<span id="page-0-0"></span>

The University of Manchester



**University of** Nottingham UK | CHINA | MALAYSIA



**Maynooth** University

National University of Ireland Mavnooth

FRETting and Formal Modelling: A Mechanical Lung Ventilator

#### Marie Farrell Matt Luckcuck Rosemary Monahan Conor Reynolds Oisín Sheridan

Department of Computer Science, The University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

School of Computer Science, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

Department of Computer Science, Maynooth University/Hamilton Institute, Maynooth, Ireland

 $27<sup>th</sup>$  of June 2024

## Overview

- $\triangleright$  We describe a methodology that captures the requirements of the ABZ 2024 case study, the Mechanical Lung Ventilator, using the Formal Requirements Eliciation Tool (FRET)
- ▶ Our workflow uses the requirements, written in FRET's structured-natural requirements language FRETISH, to guide the development of a formal model in Event-B.
- ▶ Our goal was to examine how formalising the requirements could uncover problems in the requirements, thus improving the requirements set and helping with the construction of a system model

# Mechanical Lung Ventilator: ABZ Case Study

## Case Study Overview

- ▶ Many requirements in the documentation.
- ▶ Partitioned into
	-
	-
	-
	-
	-
	- ▶ Functional Requirements (FUN),<br>
	▶ Values and Ranges (PER),<br>
	▶ Sensors and Interfaces (INT),<br>
	▶ Alarm Requirements (SAV),<br>
	▶ GUI Requirements (GUI),<br>
	▶ Controller Requirements (CONT), and<br>
	▶ Alarms (AL).
	-
- ▶ Some requirements have 'child' requirements; for example, FUN6 is decomposed into FUN6\_1–6.
- ▶ Requirements also reference others; for example, CONT4 refers to FUN6.



# Mechanical Lung Ventilator: ABZ Case Study



Figure 1: The controller state machine is labelled as Fig 4.1 in the case study documentation.

# <span id="page-4-0"></span>[Formalisation with FRET](#page-4-0)

# The Formal Requirements Elicitation Tool (FRET)

## FRET

- ▶ An open source tool for requirements engineering developed by NASA
- ▶ Requirements are written in a structured natural-language called FRETish
- ▶ FRET provides automated translations from FRETish to CoCoSpec contracts, which can be verified with the Kind2 model checker, and Copilot runtime monitors
- $\triangleright$  Formalised requirements are indicated in green, those in white have not been formalised, and a red circle indicates invalid FRETish



# The Formal Requirements Elicitation Tool (FRET)



## Method

- ▶ We focused on the Functional and Controller requirements from the case study document. In total, we formalised 121 requirements in FRET, out of 142 total natural-language requirements in these categories.
- ▶ The formalisation was performed in stages, producing multiple versions of the requirements set:
	- $\triangleright$  v0.1 and v0.2 comprised the initial formalisation of the FUN requirements
	- $\triangleright$  v0.3, v0.3.1, and v0.4 included revisions to better align with the case study documentation where possible, and fix invalid variable names
	- $\triangleright$  v0.5 and v0.5.1 formalised the Controller requirements
	- $\triangleright$  v0.6 and v0.6.1 updated all requirements to use explicit timing conditions
- $\triangleright$  For traceability, we created FRETish requirements for all of the FUN and CONT requirements, even those that could not be formalised





## **Fields**

- ▶ FRET generates a Metric Temporal Logic (MTL) semantics for requirements using template keys
- Each template key is a tuple of: [scope-option, condition-option, timing-option]
- $\triangleright$  We used the scope field wherever the requirements explicitly mentioned a syetm mode

#### Timing

- ▶ Initially, we only included timing where it was explicitly mentioned in natural-language.
- ▶ On a second pass, we rechecked the timing conditions and added them explicitly.
- ▶ We usually used:
	- $\triangleright$  always when the requirement had no conditions.
	- $\triangleright$  eventually for events that would take an indeterminate amount of time (e.g. waiting for a process to finish or for user input), and
	- ▶ at the next timepoint for a response triggered by an event or button-press. We chose at the next timepoint instead of immediately to represent the time taken to react to the trigger and generate the response.



#### **Inconsistencies**

- ▶ We encountered some cases where the Functional and Controller requirements didn't quite align, or where the language used wasn't entirely consistent.
- ▶ The mode that comes after the self test has passed and before the system moves to PCV or PSV mode is called "Standby Mode" in the FUN requirements, but is named "VentilationOff" in the CONT requirements.
- ▶ CONT24 and FUN22 refer to the Recruitment Maneuver. FUN22 says the maneuver should be initiated "with the push of a single button", which seemed to imply that the maneuver starts immediately when the button is pressed. However, CONT24 says that the maneuver should start at the end of an inspiration phase (if it has been set by the GUI).
- ▶ Formalising requirements in a structured language like FRETish helps to find cases like these where a requirement lacks important details.

#### Unformalised and Invalid Requirements

- ▶ The unformalised requirements often related to capabilities of the overall system, rather than specifiable behaviour
	- $\triangleright$  e.g. FUN.1: "The system shall provide ventilation support for patients who require mechanical ventilation and weigh more than 40 kg (88 lbs). Rationale: ventilation of children and infants is more challenging",
- ▶ Similarly, there was no meaningful way to capture the "Measured and displayed" parameters" requirements without a more detailed understanding of the sensors and GUI
- $\triangleright$  Some requirements were not written in a form that works in FRET. For example, CONT.36 simply reads: "If the patient is in expiration phase:", and rely on its three child requirements to provide details

# <span id="page-13-0"></span>[Modelling in Event-B](#page-13-0)

### Overview

- ▶ Using the natural-language and FRET ish requirements as a base, we constructed a model of the ventilator system in Event-B
- ▶ The structure of the initial model was based on the "controller state machine" diagram from the case study documentation.
- ▶ We then encoded the requirements into Event-B in different ways, depending on what they specified. Some requirements were easily represented in a context, others became part of the behavioural event specifications, and some became invariant specifications.

## Event-B Model

 $\frac{1}{2}$  MACHINE mac00  $\frac{2}{3}$  SEES ctx00 VARIABLES mode 4 INVARIANTS typeof\_\_mode: mode ∈ Mode 5 EVENTS<br>6 Initia 6 Initialisation  $\frac{1}{2}$  then  $act1: mode = PoweredOff$  $8$  Event PowerOn  $\widehat{=}$ <br>9 when grd0\_1: mode = PoweredOff 10 then  $act0$  1: mode := StartUp 11 Event StartUpEnded  $\hat{=}$ <br>12 when  $\frac{\text{grad}(1: \text{mod}6)}{2}$ 12 when  $\text{grd0}_1$ : mode = StartUp<br>13 then  $\text{act0 1: mode} := \text{SelfTest}$ then  $act0.1: mode = SelfTest$ 14 Event ResumeVentilation  $\hat{=}$ <br>15 when grd0\_1: mode = SelfTest 16 then  $act0$  1: mode := VentilationOff 17 Event SelfTestPassed  $\widehat{=}$ <br>18 when grd0 1: mode = 18 when  $\text{grd0}_1$ : mode = SelfTest<br>19 then  $\text{act0 1: mode} := \text{Ventilat}$ then  $act0.1: mode = VentilationOff$ 20 Event StartPCV  $\widehat{=}$ <br>21 when  $\frac{\text{grad}(1)}{1}$ when  $\text{grad}0, 1$ : mode = VentilationOff 22  $\vee$  mode = PSV<br>23 then act0 1: mode := PCV then  $act0 1: mode := PCV$ 

 $\begin{array}{l} 24 \qquad \quad \textnormal{Event StartPSV} \, \widehat{=} \ 25 \qquad \qquad \textnormal{when} \quad \textnormal{grd0\_1:} \,\, \textnormal{mode} = \textnormal{VertilationOfI} \end{array}$ 26  $\vee$  mode = PCV<br>27 then act0.1: mode = PSV then  $act01: mode := PSV$ 28 Event StopVentilation  $\hat{=}$ <br>29 being and 1: mode = 29 when  $\text{grd0}_1$ : mode = PCV<br>30  $\vee$  mode = PSV 30  $\vee$  mode = PSV<br>31 then act0 1: mode = Ven then  $act0 1: mode := VentilationOff$ <sup>32</sup> Event MoveToPSV <sup>=</sup><sup>b</sup> 33 when grd0\_1: mode = PCV  $34$  then  $act0$  1: mode := PSV 35 Event Apnealag  $\widehat{=}$ <br>36 **Event Apnealag**  $\widehat{=}$ 36 when  $\text{grd}0.1$ : mode = PSV<br>37 then  $\text{act}0.1$ : mode = PCV then  $act0.1: mode := PCV$ <sup>38</sup> Event Error <sup>=</sup><sup>b</sup> 39 when grd0\_1: mode ̸= PoweredOff 40  $\text{grd0}_2$ : mode  $\neq$  Failsafe<br>41 then act0 1; mode = Failsafe then  $act0 1: mode := Failsafe$ 42 Event PowerOff  $\hat{=}$ <br>43 when  $\sigma$ rdO 1: 43 when  $\text{grd0}_1$ : mode  $\neq$  PoweredOff<br>44 then act0.1: mode  $=$  PoweredOff then  $act01: mode := PoweredOff$ 45 END

```
CONTEXT ctx00
 2 SETS Mode
 3 CONSTANTS
 4 Failsafe, PoweredOff, VentilationOff
 5 PCV, PSV, SelfTest, StartUp
 6 AXIOMS
 7 axm0_1: partition(Mode, {StartUp},<br>8 {SelfTest}, {VentilationOf
 8 {SelfTest}, { VentilationOff},<br>9 {PCV} {PSV} {Eailsafe}\{PCV\}, \{PSV\}, \{Failsafe\},
10 \qquad \qquad \{PoweredOff\})11 END
```
Context for the abstract machine, capturing FUN4/CONT1.

```
1 CONTEXT ctx01
 2 EXTENDS ctx00<br>3 SETS ValveSta
 3 SETS ValveState, TestResult<br>4 CONSTANTS
      CONSTANTS
 5 ValveOpen, ValveClosed,
 6 TestPassed, TestFailed, TestSkipped
 7 AXIOMS
 8 \frac{1}{2}: partition(ValveState, 9
                    9 {ValveOpen}, {ValveClosed})
10 axm1_2: partition(TestResult,<br>11 fTestPassed), {Test
11 {TestPassed}, {TestFailed},<br>12 {TestSkipped})
                    {TestSkipped}13 END
```
Extending context to capture necessary sets and constants related to the selftest process  $(FUN6 1–6)$ .

# Event-B Model

```
1 Event SelfTestPassedOrSkipped \widehat{=}<br>2 BEEINES SelfTestPassed
2 REFINES SelfTestPassed<br>3 any timePoweredOff
         any timePoweredOff
\frac{4}{5} when
5 \text{grd0}_1: mode = SelfTest<br>6 \text{grd1}_1: testPowerSwitch
6 grd1_1: testPowerSwitch \in {TestPassed, TestSkipped}<br>7 grd1_2: testLeaks \in {TestPassed, TestSkipped}
7 \text{grd1}_2: testLeaks ∈ {TestPassed, TestSkipped}<br>8 \text{grd1}_3: testFF12 ∈ {TestPassed, TestSkipped}
8 grd1_3: testFF12 \in {TestPassed, TestSkipped}<br>9 grd1 4: testPS EXP \in {TestPassed, TestSkipp
9 grd1_4: testPS_EXP ∈ {TestPassed, TestSkipped}<br>10 grd1 5: testOxvgenSensor ∈ {TestPassed, TestSkip
10 grd1_5: testOxygenSensor ∈ {TestPassed, TestSkipped}<br>11 grd1_6: testAlarms ∈ {TestPassed, TestSkipped}
11 \frac{\text{grd1}_6: \text{testAlarms} \in \{\text{TestPassed}, \text{TestSkipped}\}}{\text{grd1}_7: \text{timePoweredOff} \in \mathbb{Z}}grad1 7: timePoweredOff ∈ Z.
13 grd1_8: timePoweredOff \leq 15 \land is_new_patient = FALSE
14 then<br>15 ac:
\begin{array}{lll} \text{15} & \text{act0}_1: & \text{mode} := \text{Vertical} \\ \text{16} & \text{act1}_1: & \text{in value} := \text{Value} \end{array}16 \arctan 1: in_valve := ValveClosed<br>17 \arctan 2: out valve := ValveOper
                act12: out value := ValueOpen18 FND
```
SelfTestPassedOrSkipped event after the first refinement step. This captures requirements FUN10 and some of its children, along with FUN6.

- ▶ FUN6: The system shall have a self-test procedure that ensures the system and its accessories are fully functional and the alarms work
- ▶ FUN10.3: If "Resume Ventilation" is selected, every step of the selftest procedure FUN.6 can be skipped or optionally rerun individually.
- ▶ FUN10.4: Once all self-test steps have been completed successfully, it shall be possible to proceed to the Standby Mode.

## Requirements in Event-B

This table outlines how various requirements were captured in the Event-B model



#### Proofs

- ▶ The Rodin Platform generates proof obligations for Event-B models, which can be discharged automatically or interactively
- ▶ We were able to discharge all 79 proof obligations generated by Rodin automatically
- Some requirements were verified by construction. For example, adherence to the controller state machine is obtained by constructing a model that evolves following the mode changes indicated by the diagram. Thus, we consider requirements referring to this sequence of states, e.g. FUN4 and CONT1, to be correct-by-construction.
- ▶ Other requirements are verified more directly, by inspecting the guard or action of the event that corresponds to the behaviour described by that requirement.
- ▶ Expected many requirements to become machine invariants, but most basic requirements become machine functionality and are not formally verifiable properties of the machine.
- ▶ Clarification of apparently inconsistent requirements difficult without domain experts, sometimes unclear what is meant to happen.
- ▶ Wanted to capture functional and controller requirements (not GUI), but some functional requirements mix types: "If the self-test mode fails, the user shall be warned that the system is out-of-service. In addition, any other operations shall be not allowed."

#### <span id="page-21-0"></span>**Summary**

- ▶ We used FRET and Event-B to formalise and model the requirements for the ABZ 2024 Mechanical Lung Ventilator case study
- ▶ We formalised the Functional and Controller requirements in FRETish, and described the methodology we followed
- ▶ We used these requirements to construct a model of the ventilator system in Event-B, and captured many of the requirements
- $\triangleright$  The FRET and Event-B artefacts are available at: <https://github.com/mariefarrell/abz2024> (link also included in the paper)