Constructive Hybrid Games

Brandon Bohrer and André Platzer

Logical Systems Lab Computer Science Department Carnegie Mellon University

IJCAR'20

Safe Cyber-Physical Systems (CPS)





Hybrid Games Model CPS





Hybrid Games Model CPS





Hybrid Games Model CPS



Constructive Proofs for Synthesis (CdGL)





$$\begin{aligned} & \mathsf{actrl} \equiv a := *; \ ?(-3 \le a \le 3) \\ & \mathsf{dctrl} \equiv \{d := 1 \cup d := -1\}^d \\ & \mathsf{phys} \equiv \{t := 0; \{t' = 1, dist' = d - a \& t \le 2\}; ?(t \ge 1)\}^d \end{aligned}$$

game \equiv {actrl; dctrl; phys}^{*} or {actrl; dctrl; phys}[×]



game \equiv {actrl; dctrl; phys}^{*} or {actrl; dctrl; phys}[×]



game $\equiv \{ actrl; dctrl; phys \}^*$ or $\{ actrl; dctrl; phys \}^{\times}$





- Formula $P, Q ::= \cdots \mid \langle \alpha \rangle P \mid [\alpha] P$
- Angel or Demon achieves P after game α

safety $\equiv dist > 0 \rightarrow (game^{\times}) dist \rightarrow 0$ Don't exceed goal

- Formula $P, Q ::= \cdots \mid \langle \alpha \rangle P \mid [\alpha] P$
- Angel or Demon achieves P after game α

safety
$$\equiv dist > 0 \rightarrow (game^{\times}) dist \rightarrow 0$$
 Don't exceed goal



Figure: Animation of Safe Car

- Formula $P, Q ::= \cdots \mid \langle \alpha \rangle P \mid [\alpha] P$
- Angel or Demon achieves ${\it P}$ after game α

$$safety \equiv dist > 0 \rightarrow \langle game^{\times} \rangle \ dist \rightarrow 0 \xrightarrow{\text{Don't exceed goal}}$$

liveness
$$\equiv dist > 0 \rightarrow \langle game^{*} \rangle \ dist \leq \epsilon \qquad \text{Reach goal}$$

- Formula $P, Q ::= \cdots \mid \langle \alpha \rangle P \mid [\alpha] P$
- Angel or Demon achieves P after game α

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{safety} \equiv \mathit{dist} > 0 \rightarrow \langle \mathsf{game}^{\times} \rangle \, \mathit{dist} \gg 0 & \texttt{Don't exceed goal} \\ \mathsf{liveness} \equiv \mathit{dist} > 0 \rightarrow \langle \mathsf{game}^{*} \rangle \, \mathit{dist} \leq \epsilon & \texttt{Reach goal} \\ \mathsf{reachAvoid} \equiv \mathit{dist} > 0 \rightarrow \langle \{\mathsf{game}; ?\mathit{dist} > 0\}^{*} \rangle \mathit{dist} \leq \epsilon \\ \hline \mathsf{Reach safely} \end{array}$$

Constructive Foundations: What's New?

- What do constructive modalities $\langle \alpha \rangle P$ and $[\alpha] P$ mean?
- Challenge: Strategies must be *constructive* ~> Types
- **Challenge:** Games both stronger and weaker (quantifier alternation, subnormal)

Constructive Foundations: What's New?

- What do constructive modalities $\langle \alpha \rangle P$ and $[\alpha] P$ mean?
- Challenge: Strategies must be *constructive* ~> Types
- **Challenge:** Games both stronger and weaker (quantifier alternation, subnormal)

$$\mathsf{K} \quad [\alpha](P \to Q) \to ([\alpha]P \to [\alpha]Q) \quad \text{vs.} \quad \mathsf{M} \quad \frac{P \vdash Q}{[\alpha]P \vdash [\alpha]Q}$$

Constructive Foundations: What's New?

- What do constructive modalities (α)P and [α]P mean?
- Challenge: Strategies must be *constructive* ~> Types
- **Challenge:** Games both stronger and weaker (quantifier alternation, subnormal)

$$\mathsf{K} \quad [\alpha](P \to Q) \to ([\alpha]P \to [\alpha]Q) \quad \text{vs.} \quad \mathsf{M} \quad \frac{P \vdash Q}{[\alpha]P \vdash [\alpha]Q}$$

- How do other proof rules change? ~> Most don't!
- Real arithmetic ~> Constructive real arithmetic
- Excluded middle → Compare-with-epsilon

$$\mathsf{cmp} \quad \epsilon > \mathsf{0} o (f > g \lor f < g + \epsilon)$$

Angel and Demon are Dual (Examples) $\begin{array}{c}
P \\
\hline (state \Rightarrow type) \\
\hline (?Q)P \\
\hline s \\
= \\
\hline Q \\
\hline s \\
 \end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
P \\
\hline rove test
\end{array}$

$$[?Q]P]s = [Q]s \Rightarrow [P]s - Assume test$$

Angel and Demon are Dual (Examples)

$$[P]$$
 : (state \Rightarrow type)
 $[\langle ?Q \rangle P] s = [Q] s * [P] s$
 $[\langle x := * \rangle P] s = \Sigma v : \mathbb{R}$. $[P]$ (set $s \times v$) [Choose x]

$$\begin{bmatrix} [?Q]P^{?}s &= \begin{bmatrix} Q^{?}s \Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} P^{?}s \end{bmatrix} \\ = \Pi v : \mathbb{R} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} P^{?}(\text{set } s \times v) \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{Receive } x} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Receive } x \end{bmatrix}$$







Lemma (Existential Property) If $(\Gamma \vdash \exists x \ p(x))$ is valid, there exist term f such that $(\Gamma \vdash p(f))$ is valid.

Natural Deduction Proofs (Selected)

- Want Curry-Howard \rightsquigarrow Natural Deduction
- Implemented as Scala prototype

$$[;]I \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha][\beta]P}{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha;\beta]P}$$
$$[:=]I \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash p(f)}{\Gamma \vdash [x:=f]p(x)}$$
$$[*]I \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash J \quad J \vdash [\alpha]J \quad J \vdash P}{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha^*]P}$$

Differential Equation Proofs (Selected)

Differential Equation Proofs (Selected)

$$['] \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \forall t : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \ \forall r : [0, t] \ q(sol(r)) \rightarrow p(sol(t))}{\Gamma \vdash [x' = f \& q(x)]p(x)}$$

DI
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash P \quad \Gamma \vdash \forall x (Q \to [x' := f](P)')}{\Gamma \vdash [x' = f \& Q]P}$$

DC
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash [x'=f \& Q]R \quad \Gamma \vdash [x'=f \& Q \land R]P}{\Gamma \vdash [x'=f \& Q]P}$$



•**O** ¬q(x)

Theorem (Soundness) If $\Gamma \vdash P$ is provable, then sequent $(\Gamma \vdash P)$ is valid.

Operational Semantics

- Ultimate Goal: Compile proofs to control + monitor
- First Step: Interpret Angel proof against Demon environment

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathsf{play}_{\alpha} & : \lceil \langle \alpha \rangle P \rceil \ s \Rightarrow \lceil [\alpha] Q \rceil \ s \Rightarrow \Sigma t : \mathsf{state.} \ P \ t \ast Q \ t \\ \mathsf{play}_{R} & (A, B) \quad (\lambda p : (\lceil R \rceil \ s). \ C) \quad s = (s, (B, C_p^{\mathcal{A}})) \\ \mathsf{play}_{x \Rightarrow} & (f, A) \quad (\lambda v : \mathbb{R}. \ B) \qquad s = (\mathsf{set} \ s \times f, (A, B_v^{f})) \\ \mathsf{play}_{\alpha \cup \beta} & (\ell \cdot A) \quad (B, C) \qquad s = \mathsf{play}_{\alpha} \ s \ A \ B \\ \mathsf{play}_{\alpha \cup \beta} & (r \cdot A) \quad (B, C) \qquad s = \mathsf{play}_{\beta} \ s \ A \ C \\ \mathsf{play}_{\alpha d} & A \qquad B \qquad s = \mathsf{play}_{\alpha} \ s \ B \ A \end{array}$$

Theorem (Consistency) Formulas $\lceil \langle \alpha \rangle P \rceil$ s and $\lceil \alpha \rceil \neg P \rceil$ s are not both inhabited.

Conclusion

