



HAL
open science

A simulation fidelity assessment framework

Sangeeth Saagar Ponnusamy, Vincent Albert, Patrice Thebault

► **To cite this version:**

Sangeeth Saagar Ponnusamy, Vincent Albert, Patrice Thebault. A simulation fidelity assessment framework. International Conference on Simulation and Modeling Methodologies, Technologies and Applications (SIMULTECH 2014), Aug 2014, Vienne, Austria. pp.463-471. hal-01912540

HAL Id: hal-01912540

<https://hal.laas.fr/hal-01912540>

Submitted on 5 Nov 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

A SIMULATION FIDELITY ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

Sangeeth saagar Ponnusamy^{1,2,3}, Vincent Albert² and Patrice Thebault¹

¹*Airbus Operations SAS, 316 Route de Bayonne, 31060, Toulouse, France*

²*CNRS, LAAS, 7 Avenue du Colonel Roche, F-31400, Toulouse, France*

³*Univ de Toulouse, UPS, LAAS, F-31400, Toulouse, France*

{sangeeth-saagar.ponnusamy,patrice.thebault}@airbus.com, valbert@laas.fr

Keywords: Abstraction, Compatibility, Experimental Frame, Formal Matching, Bisimulation, Galois connection, Ontology, Simulation

Abstract: A proposition for the correct by design of abstraction with respect to the simulation objectives based on the concepts of approximate bisimulation, Galois connections and ontology is presented. It addresses the fundamental problem of fidelity in simulation, namely, given a class of models and a class of properties that must be preserved, how to extract modeling abstractions that preserves the properties of interest which allows to conclude about the system being simulated. Fidelity and validity are explained in the framework of the experimental frame and discussed in the context of modeling abstractions. A formal method for the fidelity quantification is explained by abstraction inclusion relations for syntactic and semantic compatibility. Abstraction inclusion in dynamic systems for semantic compatibility by approximate bisimulation and the problem of finding surjection maps compatible with simulation objectives are discussed. Syntactic compatibility is explained by ontologies followed by a brief discussion on the Galois connections and building Galois surjections compatible with the simulation objectives at the end.

1 INTRODUCTION

Modeling and Simulation (M&S) are the analysis and decision means to assess performances, functionalities and operations of a system of interest [Brade, 2004]. Simulation is increasingly being used as a means to design and analyze real world complex systems, and hence, a Model Based Systems Engineering approach is important in development and usage of simulation products. In the context of systems engineering, Verification and Validation (V&V) determine the compliance of simulation products with their specifications and fitness for their intended use respectively. However, a 'distance to reality' requirement is seldom expressed even if the context of use is well known.

The effectiveness of simulation in reproducing the reality i.e. realism of simulation, motivates the following questions:

- How to quantify the distance between a system and its simulation with respect to its V&V objectives?
- Regarding the V&V objectives, what are the fidelity requirements on the means of simulation?

- How to develop simulation models with respect to fidelity requirements?
- How to develop a consistent approach to the evaluation of fidelity of simulation models along the product development cycle?

In the model based design approach, effectiveness largely depends on the degree to which design concerns captured in the different abstraction layers by different stakeholders are orthogonal, i.e. how much the design decisions in the different layers are independent [Clark, 2013]. Thus it is necessary to capture and implement modeling abstractions consistent with the design objectives. This paper describes a formal proposition for finding and implementing modeling abstractions compatible with simulation objectives in the established M&S framework by Zeigler [Zeigler, 2000] using concepts from control and computer theory such as approximate bisimulation (AB) [Girard, 2007], abstract interpretation (AI) [Cousot, 1992] and ontology [Wagner, 2012]. The concepts of fidelity and abstractions are briefly explained followed by proposition on formal approach in the modeling and simulation context.

2 ABSTRACTIONS & FIDELITY

Abstraction is an operation mapping a system described by differential equations, logical statements etc. onto another abstract system, whereby all what is true about the abstract system is true of the original system, but, the converse is not necessarily true. A model is always an abstraction of the reality and this modeling abstraction is the causative of fidelity with an inverse relation. In using simulation for system design and V&V activities, the model and its level of abstraction should be coherent to derive any meaningful conclusion from the simulation results about the system. In modeling and simulation of complex systems, often the difficulty is finding and implementing consistent and valid abstractions to model the simulated system with respect to simulation requirements. This is more so true in developing a complex simulation product where the component models can be developed by different stakeholders and a common frame of reference must exist in terms of implementing consistent abstractions in the experimental frame.

2.1 Experimental Frame

In the context of studying a system through simulation, the concept of experimental frame (EF) introduced in [Zeigler, 1984] is used to describe experimental scenarios under which the System Under Test (SUT) will be used. An EF defines controllability and observability means to stimulate and observe the model temporal evolution in addition to conditions of experimentation.

An Experimental Frame, in general, is composed of primary components called generator (G), transducer (T) and acceptor (A) and, secondary components called environmental model which simulate the real environment in which the SUT operates. The components could be interconnected and hierarchically composed to build an EF. Let us denote the EF as

$$EF = EF_p \cup EF_s \quad (1)$$

$$\text{where } EF_p = \{ M_p \mid P = \{G, T, A\} \}$$

$$EF_s = \{ M_s \mid S = \{1, 2, \dots, S_N\} \}$$

refers to the primary and secondary EF components respectively.

The components models in Eq.1 are given as

$$M_{p,s} = \langle T, X_{p,s}, Y_{p,s} \rangle \quad (2)$$

where $P = \{G, T, A\}$, $S = \{1, 2, \dots, S_N\}$, X and Y are input and output variables defined over a time base T.

The concepts of homomorphism, applicability and derivability were proposed by [Zeigler, 1984] in the framework of M&S. Morphism relation establishes behavioural equivalence between a concrete model and its abstraction. Applicability and derivability defines a compatibility criterion between a model and EF, and also between two experimental frames. A fidelity framework needs to address consistent abstractions for morphism relation. In addition, as a prerequisite for validity assessment, the framework needs to address whether the EF can meet simulation objectives and whether the model can work with the EF.

The abstractions made when the model is built must match a set of acceptance conditions given by the experimental frame [Ponnusamy, 2014]. An experimental frame typology could be thus found by having equivalence classes according to the system considered (system, equipment, type of system, software, etc.) and the system properties (performance, robustness etc.) targeted by the V&V activity [Albert, 2009]. Thus, the objective will be to define a way of formally quantifying the fidelity of a simulation and to define a methodology for finding and implementing the abstractions consistent with the simulation objectives.

2.2 Validity in Experimental Frame

A model is said to be valid if it is representative enough of the system it represents and satisfies the experimental frame. In this context of definition of validation requirements, it is important to distinguish between simulation validity and system validity. Simulation validity answers whether the simulation is adequate to answer questions on system validation. System validation is validation of system with respect to its requirements. Simulation validity is a prerequisite of system validity and thus decisions taken at any stage along the V cycle where simulation is used as a means of V&V is intrinsically tied to the key question of simulation fidelity. A system is said to be valid by simulation only when the simulation itself is valid and thus it is a necessary and sufficient condition for system validity assessment through simulation. Let φ_{sys} and φ_{sim} be system and simulation requirements respectively on the system (S_{sys}) and its representation (S_{sim}). The system validity assessment by simulation thus becomes

$$\varphi_{i=1..n} = \varphi_{sys} \cup \varphi_{sim} \quad (3)$$

In this context, in [Albert, 2009], experimental frames were proposed in terms of model usage domain and model objective domain called Simulation Domain of Use (SDU) and Simulation Objective of Use (SOU) respectively. In other words, SOU is the frame of experimentation and SDU is the frame of the developed simulation i.e. model capabilities.

Simulation validity in other words can be defined as the compatibility between an SDU and an SOU. Compatibility is discussed in terms of validity through abstraction. In simulating a complex system which is hierarchically composed of different subsystems, modeling abstraction choices in building an SDU consistent with simulation objectives described by an SOU will yield this compatibility.

The compatibility is discussed in terms of reachability of the SUT where reachability is defined as the set of all possible states reachable by a system and is used to verify temporal logic properties defined as safety etc. A study on the abstraction of the primary EF components, EF_p , with respect to the SOU and a validity assessment methodology in terms of trace inclusion was proposed by Ponnusamy et al [Ponnusamy, 2014]. However this study deals with abstraction itself rather than its effect on validity assessment. The paper is focused on the development of systematic abstraction and formal abstraction compatibility criterion of the EF components in the framework of simulation fidelity. Essentially, the philosophy of current study is correct 'by design' in that the simulation product (SDU) designed is "correct (i.e. faithful) by design" which exhibit behaviour consistent with respect to the simulation requirements (SOU) through the implementation of abstractions.

In abstraction of a system and its validation against the specifications, different classes of abstractions (SDU) on four axes of architecture, data, computation & time were proposed by Albert [Albert, 2009]. Similar such definition can be extended to class of specifications (SOU) and a unified formal fidelity framework will have to encompass all such classes and defines a quantitative compatibility criterion between the class of abstractions and specification. Thus fidelity assessment through abstraction compatibility means, given a class of models (e.g.: hybrid), and a class of properties that must be preserved (e.g.: safety), extract modeling abstractions (e.g.: state aggregation) that preserve the properties of interest.

2.3 Design & Measured Fidelity

Fidelity is often used in different contexts both in scientific and non-scientific fields alike, and myriad interpretations of fidelity, especially in the M&S community, leads to inconsistency in the V&V activities which necessitates a precise notion of this generic term. In this paper, Fidelity is defined as a notion of distance to reality and this is akin to the definitions by Implementation Study Group (ISG) of Simulation Interoperability Standards Organization (SISO) [Gross, 1999]. Based on this notion, fidelity could be classified into design fidelity and measured fidelity. Design Fidelity is defined as the distance between the system specification and the simulation specification, whereas, Measured Fidelity is the distance between the real system and the simulation product. These concepts are illustrated below in a simulation product development cycle.




Figure 1: Design & Measured Fidelity

Current method of system validation through simulation is a process based on measured fidelity. This conventional bottom up approach necessitates the knowledge of executability of the V&V plan on the means of simulation and confidence of the results. Fidelity requirements (expected capabilities, tolerances etc.) are not explicitly represented in the system V&V plan and fidelity assessment is relied upon by traditional but arduous method based on high end expertise review and past experience.

Challenges in complexity, methodology and continuous evolution of change in product requirements often makes model development an iterative process and in this paper we attempt to lean this modeling process by quantifying the relation between model abstraction levels and its associated validity requirements. This is essentially a paradigm shift from a process based on measured fidelity to a process based on design fidelity.

2.4 Fidelity Quantification

Model Fidelity, M_F , is the distance of the SDU from the real system. Simulation fidelity, S_F , and simulation model fidelity, M_F , are different with the former being affected by factors such as the model

of computation (C), execution platform (P) etc. which are not discussed in the scope of our study. Thus the simulation fidelity is the aggregation of all component fidelities, $S_F = \sum(\sum M_F + P_F + \sum C_F + \dots)$

Fidelity, resulting from abstraction, is based on both the SUT type and type of operation (SOU). It is to be noted that the fidelity per se is an absolute realism measure of the SDU (what the model can do) *independent* of the SOU (how the model is intended to be used). However, an absolute definition of fidelity is neither feasible nor useful since a model is always abstracted with an objective behind [Gross, 1999], [Brade, 2004] & [Roza, 1999]. A more pertinent question is what is the right level of abstraction for the Intention Of Use (IOU)? Or succinctly, how do we formally relate fidelity and validity?

Let ϵ be this distance notion, hitherto referred to as abstraction precision. Then absolute model fidelity can be defined as,

$$M_F^{abs} = \epsilon_{SDU} + \epsilon_X \quad (4)$$

where ϵ_{SDU} denotes the EF modeling abstraction precision with an unknown additional precision, ϵ_X , implied by multitude of factors such as modeling formalism, layer of abstraction etc. Instead of an absolute measure, a relative measure called the relative fidelity or simulation model fidelity which is defined as a measure of *closeness of abstraction* between the SOU and SDU is introduced as follows,

$$M_F^{sim} = \epsilon_{SDU} / \epsilon_{SOU} \quad (5)$$

If $M_F^{sim} = 1$, then it is at the right level of abstraction and $M_F^{sim} < 1$, then the abstraction is too precise (over fidelity) and vice versa. Alternatively the validity (pseudo) metric, $\delta_v = \epsilon_{SDU} - \epsilon_{SOU}$ says how close the abstractions are with the key question can fidelity be measured as precision of abstraction as described.

It may be reminded that the SDU abstraction is valid if it is compatible with the SOU abstraction. But the level of compatibility yields a measure of required abstraction. Consider a system of order $n_{sys} = 5$ abstracted to $n_{sdu} = 2$ with $n_{sou} = 3$. This is a case of over abstraction with respect to objective as $M_F^{sim} > 1$. However if the objective is different, say $n_{sou} = 1$, then it is a case of under abstraction with $M_F^{sim} < 1$. Thus the correct abstraction is subjected to the SOU definition i.e. a model may have low fidelity but still be valid.

Consider an another simple example, let us assume an ideal system output of $Y_{sys} = 1^\circ$ at interface of the SUT, which is abstracted by the SDU and SOU as range of values, an interval abstraction defined by [min max]. The abstraction is valid if the acceptable range is bigger than the available range and relative fidelity is high as the two ranges are closer.

Required fidelity is expressed via allowable abstractions and indirectly in terms of required relative fidelity. Two key perspectives for formal fidelity assessment method emerge here, namely, verification & synthesis. In a verification perspective, a formal fidelity quantification method yields the validity pseudo metric or relative fidelity for a given SDU abstraction. The key idea is: *are my abstractions compatible with a metric assigned on its compatibility?* Instead, in synthesis perspective, for a required fidelity defined by the SOU, a formal fidelity method gives a necessary and sufficient SDU abstraction. The key idea here is: *what are my compatible abstractions with respect to a metric?* Consider first example, it is akin to asking what is n_{sou} (a modeling rule) for a given fidelity requirement. This correct 'by design' synthesis approach is the objective of the study.

3 FIDELITY FRAMEWORK

In general, implementation of the fidelity framework is twofold, capturing and assessing fidelity. *Capturing* fidelity needs refers to the collection of fidelity requirements from the SOU in terms of allowable abstraction or required abstraction precision. *Assessing* fidelity refers to quantitative assessment by a formal abstraction compatibility criterion between allowable and implemented abstractions i.e. SOU and SDU respectively.

The assessment is based on the framework of finding consistent abstractions compatible with simulation objectives and there exists two perspectives called semantic and syntactic compatibility based on the behavior and structure of models respectively. Class of abstractions and specifications could be mapped with those two hierarchical layers and propositions for compatibility are explained based on the concepts of AB and ontology for each perspective.

It may be recalled that a morphism relation establishes correspondence between a concrete model and its abstraction through abstraction operation. Abstractions are manifold depending on

the simulation objectives and hypotheses. From the classes of abstractions defined in [Albert, 2009], we define abstraction operation as α over an abstraction class. The validity of the SDU abstraction against the SOU is defined by abstraction inclusion. An abstraction inclusion relation could be formalized by defining a partial order on abstractions. A partially ordered set or a poset is a set $P = (\preceq, S)$ with reflexive, transitive relation on a set S . The hierarchy of abstractions could be defined as a partial order relation over a finite lattice. This would serve as a baseline for model developers to choose the modeling rule and, for users to choose the model on a V&V platform, with sufficient fidelity. In addition, it would be beneficial if common modeling rules for models with respect to the IOU were identified which helps in reusability of existing models and better utilization of resources. Such a framework would help in traceability between the system specifications and the IOU. The proposed framework is briefly illustrated in the following figure.




Figure 2: Fidelity Framework

3.1 Semantic Compatibility - Approximate Bisimulation Framework

Semantic compatibility refers to the abstraction resulting in abstract semantics compatible with the simulation objectives. More precisely, the focus is on abstractions of data class, state aggregation type in model order reduction of dynamic systems using AB relations developed by Pappas, Girard et al [Girard, 2007] within the framework of metric transition systems. A metric transition system is a transition system whose outputs are equipped with a metric such as the Euclidean distance. Consider two transition systems $T_{1,2}$ which essentially refer to a

concrete EF model and its abstraction defined in Eq.2 as,

$$T_n = \langle S_n, X_n, T_n, S_n^0, Y_n, O_n \rangle, n=1,2 \quad (6)$$

where

S_n are the set of states

X_n are the set of inputs

T_n are the transition maps, $T_n : S_n \times X_n \rightarrow 2^{S_n}$

S_n^0 are the set of initial states $S_n^0 \subseteq S_n$

O_n are the output maps $O_n : S_n \rightarrow Y_n$ equipped with a metric d .

AB relations are intended to capture the most significant characteristics of a system dynamics and neglect the less important ones [Girard, 2007]. The degree of approximation is given by the precision of the AB function (ϵ) and this precision provides a bound of the distance between the output trajectories of a system and its abstraction. The set of output trajectories, $\{(Y, X) \mid Y = \mathcal{O}(S)\}$, denoted by $\mathcal{L}(T)$ is called the language of the transition system, T . The behavioral equivalence by homomorphism relation described in section 2.1 is given here in terms of the observational equivalence i.e. language inclusion and equivalence.

From [Girard, 2007], two metric transition systems T_1 and T_2 are said to be bisimilar with a precision ϵ , if there exists bisimulation relation, \mathcal{R}_ϵ and for all $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{R}_\epsilon$

$$d(O_1(s_1), O_2(s_2)) \leq \epsilon \quad (7)$$

$$\{ \forall x \in X, \forall s'_1 \in S_1(s_1, x), \exists s'_2 \in S_2(s_2, x) \mid (s'_1, s'_2) \in \mathcal{R}_\epsilon \}$$

$$\{ \forall x \in X, \forall s'_2 \in S_2(s_2, x), \exists s'_1 \in S_1(s_1, x) \mid (s'_1, s'_2) \in \mathcal{R}_\epsilon \}$$

Such bisimulation relations could be expressed as bisimulation function, f_B . The function $f_B : S_1 \times S_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a bisimulation function between T_1 and T_2 , if for all $(s_1, s_2) \in S_1 \times S_2$

$$f_B(s_1, s_2) \geq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(O_1(s_1), O_2(s_2)), \\ \sup_{x \in X} \inf_{s'_2 \in S_2(s_2, x)} f_B(s'_1, s'_2), \\ \sup_{s'_1 \in S_1(s_1, x)} \inf_{s'_2 \in S_2(s_2, x)} f_B(s'_1, s'_2), \\ \sup_{x \in X} \inf_{s'_1 \in S_1(s_1, x)} f_B(s'_1, s'_2) \end{array} \right\} \quad (8)$$

where the bisimulation function f_B bounds the distance between the observations for a couple (s_1, s_2) by precision $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that $f_B(s_1, s_2) \leq \epsilon$ and non-increasing under operational dynamic conditions.

Applications of AB include bisimulation metrics for linear systems, abstractions of hybrid systems and hierarchical control design. A correct ‘by design’ of embedded control software using bisimulation relations was implemented by tools such as PESSOA [Mazo, 2010] and CoSyMa [Sebti, 2013] by expressing requirements in temporal logic. The current approach is inspired from such work and attempts to derive abstractions based on required precision of abstraction rather than the other way around.

AB is more amenable for applications such as safety verification since transient dynamics are included in abstraction and error bounds are based on L^∞ norm unlike classical model reduction frameworks [Girard, 2007]. This error bound or precision of abstraction can be related to fidelity requirement and thus gives a framework in synthesizing abstraction yielding required precision. By relating the desired precision mandated by the simulation users (SOU) with implemented precision by the model developers (SDU) through a formal framework, fidelity could be quantified.

Proposition 1: Let $\alpha_{\varepsilon_{SDU}}$ and $\alpha_{\varepsilon_{SOU}}$ be abstractions of SDU and SOU with precision ε_{SDU} and ε_{SOU} respectively, a simulation product is said to be faithful if the developer abstractions are more precise than user abstractions i.e. $\alpha_{\varepsilon_{SDU}} \leq \alpha_{\varepsilon_{SOU}}$.

From the definition of the EF specification in Eq.1, let us denote the concrete system (M_C), its reference abstraction (M_{SOU}) and implemented abstraction (M_{SDU}). The V&V cycle can be illustrated in terms of such hierarchical abstraction and requirements in Figure 3. The diagram can be interpreted as follows, a concrete system (M_C) is said to be valid if it satisfies the system requirements (φ_{sys}) and denoted by $M_{\varphi_{sys}}$. Similarly $M_{\varphi_{SDU}}$ and $M_{\varphi_{SOU}}$ are defined for the SDU and SOU respectively with respect to the simulation specification, φ_{sim} .




Figure 3: Abstraction in Modeling & Simulation

A fidel simulation allows to conclude about $M_{\varphi_{sys}}$ by studying $M_{\varphi_{SDU}}$ derived from $M_{\varphi_{SOU}}$. Thus the objective is to develop M_{SDU} consistent with M_{SOU} to answer questions on M_C . In validity assessment of system by simulation, the simulation user i.e. SOU defines a set of acceptable abstractions (α_{SOU}) resulting in model behavior representing the system. The model developer i.e. SDU, based on system specification and simulation specification, develops models implementing abstractions (α_{SDU}) resulting in a certain model behavior consistent with simulation objectives. The question of requirement validation is not addressed here and it was assumed that the given simulation requirements are valid with respect to its system requirements.

It is known that an abstraction operation is essentially a *modeling rule* to reduce the complexity of a model and to have a simulation model with sufficient fidelity, the abstraction mandated by the SOU must be compatible with the one actually implemented by the SDU. In the framework of fidelity, the abstraction inclusion can be interpreted in verification as well as a synthesis perspective. The simulation specification lays out the required rule in terms of precision of abstraction, ε_{SOU} allowed or the reference abstraction, M_{SOU} itself. In the former case it becomes a verification problem such that the precision of allowable abstraction, ε_{SOU} , is checked against the abstraction implemented, M_{SDU} ,

$$\begin{aligned} f_B^{ver}(M_C, M_{SOU}) &= \varepsilon_{SOU} \\ f_B^{ver}(M_C, M_{SDU}) &= \varepsilon_{SDU} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Then, by definition of inclusion, a simulation model is valid when $\varepsilon_{SDU} \leq \varepsilon_{SOU}$. In other words, the unknown reference model $M_{\varphi_{SOU}}$ is verified against implemented model $M_{\varphi_{SDU}}$ through the precision of abstraction. Properties such as safety could be verified through reachability analysis using an adaptation of discrete verification techniques to the continuous context, namely, computing by geometric means an over-approximation of the set of states reached by all trajectories. Various approaches to reachability computation and their applications can be found in [Stursberg, 2003], [Tomlin, 2003] & [Maler, 2002].

In the latter case, namely synthesis, for a given precision, ε_{SOU} , a corresponding user abstraction is found, M_{SOU} .

$$f_B^{syn}(M_C, \varepsilon_{SOU}) = M_{SOU} \quad (10)$$

Then it is essentially a problem of correction i.e. implementation of reference model M_{SOU} as M_{SDU} in the environmental model. However, the SOU is seldom expressed as a reference model and is usually expressed in terms of acceptable error tolerances. Intuitively, acceptable abstractions are indirectly expressed as acceptable error tolerances. Interpreting such error tolerances as precision of abstraction in the context of AB, the question would be given acceptable error tolerances what are the necessary and sufficient abstractions consistent with the SOU such that $M_{\varphi_{SDU}} \sim M_{\varphi_{SOU}}$.

This implies that abstraction is finding a surjection map and valid abstraction is finding the surjection map consistent with the SOU. Let, $\alpha: \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$, be an abstraction mapping a concrete model, M_c^1 , to its abstract version, M_A^1 , where $n_1 > n_2$. The hierarchy of abstractions are related by binary relation forming a partial order as follows.

$$M_c^1 \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} M_A^1 \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} \dots M_A^n \quad (11)$$

Different such abstractions may be feasible defined by a set N and the valid set of abstractions among them are defined by

$$\forall i \in N, \exists \{\alpha_i^{EF}\} \models \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \dots \varphi_n\} \quad (12)$$

where $\varphi_{i=1..n}$ are the requirements defined in formalism such as temporal logic.

In the AB framework, consider abstraction of linear system M_c^1 to M_A^1 by α_1 where α_1 is a linear quotient map. Conditions for the surjection map to be an observation preserving partition which in turn is a bisimulation are given in [Pappas, 2003]. Further, in [Girard, 2007], Girard et al remarks that such an admissible surjective map can be chosen such that the precision of abstraction formalised as a semi definite optimisation problem is minimal. The selection method, however, is based on heuristics and Girard et al emphasises the need for better method to find this map such that precision of abstraction is minimal. In our synthesis approach, however, the question is to find the surjection map such that precision of abstraction is arbitrarily closer to the required precision. The existence of such an admissible surjection map gives the necessary and sufficient abstraction consistent with the simulation objectives.

Proposition 2: For a given fidelity requirement, defined over some metric, δ_F , the best possible abstraction precision is given by $\epsilon_{SOU} \sim \epsilon_{SDU}$.

In abstracting concrete semantics, different levels of abstraction are possible and the best possible abstraction $\alpha_{\epsilon_{SDU}} \sim \alpha_{\epsilon_{SOU}}$, with respect to required fidelity is given by distance between the required precision and available precision of abstraction.

By partial order relation, for abstraction M_{SDU}^i where $i = 1..n$ are different levels of model abstractions, if

$$\begin{aligned} M_{SDU}^i &\leq M_{SDU}^{i+1} \\ M_{SDU}^{i+1} &\leq M_{SDU}^{i+2} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Then

$$M_{SDU}^i \leq M_{SDU}^{i+2}$$

The best possible abstraction is the one whose precision of abstraction is closest to the required precision.

In addition to abstraction of model semantics, model interfaces are abstracted based on their syntax definitions and the semantics they handle. The syntactic (number of ports, coupling, structure) and semantic (data type, type signature) of the EF and SUT interfaces must be compatible and are defined in terms of a partial order relation. Such a definition followed by an inclusion criterion will help address the simulation validity with respect to abstractions.

The ‘correct by design’ abstractions once constructed will result in model behaviour satisfying objectives. This can be verified by a model coverage metric proposed in [Ponnusamy, 2014], [Foures, 2013] to analyse the extent of model coverage through abstraction.

3.2 Syntactic Compatibility - Ontology Framework

The syntactic perspective concerns only the structure of the dynamics and not their effect. Syntactic compatibility deals with the abstraction resulting in a structure of the system dynamics consistent with simulation objectives. This compatibility is equally important as the current languages of systems engineering are usually informal (text and pictures) and semiformal (diagrams and drawings) but seldom formal (rigorous domain-specific languages). More formal language usage through such syntactic compatibility in the system definition will result in system implementation with less error. Ontology, which is a formal representation of a set of concepts within a domain and the relationships between those concepts, can be used in such a definition.

The formal method based on ontologies could serve as an integrating standard in system modeling and simulation by organizing and relating analyses of a design in a consistent manner [Wagner, 2012]. In [Man, 2009] a correct, scalable and automated method, semantic properties are inferred using lattice-based ontologies. Similar notion can be extended to a systems perspective in tools such as SysML for system and architecture definition. For the SOU and SDU abstractions of the same class, abstraction hierarchy forms a partial order relation for each abstraction class. The compatibility between two abstractions (SOU and SDU) can be checked by inferring the precision ordering and by measuring how far they are apart with help of a distance metric such as the Hausdorff distance giving a measure of fidelity (i.e. distance between abstractions) as defined in section 2.4.

3.3 Galois connection

Galois connections give a mathematical framework for sound and precise abstractions through refinement. Galois connections were first used in the AI framework by Cousot [Cousot, 1992]. AI is the interpretation of program semantics by abstract values and it expresses connection between the concrete semantics and abstract semantics using Galois connection between associated property lattices. It is to be noted that abstraction can be defined in terms of homomorphism and its inverse function giving a Galois connection. In addition, homomorphism between Kripke structures preserves the ability to transit between states and in this context it is referred to as ‘simulation’. Simulation relations, similar to the one explained in section 3.1 shows the behavioral equivalence and inclusion between two systems by defining the Galois connections, and hence, the abstractions. Thus the AI semantics is similar to bisimulation notion. An analogy with AI framework used in program analysis could be drawn as AI is a verification of specification through concrete domain abstraction. The abstraction is given by Galois connection between the concrete semantics defined as least fixed point over a complete lattice and an abstract semantics defined over an abstract lattice.

Given a complete lattice of concrete data, C , and a simpler complete lattice of abstract data, A , the two domains can be related by abstraction operation, $\alpha: C \rightarrow A$ and inversely by concretization operation, $\gamma: A \rightarrow C$. For each function $f: C \rightarrow C$, synthesize $f^\#: A \rightarrow A$, such that α is a homomorphism and thus concrete semantics is abstracted. In general, (α, γ) is called a Galois connection if and only if

$$\alpha(c) \leq a \Leftrightarrow c \leq \gamma(a) \quad (14)$$

The Galois connection defines a closure operator $\rho = \gamma \bullet \alpha$ and hence a best abstraction [Cousot, 1992]. As a corollary, when α is a surjection then it becomes a Galois surjection. Galois surjection can thus be used to define the best abstraction for projection of high dimensional system to its low dimensional subspace. Soundness and precision criteria of Galois connection could be useful in synthesizing such best abstractions with respect to the SOU. Further studies are being carried out to ascertain the possibility of synthesizing surjection map consistent with simulation objectives using Galois connections.

4 FUTURE WORK

The heuristics based choice of surjection map, though not an optimal method, yields better experimental results for verification which in turn is an iterative procedure to find the valid abstraction [Girard, 2007]. The method proposed in this paper could alleviate this heuristics problem and yield a systematic method to choose the surjective map based on the synthesis or verification objective. However, further research is needed to integrate these concepts into a scalable algorithmic framework applicable to complexity reduction in dynamic systems. Also worth noting is that other abstraction parameters such as time, architecture, scope etc. are not discussed and a comprehensive abstraction framework will need to include all such classes to yield a valid model abstraction.

In addition, notion of reachability is more pertinent than simulation for dynamic systems since an exhaustive breadth first search of state space through reachability analysis, difficult though it might be in terms of computational cost, yields formal verification of system [Tiwari, 2003]. However, application of such formal methods to large scale industrial systems which are typically system of systems with different layers of abstraction will be incremental and the proposition described in this paper is one such method for simulation model development. In reality, simulation as an enabling method for design and development of systems will not be replaced by formal verification such as reachability, at least not in the near future and not in some specific domains (e.g.: HMI, FDI, FEMA etc.). Hence, the onus should be on model development rather than on the verification aspects.

5 CONCLUSIONS

A proposition for a mathematical framework in synthesising abstractions consistent with the simulation objectives is explained and the next step would be to develop the theoretical proof and build tools upon them. Realization of such an objective will help improve the level of confidence in simulation results for the system V&V and help better utilization of simulation resources by selecting the best available resource according to the test objectives. Identification of such a consistent and continuous way to improve simulation products will help improving product development life cycle quality while controlling the cost and mitigating risk.

REFERENCES

- Albert, V, 2009, Simulation validity assessment in the context of embedded system design, PhD Thesis, LAAS-CNRS, University of Toulouse, Unpublished.
- Brade D, VV&A Global Taxonomy (TAXO), 2004, Common Validation, Verification and Accreditation Framework for Simulation, REVVA.
- Clark M, Koutsoukos X, Kumar R, Lee I, Pappas G J, Lee P, Porter J, Sokolsky O, 2013, A Study on Run Time Assurance for Complex Cyber Physical Systems, Interim Technical Report, AFRL/RQQA, NTIS Issue No 13.
- Cousot, P, 1992, Abstract Interpretation Frameworks, Journal of Logic and Computation, Volume 2, pages 511-547.
- Foures, D, Albert, V, Nkesta, A, 2013, Simulation validation using the compatibility between simulation model and experimental frame, Proceedings of the 2013 Summer Computer Simulation Conference, Society for Modeling & Simulation International, Vista, CA, Article 55.
- Frantz F K, 1995, A taxonomy of model abstraction techniques, Proceedings of the 27th conference on winter simulation, pages 1413-1420, Arlington, Virginia, United States.
- Girard A, Pappas G J, 2007, Approximate bisimulation relations for constrained linear systems, Automatica, Volume 43 Issue 8, pages 1307-1317.
- Girard A, Pappas G J, 2007, Approximation Metrics for Discrete and Continuous Systems, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, Volume 52, Issue 5, pages 782-798.
- Gross D, 1999, Report from the Fidelity Implementation Study Group, *Simulation Interoperability Workshop*, USA.
- Kim H, 2004, Reference model based high fidelity simulation modeling for manufacturing systems, PhD Thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology, Unpublished.
- Lickly B, Shelton C, Latronico E and Lee E, 2011, A Practical Ontology Framework for Static Model Analysis, In Proceedings of the ninth ACM international conference on Embedded software, New York, NY, USA, 23-32.
- Maler O, 2002, Control from Computer Science, IFAC Annual Review in Control 26(2), pages 175-187.
- Man-Kit-Leung, J, Mandl, T, Lee, E A, Latronico, E, Shelton, C, Tripakis, S, Lickly, B, 2009, Scalable semantic annotation using lattice based ontologies. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Volume 5795, pages 393-407.
- Mazo M, Davitan A, Tabuada P, 2010, PESSOA: a tool for embedded controller synthesis, Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Computer Aided Verification, pages 566-569.
- Pappas G J, 2003, Bisimilar linear systems, Automatica, Volume 39, Issue 12, pages 2035-2047.
- Pola G, Girard A, Tabuada P, 2007, Symbolic models for nonlinear control systems using approximate bisimulation, 46th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, pages 4656-4661.
- Ponnusamy S, Albert V, Thebault P, 2014, Modeling & Simulation framework for the inclusion of simulation objectives by abstraction, 4th International Conference on Simulation and Modeling Methodologies, Technologies & Applications, submitted.
- Roza M, 1999, Fidelity Requirements Specification: A Process Oriented View, *Fall Simulation Interoperability Workshop*.
- Sebti M, Girard A, Gregor G, 2013, CoSyMA: a tool for controller synthesis using multi-scale abstractions, 16th international conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control, HSCC'13, pages 83-88.
- Stursberg O, Krogh B H, 2003, Efficient Representation and Computation of Reachable Sets for Hybrid Systems, Hybrid systems: Computation and Control, Lecture Notes in Computer Science Volume 2623, pages 482-497.
- Tiwari A, Shankar N, and Rushby J, 2003, Invisible Formal Methods for Embedded Control Systems, Proceedings of the IEEE, Vol 91. No. 1, pages 29-39.
- Tomlin C J, Mitchell I, Bayen A, Oishi M, 2003, Computational Techniques for the Verification of Hybrid Systems, Proceedings of the IEEE, Vol. 91, No. 7.
- Wagner, D A, Bennett, M B, Karban R, Rouquette N, Jenkins S, Ingham M, An ontology for State Analysis: Formalizing the mapping to SysML, *Aerospace Conference, 2012 IEEE*.
- Zeigler B P, Praehofer H & Tag G K, 2000, *Theory of modeling and simulation*, Academic Press, San Diego, California, USA.