arXiv:2012.00856v2 [cs.SE] 8 Jun 2021

Using Formal Methods for Autonomous Systems: Five Recipes for Formal Verification*

Matt Luckcuck

Department of Computer Science, University of Manchester, UK

19th January 2022

Abstract

Formal Methods are mathematically-based techniques for software design and engineering, which enable the unambiguous description of and reasoning about a system's behaviour. Autonomous systems use software to make decisions without human control, are often embedded in a robotic system, are often safety-critical, and are increasingly being introduced into everyday settings. Autonomous systems need robust development and verification methods, but formal methods practitioners are often asked: *why use Why use Formal Methods for Autonomous Systems?*. To answer this question, this position paper describes five recipes for formally verifying aspects of an autonomous system, collected from the literature. The recipes are examples of how Formal Methods can be an effective tool for the development and verification of autonomous systems. During design, they enable unambiguous description of requirements; in development, formal specifications can be verified against requirements; software components may be synthesised from verified specifications; and behaviour can be monitored at runtime and compared to its original specification. Modern Formal Methods often include highly automated tool support, which enables exhaustive checking of a system's state space. This paper argues that Formal Methods are a powerful tool for the repertoire of development techniques for safe autonomous systems, alongside other robust software engineering techniques.

1 Introduction

Autonomous systems use software to make decisions without the need for human control. They are often embedded in a robotic system, and are increasingly being introduced into situations where they are near to or interact (physically or otherwise) with humans. These features mean that autonomous systems – and especially autonomous *robotic* systems – are often safety-critical, where failures can cause harm to humans or even their death.

The term Formal Methods (FM) describes a wide range of mathematically-defined techniques for specifying how a system should behave or how it will operate on data, and robustly reasoning about these specifications. FM are a useful tool for software engineering. Despite this, discussions of using FM often still being dogged by myths, both supportive and critical, that have persisted for decades – for example the 'myths' papers [14, 39], which were published in 1990 and 1995, respectively. FM are effective in real-world situations, as shown by their successful use in many industrial

*Thanks are owed to Marie Farrell, for our previous (and current) collaborations and for her *powerful* proof-reading; and Louise Dennis, Angelo Fernando, Rafael C. Cardoso, and Michael Fisher, for their helpful conversations about the work that went into this paper. Parts of this work were completed while the author was employed by the University of Liverpool and then the University of Manchester, UK. Work supported through the UKRI Robotics and AI in Nuclear (RAIN) grant EP/R026084.

projects [80]; and FM have been used in the literature to overcome the challenges faced when specifying and verifying autonomous systems [53]. But FM researchers and practitioners are still often asked

Why use Formal Methods for Autonomous Systems?

In this position paper, we answer this question by:

- describing four approaches to using FM for engineering safe autonomous systems, and
- presenting five *recipes* for the formal verification of components or aspects of an autonomous system.

Throughout the paper, we argue that FM are useful to have in ones repertoire when verifying autonomous systems. This paper often discusses autonomous systems that control a robotic system, because of the extra safety requirements this brings. However, the majority of the recipes that we present can be applied to general autonomous systems.

Autonomous systems need to be safe, correct, and trustworthy, so the most robust design and verification methods available should be used to reduce the risks to humans to as low as is reasonably practicable. For autonomous systems used in industry, the people at risk are likely to be workers; for systems like autonomous vehicles and domestic assistants, the people at risk will be the system's users (for example the people in the autonomous car or the person receiving domestic assistance) and bystanders (for example pedestrians or household visitors). Security flaws in autonomous systems are also a concern, both because of the sensitive data they are likely to contain and because a security failure can cause a safety failure. Verifying that the autonomous system preserves these safety and security requirements is a crucial activity in the systems development life cycle.

According the Software Engineering Body of Knowledge (SWEBOK), version 3 [13] "Verification is an attempt to ensure that the product is built correctly, in the sense that the output products of an activity meet the specifications imposed on them in previous activities." Whereas "Validation is an attempt to ensure that the right product is built – that is, the product fulfils its specific intended purpose." Or, in the informal description of Boehm [10], verification answers the question "Am I building the product right?", and validation answers the question "Am I building the right product?". While both of these activities are important, this paper discusses 'verification', in the sense of evaluating a system's compliance with a specification of its requirements, and uses the term 'formal verification' to mean verification by FM.

As part of previous work, we identified the challenges that are faced when formally specifying and verifying the behaviour of (autonomous) robotic systems [53]. To summarise [54], these challenges can be *external* or *internal* to the autonomous system. The two external challenges were that of modelling the system's operating environment, and of providing evidence that the public or a regulator should trust the system. Arguably, the biggest external challenge is the system's operating environment. This is where the *reality gap*, the difference between design-time models of the environment and the real world, can cause an autonomous system to fail. The internal challenges were related to how the autonomy was implemented (which we discuss in detail in the Autonomous Systems section) and how the system's architecture was arranged. Arguably, the internal challenge that is most important to overcome is that of checking that an autonomous system's executive decisions are correct.

FM can be applied across the systems development life cycle, from requirements through to operation. Formal specifications (and sometimes software code) can be formally verified as conforming to a set of properties – a simple example is the property of deadlock freedom. Like verification by testing or simulation, formal verification requires careful thought about the level of abstraction used to represent the system and its environment, and about what properties to check the system for. This takes a level of skill that is similar to producing good tests or good simulations.

Each of our formal verification recipes is drawn from examples in the literature, but the recipes are described in a generic way so as to encourage their application to a wide range of autonomous systems. The recipes help to fill the gap in guidance for how to apply FM to autonomous system in a systematic way. A recipe is implemented by using a formal *approach*, by which we mean the different ways of using a formal notation such as model checking or runtime verification. Thus, our recipes use formal approaches, which themselves use formal notations or languages.

The formal approaches described in this paper, and the way that we use the term 'approach' here, are drawn from our previous survey paper [53]. The recipes are drawn from the same survey and from research experience during the Robotics and AI in Nuclear (RAIN) project, one of the UK's *Robots for*

a Safer World[1] research and innovation hubs; some of this previous experience is summarised in [35].

The rest of this paper is organised as follows. The second section, Autonomous Systems, introduces the basic concepts of autonomous systems and explains the challenges they pose to verification efforts. The third section, Formal Verification Approaches, introduces four popular approaches to using formal methods. In the fourth section Formal Verification Recipes, we describe the five recipes for using FM for the verification of specific aspects or components of an autonomous system. Finally, the fifth section, Conclusion, concludes the paper.

2 Autonomous Systems

Autonomous systems should be designed with verification in mind, especially where they are mission-critical[2] or safety-critical[3] systems. Autonomous systems combine software that makes decisions and interprets sensor signals, with hardware that physically interacts with the real-world. Both of these elements pose challenges for verification.

Autonomy can be implemented using, broadly, two different styles of Artificial Intelligence (AI): symbolic and sub-symbolic. As discussed in the Types of Autonomy section, symbolic approaches tend to be easier to inspect and formally verify.

An autonomous system may contain components implemented in each of these styles, and it is important to choose the right AI technique for the right function. The criteria for choosing which AI technique to use are similar to when choosing a human to do the same job: how can its decisions be checked for correctness, and how confident are we in the checks that are available. This is especially important when assurance evidence is needed for regulatory approval.

The introduction of robotic and autonomous systems can raise a variety of ethical issues, which may not be safety or security hazards but still have a negative impact on user trust and societal acceptability. Current ethics guidance for AI is fragmented, but a recent survey [44] found convergence on five principles: transparency, justice and fairness, non-maleficence, responsibility, and privacy, with a further six principles: beneficence, freedom and autonomy, trust, sustainability, dignity and solidarity mentioned in many guideline documents. Further, the IEEE are currently developing the P7000 series of standards, which cover a variety of aspects of ethics for autonomous systems[4]; including: P7001 'Transparency of Autonomous Systems', P7003 'Algorithmic Bias Considerations', and P7009 'Fail-Safe Design of Autonomous and Semi-Autonomous Systems'.

The BS 8611 standard *'ethical design and application of robots and robotic systems'* [15] uses the term *ethical hazards*: a potential source of ethical harm, which is anything likely to compromise psychological, societal, and environmental well-being. Any hazard assessment should include the assessment of ethical hazards, and they should be designed out of the final system. These design-time efforts could be paired with run-time techniques, for example, an *ethical black box* [79] that records the sensor input and internal state of a system to enable offline checking of the system's decisions in the event of a failure. Leaving ethical harms to be discovered or handled as part of the operation phase of the system is, by definition, unethical. Ethical harms that are discovered while the system is in-use can directly impact the safety or security of the system or cause huge reputational damage to the system's developers or operators, both of which can have financial impacts as well.

When interacting with the real world, an autonomous system will have to cope with some degree of uncertainty. Sensor input may be noisy and unreliable, and AI techniques for recognising objects are often inherently statistical. Movement and navigation is usually aided by internal (often pre-built) models of the environment, but if the environment changes and the model isn't updated, then using it can become unreliable.

These elements of autonomous systems can be a challenge for both formal and informal verification methods. Autonomous systems combine hardware and software components that use expertise from various sub-domains of computer science, electronics, and engineering. Each of these sub-domains often has their own domain-specific verification approaches, and therefore the most trusted or suitable verification approach might be different for different components. For this reason, our previous work argues that the verification of autonomous systems benefits from the integration of formal and informal

[1] `https://www.ukri.org/our-work/our-main-funds/industrial-strategy-challenge-fund/future-of-mobility/robots-for-a-safer-w`

[2] A mission-critical system is one where a failure may lead to large data- or financial-losses.

[3] A safety-critical system is one where a failure may lead to ecological or financial disaster, serious injury, or death.

[4] IEEE P7000 standards: `https://ethicsinaction.ieee.org/p7000/`

verification techniques [32]. The Challenges to Verification section discusses in detail the challenges that autonomous systems pose to both formal and informal verification.

2.1 Types of Autonomy

There are broadly two AI approaches used in implementing autonomous systems: symbolic and sub-symbolic. Symbolic approaches include logic programming (for example Prolog) and agent programming languages (for example, Jason [11]), where statements and rules are used to describe the world and available actions. Because these systems are explicit and based on mathematical logic, they are (relatively) easier to inspect. However, engineering the knowledge they need (the statements and rules) can present an overhead. Also, problems that cannot be easily expressed as logical statements and rules are difficult to encode in symbolic systems.

Sub-symbolic (or connectionist) approaches to AI include machine learning and neural networks, where inferences are made about large amounts of existing data to build knowledge about the world, often using statistical methods. This can make these approaches better suited to situations where *how* to reach a decision is not well understood or not easy to describe logically. However, these approaches are much more difficult to inspect, meaning that their decisions are less amenable to verification.

Clearly, the approach(es) chosen will impact the techniques available for verifying the system's decisions, and so impact the assurance argument. It is likely that an autonomous system might need both types of AI, for example a symbolic approach to planning but a sub-symbolic approach to vision classification. Other work in the literature already combines logical symbolic approaches with flexible sub-symbolic approaches [2,4]. So it is useful to have verification techniques that can target both types of AI approach.

Where an autonomous system will be used in safety-critical scenarios, using symbolic approaches for high-level decisions and planning enables robust verification of the system's choices, as well as providing a route to explaining those choices. Confining sub-symbolic approaches to functions to which they are better suited (functions that are often not amenable to symbolic approaches) reduces the number of components that are difficult to inspect. The system's architecture can then be used to prevent potential failures caused by a sub-symbolic component from propagating to the overall behaviour of the system. This is discussed in more detail in various subsections of the Formal Verification Recipes section.

2.2 Levels of Autonomy

In addition to how an autonomous system is implemented, there are also various ways of describing how much, or what level, of autonomy a system has. For example, an autonomous robotic system might be described as semi-autonomous or fully autonomous. A semi-autonomous robotic system is one where the "robot and a human operator plan and conduct the task, requiring various levels of human interaction" [72]. In a fully-autonomous robotic system, the robot performs its task "without human intervention, while adapting to operations and environmental conditions" [72].

There are also frameworks that describe the different *levels* of autonomy that a system might have. The original levels of autonomy were defined for undersea teleoperation systems [70] – though they are worded rather neutrally, so they may have wider applicability – and were revised in [30]. A detailed review of frameworks for levels of autonomy can be found in Beer et al.'s work on developing a framework for levels of autonomy in Human-Robot Interaction §3 of [9].

Some frameworks for levels of autonomy are generic and aimed at all autonomous systems, for example Huang et al. [42], who describe autonomy levels for 'unmanned' systems generally; and Beer et al. [9], who describe levels of autonomy from a Human-Robot Interaction perspective. Other frameworks are specific to a particular sector or operational environment, for example spacecraft [69] or autonomous cars [63]. Adapting or reusing a framework for levels of autonomy in a new context might seem attractive, but this can lead to confusion because the levels that are defined for one environment may not clearly map onto another.

Frameworks and definitions of the type or level of autonomy that a system possesses can be useful for describing its capabilities. However, there is no single framework that has been universally adopted, so it is important to be clear about *which* framework or definition is being used.

2.3 Challenges to Verification

Autonomous systems pose challenges to verification, especially when they are embedded in a robotic system [32]. As previously mentioned, by 'verification' we specifically mean the evaluation of a system's compliance with a specification. The two key challenges when verifying autonomous systems are: that the system is making decisions for itself and it is operating in (and possibly physically interacting with) the real world. These challenges are faced by all types of verification approaches, but a detailed survey of the current challenges being tackled specifically in the FM literature is presented in [53].

As described in the Types of Autonomy section, the way that an autonomous component is implemented has a notable impact on what verification techniques can be applied to it. Symbolic AI (such as agent-based systems) are often easier to verify, whereas Sub-Symbolic (connectionist) AI can prove more difficult. Ideally, verifiability should be designed into the system; autonomous components should be verifiable, the number of autonomous components that are difficult to analyse should be limited, and careful mitigations should be introduced where difficult-to-analyse autonomous components are needed. Mitigations could include adopting an architecture that defends the system from components with lower levels of assurance, using runtime software checks, or using FM approaches. The Formal Verification Recipes section presents five recipes, built from FM, to mitigate these challenges by enabling the verification of different parts of an autonomous system.

Aside from the challenges that autonomous software presents, it also provides the opportunity to examine a system's decision-making mechanisms. This requires designing autonomous software with verification in mind, and selecting AI techniques that can be inspected. Examining the system's decision-making is especially important when safety assurance evidence is required, or when the system's choices need to be compared with a qualified human operator. Ignoring the chance to interrogate the decisions that an autonomous system is making would be a wasted opportunity.

Where an autonomous system is embedded within a robotic system, the robotic parts are often checked with physical tests, but doing this systematically can be challenging. Physical tests with a robot can be dangerous to the human testers in the early phases of development, and are often difficult or time-consuming to set-up and run. This means that simulations and code analysis are helpful, even though these may lack the fidelity of the actual operating environment. Despite this, there is evidence that even a low-fidelity simulation of a robot's environment can reproduce bugs that were found during field tests of the same robot; Sotiropoulos et al. [71] found that of the 33 bugs that occurred during a field test of a robot, only one could not be reproduced in their low-fidelity simulation.

Informal verification techniques have been developed for some of the frequently used control and autonomy approaches. For example, there are well established checks to assess the correctness of feedback control mechanisms. Usually, feedback controllers model the system that they are controlling using differential equations. It is important to check that: (1) the model is validated against the real world, and that it is based on valid data; (2) any abstractions in the implementation of the feedback controller are valid, and; (3) the feedback controller is robust against variations in the system's performance, and can cope with any differences between its model and the real system.

Similarly, techniques are being developed for the verification and testing of Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) – and a survey of the current state of the art can be found in [43]. A key correctness property for a DNN is whether two inputs that appear identical to a human observer could be classified differently by the DNN. When safety assurance evidence is needed for a DNN, it is important to be clear about how the correctness properties are defined and how they have been assessed.

Without being specifically developed for autonomous systems, FM can be applied across autonomous system's development lifecycle. In the requirements and design phases, FM can provide an unambiguous specification of the system's requirements or its design.

Requirements formalisation was the most often used formal technique in the industrial projects surveyed in [80]. A recent survey of the literature for formal techniques for capturing requirements can be found in [16], which also emphasises that a formal representation of requirements can support other representations, instead of just replacing them. On the spectrum from natural-language requirements to fully-formalised requirements, the Formal Requirements Elicitation Tool (FRET) sits in the middle, using a structured natural language that can be automatically translated into temporal logic [36]. Even if not using the temporal logic translation, FRET can help to bridge the gap between informal requirements and assurance arguments, and properties in other formalisms, for example Event-B [12]

Formal designs can be used to generate provably correct source code from specifications and designs. For example, translating high-level system designs written in Architecture Analysis and Design Language (AADL)

into the Behaviour Interaction Priority (BIP) framework to facilitate controller generation [23], or the generation of movement plans for an autonomous robotic system [45, 48]. This approach can be seen as similar to Model-Driven Engineering, but using formal models. This can help to minimise the likelihood of introducing faults during software development. Generating control programs from high-level formal specifications is described in more detail in the Formal Synthesis section.

FM can also be used to perform rigorous static and dynamic analysis. Static analysis can be performed on more abstract models of the system, but techniques exist that are capable of operating directly on program code itself – for example the Bounded Model Checkers for C programs (CBMC[1]) and Java programs (JBMC[2]), and the Model Checking Agent Programming Language (MCAPL) framework [26] for agent programs. Using FM here has the benefits of being automatic and exhaustive. FM are capable of accepting models that talk about time and probabilities. For tackling very large specifications, there are also static analysis techniques that take a similar approach to statistical testing, taking samples of the available paths through a model. Two static analysis approaches are discussed in the Model-Checking and Theorem Proving sections.

For dynamic formal analysis, FM can monitor a running system, checking it against a formal specification of its expected behaviour. Effectively, this re-runs the design-time verification but with the behaviour of the system as input. If the system's behaviour differs from the specification, then the monitor can log the failure, alert the user, or trigger mitigating actions. This is described in more detail in the Runtime Verification section.

It is likely that some components in an autonomous system are more critical to the system's safe operation than others, this is referred to as a mixed-criticality system. The more critical a component is, the higher the assurance against failure that the component needs. It may be useful to analyse the criticality of the system's components and apply FM to the most critical (where the component is amenable to FM). This suggestion aims to ensure that the most critical components are assured against failure, without requiring the entire system to be formally verified. For a comprehensive review of mixed-criticality research see [18].

The connection between an autonomous system and its environment is often implemented in a general purpose programming language, which can make it more difficult to use formal verification techniques. Where an autonomous system is connecting to the real world, the Robot Operating System (ROS)[3] middleware is often used. A ROS system is a network of communicating nodes, programmed in either C++ or Python. For autonomous systems linked to simulated worlds, the landscape is more fragmented but examples include an autonomous agent linked to the flight simulator FLIGHTLAB [76], and a connector to link multi-agent systems to the video game StarCraft [47]. Using connectors or middleware can make programming the system easier, but it is another component of the system that could cause (or contribute to) failures.

In addition to the off-the-shelf FM, there are also techniques that are specialised to autonomous systems, capable of tackling the challenges that they pose during verification [53]. In the next section, we introduce four approaches that use FM, describe them in detail, and give examples of their use in the verification of autonomous systems.

3 Formal Verification Approaches

This section presents an overview of four approaches to using FM, often found in the literature. As previously mentioned, by an 'approach' we mean *how* a formal notation is used to verify properties. Each approach is illustrated by examples from the literature. This is nowhere near an exhaustive list, but is intended to show a range of approaches and introduce the reader to the approaches used in recipes, which are described in the next section.

In addition to applying single formal approaches, there is a field of research investigating the *integration* of different formal (and informal) verification approaches – for example, the integrated Formal Methods (iFM) conference series has been running since 1999 [6]. There is significant scope in the area of robotics and autonomous systems to use integrated approaches [32, 37] because these systems combine components from many different disciplines. The *Corroborative Verification and Validation (V&V)* approach [78] is specifically designed to integrate formal and informal models of the same system to

[1] `http://www.cprover.org/cbmc/`
[2] `http://www.cprover.org/jbmc/`
[3] `https://www.ros.org/`

support wholistic verification. A fuller description of the formal approaches that have been applied to autonomous systems in recent literature, including integrated approaches, can be found in our previous survey paper [53].

3.1 Model-Checking

Model Checking determines whether or not a property holds in every state of a formal specification. The specification and the property may be written in the same notation, but they are often not. For example, many model checking tools accept the specification as some form of Finite-State Machine (FSM) with the property written in some form of temporal logic.

Model checking is a flexible, exhaustive formal verification approach. Some model checkers accept timed (e.g. UPPAAL[1]) or probabilistic specifications (e.g. PRISM[2]). Variants of this approach, called *program* model checkers (e.g. Java PathFinder[3]), operate on the program itself [75].

An example of model checking in the literature is Webster et al. [76, 77], who use a program model checker to show that an autonomous system controlling a pilotless aircraft meets the requirements for human pilots. The autonomous system is implemented as a Belief-Desire-Intention (BDI) agent, so its decision making can be checked using the program model checker AJPF [28]. The system is verified against the requirements for human pilots, formalised from the UK Civil Aviation Authority's Rules of the Air. This can be seen as analogous to checking that a human pilot obeys the Rules of the Air.

Model checking has some advantages over other approaches: model checkers are automatic, which makes them relatively easy to use; also, the concept of checking every state in a model to see if a required property holds is relatively intuitive. However, because model checking exhaustively explores a specification, care must be taken when writing the input specification and choosing properties, to avoid state space explosion (where the number of states that the model checker has to search becomes intractably large). State space explosion, and building the specifications themselves [68], are the two obvious overheads of this approach.

3.2 Theorem Proving

Theorem Proving is an approach for producing formal proofs of the correctness of a software system. Like model checking, there are a variety of logical systems available and the user is often aided by automatic or semi-automatic theorem proving tools. Formal proofs have the advantage of being able to describe systems with an infinite state space.

In the literature, Mitsch et al. [61] use theorem proving to verify that a ground rover will not collide with, and maintains a sufficient distance from, both stationary and moving obstacles in the rover's environment. Their robot is navigating its environment using the dynamic window algorithm. Both the robot and its environment are modelled in differential dynamic logic (dL) [65], which is designed for hybrid systems – that is, systems with both discrete and continuous elements. They report that the theorem prover they used performed 85% of the proof steps automatically.

Farrell et al. [57] use theorem proving to verify a grasping algorithm used by an autonomous robotic arm. The arm is attached to a satellite that is collecting orbital debris. They use the Dafny program verifier to model the algorithm and verify three safety properties about the algorithm. Dafny uses the Z3 automated theorem prover to perform the checks automatically.

Theorem proving is effective and powerful, but the learning curve for the approach and its tools may be higher than the other approaches mentioned in this section. Also, the concept of theorem proving and the results it produces may be more difficult to explain to stakeholders who do not have a mathematics or formal methods background.

3.3 Runtime Verification

Runtime Verification (RV) uses a monitor, which consumes events or variable updates from a system and compares them to a formal specification of the expected behaviour. If the system's behaviour differs from that described by the specification, then the monitor can take some mitigating action. RV can work while the system is running (online RV) or can consume logs of previous runs (offline RV).

[1] `http://uppaal.org/`
[2] `http://www.prismmodelchecker.org/`
[3] `https://github.com/javapathfinder`

The mitigating actions that can be implemented depend on the use case and system's architecture. For a simple application of runtime monitoring, the mitigating action could be to log the failure, or to alert a responsible human. More sophisticated approaches can move towards runtime *enforcement*, where the system is prevented from behaving in a way that does not conform to the expected behaviour.

One approach in the literature uses a model checker at design-time to verify that a formal specification of an autonomous vehicle in its environment always maintains a safe distance from other vehicles [5]. When the system is operating, the environment is monitored and if the environment doesn't conform to the design-time model (for example, if there is a vehicle closer than the safe distance) then the system enters a safe stop mode.

RV has several benefits. First, it bridges the *reality gap* – the gap between design-time models and the real world at runtime. This means that RV is useful when the system's intended environment becomes impossible to model with enough accuracy; the assumptions and abstractions can be checked as the system is operating.

Second, RV monitors are usually simpler than the system that they are monitoring, which can help when analysing the software element of a RV tool. Further, the expected behaviour is a formal specification, so it can usually be verified separately, to ensure that the specified expected behaviour is correct.

Third, RV can often reuse an existing formal specification, which enables a workflow where a system is specified, statically verified, and then monitored during its operation [33]. This reuse is especially helpful since building specifications is the bottleneck in the application of most FM [68].

One obvious downside is that running a monitor uses extra memory, CPU time, and possibly network bandwidth (compared to running the system without a monitor). *Predictive* Runtime Verification [64, 81] aims to reduce the overheads of RV, by using specifications of the system's possible behaviour to predict when a property will remain satisfied, which allows the monitor to be paused or stopped. Predictive RV also provides a route to runtime enforcement by highlighting the possibility of a violation before it has occurred, so that the violation can be prevented.

3.4 Formal Synthesis

Formal Synthesis is an approach that automatically derives low-level controllers for autonomous systems, from high-level task specifications. When used for autonomous robotic systems, the synthesised controllers often control the robot's movement. The utility of this approach lies in automating the conversion of complex task specifications into controllers, especially when they cannot be trivially converted to a sequence of "go here" statements.

Several studies have shown the utility of formally synthesising (usually movement) plans that satisfy some specified properties (e.g [51]). Some have tackled generating movement plans for autonomous robots [45, 48]. Formal synthesis has the potential to be used during execution by the autonomous system itself [45]. Since this is a similar technique to model checking, it too can suffer from state space explosion. The examples in both [45] and [48] plan a short distance ahead to help sidestep the problem of state space explosion. Formal synthesis has also been used to generate controllers for autonomous robots in a team, from a top-down specification of the team's required behaviour [21, 22].

Formal synthesis is an active research area, and can be a powerful technique for deriving a controller that implements a particular task or behaves according to certain rules. Various synthesis approaches adapt model-checking algorithms, but for more complex systems this can also cause state space explosion [22]. Automating controller synthesis moves the development overhead to an earlier development lifecycle stage; like with model checking, designing the right specification is key.

4 Formal Verification Recipes

This section describes five recipes for formally verifying different components or aspects of an autonomous system. As previously mentioned, each recipe makes use of formal approach(es), like those mentioned in the Formal Verification Approaches section. The recipes aim to overcome some of the verification challenges that autonomous systems present, and illustrate why FM are a set of powerful techniques that should included in the verification repertoire for autonomous systems.

The software in an autonomous system is responsible for making decisions, which brings both new challenges and new opportunities. If an autonomous system is implemented using AI that is amenable

to inspection (see the Types of Autonomy section) then this enables us to look inside the 'brain' of the system and ensure that it is making correct, ethical, and safe decisions.

While this paper often focusses on autonomous robotic systems, because of their safety implications, the majority of the recipes that we discuss in this section can be applied to autonomous systems in general. The first two recipes, Recipe 1: Verifying Executive Decisions and Recipe 2: Controlling Machine Learning, are directly focussed on the AI components making the system's decisions. The next two recipes, Recipe 3: Verifying and Enforcing Safety Claims and Recipe 4: Verifying Task and Missions, discuss formal verification of high-level system properties or descriptions (respectively, safety claims and tasks/missions). The final recipe, Recipe 5: Logical Barriers, is most obvious applicable to autonomous *robotic* systems, but even so this could be applied to general autonomous systems that have decisions that the system *can* but *should not* make.

Autonomous systems often comprise some components that are amenable to FM and some that are not [54]. Components that are easier to formally verify include an agent that is making the system's executive decisions, like in Cardoso et al.'s example application [19]. Components that are less easy to apply FM to include machine learning components. Focussing the use of FM on the components of a system that are amenable to formalisation is useful [19, 20], especially if the components that are formalised are those most critical to the safety of the system. Applying FM in only some phases of the system's development is also beneficial, for example formally specifying the system's requirements clarifies its expected behaviour and can also provide an unambiguous starting point for informal verification approaches [12].

Dynamic verification of autonomous systems should be used in addition to static verification techniques, especially where an autonomous system may encounter humans. This has the extra benefit of helping to bridge the reality gap. This can be implemented as some kind of RV, preferably while the system is running (online RV) to ensure that the system is still fulfilling its original specification. This is especially useful if the system learns online, is capable of reconfiguring itself, or will be in use autonomously for a long time.

Driverless cars are a good example of where both static and dynamic verification would prove useful. We have had many decades of incrementally improving the safety of the physical aspects of cars; the challenge with *autonomous* cars lies in the software that controls the vehicle. When a person learns to drive a car, they must (usually) pass some tests to obtain a licence; the skills that a human needs to display to pass their driving test are also (some of) the requirements of an autonomous system controlling a car. These requirements could be formalised and the autonomous component can be statically checked to ensure that it never chooses to disobey them (unless a human driver would be expected to disobey some rules in a particular situation). Dynamic checks could then be used, against the same formal specification, to show that the driverless car is still displaying the properties needed to get a licence. Interestingly, this could allow a driverless car's 'licence' to be revoked if the vehicle is no longer obeying its requirements. This could be caused by a fault in the software or by a mismatch between the system's internal models (defined at design-time) and the real world that the system encounters at runtime – the *reality gap*.

While there are many aspects of autonomous software that provide unique challenges, there are other aspects that resemble problems similar to those in other types of software system. Approaches to verifying these similar problems can often be reused or adapted for autonomous systems.

For example, Multi-Agent Systems (MAS) and robot swarms exhibit challenges that are similar to multi-threaded systems, such as scheduling and resource allocation. Other autonomous systems choose which tasks to complete within a particular time frame (such as in [40]), which makes the similarity to scheduling more obvious.

ROS is often used in the literature for implementing autonomous robotic systems, and FM has been used to enable the verification of its producer-consumer communication mechanism [38]. ROS systems are composed of nodes that communicate over a network. Each node can publish data to named channels, and subscribe to receive data from channels. Nodes must state the rate at which they will publish to a channel, and the size of buffer used when subscribing to a channel. A formal model is used to capture the publishing rate and buffer sizes of the ROS nodes, for a particular program. A model checker is used to verify that the buffers never overflow. This is an important property to verify, and this technique uses an abstraction to produce a model that captures just the pertinent details.

The remainder of this section describes the five verification recipes and the utility of FM approaches in applying the recipes. The five recipes in this section are Recipe 1: Verifying Executive Decisions,

Recipe 2: Controlling Machine Learning, Recipe 3: Verifying and Enforcing Safety Claims, Recipe 4: Verifying Task and and Recipe 5: Logical Barriers. While this is not an exhaustive list of where and how FM approaches can be applied to autonomous systems, this is the starting point for a larger, cookbook of formal verification recipes.

4.1 Recipe 1: Verifying Executive Decisions

The executive decisions of an autonomous system should be taken by rational, symbolic AI components (for example BDI agents [67]) that enable the verification of the choices being made. Using this type of autonomy to make the system's executive decisions provides the opportunity to inspect and verify those decisions, something that is currently almost impossible to do with human decision-making. This opportunity should not be wasted, and is another instance where autonomous systems should be designed for verification.

With verifiable autonomy, the system's choices can be checked to ensure that they obey safety requirements. This could be seen as akin to being able to check that a new driver will obey all the relevant driving laws before they get their driving licence.

Specifically in the case of BDI languages, the program model checker AJPF [28] can directly verify properties about the agent program. An example of this approach can be found in [76], where the authors encode the UK Civil Aviation Authority's Rules of the Air and verify that the BDI agent making the executive decisions always abides by these rules. This example is similar to Recipe 3: Verifying and Enforcing Safety Claims.

Using this recipe requires autonomy that is amenable to inspection and verification. If AI techniques that are opaque and less amenable to inspection and verification are used, then the dynamic verification described in Recipe 3: Verifying and Enforcing Safety Claims may be useful instead. However, even if the static verification described in this recipe is used, the checks assume the correctness of the system's sensors. Given the possibility of sensor failure or incorrect interpretation of noisy sensor data, both of these verification techniques could be used alongside each other, for extra assurance.

The flexibility of this approach has also been used to check that autonomous systems are making ethical decisions. This is an open challenge, but must be dealt with if autonomous systems are to be trustworthy. Often, an autonomous system's choices are evaluated as being either ethical or not [7, 8, 17]. This is a useful starting point, but real-life situations are unlikely to be so simple. An example of taking a less dichotomous approach is [25], which describes an autonomous system (using a BDI language) that can reason about the ethical weighting of its choices. These programs are directly verified to check more complex ethical properties, such as the system choosing the least-worst option in situations where only unethical choices are available.

4.2 Recipe 2: Controlling Machine Learning

A machine learning component should be paired with a *governor* that ensures that the output of the machine learning component remains within a correct operating envelope – compare with mechanical governors [58]. Crucially, this requires an architecture where the governor is able to prevent an incorrect decision from the machine learning component from propagating to the rest of the system. This recipe is useful where incorrect output from a machine learning component could cause the executive control component(s) to make a decision that leads to a failure, for example a vision classifier.

Machine learning can be useful for discovering solutions to problems where there is little or no prior knowledge of the context; for example, classifying objects or exploring unknown environments. But ensuring that machine learning remains within a safe operating envelope can be challenging [56]. For example, as raised by Koopman and Wagner, and summarised in [56]; machine learning components can suffer from:

- **Over-fitting**, where the machine learning component too closely corresponds to the training data and therefore might not be reliable on real-world data;
- **Black Swan Events**, which are special cases that the component has not seen in the training data and therefore might not react to correctly; and,
- **Reward Hacking** [31], where an incorrectly specified reward function might be exploited by the machine learning component to gain rewards for unsafe actions or predictions.

Machine learning components should be separated from the executive control of the system, and not linked directly to actuation. This recipe enables verification and monitoring techniques to be used to mitigate the risk of incorrect output from a machine learning component causing the overall system to perform unsafe behaviour.

A governor could be implemented as a purely software monitor, but this just shifts the burden of verification from the autonomous system to the software monitor, which is likely to be simpler but will face similar verification challenges. Instead, a formal runtime *enforcement* approach adds confidence to the monitoring used by the governor and can be directly verifiable itself. It also has the benefit that the specification for the correct operating envelope is unambiguous and provably correct.

Governors used in this way could enforce relatively simple properties, like a confidence threshold for a machine learning verdict. But they could also track the ongoing output of the machine learning component to enforce more complex properties. As an example, consider a driverless car that uses a machine learning classifier to identify obstacles. The classifier might be reliable on clear distinctions between cars, bicycles, and pedestrians. However, it might not have been trained on 'messy' scenes showing, for example, a pedestrian pushing a bicycle across the road. In this situation the classifier might differ between a classification of 'pedestrian' and 'bicycle'. A governor introduced here could enforce a property saying: if the classifier hasn't settled on a result within a given time frame, then the vehicle would slow down and prepare to stop. This would enforce the safe behaviour expected of a human driver.

This recipe can be found in the literature. The WiseML approach [55] is an RV framework that enforces invariants in autonomous systems that use Reinforcement Learning (RL). It is demonstrated on an autonomous system that is using an RL algorithm to explore an unknown environment. Another implementation route, for systems using the ROS middleware, is ROSMonitoring[1] [34], which is an RV framework that can drop messages that do not conform to a formal specification. This could be used to vet the output from the machine learning component and prevent incorrect messages from reaching the rest of the system. Finally, the concept of *shields* [3, 49, 50] is another route. A shield is a correct-by-construction runtime enforcer, synthesised from a safety property. Like the idea behind ROSMonitoring, the shield operates at runtime to detect and overwrite violations of the safety property, so that the system always obeys its safety requirements.

4.3 Recipe 3: Verifying and Enforcing Safety Claims

RV techniques provide a good way of showing that a system's safety claims are fulfilled at runtime, and can be extended to enforce the safety claims too. Static verification is useful (for example, Recipe 1: Verifying Executive Decisions could also be used here) but dynamic checking and enforcement of safety requirements provides strong evidence for the system obeying its requirements in more realistic settings. This kind of evidence is especially important where a system needs regulator approval before operation.

The safety claims or properties in a safety document describe how the system's behaviour is constrained to maintain safety. Examples include keeping a minimum distance from obstacles, limiting the speed or force that the system can apply, or constraining a behaviour to a certain location (such as a laser cutter only being activated when it is pointing towards a safe cutting zone).

As described in the Runtime Verification section, RV monitors the running system and compares its behaviour to a formal specification of its expected behaviour. Using the system's safety documents as the source for the specification of the expected behaviour enables these safety claims to be checked and enforced.

In previous work, we formalise the safety subsystem described in a safety design document and use the resulting specification as a runtime monitor [52]. The specification is checked against the safety requirements (also extracted from the safety document) to validate the model. This has the side-benefit of checking the design of the safety subsystem. This specification can also be used to guide the implementation of the safety subsystem, if it is still being developed.

The monitoring provided by RV could be extended to enable enforcement of the safety requirements. One approach to runtime enforcement could be to use *predictive* RV [81] to try to foresee the future violation of a safety property and use this information to prevent the violation. The workflow described in [52] could be used to guide the formalisation of existing safety documentation to use as the predictive

[1] `https://github.com/autonomy-and-verification-uol/ROSMonitoring`

model. The benefit of predictive RV is that it might also foresee the continued satisfaction of a property, which means that the monitor could be switched off to save CPU and memory usage.

Similarly to Recipe 2: Controlling Machine Learning, runtime enforcement requires a system architecture that allows the monitor to intercept instructions that would cause the system to violate a safety requirement. An example of how to achieve this is presented in [34], where a monitor is placed inside a ROS system and is able to drop messages that do not conform to its specification of acceptable behaviour. This means that the unsafe messages do not get acted on, so the safety requirements are enforced at runtime.

4.4 Recipe 4: Verifying Task and Missions

Autonomous systems are often given goals to complete, to guide their behaviour, which could be viewed as high-level programs. This means that the arrangement of goals can be a source of failure and so they are a target for verification.

Often, these goals and how to achieve them are described as *tasks* or *missions*. Here, we will use *task* to mean a collection of actions, such as moving to a waypoint or inspecting an object; and *mission* to mean a collection of tasks to achieve some goal, such as inspecting every waypoint in the map. For some systems, missions and tasks might be set by a human user or operator, in others the system might make more decisions about its mission or how to achieve a goal.

The tasks should be identified and well defined, this makes the system's capabilities clear to both the implementers and the users of the system. This should include, for example: the task's context and inputs (and any other pre-conditions), how it performs the task, the expected outputs (and any other postconditions), what might cause the task to fail and how the system should recover, etc.

The software implementation of a task or a mission is often written in a general purpose programming language, because it must be executed by the software controlling the system. This means that verification approaches (especially formal verification approaches) could be applied directly to the software. However, there is still utility in taking a formal approach to the design of tasks and missions, similarly to the benefit of formalising a system's requirements.

Using informal notations (such as flowcharts or communication diagrams) is useful for clarifying the intended behaviour of tasks and missions, and would enable formalisation at a later stage. For someone trying to formalise a system, this would already be an improvement over trying to extract a formal specification from program code or natural-language documentation.

Formalising the system state that the task expects before it starts (pre-conditions) and how the task will have changed the system state after it has finished (post-conditions) is a good start for formalising the design of a task – as in Hoare triples [41]. These formal conditions clarify the task's requirements and can be used to verify that its implementation meets these requirements (either statically or by using RV). This lightweight formal approach could identify where a mission is incorrectly constructed. For example, it could highlight where one task's pre-condition relies on something that the previous task's post-condition does not guarantee. This design-time check would enable developers to fix a potential failure before implementation.

When specifying a task it is important to remember that the system will interact with a (virtual or physical) environment, so an action might fail or otherwise not behave as intended. This could be due to a changing environment, unforeseen conditions, or a hardware failure. Once a failed action has been detected, the system can take steps to recover. This should also be specified in the task's design, including a fallback task (or tasks) to safely recover from the failure or move to some known safe state. For example the mission specification language Sophrosyne enables the specification of tasks and fallback actions for if the task fails [**?**, 74]). Another example is the extensions to agent programming languages that enable the description of tasks ('plans' in the agent program) that can (attempt) to reconfigure themselves if they fail [27, 73]. This includes describing the pre- and post-conditions for each task and then using an automated planner to attempt to repair the plan.

The mission pattern catalogue described in [60] provides an example of how to formally verify missions. The pattern catalogue is a taxonomy of mission categories – including avoidance, surveillance, and coverage patterns – created from a survey of the robotic literature. Each category is populated by several patterns, and each pattern is described in English and in temporal logic. Their tool, PsALM [59], enables missions to be constructed from the patterns in the taxonomy, from which a temporal logic specification of the mission is synthesised. This enables missions to be formally verified before operation.

4.5 Recipe 5: Logical Barriers

Autonomous robotic systems may have a physical barrier to contain them within a safe area, this could be complemented by a formally verifiable *logical* barrier. A logical barrier is a software restriction on the area in the operating environment that an autonomous robotic system can move to. More generally, a logical barrier could be a restriction on the decisions that an autonomous system can make but should not, for legal, ethical, or safety reasons.

The concept of a logical barrier is not entirely new, for example it can be seen in autonomous vehicle platooning, where software controllers ensure that vehicles keep a safe distance from the vehicle in front of them [1,24,46]; and where mobile robots need to avoid obstacles, for example in [5,62], or stay within a predefined area (geofencing) [29, 74]. It is similar in intent to the work on barrier certificates [66], which is a technique for showing that a hybrid system does not enter an unsafe region.

This concept has obvious applications where autonomous robotic systems might be close to humans, who must be protected from physical harm. In this situation, a physical barrier might be a wall or other buffer that stops the system moving too far from one position or too close to other objects or people. For example, a robotic arm surrounded by a safety barrier that stops it from moving outside of a safe working area.

Using a logical barrier provides a penultimate line of defence; the software will stop the system from getting close to the physical barrier, but the physical barrier is there in case the software safety system fails. The logical barrier could be in the same place as the physical barrier or it could be slightly offset to provide a logical buffer zone, for example to allow enough space for the robotic system to slow down before hitting the physical barrier. The placement of a logical barrier should be based on an assessment of concerns like robotics systems' maximum speed or the force that it can deliver.

One approach to implementing this recipe is to use RV to provide runtime enforcement. So long as the monitor can listen to the system's behaviour, this approach would not require a particular type of autonomy. However, the architecture of the system must be arranged so as to allow the monitor to change the system's behaviour, to prevent it from crossing the logical barrier. As previously mentioned, RV can add computational overheads, so it must be implemented carefully to avoid potentially delaying the system.

Another approach to implementing this recipe could be to incorporate the logical barriers into the executive decision making component, in such a way that it is formally verifiable. This is related to Recipe 1: Verifying Executive Decisions, so there is a similar requirement that the high-level decision making uses AI techniques that can be inspected (symbolic AI). This enables the verification that, for example, the system never chooses to move past the logical barrier.

Using the RV approach checks the dynamic behaviour of the system; checking the system's decision-making is static verification. Even if the system never *chooses* to move past the barrier, it could conceivably do so by accident. Clearly, a combination of these two approaches would work well.

The need for logical barriers, when the physical barriers exist, is possibly subtle; but they provide an extra layer of assurance. Logical barriers could also be useful in situations where a physical barrier is desired, but not possible – though, the combination of both types of barrier would be the most effective. This could be helpful in establishing enough confidence in an autonomous system's safety to enable field tests; without such confidence, the risk of injury during field tests might be considered too high.

5 Conclusion

This paper answers the question *Why use Formal Methods for Autonomous Systems?* by describing the utility of four often-used formal verification approaches and by presenting five formal verification recipes for autonomous systems. The formal approaches explain what FM can do, and the recipes describe how they can be used to verify particular components or aspects of an autonomous system.

FM are a powerful technique to have in one's repertoire when verifying autonomous systems. They can be used in many stages of the systems development life cycle, providing both static and dynamic verification; and they enable exhaustive, automatic checks over unambiguously-defined specifications. Despite persistent myths about FM [14, 39], they have been used in industry [80] and in the academic literature on formally verifying autonomous systems [53].

Applying formal verification needs a good description of the system and its requirements, just like

any other verification technique. Improving these descriptions requires better collaboration between FM practitioners and developers of autonomous systems. Formal verification approaches need to be able to cope with the architectures, requirements, and challenges of autonomous systems. In turn, autonomous systems engineering must ensure that it can produce systems that are amenable to robust verification techniques and provides clear definitions of the system's scope and requirements. The recipes presented here are grounded in our previous survey [53] and research experience [35] of formal verification for safety-critical autonomous systems.

As previously mentioned, some of the recipes describe multiple ways that they can be implemented. It is also possible that more than one of the recipes will be applied to the same system at the same time, and some of the recipes suggest how they can be used with another. In previous work [32], we argue that autonomous systems (particularly those embedded in robotic systems) need an integrated approach to verification, because of their complexity and blending of different specialist fields into one system. This means that it is likely that a system will need a combination of formal and informal verification approaches. One methodology for combining different approaches is the *Corroborative V&V* approach [78], which describes how to use formal and informal models of the same system to support wholistic verification. We consider this to be an *integrated* approach, because it combines (or integrates) several approaches.

The formal verification recipes discussed in this paper are a non-exhaustive snapshot of the utility of formal verification, but they are the starting point for a larger cookbook of recipes. There is currently little guidance about which FM to use, and best practice on how to use them. Efforts like the collection of relevant surveys and evaluations of the state-of-the-art in FM by the Formal Methods Europe association[1] are a good starting point. The recipes we present in this paper kickstart the discussion about systematic ways of formally verifying aspects of autonomous systems. Useful future work in this area includes implementing the recipes presented here to refine them, and analysing the literature and case studies for other useful formal verification recipes.

Because of the safety and security implications of an autonomous system failing, the most robust methods should be chosen for each system component and development phase. Formal methods are, by no means, a panacea for the challenges of engineering safe, correct, and trustworthy autonomous systems. However, the recipes presented in this paper illustrate why FM are useful for the verification of autonomous systems – alongside other verification techniques, including software testing, simulation-based testing, or physical tests. FM can provide robust specification and verification of many components and aspects of an autonomous system, so formal methods should be included in the repertoire of verification techniques used in the engineering of autonomous systems.

References

[1] Formal verification of autonomous vehicle platooning. 148.

[2] Jonathan M. Aitken, Sandor M. Veres, Affan Shaukat, Yang Gao, Elisa Cucco, Louise A. Dennis, Michael Fisher, Jeffrey A. Kuo, Thomas Robinson, and Paul E. Mort. Autonomous nuclear waste management. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 33(6):47–55, November 2018.

[3] Mohammed Alshiekh, Roderick Bloem, Rüdiger Ehlers, Bettina Könighofer, Scott Niekum, and Ufuk Topcu. Safe Reinforcement Learning via Shielding. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, April 2018.

[4] Michael Anderson and Susan Leigh Anderson. GenEth: a general ethical dilemma analyzer. *Paladyn, Journal of Behavioral Robotics*, 9(1):337–357, November 2018.

[5] Adina Aniculaesei, Daniel Arnsberger, Falk Howar, and Andreas Rausch. Towards the Verification of Safety-critical Autonomous Systems in Dynamic Environments. *Electron. Proc. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 232:79–90, dec 2016.

[6] Keijiro Araki, Andy Galloway, and Kenji Taguchi, editors. *IFM'99*. Springer London, London, 1999.

[1] Formal Methods Europe 'Choosing a Formal Method': `https://fmeurope.org/choosingaformalmethod/`

[7] Ronald Arkin, Patrick Ulam, and Brittany Duncan. An Ethical Governor for Constraining Lethal Action in an Autonomous System. Technical Report Technical Report GIT-GVU-09-02, GEORGIA INST OF TECH ATLANTA MOBILE ROBOT LAB, GEORGIA, 2009.

[8] Ronald Arkin, Patrick Ulam, and Alan Wagner. Moral Decision Making in Autonomous Systems: Enforcement, Moral Emotions, Dignity, Trust, and Deception. *Proc. IEEE*, 100(3):571–589, mar 2012.

[9] Jenay M Beer, Arthur D Fisk, and Wendy A Rogers. Toward a Framework for Levels of Robot Autonomy in Human-Robot Interaction. *Journal of Human-Robot Interaction*, 3(2):74, June 2014.

[10] B.W. Boehm. Verifying and Validating Software Requirements and Design Specifications. *IEEE Software*, 1(1):75–88, January 1984.

[11] Rafael H. Bordini, Michael Wooldridge, and Jomi Fred Hübner. *Programming Multi-Agent Systems in AgentSpeak using Jason*. John Wiley & Sons, 2007.

[12] Hamza Bourbouh, Marie Farrell, Anastasia Mavridou, Irfan Sljivo, Guillaume Brat, Louise A. Dennis, and Michael Fisher. Integrating Formal Verification and Assurance: An Inspection Rover Case Study. In Mariano M. Moscato, Aaron Dutle, Laura Titolo, Ivan Perez, and César A. Muñoz, editors, *NASA Formal Methods*, volume 12673, pages 53–71. Springer International Publishing, 2021. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.

[13] P. Bourque and R.E. Fairley, editors. *Guide to the Software Engineering Body of Knowledge, Version 3.0*. IEEE Computer Society, 2014.

[14] J.P. Bowen and M.G. Hinchey. Seven more myths of formal methods. *IEEE Softw.*, 12(4):34–41, jul 1995.

[15] British Standards Institution. *BS 8611:2016 - Robots and robotic devices. Guide to the ethical design and application of robots and robotic systems*. British Standards Institution, 2016.

[16] Jean-Michel Bruel, Sophie Ebersold, Florian Galinier, Manuel Mazzara, Alexandr Naumchev, and Bertrand Meyer. The Role of Formalism in System Requirements. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 54(5):1–36, May 2021.

[17] P Brutzman Donald, T Davis Duane, R Lucas George, B McGhee Robert, Donald Brutzman, Duane Davis, George Lucas, and Robert McGhee. Run-time Ethics Checking for Autonomous Unmanned Vehicles: Developing a Practical Approach, Paper and Slideset. In *Int. Symp. Unmanned Untethered Submers. Technol.*, Portsmouth New Hampshire, 2013. Monterey, California: Naval Postgraduate School.

[18] Alan Burns and Robert Davis. Mixed Criticality Systems - A Review. Technical Report August 2018, University of York, York, 2018.

[19] Rafael C. Cardoso, Louise A. Dennis, Marie Farrell, Michael Fisher, and Matt Luckcuck. Towards Compositional Verification for Modular Robotic Systems. In *Second Workshop on Formal Methods for Autonomous Systems (FMAS2020)*, volume 329, pages 15–22. Electronic {Proceedings} in {Theoretical} {Computer} {Science}, December 2020.

[20] Rafael C. Cardoso, Marie Farrell, Matt Luckcuck, Angelo Ferrando, and Michael Fisher. Heterogeneous Verification of an Autonomous Curiosity Rover. In Ritchie Lee, Susmit Jha, Anastasia Mavridou, and Dimitra Giannakopoulou, editors, *NASA Formal Methods*, volume 12229, pages 353–360. Springer International Publishing, 2020. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.

[21] Yushan Chen, Xu Chu Ding, Alin Stefanescu, and Calin Belta. Formal approach to the deployment of distributed robotic teams. *Trans. Robot.*, 28(1):158–171, 2012.

[22] Yushan Chen, Xu Chu Ding, Alin Stefanescu, and Calin Belta. A Formal Approach to Deployment of Robotic Teams in an Urban-Like Environment. In Alcherio Martinoli, Francesco Mondada, Nikolaus Correll, Grégory Mermoud, Magnus Egerstedt, M Ani Hsieh, Lynne E Parker, and Kasper Støy, editors, *Distrib. Auton. Robot. Syst.*, volume STAR 83, pages 313–327. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013.

[23] Mohamed Yassin Chkouri, Anne Robert, Marius Bozga, and Joseph Sifakis. Translating AADL into BIP-application to the verification of real-time systems. In *International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems*, pages 5–19. Springer, 2008.

[24] Samuel Colin, Arnaud Lanoix, Olga Kouchnarenko, and Jeanine Souquières. Using CSP||B Components: Application to a Platoon of Vehicles. In C Cofer and A Fantechi, editors, *Formal Methods for Industrial Critical Systems*, volume 5596 of *LNCS*, pages 103–118, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. tex.ids: colinUsingCSPBackslash2009, colinUsingCSPComponents2009.

[25] Louise Dennis, Michael Fisher, Marija Slavkovik, and Matt Webster. Formal verification of ethical choices in autonomous systems. *Rob. Auton. Syst.*, 77:1–14, 2016.

[26] Louise A. Dennis. The mcapl framework including the agent infrastructure layer and agent java pathfinder. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 3(24):617, 2018.

[27] Louise A Dennis and Michael Fisher. Actions with Durations and Failures in BDI Languages. In *ECAI 2014 - 21st European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 18-22 August 2014, Prague, Czech Republic - Including Prestigious Applications of Intelligent Systems (PAIS 2014)*, pages 995–996, 2014.

[28] Louise A Dennis, Michael Fisher, Matt Webster, and Rafael H. Bordini. Model checking agent programming languages. *Automated Software Engineering*, 19(1):5–63, 2012.

[29] Evan T. Dill, Steven D. Young, and Kelly J. Hayhurst. SAFEGUARD: An assured safety net technology for UAS. In *2016 IEEE/AIAA 35th Digital Avionics Systems Conference (DASC)*, pages 1–10, Sacramento, CA, USA, September 2016. IEEE.

[30] Mica R. Endsley. Level of automation effects on performance, situation awareness and workload in a dynamic control task. *Ergonomics*, 42(3):462–492, March 1999.

[31] Tom Everitt, Victoria Krakovna, Laurent Orseau, and Shane Legg. Reinforcement Learning with a Corrupted Reward Channel. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 4705–4713, Melbourne, Australia, August 2017. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization.

[32] Marie Farrell, Matt Luckcuck, and Michael Fisher. Robotics and Integrated Formal Methods: Necessity Meets Opportunity. In C Furia and K Winter, editors, *Integr. Form. Methods*, volume 11023 of *LNCS*, pages 161–171. Springer, 2018.

[33] Angelo Ferrando. The early bird catches the worm: First verify, then monitor! *Science of Computer Programming*, 172:160–179, mar 2019.

[34] Angelo Ferrando, Rafael C. Cardoso, Michael Fisher, Davide Ancona, Luca Franceschini, and Viviana Mascardi. ROSMonitoring: A Runtime Verification Framework for ROS. In *Towards Autonomous Robotic Systems*, volume 12228, pages 387–399. Springer International Publishing, 2020. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.

[35] Michael Fisher, Rafael C. Cardoso, Emily C. Collins, Christopher Dadswell, Louise A. Dennis, Clare Dixon, Marie Farrell, Angelo Ferrando, Xiaowei Huang, Mike Jump, Georgios Kourtis, Alexei Lisitsa, Matt Luckcuck, Shan Luo, Vincent Page, Fabio Papacchini, and Matt Webster. An Overview of Verification and Validation Challenges for Inspection Robots. *Robotics*, 10(2):67, April 2021.

[36] Dimitra Giannakopoulou, Thomas Pressburger, Anastasia Mavridou, and Johann Schumann. Generation of Formal Requirements from Structured Natural Language. In Nazim Madhavji and Liliana Pasquale, editors, *Requirements Engineering: Foundation for Software Quality*, volume 12045, pages 19–35, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.

[37] Mario Gleirscher, Simon Foster, and Jim Woodcock. New Opportunities for Integrated Formal Methods. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 52(6):1–36, January 2020. arXiv: 1812.10103.

[38] Raju Halder, José Proença, Nuno MacEdo, and André Santos. Formal Verification of ROS-Based Robotic Applications Using Timed-Automata. In *Workshop on Formal Methods in Software Engineering*, pages 44–50. IEEE, May 2017.

[39] Anthony Hall. Seven myths of formal methods. *IEEE Softw.*, 7(5):11–19, sep 1990.

[40] Nick Hawes, Christopher Burbridge, Ferdian Jovan, Lars Kunze, Bruno Lacerda, Lenka Mudrova, Jay Young, Jeremy Wyatt, Denise Hebesberger, Tobias Kortner, Rares Ambrus, Nils Bore, John Folkesson, Patric Jensfelt, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Hermans, Bastian Leibe, Aitor Aldoma, Thomas Faulhammer, Michael Zillich, Markus Vincze, Eris Chinellato, Muhannad Al-Omari, Paul Duckworth, Yiannis Gatsoulis, David C. Hogg, Anthony G. Cohn, Christian Dondrup, Jaime Pulido Fentanes, Tomas Krajnik, Joao M. Santos, Tom Duckett, and Marc Hanheide. The STRANDS project: Long-term autonomy in everyday environments. *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, 24(3):146–156, September 2017.

[41] C A R Hoare. An axiomatic basis for computer programming. *Communications of the ACM*, 12(10):576–580, 1969.

[42] Hui-Min Huang, Kerry Pavek, James Albus, and Elena Messina. Autonomy levels for unmanned systems (ALFUS) framework: an update. page 439, Orlando, Florida, USA, May 2005.

[43] Xiaowei Huang, Daniel Kroening, Wenjie Ruan, James Sharp, Youcheng Sun, Emese Thamo, Min Wu, and Xinping Yi. A Survey of Safety and Trustworthiness of Deep Neural Networks. *arXiv:1812.08342 [cs]*, July 2019. arXiv: 1812.08342.

[44] Anna Jobin, Marcello Ienca, and Effy Vayena. The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9):389–399, 2019.

[45] Sertac Karaman and Emilio Frazzoli. Sampling-based motion planning with deterministic μ-calculus specifications. In John Baillieul and Lei Guo, editors, *Conf. Decis. Control*, page 8, Shanghai, China, dec 2009. IEEE, IEEE.

[46] Oussama Karoui, Mohamed Khalgui, Anis Koubâa, Emna Guerfala, Zhiwu Li, and Eduardo Tovar. Dual mode for vehicular platoon safety: Simulation and formal verification. *Information Sciences*, 402(September):216–232, 2017.

[47] Vincent J. Koeman, Harm J. Griffioen, Danny C. Plenge, and Koen V. Hindriks. Designing a Cognitive Agent Connector for Complex Environments: A Case Study with StarCraft. In Danny Weyns, Viviana Mascardi, and Alessandro Ricci, editors, *Engineering Multi-Agent Systems*, volume 11375, pages 302–319, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.

[48] Hadas Kress-Gazit, Tichakorn Wongpiromsarn, and Ufuk Topcu. Correct, Reactive, High-Level Robot Control. *Robot. Autom. Mag.*, 18(3):65–74, sep 2011.

[49] Bettina Könighofer, Mohammed Alshiekh, Roderick Bloem, Laura Humphrey, Robert Könighofer, Ufuk Topcu, and Chao Wang. Shield synthesis. *Formal Methods in System Design*, 51(2):332–361, November 2017.

[50] Bettina Könighofer, Julian Rudolf, Alexander Palmisano, Martin Tappler, and Roderick Bloem. Online Shielding for Stochastic Systems. In Aaron Dutle, Mariano M. Moscato, Laura Titolo, César A. Muñoz, and Ivan Perez, editors, *NASA Formal Methods*, volume 12673, pages 231–248. Springer International Publishing, 2021. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.

[51] S.G. Loizou and K.J. Kyriakopoulos. Automatic synthesis of multi-agent motion tasks based on LTL specifications. In *2004 43rd IEEE Conf. Decis. Control (IEEE Cat. No.04CH37601)*, pages 153–158 Vol.1. IEEE, 2004.

[52] Matt Luckcuck. Offline Runtime Verification of Safety Requirements using CSP. *arXiv:2007.03522 [cs]*, May 2021. arXiv: 2007.03522.

[53] Matt Luckcuck, Marie Farrell, Louise A Dennis, Clare Dixon, and Michael Fisher. Formal Specification and Verification of Autonomous Robotic Systems: A Survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 52(5):1–41, September 2019.

[54] Matt Luckcuck, Marie Farrell, Louise A. Dennis, Clare Dixon, and Michael Fisher. A Summary of Formal Specification and Verification of Autonomous Robotic Systems. In Wolfgang Ahrendt and Silvia Lizeth Tapia Tarifa, editors, *Integrated Formal Methods*, volume 11918, pages 538–541. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.

[55] Piergiuseppe Mallozzi, Ezequiel Castellano, Patrizio Pelliccione, Gerardo Schneider, and Kenji Tei. A Runtime Monitoring Framework to Enforce Invariants on Reinforcement Learning Agents Exploring Complex Environments. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 2nd International Workshop on Robotics Software Engineering (RoSE)*, pages 5–12, Montreal, QC, Canada, May 2019. IEEE.

[56] Piergiuseppe Mallozzi, Patrizio Pelliccione, and Claudio Menghi. Keeping intelligence under control. *1st International Workshop on Software Engineering for Cognitive Services (SE4COG)*, pages 37–40, 2018.

[57] Marie Farrell, Nikos Mavrakis, Clare Dixon, and Yang Gao. Formal Verification of an Autonomous Grasping lgorithm. In *i-SAIRAS2020-Papers*, 2020.

[58] James Clerk Maxwell. I. On governors. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, 16:270–283, December 1868.

[59] Claudio Menghi, Christos Tsigkanos, Thorsten Berger, and Patrizio Pelliccione. PsALM: Specification of Dependable Robotic Missions. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings (ICSE-Companion)*, pages 99–102, Montreal, QC, Canada, May 2019. IEEE.

[60] Claudio Menghi, Christos Tsigkanos, Patrizio Pelliccione, Carlo Ghezzi, and Thorsten Berger. Specification Patterns for Robotic Missions. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, pages 1–1, 2019.

[61] Stefan Mitsch, Khalil Ghorbal, and André Platzer. On Provably Safe Obstacle Avoidance for Autonomous Robotic Ground Vehicles. *Robot. Sci. Syst.*, 2013.

[62] Stefan Mitsch, Khalil Ghorbal, and André Platzer. On Provably Safe Obstacle Avoidance for Autonomous Robotic Ground Vehicles. In Paul Newman, Dieter Fox, and David Hsu, editors, *Robotics: Science and Systems IX*, page 8, Berlin, Germany, June 2013. Robotics: Science and Systems Foundation.

[63] On-Road Automated Driving (ORAD) committee, SAE International. Taxonomy and Definitions for Terms Related to Driving Automation Systems for On-Road Motor Vehicles. Technical Report J3016_201806, SAE International, August 2018.

[64] Srinivas Pinisetty, Thierry Jéron, Stavros Tripakis, Yliès Falcone, Hervé Marchand, and Viorel Preoteasa. Predictive runtime verification of timed properties. *J. Syst. Softw.*, 132:353–365, 2017.

[65] André Platzer. Differential Dynamic Logic for Verifying Parametric Hybrid Systems. In *TABLEAUX*, volume 4548 of *LNCS*, pages 216–232. Springer, 2007.

[66] Stephen Prajna and Ali Jadbabaie. Safety Verification of Hybrid Systems Using Barrier Certificates. In Gerhard Goos, Juris Hartmanis, Jan van Leeuwen, Rajeev Alur, and George J. Pappas, editors, *Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, volume 2993, pages 477–492, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.

[67] Anand S. Rao and Michael P. Georgeff. BDI agents: From theory to practice. In Victor R. Lesser and Les Gasser, editors, *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Multiagent Systems, June 12-14, 1995, San Francisco, California, USA*, pages 312–319. The MIT Press, 1995.

[68] Kristin Yvonne Rozier. Specification: The Biggest Bottleneck in Formal Methods and Autonomy. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 8–26. Springer International Publishing, 2016.

[69] Ryan Proud, Jeremy Hart, and Richard Mrozinski. Methods for Determining the Level of Autonomy to Design into a Human Spaceflight Vehicle: A Function Specific Approach. page 15, Gaithersburg, MD; United States, September 2003.

[70] Thomas B Sheridan and William L Verplank. Human and computer control of undersea teleoperators. Technical report, Massachusetts Inst of Tech Cambridge Man-Machine Systems Lab, 1978.

[71] Thierry Sotiropoulos, Hélène Waeselynck, Jérémie Guiochet, and Félix Ingrand. Can robot navigation bugs be found in simulation? An exploratory study. In *Softw. Qual. Reliab. Secur.*, pages 150–159. IEEE, 2017.

[72] Standing Committee for Standards Activities of the IEEE Robotics and Automation Society. IEEE Standard Ontologies for Robotics and Automation. Technical report, IEEE, 2015.

[73] Peter Stringer, Rafael C. Cardoso, Xiaowei Huang, and Louise A. Dennis. Adaptable and Verifiable BDI Reasoning. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Agents and Robots for reliable Engineered Autonomy*, volume 319, pages 117–125. Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science (EPTCS), July 2020.

[74] Louis Viard, Laurent Ciarletta, and Pierre-Etienne Moreau. A Mission Definition, Verification and Validation Architecture. In Marie Farrell and Matt Luckcuck, editors, *Formal Methods. FM 2019 International Workshops*, volume 12232, pages 281–287. Springer International Publishing, 2020. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.

[75] Willem Visser, Klaus Havelund, Guillaume Brat, Seung Joon Park, and Flavio Lerda. Model Checking Programs. *Autom. Softw. Eng.*, 10(2):3–11, 2002.

[76] Matt Webster, Neil Cameron, Michael Fisher, and Mike Jump. Generating certification evidence for autonomous unmanned aircraft using model checking and simulation. *J. Aerosp. Inf. Syst.*, 11(5):1–31, may 2014.

[77] Matt Webster, Michael Fisher, Neil Cameron, and Mike Jump. Formal Methods for the Certification of Autonomous Unmanned Aircraft Systems. In F Flammini, S Bologna, and V Vittorini, editors, *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.*, volume 6894 of *LNCS*, pages 228–242, Naples, Italy, 2011. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

[78] Matt Webster, David Western, Dejanira Araiza-Illan, Clare Dixon, Kerstin Eder, Michael Fisher, and Anthony G Pipe. A corroborative approach to verification and validation of human–robot teams. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 39(1):73–99, 2020.

[79] Alan Winfield and Marina Jirotka. The case for an ethical black box. In *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.*, volume 10454 LNAI, pages 262–273. Springer, jul 2017.

[80] Jim Woodcock, Peter Gorm Larsen, Juan Bicarregui, and John Fitzgerald. Formal methods: Practice and Experience. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 41(4):1–36, 2009.

[81] Xian Zhang, Martin Leucker, and Wei Dong. Runtime verification with predictive semantics. In *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.*, 2012.