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Focus on software
(but some information on systems, architectures and networks in 3)
Certification

• Negotiation between industrial company and certification authorities all along the development
  • EASA Europe
  • FAA USA
• For each aircraft
• Based on existing certification standards
• With negotiated specificities (Certification Review Item)
Aeronautic safety standards

Airworthiness Regulation Requirements
- FAR CS 25.1309: « Equipment, Systems and Installation »
- AC AMC 25.1309: « System, Design and Analysis »

Safety Assessment Process Guidelines & Methods
(ARP 4761 / ED - 135)

Function, Failure System Design Information Information

Aircraft & System Development Processes
(ARP 4754 / ED - 79)

Guidelines for Integrated Modular Avionics
(DO - 297 / ED - 124)

Electronic Hardware Development Life Cycle
(DO - 254 / ED - 80)

Software Development Life Cycle
(DO - 178 B / ED - 12 B)

Development Phase

Safety Assessment of Aircraft in Commercial Service
(ARP 5150 / 5151)

Functional System

Operation

In-Service / Operational Phase

Intended Aircraft Function

Law
Relationships ARP 4754 / DO-178B

Software development assurance level is defined with respect to the criticality level of the system in which the software is included, to the potential consequences of the failure of this system.

Certification objectives for software are then defined for each DAL by ED-12/DO-178.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Failure condition</th>
<th>DAL (development assurance level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAT ((10^{-9}))</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ ((10^{-7}))</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ ((10^{-5}))</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No safety effect</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DO-178B
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Introduction

SOFTWARE CONSIDERATIONS IN AIRBORNE SYSTEMS AND EQUIPMENT CERTIFICATION

RTCA

DOCUMENT NO. RTCA/DO-178B

December 1, 1992

Prepared by: SC-167

"Requirements and Technical Concepts for Aviation"
Software development processes

- **System Requirements**
  - High-Level Requirements
    - Software Architecture
      - Low-Level Requirements
        - Source Code
          - Executable Object Code

Software requirement process
Software design process
Software coding process
Software integration process
Software verification process objectives

Compliance: with requirements
Conformance: with standards

A-3.2 Accuracy & Consistency
A-3.3 HW Compatibility
A-3.4 Verifiability
A-3.5 Conformance
A-3.7 Algorithm Accuracy

A-4.8 Architecture Compatibility
A-4.9 Consistency
A-4.10 HW Compatibility
A-4.11 Verifiability
A-4.12 Conformance
A-4.13 Partition Integrity

A-5.2 Compliance
A-5.3 Verifiability
A-5.4 Conformance
A-5.6 Accuracy & Consistency

A-5.7 Complete & Correct

A-6.1 Compliance
A-6.2 Robustness
A-6.3 Compliance
A-6.4 Robustness
A-6.5 Compatible With Target

A7 Verification of verification (Functional & Structural coverage)
Verification process objectives level A

A-3.2 Accuracy & Consistency
A-3.3 HW Compatibility
A-3.4 Verifiability
A-3.5 Conformance
A-3.7 Algorithm Accuracy

A-4.8 Architecture Compatibility
A-4.9 Consistency
A-4.10 HW Compatibility
A-4.11 Verifiability
A-4.12 Conformance
A-4.13 Partition Integrity

A-5.2 Compliance
A-5.3 Verifiability
A-5.4 Conformance
A-5.6 Accuracy & Consistency

A-5.7 Complete & Correct
A-6.1 Compliance
A-6.2 Robustness
A-6.3 Compliance
A-6.4 Robustness
A-6.5 Compatible With Target

A-7 Verification of verification
(Functional & Structural coverage)
Software verification process : level B

- Compliance: with requirements
- Conformance: with standards
- With independence

**System Requirements**
(A-2: 1, 2)

- A-3.1 Compliance
- A-3.6 Traceability

**High-Level Requirements**  
(A-2: 3, 4, 5)

- A-4.1 Compliance
- A-4.6 Traceability

**Software Architecture**

- A-4.2 Accuracy & Consistency
- A-4.3 HW Compatibility
- A-4.4 Verifiability
- A-4.5 Conformance
- A-4.7 Algorithm Accuracy

**Low-Level Requirements**

- A-5.1 Compliance
- A-5.5 Traceability

**Source Code**

- A-5.2 Compliance
- A-5.3 Verifiability
- A-5.4 Conformance
- A-5.6 Accuracy & Consistency

**Executable Object Code**

- A-5.7 Complete & Correct

- A-6.1 Compliance
- A-6.2 Robustness
- A-6.3 Compliance
- A-6.4 Robustness
- A-6.5 Compatible With Target

A7 Verification of verification (Functional & Structural coverage)
Software verification process: level C

- A-3.2 Accuracy & Consistency
- A-3.3 HW Compatibility
- A-3.4 Verifiability
- A-3.5 Conformance
- A-3.7 Algorithm Accuracy

- A-4.8 Architecture Compatibility
- A-4.9 Consistency
- A-4.10 HW Compatibility
- A-4.11 Verifiability
- A-4.12 Conformance
- A-4.13 Partition Integrity

- A-5.2 Compliance
- A-5.3 Verifiability
- A-5.4 Conformance
- A-5.6 Accuracy & Consistency

- A-6.1 Compliance
- A-6.2 Robustness
- A-6.3 Compliance
- A-6.4 Robustness
- A-6.5 Compatible With Target

- Compliance: with requirements
  Conformance: with standards
  With independence
  Not required

A7 Verification of verification
(Functional & Structural coverage)
Software verification process: level D

A-3.2 Accuracy & Consistency
A-3.3 HW Compatibility
A-3.4 Verifiability
A-3.5 Conformance
A-3.7 Algorithm Accuracy

A-4.8 Architecture Compatibility
A-4.9 Consistency
A-4.10 HW Compatibility
A-4.11 Verifiability
A-4.12 Conformance
A-4.13 Partition Integrity

A-5.2 Compliance
A-5.3 Verifiability
A-5.4 Conformance
A-5.6 Accuracy & Consistency

A-6.1 Compliance
A-6.2 Robustness
A-6.3 Compliance
A-6.4 Robustness
A-6.5 Compatible With Target

A7 Verification of verification (Functional & Structural coverage)

Compliance: with requirements
Conformance: with standards
With independence
Not required
Software verification process activities

• Reviews: qualitative assessment of correctness
• Analyses: repeatable assessment of correctness

6.3 Software reviews and analyses
   6.3.1 Reviews and analyses of the HLR
   6.3.2 Reviews and analyses of the LLR
   6.3.3 Reviews and analyses of the software architecture
   6.3.4 Reviews and analyses of the source code
   6.3.5 Reviews and analyses of the outputs of the integration process
   6.3.6 Reviews and analyses of the test cases, procedures and results
Software verification process activities

A-3.2 Accuracy & Consistency
A-3.3 HW Compatibility
A-3.4 Verifiability
A-3.5 Conformance
A-3.7 Algorithm Accuracy

A-4.8 Architecture Compatibility
A-4.9 Consistency
A-4.10 HW Compatibility
A-4.11 Verifiability
A-4.12 Conformance
A-4.13 Partition Integrity

A-5.2 Compliance
A-5.3 Verifiability
A-5.4 Conformance
A-5.6 Accuracy & Consistency
A-5.7 Complete & Correct

A-3.1 Compliance
A-3.6 Traceability

A-4.1 Compliance
A-4.6 Traceability

A-4.2 Accuracy & Consistency
A-4.3 HW Compatibility
A-4.4 Verifiability
A-4.5 Conformance
A-4.7 Algorithm Accuracy

A-5.1 Compliance
A-5.5 Traceability
Software verification process activities

- Reviews: qualitative assessment of correctness
- Analyses: repeatable assessment of correctness

- Test
  6.4 Software testing process
    6.4.1 Test environment
    6.4.2 Requirements-based test case selection
    6.4.3 Requirements-based testing method
    6.4.4 Test coverage analysis
Software verification process activities

Compliance: with requirements
Conformance: with standards

A-3.2 Accuracy & Consistency
A-3.3 HW Compatibility
A-3.4 Verifiability
A-3.5 Conformance
A-3.7 Algorithm Accuracy

A-4.8 Architecture Compatibility
A-4.9 Consistency
A-4.10 HW Compatibility
A-4.11 Verifiability
A-4.12 Conformance
A-4.13 Partition Integrity

A-5.2 Compliance
A-5.3 Verifiability
A-5.4 Conformance
A-5.6 Accuracy & Consistency

A-5.7 Complete & Correct

A-6.1 Compliance
A-6.2 Robustness
A-6.3 Compliance
A-6.4 Robustness
A-6.5 Compatible With Target

A-3.1 Compliance
A-3.6 Traceability

A-4.1 Compliance
A-4.6 Traceability

A-5.1 Compliance
A-5.5 Traceability

A-4.2 Accuracy & Consistency
A-4.3 HW Compatibility
A-4.4 Verifiability
A-4.5 Conformance
A-4.7 Algorithm Accuracy

A-2: 1, 2
A-2: 3, 4, 5
A-2: 6
A-2: 7
Test

Functional test only

Coverage analysis
- functional
- structural
Coverage

• Nominal and robustness test cases

• Functional coverage
  • At least one test case for each requirement (HLR and LLR)

• Structural coverage
  • Coverage criteria depending on DAL
    • MC/DC coverage level A
    • Decision coverage level B
    • Statement coverage level C
  • Dead code must be removed
DO-178C

- RTCA SC-205 / EUROCAE WG-71
  - 2005-2011
  - Industrials, certification authorities, tool vendors, experts
  - Consensus

- Outcome
  - Core document DO-178C
  - New document : DO-330 Tool qualification
  - Technical supplements
    - Model Based Development DO-331
    - Object-Oriented technologies DO-332
    - Formal Methods DO-333
Enables the use of formal methods in replacement of traditional verification techniques

- Provides a guide for the use of formal methods
  - Modify existing objectives
  - Define new objectives
  - Describe activities
  - Define conditions for their use
- Provides information on formal methods
- Identifies and presents their characteristics
A model is an abstract representation of a given set of aspects of a system that is used for analysis, simulation, code generation, or any combination thereof.

A formal model is a model defined using a *formal notation*.

A *formal notation* is a notation having a precise, unambiguous, mathematically defined syntax and semantics.
DO-333: Definition of formal methods

The use of mathematical reasoning to guarantee that properties are always satisfied by a *formal model*.

*Soundness* is required for an analysis to be considered formal.
FM 6.3: Software reviews and analyses

When HLR are formally expressed
Formal analysis can be used
FM 6.3: Software reviews and analyses

- Accuracy & Consistency
- HW Compatibility
- Verifiability
- Conformance
- Algorithm Accuracy

- Architecture Compatibility
- Consistency
- HW Compatibility
- Verifiability
- Conformance
- Partition Integrity

- Compliance
- Verifiability
- Conformance
- Accuracy & Consistency

- When HLR and LLR are formally expressed, formal analysis can be used.

- System Requirements

- Formal HLR
  - Compliance
  - Traceability

- Formal LLR
  - Compliance
  - Traceability

- Software Architecture
  - Compliance
  - Traceability

- Source Code
  - Compliance
  - Traceability

- Executable
  - Object Code
  - Complete & Correct

- Compatible With Target

- Accuracy & Consistency
- HW Compatibility
- Verifiability
- Conformance
- Algorithm Accuracy

- Compliance
- Robustness
When LLR are formally expressed with property preservation between source code and EOC, then formal analysis can be used to replace some tests.
Properties might be proved directly on EOC: WCET, Stack usage, …
Formal Analysis might replace:
- Review and analysis objectives
- Conformance tests versus HLR & LLR
- Robustness tests

Formal Analysis might help for verification of compatibility with the hardware

Formal Analysis cannot replace HW/SW integration tests

Therefore testing will always be required.
FM 6.7.1 Principle of coverage analysis when using formal methods

• Test
  • Requirements-based coverage analysis
  • Structural coverage analysis

• Formal methods: the structural coverage objectives may be replaced by
  • Complete coverage of each requirement (6.7.1.2)
  • Completeness of the set of requirements (6.7.1.3)
  • Detection of unintended dataflow relationships (6.7.1.4)
  • Detection of extraneous code including dead code and deactivated code (6.7.1.5)
FM 6.7.1 Principle of coverage analysis when using formal methods

- Structural coverage analysis aims at detecting:
  - Shortcomings in requirements-based verification cases or procedures: 6.7.1.2
  - Inadequacies in software requirements: 6.7.1.3 + 6.7.1.4
  - Extraneous code, including dead code, and deactivated code: 6.7.1.5

- Intuitively
  - FM ensure exhaustive coverage for a given requirement
  - To ensure complete coverage of the code, it remains to show that the set of requirements is complete wrt to the considered function
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Industrial practice: MBD

Model based development

- Aircraft level:
  - Aircraft high level requirements
  - High level requirements
  - Detailed requirements
  - Scade design
  - Partial automatic code generation
  - Partial manual Coding
  - Integration testing
- System level:
  - Model tests
  - Lab tests
- Equipment level:
  - Aircraft level simulation
  - Flight tests
  - Ground tests
  - Unit testing and Formal verification
Industrial practice: FM

- Models (Simulink, Scade)
  - Model checking
    - No certification credit yet
    - Better model earlier
- Source code (C, ada)
  - Proof of functional properties
    - DO-178 level A
- Model/code
  - Robustness analysis of models using static analysis on source code
- EOC
  - Abstract interpretation for stack analysis, wcet, absence of run-time errors
    - DO-178 level A, B, C
Airbus example

- Experimenting model checking on Scade model
- Absint Frama-C for DO-178 level A
• Frama-C frama-c.com
  • Extensible and collaborative platform
  • Dedicated to source-code analysis of C software
  • Connected to Z3, CVC3, Yices, Alt-Ergo, Coq, …

• Absint www.absint.com
  • Abstract interpretation based tools
  • Stack analysis
  • Wcet computation
  • Absence of run-time errors

• Tools have to be qualified (DO-330)
Industrial practice of formal methods

- 5 criteria defined by Airbus for the use of formal methods
  - Soundness
  - Cost Savings
  - Analysis of unaltered programs
  - Usability by normal software engineers on normal machines
  - Ability to be integrated into the DO-178B conforming process
• Testing or Formal Verification: DO-178C Alternatives and Industrial Experience
  Yannick Moy, Emmanuel Ledinot, Hervé Delseny, Virginie Wiels, Benjamin Monate
  IEEE Software, 2013

• Formal verification of avionics software products
  Jean Souyris, Virginie Wiels, David Delmas, Hervé Delseny
  FM 2009

• Model checking flight control systems: the Airbus experience
  Thomas Bochot, Pierre Virelizier, Hélène Waeselynck and Virginie Wiels
  ICSE 2009

• www.onera.fr/staff/virginie-wiels
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Formal safety assessment

- Formal models (Altarica)
- Evaluation
  - Elementary causes of a failure
  - Probability of failure
- Synthesis (solvers)
  - Independence relations
  - DAL allocation
    (Development Assurance Level)
- Industrial applications
  - Dassault (Falcon 7X)
  - Airbus
  - Astrium
- PoC: Pierre.Bieber@onera.fr
**Architecture exploration**

- **Synthesis of correct solutions**
  - From a set of constraints
  - Multi-viewpoints (Safety, Real Time, …)

- **Design choices exploration/ dimensioning**
  - Applied to allocation of functions on architectures

**PoC:** David.Doose@onera.fr
Real Time assessment

- **Worst Case Traversal Time**
  - Commuted networks (AFDX…)
  - Network calculus
  - Tool developed with RTaW
  - PoC: Marc.Boyer @ onera.fr

- **Worst Case Response Time**
  - Includes functional level
  - Constraint solving
  - PoC: Frederic.Boniol@onera.fr

- **Worst Case Execution Time**
  - Probabilistic methods
  - PoC: Luca.Santinelli@onera.fr
Multi/Many-core architectures

- Multi-many
  - Demonstration of determinism?
- Scheduling
  - Schedulability analysis
  - Off-line scheduling synthesis
- Code generation
  - Multi-threaded
- PoC: Eric.Noulard@onera.fr, Claire.Pagetti@onera.fr

Texas 8 cores  Freescale 8 cores  Tilera 32 cores  Kalray 256 cores
Cooperation of formal techniques

- Verification framework at model level (Lustre)
  - K-induction, backward analysis, invariant generation, AI
  - In collaboration with Rockwell-Collins
- Poc: Remi.Delmas@onera.fr
Software verification: model/code

- Formal proof of compliance of C code wrt UML state machine model (using Frama-C)
- PoC: Thomas.Polacsek@onera.fr
End-to-end verification of control-command systems

- Stability properties of control-command systems
  - Embedding properties all along the development
  - In collaboration with Georgia Tech, NASA, Iowa University
- PoC: Pierre-Loic.Garoche@onera.fr
Dynamic analysis and combination with test

- Formal verification of temporal properties on execution traces
  - Avionics software (Airbus)
  - Static analysis for the generation of observation points
  - Efficient verification (Büchi) for long traces
- Long-term objective
  - Finely combine static analysis, dynamic analysis and test

- PoC: Virginie.Wiels@onera.fr
Support to certification

- Software
  - Application of DO-333 (FM) and DO-331 (MBDV)
- Tools
  - Certification of FM tools
- IMA (Integrated Modular Architectures)
  - Support to certification authorities
  - Incremental certification
- ARP 4754
  - DAL allocation
- Multi/Manycore
  - Identification of specific issues for certification