Formal Verification of Intelligent Systems Modeled as Decision Procedures

Siddhartha Bhattacharyya, Thomas C. Eskridge and Marco Carvalho



Florida Institute of Technology

Harris Institute for Assured Information



Motivation

- Autonomous agents are controlling or coordinating autonomous systems to autonomously execute missions in battle space, civil airspace, cyber space
- Autonomous agents can be designed as – Cognitive architecture (Soar, ACT-R)
 - Perception, production system, memory
- Autonomous agents need to be rigorously analyzed to guarantee satisfaction of requirements, correctness to build trust on them



Research Challenges

- Cognitive architecture provides a simulation environment but lacks rigorous analytical capability
 - Translation into formal environment enables analytical capability
- Addressing the differences in the cognitive model and formal verification
 - Lack of visibility into algorithmic methods
 - Use of complex constructs
 - Dynamic nature of autonomy (rules modified at runtime)



Cognitive Model with Formal Verification Flow

- Requirements are coded into a Soar cognitive agent
- Agent is transformed into formal environment for verification
 - Generates runtime monitors
 - Corrects the present design
- Soar agent can learn efficient ways
 - Creates or modifies rules which are evaluated and/or verified





Cognitive Architecture

- Agent architecture

 Integration of several components
 - Perception
 - Memory
 - Production systems (decision procedures)



Ref: http://educatech.sytes.net/wiki/Soar



Soar Processing Cycle



Proposed Soar processing cycle (refs: 3)

- Proposed soar processing cycle
- Generic representation
 - Any rule that is true can be executed
 - Satisfies diverse range of cognitive models



Uppaal a Real Time Verification Tool

- Modeling, validation and verification of real-time systems modeled as networks of timed automata, extended with data types (bounded integers, arrays, etc.)
 - Editor
 - Simulator
 - Verifier

Editor	Simulator Concretesimulator verifier rggdrasii
Enabled Transitions	Run_Rule? S_Superstate == nil && PlanOK & NavOK & LaunchOK & FuelOK Start Plan_Route = true, S_Superstate = not_nil
Next Reset	Run_Rule?
Simulation Trace (Run, Start, Start, Start, Start, Sta Schd (Run, Start, Start, Start, Start, Sta Run_Rule: Schd → Initialized_OPI (Start, Run, Start, Start, Start, Sta	Plan_0 DistanceToDestination: int[100,600] Run_Rule? Plan_Route File_Plan = true, Plan_Route = false, Distance = DistanceToDestination, Waypoint_Number = Distance/Distance_To_Next_Waypoint Start Run_Rule?
Trace File:	Initialized_0 Plan_0 File_0 Launch_0 Waypoint_Navigator_0 Check_



Translation from Cognitive Model to Uppaal





Soar Parsing for Translation

- 1. Create Antlr grammar for Soar
- 2. Generate the Soar parser
- 3. Create the data structure
- 4. Generate the xml for Uppaal





Scheduler: Maintaining Generic Processing Cycle

- Notion of implementing a scheduler that executes a more generic representation
 - Do not need to differentiate between propose, apply and other phases
 - The satisfaction of the precondition selects the rule to be executed



Mapping Soar to Uppaal with Counter





Mapping Soar to Uppaal with Counter (contd.)



ah Tech with a Human Touch

Mapping Soar to Uppaal with Counter (contd.)



```
rule_1 = counter_propose_initialize_counter(); //cpic
rule_2 = counter_apply_initialize_counter();//caic
rule_3 = counter_propose_increment();//cpi
rule_4 = counter_apply_increment();//cai
goal = counter_detect_goal_achieved();//cdga
schd = scheduler();
```

// List one or more processes to be composed into a system.
system rule_1, rule_2, rule_3, rule_4, goal, schd;

Properties checked:

For all paths eventually it reaches the goal: A<> s_num == 7

For all paths eventually is the number is larger than the specified : A<> s_num>7



Mapping Soar to Uppaal: Pilot Agent

Executes sequence of tasks for its mission: preflight checks, flight plan, file the plan, launch, navigate, refuel, land and reach destination





Mapping Soar to Uppaal: Pilot Agent (contd.)

Properties checked:

- All paths eventually lead to reaching destination
 A<> Goal.Goal
- Does there exist a point when next waypoint is not reached but the navigator says it has been reached

E<> t< Time_To_Next_Waypoint and Navigate_0.Run</pre>

 Does there exist a condition where next waypoint is not reached but the UAV is trying to refuel

E<>Waypoint_Navigator_0.Run and Refuel_0.Run

Does there exist a path where fuel is not checked
 E[] Check_Fuel == false

Uppaal's new feature generates test cases to indicate coverage based on states and edges traversed through the properties checked



Counterexample

Does there exist a point when next destination is not reached but the navigator says it has been reached

Property spec: E<> t< Time_To_Next_Waypoint and Navigate_0.Run

Correction: adding guard Check_Fuel = false





Conclusion and Future Work

- Developed automated translator from Soar to Uppaal
- Performed formal verification of cognitive model designed in Soar
- Method can be extended to other similar cognitive models with appropriate modifications
- Extend the translator to handle other relevant constructs in cognitive models
- Evaluate the translation going back from Uppaal to Soar
- Extend the framework to integrate learning and the associated verification



References

- Formal Verification of Autonomous Vehicle Platooning, M. Kamali, L. A. Dennis, O. McAree, M. Fisher, and S. M. Veres, Feb 2016, ArXiv e-prints.
- 2. Enhancing autonomy with Trust, S. Bhattacharyya, J. Davis, M. Matessa et. al. AUVSI 2015.
- Extending the soar cognitive architecture, J. E. Laird, 2008 Proceeding AGI
- 4. Verification and validation and Artificial Intelligence, T. Menzies and C. Pechuer, Elsevier science, 2004.
- 5. www.uppaal.org

