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Abstract

This paper is related to the generalised/generic version of the SysML/KAOS domain metamodel and on translation rules between the new domain models and B System specifications.
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1. Background

1.1. Event-B and B System

Event-B [1] is an industrial-strength formal method for system modeling. It is used to incrementally construct a system specification, using refinement, and to prove useful properties. B System is an Event-B syntactic variant proposed by ClearSy, an industrial partner in the FORMOSE project [2], and supported by Atelier B [3]. Event-B and B System have the same semantics defined by proof obligations [1].

Figure 1 is a metamodel of the B System language restricted to concepts that are relevant to us. A B System specification consists of components (instances of Component). Each component can be either a system or a refinement and it may define static or dynamic elements. A refinement is a component which refines another one in order to access the elements defined in it and to reuse them for new constructions. Constants, abstract and enumerated sets, and their properties, constitute the static part. The dynamic part includes the representation of the system state using variables constrained through invariants and initialised through initialisation actions. Properties and invariants can be categorised as instances of LogicFormula. Variables can be involved only in invariants. In our case, it is sufficient to consider that logic formulas are successions of operands in relation through operators. Thus, an instance of LogicFormula references its operators (instances of Operator) and its operands that may be instances of Variable, Constant, Set or SetItem.

1.2. SysML/KAOS Goal Modeling

1.2.1. Presentation

SysML/KAOS [4,5] is a requirements engineering method which combines the traceability provided by SysML [6] with goal expressiveness provided by KAOS [7]. It allows the representation of requirements to be satisfied by a system and of expectations with regards to the environment through a hierarchy of goals. The goal hierarchy is built through a succession of refinements using two main operators: AND and OR. An AND refinement decomposes a goal into subgoals, and all of them must be achieved to realise the parent goal. An OR refinement decomposes a goal into subgoals such that the achievement of only one of them is sufficient for the achievement of the parent goal.
For this work, the case study focuses on a communication protocol called SATURN proposed by ClearSy. SATURN relies on exchanges of communication frames between different agents connected through a bus. This case study is restricted to input/output agents. Input agents provide boolean data. Each input data undergoes a boolean transformation and the result is made available to output agents.
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Figure 1: Metamodel of the B System specification language

Figure 2 is an excerpt from the SysML/KAOS goal diagram representing the functional goals of SATURN. The main purpose of the system is to transform data provided by input agents (in) and make the result (out=FB(in)) available to output agents.
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Figure 2: Excerpt from SATURN system goal diagram
output agents. The purpose gives the root goal *Saturn* of the goal diagram of Fig[2] However, goal *Saturn* disregards input reads and result writes. The AND operator is used just after to introduce, at the first refinement level, a goal *Put* for input data acquisition from input agents. Term \( \text{in}_{-r} \) designates the data available within input agents and term \( \text{in}_{-l} \) designates the input data used to compute the output data. Similarly, the second refinement level introduces a goal *Put* to make the result \( \text{out}_{-l} \) available to output agents (\( \text{out}_{-r} \) represents the data received by output agents). The third refinement level refines goals defined within the second refinement level to take into account multiplicities of input and output agents. Thus, input data acquisition generates a boolean array \( s_{\text{in}_{-l}} \) instead of \( \text{in}_{-l} \), computation becomes a transformation between arrays \( s_{\text{out}_{-l}} = \text{VFB}(s_{\text{in}_{-l}}) \) and result delivery transfers the content of array \( s_{\text{out}_{-l}} \) to output agents.

In addition, *SysML/KAOS* includes a domain modeling language which combines the expressiveness of *OWL* [8] and the constraints of *PLIB* [9].

### 1.3. SysML/KAOS Domain Modeling

#### 1.3.1. Presentation

Domain models in SysML/KAOS are represented using ontologies. These ontologies are expressed using the SysML/KAOS domain modeling language [10] [11], built based on *OWL* [8] and *PLIB* [9], two well-known and complementary ontology modeling formalisms.

Figure 3 is an excerpt from the metamodel associated with the SysML/KAOS domain modeling language. Each domain model is associated with a level of refinement of the SysML/KAOS goal diagram and is likely to have as its parent, through the *parent* association, another domain model. *Concepts* (instances of *Concept*) designate collections of *individuals* (instances of *Individual*) with common properties. A concept can be declared *variable* (*isVariable=True*) when the set of its individuals can be updated by adding or deleting individuals. Otherwise, it is considered to be *constant* (*isVariable=False*).

*Relations* (instances of *Relation*) are used to capture links between concepts, and *attributes* (instances of *Attribute*) capture links between concepts and *data sets* (instances of *DataSet*). *Relation maplets* (instances of *RelationMaplet*) capture associations between individuals through relations and *attribute maplets* (instances of *AttributeMaplet*) play the same role for attributes. A relation or an attribute can be declared *variable* if the list of maplets related to it is likely to change over time. Otherwise, it is considered to be *constant*. The variability of an association (relation, attribute) is related to the ability to add or remove maplets. Each *domain cardinality* (instance of *DomainCardinality*) makes it
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possible to define, for a relation \( r \), the minimum and maximum limits of the number of individuals of the domain of \( r \) that can be put in relation with one individual of the range of \( r \). In addition, the range cardinality (instance of RangeCardinality) of \( r \) is used to define similar bounds for the number of individuals of the range of \( r \).

*Predicates* (instances of Predicate) are used to represent constraints between different elements of the domain model in the form of *horn clauses*: each predicate has a body which represents its *antecedent* and a head which represents its *consequent*, body and head designating conjunctions of atoms. A data set can be declared abstractly, as a *custom data set* (instance of CustomDataSet), and defined with a predicate. *Gluing invariants* (instances of GluingInvariant), specialisations of predicates, are used to represent links between data defined within a domain model and those appearing in more abstract domain models, transitively linked to it through the *parent* association. They capture relationships between abstract and concrete data during refinement and are used to discharge proof obligations.

1.3.2. Illustration and Shortcomings

![Diagram](image)

Figure 4: *Saturn_1*: ontology associated with the root level of the goal diagram of Fig. 2

Figure 4 is an attempt to represent the domain model associated with the root level of the goal diagram of Fig. 2 using the SysML/KAOS domain modeling language previously described. It is illustrated using the syntax proposed by OWL-Gred [12] and, for readability purposes, we have decided to hide the representation of optional characteristics. It should be noted that the individualOf association is illustrated, through OWL-Gred, as a stereotyped link with the tag «instanceOf».

The type of input data is modeled as a concept \( T_{IN} \) defining an individual \( in \) which represents the input data. Similarly, the type of output data is modeled as a concept \( T_{OUT} \) defining an individual \( out \) which represents the output data. The computation function \( FB \) is modeled as a functional relation from \( T_{IN} \) to \( T_{OUT} \).

The first difficulty we encountered is related to the changeability of domain entities. In fact, the states of input and output data change dynamically. In domain model of Fig. 4 a workaround consisted in considering that concepts \( T_{IN} \) and \( T_{OUT} \) and relation \( FB \) are variables. Thus, going from a system state where \( out1 = FB(in1) \) to a system state where \( out2 = FB(in2) \) is feasible and goes through: (1) withdrawal of maplet \( in1 \mapsto out1 \) from \( FB \); (2) withdrawal of individual \( in1 \) from \( T_{IN} \); (3) withdrawal of individual \( out1 \) from \( T_{OUT} \); (4) addition of individual \( in2 \) in \( T_{IN} \); (5) addition of individual \( out2 \) in \( T_{OUT} \); and (6) addition of maplet \( in2 \mapsto out2 \) in \( FB \). However, this representation does not conform to SATURN’s design. Indeed, from a conceptual point of view: (1) the input data type must be constant (corresponds to the set of \( n \)-tuples of Booleans \( 1 \)); (2) the output data type must be constant (corresponds to the set of \( m \)-tuples of Booleans \( 2 \)); (3) the computation function \( FB \) is hard-coded and is therefore constant. What should change are individuals representing the input and output data. It is thus necessary to be able to model variable individuals: individual which can dynamically take any value in a given concept. A similar need appears for relations with relation maplets, attributes with attribute maplets and data sets with data values.

Another difficulty has been encountered related to multiplicities of input and output agents (domain model associated with the third refinement level of the goal diagram of Fig. 2). Indeed, the array that represents input data needs to be modeled by a relation, ditto for the array that represents output data. Thus, the computation function needs to be

---

1. When considering \( n \) input agents
2. When considering \( m \) output agents
modeled by a relation for which the domain and the range are relations, which is impossible with the current definition of the SysML/KAOS domain modeling language.

The SATURN case study also revealed the need to be able to:

• define domain and range cardinalities for attributes;
• define a named maplet (instance of RelationMaplet or AttributeMaplet) with or without antecedent and image;
• define an initial value for a variable individual, maplet or data value;
• define associations between data sets and maplets between data values;
• refine a concept with an association or a data set;
• refine an individual with a maplet or a data value.

We have therefore identified the need to build a generalisation of the metamodel of Fig. 3 which enriches the expressiveness of the SysML/KAOS domain modeling language while preserving the fundamental constraints identified in [10, 11]. A major contribution of this new metamodel is that it federates notions of concept, data set, attribute and relation as well as notions of individual, maplet and data value that have always been considered distinct by ontology modeling languages. Additional constraints are defined to preserve the formal semantics of the language and to ensure unambiguous transformation of any domain model to a B System specification.

2. The New SysML/KAOS Domain Modeling Language

2.1. Presentation

Figure 5 is an excerpt from the updated SysML/KAOS domain metamodel.

2.1.1. Description

Domain models are also associated with levels of refinement of the SysML/KAOS goal model. Concepts (instances of Concept) designate collections of individuals (instances of Individual) with common properties. A concept can be declared variable (isVariable=True) when the set of its individuals can be updated by adding or deleting individuals. Otherwise, it is considered to be constant (isVariable=False). In addition, a concept can be an enumeration (isEnumeration=True) if all its individuals are defined within the domain model. It should be noted that an individual can be variable (isVariable=True) if it is introduced to represent a system state variable: it can represent different individuals at different system states. Otherwise, it is constant (isVariable=False).

Associations (instances of Association) are concepts used to capture links between concepts. Maplet individuals (instances of MapletIndividual) capture associations between individuals through associations. Each named maplet individual can reference an antecedent and an image. When the maplet individual is unnamed, the antecedent and the image must be specified. The variability of an association is related to the ability to add or remove maplets. Each domain cardinality (instance of DomainCardinality) makes it possible to define, for an association re, the minimum and maximum limits of the number of individuals of the domain of re that can be put in relation with one individual of the range of re. In addition, the range cardinality (instance of RangeCardinality) of re is used to define similar bounds for the number of individuals of the range of re.

Class LogicalFormula replaces class Predicate of the metamodel of Fig. 3 to represent constraints between domain model elements.

2.1.2. Additional Constraints

This section defines the constraints that are required to preserve the formal semantics of the domain modeling language and to ensure an unambiguous transformation of any domain model to a B System specification. The constraints are defined using the B syntax [1].

• \( x \in \text{Concept} \setminus \text{Association} \Rightarrow \text{Individual}_{-}\text{individualOfConcept}[x] \cap \text{MapletIndividual} = \emptyset \): if concept \( x \) is not an association, then no individual of \( x \) can be a maplet individual.

---

3 An entity \( ec \), defined in a concrete domain model, refines the entity \( ea \), defined in an abstract domain model, if it can be deduced that \( ec = ea \) from domain model definitions.
Figure 5: Excerpt from the updated SysML/KAOS domain metamodel

- \( x \in \text{MapletIndividual} \cap \text{dom}(\text{MapletIndividual\_antecedent\_Individual}) \) 
  \( \Rightarrow \) \( \text{MapletIndividual\_antecedent\_Individual}(x) \in \text{Association\_domain\_Concept}(\text{Individual\_individualOf\_Concept}(x)) \): if maplet individual \( x \) has an antecedent, then the antecedent is an individual of the domain of its association.

- \( x \in \text{MapletIndividual} \cap \text{dom}(\text{MapletIndividual\_image\_Individual}) \) 
  \( \Rightarrow \) \( \text{MapletIndividual\_image\_Individual}(x) \in \text{Association\_range\_Concept}(\text{Individual\_individualOf\_Concept}(x)) \): if maplet individual \( x \) has an image, then the image is an individual of the range of its association.

- \( \text{ind} \in \text{Individual} \setminus \text{MapletIndividual} \Rightarrow \text{ind} \in \text{dom}(\text{Individual\_name}) \): every individual which is not a maplet individual must be named.

- \( \text{ind} \in \text{Individual} \setminus \text{dom}(\text{Individual\_name}) \Rightarrow \text{Individual\_isVariable}(\text{ind}) = \text{FALSE} \): every unnamed individual must be constant.

- \( \text{ind} \in \text{MapletIndividual} \setminus \text{dom}(\text{MapletIndividual\_antecedent\_Individual}) \cap \text{dom}(\text{MapletIndividual\_image\_Individual}) \) 
  \( \Rightarrow \) \( (\text{MapletIndividual\_antecedent\_Individual}(\text{ind}) \in \text{dom}(\text{Individual\_name}) \cup \text{MapletIndividual\_image\_Individual}(\text{ind}) \in \text{dom}(\text{Individual\_name})) \): antecedents and images of maplet individuals must be named.

- \( \text{ind} \in \text{MapletIndividual} \setminus \text{dom}(\text{Individual\_name}) \) 
  \( \Rightarrow \) \( \text{ind} \in \text{dom}(\text{MapletIndividual\_antecedent\_Individual}) \cap \text{dom}(\text{MapletIndividual\_image\_Individual}) \): every unnamed maplet individual must have an antecedent and an image.
• \( x \in \text{Concept} \setminus (\text{Association} \cup \text{DefinedConcept} \cup \text{dom}(\text{Concept_parent_Concept})) \Rightarrow \text{Concept_isVariable}(x) = \text{FALSE} \): every abstract concept (that has no parent concept) that is not an association must be constant.

• \( x \in \text{Concept} \land \text{Concept_isEnumeration}(x) = \text{TRUE} \Rightarrow \text{Concept_isVariable}(x) = \text{FALSE} \): every concept that is an enumeration must be constant.

• \((\text{ind} \in \text{MapletIndividual} \setminus \text{dom}(\text{MapletIndividual_antecedent_Individual}) \setminus \text{dom}(\text{MapletIndividual_image_Individual}) \land \text{Individual_isVariable}(\text{ind}) = \text{FALSE}) \Rightarrow (\text{Individual_isVariable}(\text{MapletIndividual_antecedent_Individual}(\text{ind})) = \text{FALSE} \land \text{Individual_isVariable}(\text{MapletIndividual_image_Individual}(\text{ind})) = \text{FALSE})\): antecedents and images of constant maplet individuals must be constant.

• \((x \in \text{Association} \land \text{Concept_isVariable}(x) = \text{FALSE}) \Rightarrow (\text{Concept_isVariable}(\text{Association_domain_Concept}(x)) = \text{FALSE} \land \text{Concept_isVariable}(\text{Association_range_Concept}(x)) = \text{FALSE})\): domains and ranges of constant associations must be constant.

2.2. Illustration

Figure 6: \textbf{Saturn}_1: ontology associated with the root level of the goal diagram of Fig. 2

Figures\textsuperscript{6, 7, 8, 9} represent domain models associated with refinement levels 0 (root level) .. 3 of the goal diagram of Fig. 2 using the updated SysML/KAOS domain modeling language. They are illustrated using the syntax proposed by the SysML/KAOS Domain Modeling tool\textsuperscript{13} and, for readability purposes, we have decided to hide the representation of optional characteristics.

\textsuperscript{4}The tool has been implemented on top of JetBrains MPS\textsuperscript{14} and PlantUML\textsuperscript{15} to provide a proof of concept of the SysML/KAOS Domain Modeling Language.
In domain model Saturn_1 (Fig. 6), the type of input data is modeled as a constant concept $T_{IN}$ (instance of class Concept of Fig. 5) defining a variable individual $\text{in}$ (instance of class Individual of Fig. 5) which represents the input data. Similarly, the type of output data is modeled as a constant concept $T_{OUT}$ defining a variable individual $\text{out}$ which represents the output data. Finally, the computation function $FB$ is modeled as a functional association (instance of class Association of Fig. 5) from $T_{IN}$ to $T_{OUT}$. Constant individuals $\text{in}0$ and $\text{out}0$ represent respectively the initial value of $\text{in}$ and that of $\text{out}$.

In domain model Saturn_2 (Fig. 7) which refines Saturn_1, individual $\text{in}$ is refined by an individual named $\text{in}_l (in_l = in)$ and a new variable individual named $\text{in}_r$ is defined to represent the acquired input data. Similarly, in domain model Saturn_3 (domain model associated with refinement level 2 of the goal diagram of Fig. 2), $\text{out}$ is
refined by \textit{out\_l} (\textit{out\_l} = \textit{out}) and individual \textit{out\_r} is added.

In domain model \textit{Saturn\_4} (Fig. 9) which refines \textit{Saturn\_3}, two concepts are defined: \textit{MI} which represents the set of input agents and \textit{MO} which represents the set of output agents. Concept \textit{agents\_in} (respectively \textit{agents\_out}) is a subconcept of \textit{MI} (respectively \textit{MO}) which represents the set of input (respectively output) agents that are active. Concept \textit{VIN}, defined as the set of total functions from \textit{agents\_in} to \text{BOOL} (\text{VIN} = \textit{agents\_in} \rightarrow \text{BOOL}) where \text{BOOL} = \{TRUE, FALSE\}, represents the type of input data which are now arrays. Similarly, concept \textit{VOUT} (\text{VOUT} = \textit{agents\_out} \rightarrow \text{BOOL}) represents the type of output data. Individuals \textit{in\_l}, \textit{in\_r}, \textit{out\_l} and \textit{out\_r} are refined respectively by individuals \textit{s\_in\_l}, \textit{s\_in\_r}, \textit{s\_out\_l} and \textit{s\_out\_r} using total injective associations \textit{vec\_to\_in} from \textit{VIN} to \text{T\_IN} and \textit{vec\_to\_out} from \textit{VOUT} to \text{T\_OUT}: \textit{in\_l} = \textit{vec\_to\_in}(\textit{s\_in\_l}), \textit{in\_r} = \textit{vec\_to\_in}(\textit{s\_in\_r}), \textit{out\_l} = \textit{vec\_to\_out}(\textit{s\_out\_l}), \textit{out\_r} = \textit{vec\_to\_out}(\textit{s\_out\_r}). Finally, the computation function is modeled as a functional association named \textit{VBF} from \textit{VIN} to \textit{VOUT}: \textit{VBF} = \textit{vec\_to\_in}; \textit{FB}; \textit{vec\_to\_out}⁻¹ (operator ; is the association composition operator used in logical formula assertions).

3. Updates in Translation Rules from Domain Models to B System Specifications

In the following, we describe a set of rules that allow to obtain a \textit{B System} specification from domain models that conform to the updated SysML/KAOS domain modeling language.

Table I gives the translation rules. It should be noted that \textit{o\_x} designates the result of the translation of \textit{x}. In addition, when used, qualifier \textit{abstract} denotes "without parent". The rules have been implemented within the \textit{SysML/KAOS Domain Modeling tool} [13] built on top of \textit{Jetbrains MPS} [14] and \textit{PlantUML} [15] to provide a proof of concept of the SysML/KAOS Domain Modeling Language. Rules 3, 4, 6..8, and 12..16 have undergone significant updates to the previously defined translation rules [16].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: The translation rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain Model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation Of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Abstract domain model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Domain model with parent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3    | Abstract concept that is not an enumeration | $CO \in \text{Concept} \setminus \text{(Association } \cup \text{DefinedConcept } \cup \text{DefaultDataType)}$  
$CO \not= \text{dom(Concept\_parent\_Concept)}$  
$\text{Concept\_isEnumeration}(CO) = \text{FALSE}$ | o_CO  
$o_CO \in \text{AbstractSet}$ |
| 4    | Abstract concept that is an enumeration | $CO \in \text{Concept} \setminus \text{(Association } \cup \text{DefinedConcept } \cup \text{DefaultDataType)}$  
$CO \not= \text{dom(Concept\_parent\_Concept)}$  
$\text{Concept\_isEnumeration}(CO) = \text{TRUE}$  
$\forall j \in 1..n, \text{Concept\_individual\_of\_Concept\_variable}(I_j) = \text{CO}$  
$\forall j \in 1..n, \text{Concept\_individual\_of\_Concept\_variable}(I_j) = \text{FALSE}$ | o_CO  
$(o_I)_{j \in 1..n}$  
{o_CO \in \text{EnumeratedSet}}  
$\forall j \in 1..n, \text{Concept\_individual\_of\_Concept\_variable}(I_j) = \text{CO}$  
$\forall j \in 1..n, \text{Concept\_individual\_of\_Concept\_variable}(I_j) = \text{FALSE}$  
$\text{SetItem}_{\text{Of\_EnumeratedSet}}(o_I) = o_CO$ |
| 5    | Concept with constant parent | CO  
$\text{PCO} \subseteq \text{Concept}$  
$\text{Concept\_parent\_Concept}(CO) = \text{PCO}$  
$o\_\text{PCO} \in \text{Set} \cup \text{Constant}$ | o_CO  
$\text{IF Concept\_isVariable}(CO) = \text{FALSE}$  
$\text{THEN } o\_CO \in \text{Constant}$  
$\text{ELSE } o\_CO \in \text{Variable}$  
$\text{LogicFormula: } o\_CO \subseteq o\_\text{PCO}$ |
| 6    | Constant concept with variable parent | CO  
$\text{PCO} \subseteq \text{Concept}$  
$\text{Concept\_isVariable}(CO) = \text{FALSE}$  
$\text{Concept\_parent\_Concept}(CO) = \text{PCO}$  
$o\_\text{PCO} \in \text{Variable}$  
$\text{PCO} \subseteq \text{close\_1(Concept\_parent\_Concept)(PCO}]$  
$\text{PCO} \subseteq \text{Set} \cup \text{Constant}$ | o_CO  
$\text{Property: } o\_\text{PCO} \subseteq o\_\text{PCO}$  
$\text{Invariant: } o\_\text{PCO} \subseteq o\_\text{PCO}$ |
| 7    | Variable concept with variable parent | CO  
$\text{PCO} \subseteq \text{Concept}$  
$\text{Concept\_isVariable}(CO) = \text{TRUE}$  
$\text{Concept\_parent\_Concept}(CO) = \text{PCO}$  
$o\_\text{PCO} \in \text{Variable}$ | o_CO  
$\text{Property: } o\_\text{PCO} \subseteq o\_\text{PCO}$  
$\text{Invariant: } o\_\text{PCO} \subseteq o\_\text{PCO}$ |
| 8    | Enumerated concept with parent | CO  
$\text{PCO} \subseteq \text{Concept}$  
$\text{Concept\_isEnumeration}(CO) = \text{TRUE}$  
$\forall j \in 1..n, \text{Concept\_individual\_of\_Concept\_variable}(I_j) = \text{CO}$  
$\forall j \in 1..n, \text{Concept\_individual\_of\_Concept\_variable}(I_j) = \text{FALSE}$  
$\forall j \in 1..n, o\_I \in o\_CO$ | o_CO  
$\text{Property: } o\_\text{PCO} \subseteq o\_\text{PCO}$  
$\text{Invariant: } o\_\text{PCO} \subseteq o\_\text{PCO}$ |
| 9    | Association or defined concept without parent | CO  
$\text{CO} \subseteq \text{Concept}$  
$\text{CO} \not= \text{dom(Concept\_parent\_Concept)}$  
$\text{true}$  
$\text{to\_defined\_with}$  
| o_CO  
$\text{IF Concept\_isVariable}(CO) = \text{FALSE}$  
$\text{THEN } o\_CO \in \text{Constant}$  
$\text{ELSE } o\_CO \in \text{Variable}$ |
| 10   | Association | AS  
$\text{CO1, CO2} \in \text{Concept}$  
$\text{AS} \in \text{Association}$  
$\text{CO1} = \text{Association\_domain\_Concept\_AS}$  
$\text{CO2} = \text{Association\_range\_Concept\_AS}$  
$\text{Association\_DomainCardinality\_minCardinality\_AS} = \text{da}$  
$\text{Association\_DomainCardinality\_maxCardinality\_AS} = \text{di}$  
$\text{Association\_RangeCardinality\_maxCardinality\_AS} = \text{ra}$  
$\text{Association\_RangeCardinality\_minCardinality\_AS} = \text{ri}$  
$\text{AS} \in \text{Constant} \cup \text{Variable}$  
$\{\text{CO1, CO2}\} \subseteq \text{(Set} \cup \text{Constant} \cup \text{Variable)}$ | T_o\_AS  
$\text{IF Concept\_isVariable}(CO1) = \text{FALSE}$  
$\land \text{Concept\_isVariable}(CO2) = \text{FALSE}$  
$\text{THEN } T_o\_AS \in \text{Constant}$  
$\text{ELSE } T_o\_AS \in \text{Variable}$  
$\text{IF } \{r, d_i, d_i\} = \{1\}$  
$\text{THEN LogicFormula: } T_o\_AS = o\_CO1 \rightarrow o\_CO2$  
$\text{ELSE IF } \{r, r_i, d_i\} = \{1\}$  
$\text{THEN LogicFormula: } T_o\_AS = o\_CO1 \rightarrow o\_CO2$  
$\text{ELSE IF } \{r, d_i, d_i\} = \{1\}$  
$\text{THEN LogicFormula: } T_o\_AS = o\_CO1 \rightarrow o\_CO2$  
$\text{ELSE IF } \{r, r_i, d_i\} = \{1\}$  
$\text{THEN LogicFormula: } T_o\_AS = o\_CO1 \rightarrow o\_CO2$  
$\text{ELSE IF } \{r, r_i, d_i\} = \{1\}$  
$\text{THEN LogicFormula: } T_o\_AS = o\_CO1 \rightarrow o\_CO2$  
$\text{ELSE }$  
$\text{LogicFormula: } T_o\_AS = o\_CO1 \rightarrow o\_CO2$  
$\land \text{true}$  
$\land \text{true}$  
$\land \text{true}$  
$\land \text{true}$  
$\land \text{true}$  
$\land \text{true}$  
$\land \text{true}$  
$\text{LogicFormula: } T_o\_AS = o\_AS \in T_o\_AS$ |

---

5. *closure*(Concept\_parent\_Concept) designates the transitive closure of relation Concept\_parent\_Concept

6. Every concrete enumeration is a constant

7. If CO has a parent concept, o_CO must be introduced by rule 5. It is therefore necessary to ensure that this is not the case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule ID</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Logic Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Individual of a constant concept that is not an abstract enumeration</strong>&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$\exists$ Ind CO $\in$ Individual $\land$ MapletIndividual</td>
<td>o_Init</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{Ind} \in$ Individual $\land$ MapletIndividual</td>
<td>$\text{CO} = \text{Individual_individualOf_Concept(Ind)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{CO}} \in$ AbstractSet $\cup$ Constant</td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{Ind}} \in$ Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Constant individual of a variable concept</strong></td>
<td>$\exists$ Ind CO $\in$ Individual $\land$ MapletIndividual</td>
<td>o_Init</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{Ind} \in$ Individual $\land$ MapletIndividual</td>
<td>$\text{Ind_isVariable(Ind)} = \text{FALSE}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{CO} = \text{Individual_individualOf_Concept(Ind)}$</td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{CO}} \in$ Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{PPCO}} \in$ Concept</td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{PPCO}} \in$ (Concept parent Concept)[Concept]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{PPCO} \in$ (closure-{Concept parent Concept})[Concept]</td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{PPCO}} \in$ Set $\cup$ Constant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Variable individual of a variable concept</strong></td>
<td>$\exists$ Ind CO $\in$ Individual $\land$ MapletIndividual</td>
<td>o_Init</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{Ind} \in$ Individual $\land$ MapletIndividual</td>
<td>$\text{Ind_isVariable(Ind)} = \text{TRUE}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{CO} = \text{Individual_individualOf_Concept(Ind)}$</td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{CO}} \in$ Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Variable individual of a concept that is an abstract enumeration</strong></td>
<td>$\exists$ Ind CO $\in$ Individual $\land$ MapletIndividual</td>
<td>o_Init</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{Ind} \in$ Individual $\land$ MapletIndividual</td>
<td>$\text{Ind_isVariable(Ind)} = \text{TRUE}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{CO} = \text{Individual_individualOf_Concept(Ind)}$</td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{CO}} \in$ Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Maplet individual</strong></td>
<td>$\exists$ Ind AS Ant Im PPCO1 PPCO2</td>
<td>o_Init</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{Ind} \in$ MapletIndividual</td>
<td>$\text{AS} = \text{Individual_individualOf_Concept(Ind)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{AS}} \in$ Constant $\cup$ Variable</td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{AS}} \in$ Constant $\cup$ Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{Ind} \in$ dom(MapletIndividual antecedent Individual)</td>
<td>$\Rightarrow \text{Ant} = \text{MapletIndividual antecedent Individual(Ind)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{Ant}} \in$ Constant $\cup$ Variable</td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{Ant}} \in$ Constant $\cup$ Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{Ind} \in$ dom(MapletIndividual image Individual)</td>
<td>$\Rightarrow \text{Im} = \text{MapletIndividual image Individual(Ind)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{Im}} \in$ Constant $\cup$ Variable</td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{Im}} \in$ Constant $\cup$ Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{PPCO1} \cup \text{PPCO2} \subseteq \text{Concept}$</td>
<td>$\text{PPCO1} \subseteq \text{Concept}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{PPCO1} \in$ (closure-{Concept parent Concept})[(Association domain Concept)[AS]]</td>
<td>$\text{PPCO2} \in$ (closure-{Concept parent Concept})[(MapletIndividual range Individual)[AS]]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{o}<em>{\text{PPCO1}}, \text{o}</em>{\text{PPCO2}} \subseteq$ Set $\cup$ Constant</td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{AS}} \in$ Constant $\cup$ Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Variable individual initialisation</strong></td>
<td>$\exists$ Ind Init CO Init_ant Init_im</td>
<td>o_Init</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{Ind} \in$ Individual $\land$ MapletIndividual</td>
<td>$\text{Ind_isVariable(Ind)} = \text{TRUE}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{Ind}} \in$ Variable</td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{Ind}} \in$ Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{CO} = \text{Individual_individualOf_Concept(Ind)}$</td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{CO}} \in$ Set $\cup$ Constant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{Ind} \notin$ dom(Individual initial value Individual) $\lor$ (Individual initial value Individual) $=$ Init</td>
<td>$\land \text{Ind_ant} = \text{MapletIndividual antecedent Individual(Init)}$ $\land$ \text{Init_im} = \text{MapletIndividual image Individual(Init)} $\land$ (Init_ant, Init_im) $\subseteq$ Constant $\cup$ Variable $\land$ (Init_ant $\in$ Constant $\land$ Variable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>Variable concept initialisation</strong></td>
<td>$\exists$ CO $(l_j)_{j=1..s}$</td>
<td>o_Init</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{CO} \in$ dom(Concept)</td>
<td>$\text{Concept_isVariable(CO)} = \text{TRUE}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\forall j \in 1..n \text{, } C_0 \in$ Individual $\land$ Individual $\land$ Individual_individualOf_Concept($l_j$) $=$ CO</td>
<td>$\land \text{Ind_isVariable($l_j$)} = \text{FALSE}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{o}_{\text{CO}} \in$ Variable</td>
<td>$\land \text{o}_{\text{CO}} \in$ Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\forall j \in 1..n \text{, } o_{l_j} \in$ o_CO</td>
<td>$\land \text{Ind_isVariable($l_j$)} = \text{FALSE}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>3</sup>AS must be an association.

<sup>4</sup>Following the variability status of $o_{\text{AS}}$, this predicate can be a property or an invariant.

<sup>5</sup>If $\exists j \in 1..n \text{, } C_0 \notin$ dom(individual name) then $o_{l_j}$ must be replaced by $o_{l_j, \text{Ant}} \leftrightarrow o_{l_j, \text{Im}}$ as in the previous rule.
Each logical formula is translated with the definition of a B System logic formula corresponding to its assertion. Since both languages use first-order logic notations, the translation is limited to a syntactic rewriting.

4. Updates in Back Propagation Rules from B System Specifications to Domain Models

We choose to support only the most repetitive additions that can be performed within the formal specification, the domain model remaining the one to be updated in case of any major changes such as the addition or the deletion of a refinement level. Table 2 summarises the most relevant back propagation rules. Each rule defines its inputs (elements added to the B System specification) and constraints that each input must fulfill. It also defines its outputs (elements introduced within domain models as a result of the application of the rule) and their respective constraints. It should be noted that for an element \( b_x \) of the B System specification, \( a_x \) designates the domain model element corresponding to \( b_x \). In addition, when used, qualifier abstract denotes "without parent".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addition Of</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Domain Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Abstract set</td>
<td>( b_{CO} )</td>
<td>( b_{CO} \in \text{AbstractSet} )</td>
<td>( o_{CO} )</td>
<td>( o_{CO} \in \text{Concept} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Abstract enumeration</td>
<td>( b_{CO} ) ((b_{J})_{j=1,s} )</td>
<td>( \forall j \in 1..n, b_{J} \in \text{SetItem} ) &amp; ( \text{SetItem}<em>{itemOf}</em>{EnumeratedSet}(b_{J}) = b_{CO} )</td>
<td>( o_{CO} ) ((o_{J})_{j=1,s} )</td>
<td>Concept_isEnumeration ((o_{CO}) = \text{TRUE} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Set item</td>
<td>( b_{elt} ) ( b_{ES} )</td>
<td>( b_{elt} \in \text{SetItem} ) &amp; ( \text{SetItem}<em>{itemOf}</em>{EnumeratedSet}(b_{elt}) = b_{ES} )</td>
<td>( o_{elt} ) ( o_{ES} )</td>
<td>Individual_isElement ((o_{elt}) = a_{ES} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Constant typed as subset of the correspondent of a concept</td>
<td>( b_{PCO} ) ( b_{CO} )</td>
<td>( b_{CO} \in \text{Constant} ) &amp; ( b_{PCO} \in \text{AbstractSet} &amp; \text{Constant} )</td>
<td>( o_{CO} ) ( o_{PCO} )</td>
<td>Concept_isElement ((o_{CO}) = \text{Constant} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Constant typed as item of the correspondent of a concept</td>
<td>( b_{elt} ) ( b_{CO} )</td>
<td>( b_{CO} \in \text{AbstractSet} &amp; \text{Concept} ) &amp; ( b_{elt} \in b_{CO} )</td>
<td>( o_{elt} ) ( o_{CO} )</td>
<td>Individual_isElement ((o_{elt}) = a_{CO} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Variable typed as subset of the correspondent of a concept</td>
<td>( b_{PCO} ) ( b_{CO} )</td>
<td>( b_{CO} \in \text{Variable} ) &amp; ( b_{PCO} \in \text{AbstractSet} &amp; \text{Variable} )</td>
<td>( o_{CO} ) ( o_{PCO} )</td>
<td>Concept_isElement ((o_{CO}) = \text{Variable} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Variable typed as item of the correspondent of a concept</td>
<td>( b_{elt} ) ( b_{CO} )</td>
<td>( b_{CO} \in \text{AbstractSet} &amp; \text{Concept} &amp; \text{Variable} ) &amp; ( b_{elt} \in b_{CO} )</td>
<td>( o_{elt} ) ( o_{CO} )</td>
<td>Individual_isElement ((o_{elt}) = a_{CO} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Constant typed as a relation</td>
<td>( b_{AS} ) ( b_{AS} ) ( b_{CO1} ) ( b_{CO2} ) ( b_{CO} )</td>
<td>( b_{AS} \in \text{Constant} ) &amp; ( {b_{CO1}, b_{CO2}} \subset \text{AbstractSet} &amp; \text{Constant} ) &amp; ( b_{AS} \in b_{CO1} &amp; b_{CO2} ) &amp; ( [o_{CO1}, o_{CO2}] \subset \text{Concept} )</td>
<td>( o_{AS} ) ( o_{AS} )</td>
<td>Association_isRelation ((a_{AS}) = \text{Association})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The addition of a non typing logic formula (logic formula that does not contribute to the definition of the type of a formal element) in the B System specification is propagated through the definition of the same formula in the corresponding domain model, since both languages use first-order logic notations. This back propagation is limited to a syntactic translation.

A fresh B System constant or variable $b_x$ is defined within the domain model, by default, as a defined concept (instance of DefinedConcept), until a typing B System logical formula is introduced (subset of the correspondence of a concept, relation, item of the correspondence of a concept or maplet). The concept $b_x$ is defined with correspondence of B System logical formulas where $b_x$ appears: there must be at least one.
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