Provably Correct Design of Observation for Fault Diagnosis and State Estimation under Privacy and Network Constraints CISE/CNS/Computer Systems Research, Grant #1618369 PI: Agung Julius (Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute)

### Background

➢ In complex cyber-physical systems, operation planning and control are performed using limited information, e.g., because of measurement limitation and privacy concerns.

➢ We seek to build a framework for formal verification and synthesis that the system operates correctly under such limitations.

Key question: Can the right inference be made using the available information, e.g., for fault diagnosis and state estimation? (verification)

Key question: What observation/information is needed for fault diagnosis and state estimation? How to synthesize the

#### **Observation Map**

Behavior: collection of all execution trajectories of a hybrid system (could be varying by init state or parameters).



#### Timed Automata as Observer

➢ Suppose that we can only observe event times. Fault diagnosis can be done using the framework of timed automata.



For simplicity, suppose we can cover the behavior with 3 robust <sup>e1</sup> tubes. Each tube has its own event timing (with uncertainty)

diagnoser/observer? (synthesis)

➢ Key question: How do limitations of communication network (transmission delay, limited bandwidth) affect the system?

We propose a model-based approach, using hybrid systems to model the system dynamics.

# **Hybrid Systems**

➢ Hybrid systems have both continuous and discrete dynamics.

➤ Can be considered as a product of automata and differential equations.



Examples of observation map: hiding some of the variables, projection to the sequence of (timed) events, defining logical predicates on the variables.

Fault diagnosis: are the observations of normal and faulty behaviors separated (with sufficient distance)?

State estimation: can be system state be identified using the observed information?

Privacy preservation: can we guarantee that two behaviors are indistinguishable under the observation map?

### **Trajectory Robustness**

➢ With trajectory robustness, we can formally bound the variation of the execution trajectories as we vary the initial state or parameters.





> Depending on when the event  $\psi$  is observed, we can deduce in which tube the state is. For example, no event until t=7 means the state is in Tube 2.

#### **Privacy Preserving Fault Detection**

➢ We consider a family of ODE models for the temperature and humidity in a room under 4 conditions: normal and occupied (NO), normal and empty (NE), faulty and occupied (FO), and faulty and empty (FE). Note: faulty means a window is open.

➢ Given continuous measurement of temperature and humidity, we can diagnose fault (i.e., if the window is open). That is, we can distinguish between (NE or NO) and (FE and FO).

➢ However, what if we do not want to divulge whether the room is occupied. That is, we do not want to distinguish between (FE or NE) with (FO or NO).

Continuous states evolve according to differential equations (dependent on the discrete state).

Discrete state is updated at transition event times (guarded by conditions on the continuous state). The continuous state can be reset upon transition event.

Ideal for modeling cyber-physical systems. Special cases include timed automata, finite transition systems, dynamical systems.

Execution trajectories of a hybrid system include the evolution of the continuous states, discrete states, and the transition events.

### **Conceptual Example**



For hybrid systems, we can also bound the divergence of event times.  $Guard_0$ 



Key enabling result: Compact behavior can be approximated by finitely many trajectories.

> Bouncing basketball is a simple example of hybrid systems. The events occur when the ball bounces off the floor, with reset in the velocity state. The entire execution trajectories would consist of the x(t) and v(t) trajectories and the "bounce" event times.

ti



> An observation map, e.g., extracts only the "bounce" event times and discard the rest.

State observation: can we reconstruct the state of the system based on the "bounce" timing (assuming the model is known)? Answer: Yes (after two bounces).

 $\geq$  Fault diagnosis: can we deduce whether the ball is properly inflated ( $\rho$ =0.8) or under-



➤ A temporal logic formula is defined as a fault monitor  $\phi(\alpha^*) = \left( \Box_{[160,180)} T > 290.75 \right) \lor \left( (\Diamond_{[0,20)} T < 290.516) \\ \land (\Diamond_{[39,65)} T > 290.525 \land (\Diamond_{[122,161)} T < 290.625) \right)$ 

This formula is robustly satisfied by all faulty trajectories, and robustly violated by all non-faulty trajectories.

## Bibliography

A.A. Julius, Trajectory-based theory for hybrid systems, in Mathematical Control Theory I: Nonlinear and Hybrid Control



inflated ( $\rho$ =0.1) from the "bounce" timing? **Answer:** Yes (after three bounces). **> Privacy preservation:** Suppose that we do not want to reveal whether the ball was dropped from  $x(0) \in [10, 11]$  or  $x(0) \in [11, 12]$ . Using the "bounce" timing would violate this privacy constraint. However, if instead of the "bounce" times we report a logical predicate of the interevent time, "short" if the interval is less than 1 unit, and "long" otherwise, we would respect the privacy constraint, while still being able to detect underinflated ball.





Systems, Springer, 2015.

 Y. Deng, A. D'Innocenzo, A.A. Julius, Trajectory-based observer for hybrid automata fault diagnosis, in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decision and Control*, pp. 942-947, Osaka, Japan, 2015.

 Y. Deng, A. D'Innocenzo, M.D. DiBenedetto, S. Di Gennaro, A.A. Julius, Verification of hybrid automata diagnosability with measurement uncertainty, *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, vol. 61(4), pp. 982-993, 2016.

 Z. Xu, S. Saha, A.A. Julius, Provably correct design of observations for fault detection with privacy preservation, submitted to IEEE Conf. Decision and Control 2017.