions

# "Contract Backed Components" = High Integrity Bricks → allow for Automatic Consistency Analysis & Prognosis



HL

- "Contracts" are dependable
- "Contracts" oblige to "Completeness"
- "Contracts" are "component" related
- "Contracts" considerably reduce the number of states
- the size of the selected components is arbitrary
- formalized "Contract Clauses" are suited for computer reasoning
- checkers can identify far reaching inconsistencies



# Why Design Defects occur with conventional RBE

### <u>MBD</u>

- A model is an Abstraction of the Real System. i.e. an Incomplete Representation of the Real A – P Relations:
- A Model may assume different states than the Real System. This leads to ambiguous A – P relations.
- The validation of A-P relations between adjacent and remote components is not formalized → "wide range" Interoperability Analysis questionable

This particularly applies to Composed Models

- → <u>only Partial State-Space Vision</u> and Prognosis
- → the "Analytical" Approach

### <u>CBD</u>

 complete specification of all A – P relations: the Contracts are the Real Representation of the Real System

Formalized Provisions from component level to System level to keep the A – P relations, and only the A – P relations valid. Total suppression of invalid and contradictory A – P relations by <u>Satisfaction & Consistency Analysis</u> and Monitoring Means. Also valid for Composed Components

- Complete validation of A P relations between adjacent and (very) remote components by <u>"Compatibility & Dominance</u> Analysis"
- → <u>"Synthetic" Approacta S E S</u> Page 20 Page 20 Engineering Solutions

### ARIANE V in Terms of "Component—Decomposition"



# Two A – P Relations that count

The alignment component signal output of the IRS can assume two different states, triggered by  $\rm V_{\rm H}$ 



The FC component relies on the IRS to provide valid NAV data during flight operation



Seite 22

# **ARIANE V - Inertial Reference System (IRS)**



Manifestation of the IRS components and their "hidden links"



# **Contracts for Alignment Operation**



SATISFACTION: protect  $V_H > V_{H max}$  at **Flight Status = FLT**  $\rightarrow$  clause is missing

CONSISTENCY: Alignment function reconfiguration at Flight Status = FLT → contradiction to the needs (needless condition)

# **Contracts for Navigation Operation**



SATISFACTION: protect NAV against alignment errors at Flight Status = FLT → clause is missing

CONSISTENCY: contradiction against fault tolerance to alignment errors at **Flight** Status = FLT → sensless condition implemented



Page 25

# **Compatibility of Component Contracts**



COMPATIBILITY: NAV Comp. has no contract on the Condition  $V_H > V_{H max}$  or Alignment = FALSE at Flight Status = FLT  $\rightarrow$ Alignment = FALSE circumvents NAV component



## Warsaw Accident, Auto-Brake as it was



the aircraft ("no braking at low altitudes")

Page 27

**Engineering Solutions** 

### Warzav Accident, Auto-Brake as it should be

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

## LIFE CYCLE BENEFITS OF CBD PRODUCTS: EXAMPLE IMA

![](_page_28_Picture_1.jpeg)

# 3<sup>rd</sup> Example: Integrated Modular Avionic Design

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

## IMA Contract Based Design Approach

The "Contracts" of the IMA platform are implemented into the IMA API and several "Platform Services" (diagnostic, re-configuration, ...). They are expressed by the design rules (in IMA terms "Usage Domain") as laid down in the MUG. Here again, the integrity of the "Contract Clauses" is validated by "Satisfaction" and "Consistency" analysis in the frame of the **IMA supplier development process**.

"Compatibility" and "Dominance" verification is performed by the IMA integrator by checking the **configuration parameters** against the "Usage Domain" of the IMA Platform (MUG). Due to the huge amount of configuration parameters this task is executed with the help of a qualified checker tool.

#### **Achievements:**

- evements: no conflicts between remotely developed apps
- resource consumption visible at design time
- integration test replaced by formal configuration validation  $\rightarrow$
- saving some 10.000 tests
- easy modification, simply by configuration change and validation

![](_page_30_Figure_9.jpeg)

Enaineerina Solutions

# Conclusion

- With growing complexity the integrity and fault tolerance of highly dependable systems is compromised
- Classical MBD and V-Model Processes are Analytical approaches to system design. They do not fully defeat the traps of complexity 
   hidden links, emergence, dys-functionality 
   too many unknown states, a hardly comprehensible, vast state space
- A way to defeat complexity is to reduce it.
- Component Contract Based Design cuts down complexity by assembling safeguarded, state-reduced bricks with formally executable checking options
- CBD is an "inverted" / "synthetic" approach to system design: it implements A- P confined models into reality.
- Broad application of CBD will create a more deterministic and dependable reality

![](_page_31_Picture_7.jpeg)

### Finis !

# Many Thanks !

# **Questions**?

mailto:henningbutz@web.de

![](_page_32_Picture_4.jpeg)

This document and all information contained herein is the sole property of Henning Butz Advanced Systems Engineering Solutions - ASES. No intellectual property rights are granted by the delivery of this document or the disclosure of its content. This document shall not be reproduced or disclosed to a third party without the express written consent of Henning Butz Advanced Systems Engineering Solutions - ASES. This document and its content shall not be used for any purpose other than that for which it is supplied.

The statements made herein do not constitute an offer. They are based on the mentioned assumptions and are expressed in good faith. Where the supporting grounds for these statements are not shown, **Henning Butz Advanced Systems Engineering Solutions -ASES** will be pleased to explain the basis thereof.

![](_page_33_Picture_2.jpeg)

Page 34