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2. Overall Objectives

2.1. Scientific Objectives

2.1.1. Introduction

In the increasingly networked world, reliability of applications becomes ever more critical as the number
of users of, e.g., communication systems, web services, transportation etc., grows steadily. Management of
networked systems, in a very general sense of the term, therefore is a crucial task, but also a difficult one.

MExICo strives to take advantage of distribution by orchestrating cooperation between different agents that
observe local subsystems, and interact in a localized fashion.

The need for applying formal methods in the analysis and management of complex systems has long
been recognized. It is with much less unanimity that the scientific community embraces methods based on
asynchronous and distributed models. Centralized and sequential modeling still prevails.

However, we observe that crucial applications have increasing numbers of users, that networks providing
services grow fast both in the number of participants and the physical size and degree of spatial distribution.
Moreover, traditional isolated and proprietary software products for local systems are no longer typical for
emerging applications.

In contrast to traditional centralized and sequential machinery for which purely functional specifications are
efficient, we have to account for applications being provided from diverse and non-coordinated sources.
Their distribution (e.g. over the Web) must change the way we verify and manage them. In particular, one
cannot ignore the impact of quantitative features such as delays or failure likelihoods on the functionalities of
composite services in distributed systems.

We thus identify three main characteristics of complex distributed systems that constitute research challenges:

- Concurrency of behavior;
- Interaction of diverse and semi-transparent components; and
- management of Quantitative aspects of behavior.

2.1.2. Concurrency

The increasing size and the networked nature of communication systems, controls, distributed services, etc.
confront us with an ever higher degree of parallelism between local processes. This field of application for
our work includes telecommunication systems and composite web services. The challenge is to provide sound
theoretical foundations and efficient algorithms for management of such systems, ranging from controller
synthesis and fault diagnosis to integration and adaptation. While these tasks have received considerable
attention in the sequential setting, managing non-sequential behavior requires profound modifications for
existing approaches, and often the development of new approaches altogether. We see concurrency in
distributed systems as an opportunity rather than a nuisance. Our goal is to exploit asynchronicity and
distribution as an advantage. Clever use of adequate models, in particular partial order semantics (ranging
from Mazurkiewicz traces to event structures to MSCs) actually helps in practice. In fact, the partial order
vision allows us to make causal precedence relations explicit, and to perform diagnosis and test for the
dependency between events. This is a conceptual advantage that interleaving-based approaches cannot match.
The two key features of our work will be (i) the exploitation of concurrency by using asynchronous models
with partial order semantics, and (ii) distribution of the agents performing management tasks.

2.1.3. Interaction

Systems and services exhibit non-trivial interaction between specialized and heterogeneous components. A
coordinated interplay of several components is required; this is challenging since each of them has only
a limited, partial view of the system’s configuration. We refer to this problem as distributed synthesis or
distributed control. An aggravating factor is that the structure of a component might be semi-transparent,
which requires a form of grey box management.
2.1.4. Quantitative Features

Besides the logical functionalities of programs, the quantitative aspects of component behavior and interaction play an increasingly important role.

- **Real-time** properties cannot be neglected even if time is not an explicit functional issue, since transmission delays, parallelism, etc, can lead to time-outs striking, and thus change even the logical course of processes. Again, this phenomenon arises in telecommunications and web services, but also in transport systems.

- In the same contexts, **probabilities** need to be taken into account, for many diverse reasons such as unpredictable functionalities, or because the outcome of a computation may be governed by race conditions.

- Last but not least, constraints on **cost** cannot be ignored, be it in terms of money or any other limited resource, such as memory space or available CPU time.

2.1.5. Evolution and Perspectives

Since the creation of MExICo, the weight of quantitative aspects in all parts of our activities has grown, be it in terms of the models considered (weighted automata and logics), be it in transforming verification or diagnosis verdict into probabilistic statements (probabilistic diagnosis, statistical model checking), or within the recently started SystemX cooperation on supervision in multi-modal transport systems. This trend is certain to continue over the next couple of years, along with the growing importance of diagnosis and control issues.

In another development, the theory and use of partial order semantics has gained momentum in the past four years, and we intend to further strengthen our efforts and contacts in this domain to further develop and apply partial-order based deduction methods.

As concerns the study of interaction, our progress has been thus far less in the domain of distributed approaches than in the analysis of system composition, such as in networks of untimed or timed automata. While continuing this line of study, we also intend to turn more strongly towards distributed algorithms, namely in terms of parametrized verification methods.

3. Research Program

3.1. Concurrency

**Participants:** Benedikt Bollig, Thomas Chatain, Paul Gastin, Stefan Haar, Serge Haddad, Stefan Schwoon.

**Concurrency:** Property of systems allowing some interacting processes to be executed in parallel.

**Diagnosis:** The process of deducing from a partial observation of a system aspects of the internal states or events of that system; in particular, fault diagnosis aims at determining whether or not some non-observable fault event has occurred.

**Conformance Testing:** Feeding dedicated input into an implemented system IS and deducing, from the resulting output of I, whether I respects a formal specification S.

3.1.1. Introduction

It is well known that, whatever the intended form of analysis or control, a global view of the system state leads to overwhelming numbers of states and transitions, thus slowing down algorithms that need to explore the state space. Worse yet, it often blurs the mechanics that are at work rather than exhibiting them. Conversely, respecting concurrency relations avoids exhaustive enumeration of interleavings. It allows us to focus on ‘essential’ properties of non-sequential processes, which are expressible with causal precedence relations. These precedence relations are usually called causal (partial) orders. Concurrency is the explicit absence of such a precedence between actions that do not have to wait for one another. Both causal orders and concurrency are in fact essential elements of a specification. This is especially true when the specification is constructed
in a distributed and modular way. Making these ordering relations explicit requires to leave the framework of state/interleaving based semantics. Therefore, we need to develop new dedicated algorithms for tasks such as conformance testing, fault diagnosis, or control for distributed discrete systems. Existing solutions for these problems often rely on centralized sequential models which do not scale up well.

3.1.2. Diagnosis

**Participants:** Benedikt Bollig, Stefan Haar, Serge Haddad, Stefan Schwoon.

Fault Diagnosis for discrete event systems is a crucial task in automatic control. Our focus is on event oriented (as opposed to state oriented) model-based diagnosis, asking e.g. the following questions:

- what are the possible fault scenarios in the system that explain the pattern?
- Based on the observations, can we deduce whether or not a certain invisible fault has actually occurred?

Model-based diagnosis starts from a discrete event model of the observed system - or rather, its relevant aspects, such as possible fault propagations, abstracting away other dimensions. From this model, an extraction or unfolding process, guided by the observation, produces recursively the explanation candidates.

In asynchronous partial-order based diagnosis with Petri nets [63], [64], [68], one unfolds the labelled product of a Petri net model $N$ and an observed alarm pattern $A$, also in Petri net form. We obtain an acyclic net giving partial order representation of the behaviors compatible with the alarm pattern. A recursive online procedure filters out those runs (configurations) that explain exactly $A$. The Petri-net based approach generalizes to dynamically evolving topologies, in dynamical systems modeled by graph grammars, see [46].

3.1.2.1. Observability and Diagnosability

Diagnosis algorithms have to operate in contexts with low observability, i.e., in systems where many events are invisible to the supervisor. Checking observability and diagnosability for the supervised systems is therefore a crucial and non-trivial task in its own right. Analysis of the relational structure of occurrence nets allows us to check whether the system exhibits sufficient visibility to allow diagnosis. Developing efficient methods for both verification of diagnosability checking under concurrency, and the diagnosis itself for distributed, composite and asynchronous systems, is an important field for MExICo.

3.1.2.2. Distribution

Distributed computation of unfoldings allows one to factor the unfolding of the global system into smaller local unfoldings, by local supervisors associated with sub-networks and communicating among each other. In [64], [48], elements of a methodology for distributed computation of unfoldings between several supervisors, underwritten by algebraic properties of the category of Petri nets have been developed. Generalizations, in particular to Graph Grammars, are still do be done.

Computing diagnosis in a distributed way is only one aspect of a much vaster topic, that of distributed diagnosis (see [60], [72]). In fact, it involves a more abstract and often indirect reasoning to conclude whether or not some given invisible fault has occurred. Combination of local scenarios is in general not sufficient: the global system may have behaviors that do not reveal themselves as faulty (or, dually, non-faulty) on any local supervisor’s domain (compare [45], [51]). Rather, the local diagnosers have to join all information that is available to them locally, and then deduce collectively further information from the combination of their views. In particular, even the absence of fault evidence on all peers may allow to deduce fault occurrence jointly, see [77], [78]. Automatizing such procedures for the supervision and management of distributed and locally monitored asynchronous systems is a long-term goal to which MExICo hopes to contribute.

3.1.3. Contextual nets

**Participant:** Stefan Schwoon.
Assuring the correctness of concurrent systems is notoriously difficult due to the many unforeseeable ways in which the components may interact and the resulting state-space explosion. A well-established approach to alleviate this problem is to model concurrent systems as Petri nets and analyse their unfoldings, essentially an acyclic version of the Petri net whose simpler structure permits easier analysis [62].

However, Petri nets are inadequate to model concurrent read accesses to the same resource. Such situations often arise naturally, for instance in concurrent databases or in asynchronous circuits. The encoding tricks typically used to model these cases in Petri nets make the unfolding technique inefficient. Contextual nets, which explicitly do model concurrent read accesses, address this problem. Their accurate representation of concurrency makes contextual unfoldings up to exponentially smaller in certain situations. An abstract algorithm for contextual unfoldings was first given in [47]. In recent work, we further studied this subject from a theoretical and practical perspective, allowing us to develop concrete, efficient data structures and algorithms and a tool (Cunf) that improves upon existing state of the art. This work led to the PhD thesis of César Rodríguez in 2014.

Contextual unfoldings deal well with two sources of state-space explosion: concurrency and shared resources. Recently, we proposed an improved data structure, called contextual merged processes (CMP) to deal with a third source of state-space explosion, i.e. sequences of choices. The work on CMP [79] is currently at an abstract level. In the short term, we want to put this work into practice, requiring some theoretical groundwork, as well as programming and experimentation.

Another well-known approach to verifying concurrent systems is partial-order reduction, exemplified by the tool SPIN. Although it is known that both partial-order reduction and unfoldings have their respective strengths and weaknesses, we are not aware of any conclusive comparison between the two techniques. Spin comes with a high-level modeling language having an explicit notion of processes, communication channels, and variables. Indeed, the reduction techniques implemented in Spin exploit the specific properties of these features. On the other side, while there exist highly efficient tools for unfoldings, Petri nets are a relatively general low-level formalism, so these techniques do not exploit properties of higher language features. Our work on contextual unfoldings and CMPs represents a first step to make unfoldings exploit richer models. In the long run, we wish raise the unfolding technique to a suitable high-level modelling language and develop appropriate tool support.

3.1.4. Verification of Concurrent Recursive Programs

Participants: Benedikt Bollig, Paul Gastin, Stefan Schwoon.

3.1.5. Dynamic and parameterized concurrent systems

Participants: Benedikt Bollig, Paul Gastin.

In the past few years, our research has focused on concurrent systems where the architecture, which provides a set of processes and links between them, is static and fixed in advance. However, the assumption that the set of processes is fixed somehow seems to hinder the application of formal methods in practice. It is not appropriate in areas such as mobile computing or ad-hoc networks. In concurrent programming, it is actually perfectly natural to design a program, and claim its correctness, independently of the number of processes that participate in its execution. There are, essentially, two kinds of systems that fall into this category. When the process architecture is static but unknown, it is a parameter of the system; we then call a system parameterized. When, on the other hand, the process architecture is generated at runtime (i.e., process creation is a communication primitive), we say that a system is dynamic. Though parameterized and dynamic systems have received increasing interest in recent years, there is, by now, no canonical approach to modeling and verifying such systems. Our research program aims at the development of a theory of parameterized and dynamic concurrent systems. More precisely, our goal is a unifying theory that lays algebraic, logical, and automata-theoretic foundations to support and facilitate the study of parameterized and dynamic concurrent systems. Such theories indeed exist in non-parameterized settings where the number of processes and the way they are connected are fixed in advance. However, parameterized and dynamic systems lack such foundations and often restrict to very particular models with specialized verification techniques.
3.1.6. Testing

Participants: Benedikt Bollig, Paul Gastin, Stefan Haar.

3.1.6.1. Introduction

The gap between specification and implementation is at the heart of research on formal testing. The general conformance testing problem can be defined as follows: Does an implementation $M'$ conform to a given specification $M$? Here, both $M$ and $M'$ are assumed to have input and output channels. The formal model $M$ of the specification is entirely known and can be used for analysis. On the other hand, the implementation $M'$ is unknown but interacts with the environment through observable input and output channels. So the behavior of $M'$ is partially controlled by input streams, and partially observable via output streams. The Testing problem consists in computing, from the knowledge of $M$, input streams for $M'$ such that observation of the resulting output streams from $M'$ allows to determine whether $M'$ conforms to $M$ as intended.

In this project, we focus on distributed or asynchronous versions of the conformance testing problem. There are two main difficulties. First, due to the distributed nature of the system, it may not be possible to have a unique global observer for the outcome of a test. Hence, we may need to use local observers which will record only partial views of the execution. Due to this, it is difficult or even impossible to reconstruct a coherent global execution. The second difficulty is the lack of global synchronization in distributed asynchronous systems. Up to now, models were described with I/O automata having a centralized control, hence inducing global synchronizations.

3.1.6.2. Asynchronous Testing

Since 2006 and in particular during his sabbatical stay at the University of Ottawa, Stefan Haar has been working with Guy-Vincent Jourdan and Gregor v. Bochmann of UOttawa and Claude Jard of IRISA on asynchronous testing. In the synchronous (sequential) approach, the model is described by an I/O automaton with a centralized control and transitions labeled with individual input or output actions. This approach has known limitations when inputs and outputs are distributed over remote sites, a feature that is characteristic of, e.g., web computing. To account for concurrency in the system, they have developed in [70], [52] asynchronous conformance testing for automata with transitions labeled with (finite) partial orders of I/O. Intuitively, this is a “big step” semantics where each step allows concurrency but the system is synchronized before the next big step. This is already an important improvement on the synchronous setting. The non-trivial challenge is now to cope with fully asynchronous specifications using models with decentralized control such as Petri nets.

3.1.6.3. Near Future

Completion of asynchronous testing in the setting without any big-step synchronization, and an improved understanding of the relations and possible interconnections between local (i.e. distributed) and asynchronous (centralized) testing. This has been the objective of the TECSTES project (2011-2014), funded by a DIGITEO DIM/LSC grant, and which involved Hernán Ponce de Léon and Stefan Haar of MExICO, and Delphine Longuet at LRI, University Paris-Sud/Orsay. We have extended several well known conformance (ioco style) relations for sequential models to models that can handle concurrency (labeled event structures). Two semantics (interleaving and partial order) were presented for every relation. With the interleaving semantics, the relations we obtained boil down to the same relations defined for labeled transition systems, since they focus on sequences of actions. The only advantage of using labeled event structures as a specification formalism for testing remains in the conciseness of the concurrent model with respect to a sequential one. As far as testing is concerned, the benefit is low since every interleaving has to be tested. By contrast, under the partial order semantics, the relations we obtain allow to distinguish explicitly implementations where concurrent actions are implemented concurrently, from those where they are interleaved, i.e. implemented sequentially. Therefore, these relations will be of interest when designing distributed systems, since the natural concurrency between actions that are performed in parallel by different processes can be taken into account. In particular, the fact of being unable to control or observe the order between actions taking place on different processes will not be considered as an impediment for testing. We have developed a complete testing framework for concurrent systems, which included the notions of test suites and test cases. We studied what kind of systems are testable in such a framework, and we have proposed sufficient conditions for obtaining a complete test suite as well as an algorithm to construct a test suite with such properties.
A mid-to long term goal (which may or may not be addressed by MExICo depending on the availability of staff for this subject) is the comprehensive formalization of testing and testability in asynchronous systems with distributed architecture and test protocols.

3.2. Interaction

Participants: Benedikt Bollig, Thomas Chatain, Paul Gastin, Stefan Haar, Serge Haddad.

3.2.1. Introduction

Systems and services exhibit non-trivial interaction between specialized and heterogeneous components. This interplay is challenging for several reasons. On one hand, a coordinated interplay of several components is required, though each has only a limited, partial view of the system’s configuration. We refer to this problem as distributed synthesis or distributed control. An aggravating factor is that the structure of a component might be semi-transparent, which requires a form of grey box management.

Interaction, one of the main characteristics of systems under consideration, often involves an environment that is not under the control of cooperating services. To achieve a common goal, the services need to agree upon a strategy that allows them to react appropriately regardless of the interactions with the environment. Clearly, the notions of opponents and strategies fall within game theory, which is naturally one of our main tools in exploring interaction. We will apply to our problems techniques and results developed in the domains of distributed games and of games with partial information. We will consider also new problems on games that arise from our applications.

3.2.2. Distributed Control

Participants: Benedikt Bollig, Thomas Chatain, Paul Gastin, Stefan Haar.

Program synthesis, as introduced by Church [59] aims at deriving directly an implementation from a specification, allowing the implementation to be correct by design. When the implementation is already at hand but choices remain to be resolved at run time then the problem becomes controller synthesis. Both program and controller synthesis have been extensively studied for sequential systems. In a distributed setting, we need to synthesize a distributed program or distributed controllers that interact locally with the system components. The main difficulty comes from the fact that the local controllers/programs have only a partial view of the entire system. This is also an old problem largely considered undecidable in most settings [76], [71], [74], [65], [67].

Actually, the main undecidability sources come from the fact that this problem was addressed in a synchronous setting using global runs viewed as sequences. In a truly distributed system where interactions are asynchronous we have recently obtained encouraging decidability results [66], [56]. This is a clear witness where concurrency may be exploited to obtain positive results. It is essential to specify expected properties directly in terms of causality revealed by partial order models of executions (MSCs or Mazurkiewicz traces). We intend to develop this line of research with the ambitious aim to obtain decidability for all natural systems and specifications. More precisely, we will identify natural hypotheses both on the architecture of our distributed system and on the specifications under which the distributed program/controller synthesis problem is decidable. This should open the way to important applications, e.g., for distributed control of embedded systems.

3.2.3. Adaptation and Grey box management

Participants: Stefan Haar, Serge Haddad.

Contrary to mainframe systems or monolithic applications of the past, we are experiencing and using an increasing number of services that are performed not by one provider but rather by the interaction and cooperation of many specialized components. As these components come from different providers, one can no longer assume all of their internal technologies to be known (as it is the case with proprietary technology). Thus, in order to compose e.g. orchestrated services over the web, to determine violations of specifications or contracts, to adapt existing services to new situations etc, one needs to analyze the interaction behavior of boxes that are known only through their public interfaces. For their semi-transparent-semi-opaque nature,
we shall refer to them as grey boxes. While the concrete nature of these boxes can range from vehicles in a highway section to hotel reservation systems, the tasks of grey box management have universal features allowing for generalized approaches with formal methods. Two central issues emerge:

- **Abstraction**: From the designer point of view, there is a need for a trade-off between transparency (no abstraction) in order to integrate the box in different contexts and opacity (full abstraction) for security reasons.
- **Adaptation**: Since a grey box gives a partial view about the behavior of the component, even if it is not immediately useable in some context, the design of an adaptator is possible. Thus the goal is the synthesis of such an adaptator from a formal specification of the component and the environment.

Our work on direct modeling and handling of "grey boxes" via modal models (see [61]) was halted when Dorsaf El-Hog stopped her PhD work to leave academia, and has not resumed for lack of staff. However, it should be noted that semi-transparent system management in a larger sense remains an active field for the team, witness in particular our work on diagnosis and testing.

### 3.3. Management of Quantitative Behavior

**Participants**: Benedikt Bollig, Thomas Chatain, Paul Gastin, Stefan Haar, Serge Haddad.

#### 3.3.1. Introduction

Besides the logical functionalities of programs, the quantitative aspects of component behavior and interaction play an increasingly important role.

- **Real-time** properties cannot be neglected even if time is not an explicit functional issue, since transmission delays, parallelism, etc, can lead to time-outs striking, and thus change even the logical course of processes. Again, this phenomenon arises in telecommunications and web services, but also in transport systems.

- In the same contexts, **probabilities** need to be taken into account, for many diverse reasons such as unpredictable functionalities, or because the outcome of a computation may be governed by race conditions.

- Last but not least, constraints on **cost** cannot be ignored, be it in terms of money or any other limited resource, such as memory space or available CPU time.

Traditional mainframe systems were proprietary and (essentially) localized; therefore, impact of delays, unforeseen failures, etc. could be considered under the control of the system manager. It was therefore natural, in verification and control of systems, to focus on **functional** behavior entirely.

With the increase in size of computing system and the growing degree of compositionality and distribution, quantitative factors enter the stage:

- calling remote services and transmitting data over the web creates **delays**;
- remote or non-proprietary components are not “deterministic”, in the sense that their behavior is uncertain.

**Time** and **probability** are thus parameters that management of distributed systems must be able to handle; along with both, the **cost** of operations is often subject to restrictions, or its minimization is at least desired. The mathematical treatment of these features in distributed systems is an important challenge, which MExICo is addressing; the following describes our activities concerning probabilistic and timed systems. Note that cost optimization is not a current activity but enters the picture in several intended activities.

#### 3.3.2. Probabilistic distributed Systems

**Participants**: Stefan Haar, Serge Haddad, Claudine Picaronny.
3.3.2.1. Non-sequential probabilistic processes

Practical fault diagnosis requires to select explanations of maximal likelihood. For partial-order based diagnosis, this leads therefore to the question what the probability of a given partially ordered execution is. In Benveniste et al. [50], [43], we presented a model of stochastic processes, whose trajectories are partially ordered, based on local branching in Petri net unfoldings; an alternative and complementary model based on Markov fields is developed in [69], which takes a different view on the semantics and overcomes the first model’s restrictions on applicability.

Both approaches abstract away from real time progress and randomize choices in logical time. On the other hand, the relative speed - and thus, indirectly, the real-time behavior of the system’s local processes - are crucial factors determining the outcome of probabilistic choices, even if non-determinism is absent from the system.

In another line of research [54] we have studied the likelihood of occurrence of non-sequential runs under random durations in a stochastic Petri net setting. It remains to better understand the properties of the probability measures thus obtained, to relate them with the models in logical time, and exploit them e.g. in diagnosis.

3.3.2.2. Distributed Markov Decision Processes

**Participant:** Serge Haddad.

Distributed systems featuring non-deterministic and probabilistic aspects are usually hard to analyze and, more specifically, to optimize. Furthermore, high complexity theoretical lower bounds have been established for models like partially observed Markovian decision processes and distributed partially observed Markovian decision processes. We believe that these negative results are consequences of the choice of the models rather than the intrinsic complexity of problems to be solved. Thus we plan to introduce new models in which the associated optimization problems can be solved in a more efficient way. More precisely, we start by studying connection protocols weighted by costs and we look for online and offline strategies for optimizing the mean cost to achieve the protocol. We have been cooperating on this subject with the SUMO team at Inria Rennes; in the joint work [44]; there, we strive to synthesize for a given MDP a control so as to guarantee a specific stationary behavior, rather than - as is usually done - so as to maximize some reward.

3.3.3. Large scale probabilistic systems

Addressing large-scale probabilistic systems requires to face state explosion, due to both the discrete part and the probabilistic part of the model. In order to deal with such systems, different approaches have been proposed:

- Restricting the synchronization between the components as in queuing networks allows to express the steady-state distribution of the model by an analytical formula called a product-form [49].
- Some methods that tackle with the combinatorial explosion for discrete-event systems can be generalized to stochastic systems using an appropriate theory. For instance symmetry based methods have been generalized to stochastic systems with the help of aggregation theory [58].
- At last simulation, which works as soon as a stochastic operational semantic is defined, has been adapted to perform statistical model checking. Roughly speaking, it consists to produce a confidence interval for the probability that a random path fulfills a formula of some temporal logic [80].

We want to contribute to these three axes: (1) we are looking for product-forms related to systems where synchronization are more involved (like in Petri nets), see [9]; (2) we want to adapt methods for discrete-event systems that require some theoretical developments in the stochastic framework and, (3) we plan to address some important limitations of statistical model checking like the expressiveness of the associated logic and the handling of rare events.
3.3.4. Real time distributed systems

Nowadays, software systems largely depend on complex timing constraints and usually consist of many interacting local components. Among them, railway crossings, traffic control units, mobile phones, computer servers, and many more safety-critical systems are subject to particular quality standards. It is therefore becoming increasingly important to look at networks of timed systems, which allow real-time systems to operate in a distributed manner.

Timed automata are a well-studied formalism to describe reactive systems that come with timing constraints. For modeling distributed real-time systems, networks of timed automata have been considered, where the local clocks of the processes usually evolve at the same rate [73] [55]. It is, however, not always adequate to assume that distributed components of a system obey a global time. Actually, there is generally no reason to assume that different timed systems in the networks refer to the same time or evolve at the same rate. Any component is rather determined by local influences such as temperature and workload.

3.3.4.1. Implementation of Real-Time Concurrent Systems

Participants: Thomas Chatain, Stefan Haar, Serge Haddad.

This was one of the tasks of the ANR ImpRo.

Formal models for real-time systems, like timed automata and time Petri nets, have been extensively studied and have proved their interest for the verification of real-time systems. On the other hand, the question of using these models as specifications for designing real-time systems raises some difficulties. One of those comes from the fact that the real-time constraints introduce some artifacts and because of them some syntactically correct models have a formal semantics that is clearly unrealistic. One famous situation is the case of Zeno executions, where the formal semantics allows the system to do infinitely many actions in finite time. But there are other problems, and some of them are related to the distributed nature of the system. These are the ones we address here.

One approach to implementability problems is to formalize either syntactical or behavioral requirements about what should be considered as a reasonable model, and reject other models. Another approach is to adapt the formal semantics such that only realistic behaviors are considered.

These techniques are preliminaries for dealing with the problem of implementability of models. Indeed implementing a model may be possible at the cost of some transformation, which make it suitable for the target device. By the way these transformations may be of interest for the designer who can now use high-level features in a model of a system or protocol, and rely on the transformation to make it implementable.

We aim at formalizing and automating translations that preserve both the timed semantics and the concurrent semantics. This effort is crucial for extending concurrency-oriented methods for logical time, in particular for exploiting partial order properties. In fact, validation and management - in a broad sense - of distributed systems is not realistic in general without understanding and control of their real-time dependent features; the link between real-time and logical-time behaviors is thus crucial for many aspects of MExICo’s work.

3.3.5. Weighted Automata and Weighted Logics

Participants: Benedikt Bollig, Paul Gastin.

Time and probability are only two facets of quantitative phenomena. A generic concept of adding weights to qualitative systems is provided by the theory of weighted automata [42]. They allow one to treat probabilistic or also reward models in a unified framework. Unlike finite automata, which are based on the Boolean semiring, weighted automata build on more general structures such as the natural or real numbers (equipped with the usual addition and multiplication) or the probabilistic semiring. Hence, a weighted automaton associates with any possible behavior a weight beyond the usual Boolean classification of “acceptance” or “non-acceptance”. Automata with weights have produced a well-established theory and come, e.g., with a characterization in terms of rational expressions, which generalizes the famous theorem of Kleene in the unweighted setting. Equipped with a solid theoretical basis, weighted automata finally found their way into numerous application areas such as natural language processing and speech recognition, or digital image compression.
What is still missing in the theory of weighted automata are satisfactory connections with verification-related issues such as (temporal) logic and bisimulation that could lead to a general approach to corresponding satisfiability and model-checking problems. A first step towards a more satisfactory theory of weighted systems was done in [53]. That paper, however, does not give definite answers to all the aforementioned problems. It identifies directions for future research that we will be tackling.

4. Application Domains

4.1. Telecommunications

Participants: Stefan Haar, Serge Haddad.

*MExICo*’s research is motivated by problems on system management in several domains:

- In the domain of service oriented computing, it is often necessary to insert some Web service into an existing orchestrated business process, e.g. to replace another component after failures. This requires to ensure, often actively, conformance to the interaction protocol. One therefore needs to synthesize *adaptators* for every component in order to steer its interaction with the surrounding processes.
- Still in the domain of telecommunications, the supervision of a network tends to move from out-of-band technology, with a fixed dedicated supervision infrastructure, to in-band supervision where the supervision process uses the supervised network itself. This new setting requires to revisit the existing supervision techniques using control and diagnosis tools.

We have participated in the Univerself Project on self-aware networks, and will be searching new cooperations.

4.2. Transport Systems

Participants: Stefan Haar, Serge Haddad, Yann Duplouy, Simon Theissing.

We participate in the IRT *System X’s system of systems* program TMM, in two projects:

- project MIC on multi-modal transport systems with academic partners UPMC, IFSTTAR and CEA, and several industrial partners including Alstom (project leader), COSMO and Renault. Transportation operators in an urban area need to plan, supervise and steer different means of transportation with respect to several criteria:
  - Maximize capacity;
  - guarantee punctuality and robustness of service;
  - minimize energy consumption.

The systems must achieve these objectives not only under ideal conditions, but also be robust to perturbations (such as a major cultural or sport event creating additional traffic), modifications of routes (roadwork, accidents, demonstrations, ...) and tolerant to technical failures. Therefore, systems must be enabled to raise appropriate alarms upon detection of anomalies, diagnose the type of anomaly and select the appropriate response. While the above challenges belong already to the tasks of individual operators in the unimodal setting, the rise of and increasing demand for multi-modal transports forces to achieve these planning, optimization and control goals not in isolation, but in a cooperative manner, across several operators. The research task here is first to analyze the transportation system regarding the available means, capacities and structures, and so as to identify the impacting factors and interdependencies of the system variables. Based on this analysis, the task is to derive and implement robust planning, with tolerance to technical faults; diagnosis and control strategies that are optimal under several, possibly different, criteria (average case vs worst case performance, energy efficiency, etc.) and allow to adapt to changes e.g. from nominal mode to reduced mode, sensor failures, etc.
- the project SVA (*Simulation pour la Sécurité du Véhicule Autonome*), where the PhD Thesis of Yann Duplouy targets the application of formal methods to the development of embedded systems for autonomous vehicles.
4.3. Biological Systems

Participants: Stefan Haar, Serge Haddad, Stefan Schwoon, Thomas Chatain.

We have begun in 2014 to examine concurrency issues in systems biology, and are currently enlarging the scope of our research’s applications in this direction. To see the context, note that in recent years, a considerable shift of biologists’ interest can be observed, from the mapping of static genotypes to gene expression, i.e. the processes in which genetic information is used in producing functional products. These processes are far from being uniquely determined by the gene itself, or even jointly with static properties of the environment; rather, regulation occurs throughout the expression processes, with specific mechanisms increasing or decreasing the production of various products, and thus modulating the outcome. These regulations are central in understanding cell fate (how does the cell differentiate ? Do mutations occur ? etc), and progress there hinges on our capacity to analyse, predict, monitor and control complex and variegated processes. Our first step in this domain is related in the conference contribution [57], where we apply Petri net unfolding techniques for the efficient computation of attractors in a regulatory network; that is, to identify strongly connected reachability components that correspond to stable evolutions, e.g. of a cell that differentiates into a specific functionality (or mutation). This constitutes the starting point of a broader research with Petri net unfolding techniques in regulation. In fact, the use of ordinary Petri nets for capturing regulatory network (RN) dynamics overcomes the limitations of traditional RN models : those impose e.g. Monotonicity properties in the influence that one factor had upon another, i.e. always increasing or always decreasing, and were thus unable to cover all actual behaviours (see [75]). Rather, we follow the more refined model of boolean networks of automata, where the local states of the different factors jointly determine which state transitions are possible. For these connectors, ordinary PNs constitute a first approximation, improving greatly over the literature but leaving room for improvement in terms of introducing more refined logical connectors. Future work thus involves transcending this class of PN models. Via unfoldings, one has access – provided efficient techniques are available – to all behaviours of the model, rather than over-or under-approximations as previously. This opens the way to efficiently searching in particular for determinants of the cell fate : which attractors are reachable from a given stage, and what are the factors that decide in favor of one or the other attractor, etc. The list of potential applications in biology and medicine of such a methodology would be too long to reproduce here.

5. Highlights of the Year

5.1. Highlights of the Year

5.1.1. Major Results

5.1.1.1. Approaching the Coverability Problem Continuously

The coverability problem for Petri nets plays a central role in the verification of concurrent shared-memory programs. However, its high EXPsACE-complete complexity poses a challenge when encountered in real-world instances. In [39], we develop a new approach to this problem which is primarily based on applying forward coverability in continuous Petri nets as a pruning criterion inside a backward coverability framework. A cornerstone of our approach is the efficient encoding of a recently developed polynomial-time algorithm for reachability in continuous Petri nets into SMT. We demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach on standard benchmarks from the literature, which shows that our approach decides significantly more instances than any existing tool and is in addition often much faster, in particular on large instances.

5.1.1.2. An Automata-Theoretic Approach to the Verification of Distributed Algorithms

In [21] we introduce an automata-theoretic method for the verification of distributed algorithms running on ring networks. In a distributed algorithm, an arbitrary number of processes cooperate to achieve a common goal (e.g., elect a leader). Processes have unique identifiers (pids) from an infinite, totally ordered domain. An algorithm proceeds in synchronous rounds, each round allowing a process to perform a bounded sequence of actions such as send or receive a pid, store it in some register, and compare register contents w.r.t. the associated
total order. An algorithm is supposed to be correct independently of the number of processes. To specify correctness properties, we introduce a logic that can reason about processes and pids. Referring to leader election, it may say that, at the end of an execution, each process stores the maximum pid in some dedicated register. Since the verification of distributed algorithms is undecidable, we propose an underapproximation technique, which bounds the number of rounds. This is an appealing approach, as the number of rounds needed by a distributed algorithm to conclude is often exponentially smaller than the number of processes. We provide an automata-theoretic solution, reducing model checking to emptiness for alternating two-way automata on words. Overall, we show that round-bounded verification of distributed algorithms over rings is PSPACE-complete.

5.1.1.3. Unfolding-Based Process Discovery

In [33] we present a novel technique for process discovery. In contrast to the current trend, which only considers an event log for discovering a process model, we assume two additional inputs: an independence relation on the set of logged activities, and a collection of negative traces. After deriving an intermediate net unfolding from them, we perform a controlled folding giving rise to a Petri net which contains both the input log and all independence-equivalent traces arising from it. Remarkably, the derived Petri net cannot execute any trace from the negative collection. The entire chain of transformations is fully automated. A tool has been developed and experimental results are provided.

6. New Software and Platforms

6.1. General Remark

The team’s software and platform are the same as in 2014, namely

- COSMOS,
- MOLE,
- CosyVerif;

no major changes have occurred in 2015.

7. New Results

7.1. Highlights

Please note that three of our most important and novel results are given in the ’Highlights’ section above.

7.2. Specifying and Verifying Concurrent C Programs with TLA+

Verifying software systems automatically from their source code rather than modelling them in a dedicated language gives more confidence in establishing their properties. In [37] we propose a formal specification and verification approach for concurrent C programs directly based on the semantics of C. We define a set of translation rules and implement it in a tool (C2TLA+) that automatically translates C code into a TLA+ specification. The TLC model checker can use this specification to generate a model, allowing to check the absence of runtime errors and dead code in the C program in a given configuration. In addition, we show how translated specifications interact with manually written ones to: check the C code against safety or liveness properties; provide concurrency primitives or model hardware that cannot be expressed in C; and use abstract versions of translated C functions to address the state explosion problem. All these verifications have been conducted on an industrial case study, which is a part of the microkernel of the PharOS real-time system.
7.3. Active Diagnosis with Observable Quiescence

Active diagnosis of a discrete-event system consists in controlling the system such that faults can be detected. In [27] we extend the framework of active diagnosis presented in [7] by introducing modalities for actions and states and a new capability for the controller, namely observing that the system is quiescent. We design a game-based construction for both the decision and the synthesis problems that is computationally optimal. Furthermore we prove that the size and the delay provided by the active diagnoser (when it exists) are almost optimal.

7.4. Test Case Generation for Concurrent Systems Using Event Structures

In [23] we deal with the test-case generation problem for concurrent systems that are specified by true-concurrency models such as Petri nets. We show that using true-concurrency models reduces both the size and the number of test cases needed for achieving certain coverage criteria. We present a test-case generation algorithm based on Petri net unfoldings and a SAT encoding for solving controllability problems in test cases. Finally, we evaluate our algorithm against traditional test-case generation methods under interleaving semantics.

7.5. State Space Reduction Strategie for Model Checking Concurrent C Programs

Model checking is an effective technique for uncovering subtle errors in concurrent systems. Unfortunately, the state space explosion is the main bottleneck in model checking tools. In [31] we propose a state space reduction technique for model checking concurrent programs written in C. The reduction technique consists in an analysis phase, which defines an approximate agglomeration predicate. This latter states whether a statement can be agglomerated or not. We implement this predicate using a syntactic analysis, as well as a semantic analysis based on abstract interpretation. We show the usefulness of using agglomeration technique to reduce the state space, as well as to generate an abstract TLA+ specification from a C program.

7.6. Simple Priced Timed Games Are Not That Simple

Priced timed games are two-player zero-sum games played on priced timed automata (whose locations and transitions are labeled by weights modeling the costs of spending time in a state and executing an action, respectively). The goals of the players are to minimise and maximise the cost to reach a target location, respectively. In [25] we consider priced timed games with one clock and arbitrary (positive and negative) weights and show that, for an important subclass of theirs (the so-called simple priced timed games), one can compute, in exponential time, the optimal values that the players can achieve, with their associated optimal strategies. As side results, we also show that one-clock priced timed games are determined and that we can use our result on simple priced timed games to solve the more general class of so-called reset-acyclic priced timed games (with arbitrary weights and one-clock).

7.7. A Hybrid-Dynamical Model for Passenger-flow in Transportation Systems

In a network with different transportation modes, or multimodal public transportation system (MPTS), modes are linked among one another not by resources or infrastructure elements—which are not shared, e.g., between different metro lines—but by the flow of passengers between them. Now, the movements of passengers are steered by the destinations that individual passengers have, and by which they can be grouped into trip profiles. To use the strength of fluid dynamics, introduce in [30] a multiphase hybrid Petri net model, in which the vehicle dynamics is rendered by individual tokens moving in an infrastructure net, while passenger quantities are given as vectors—whose components correspond to trip profiles—and evolve at stations according to fluid dynamics. This model is intended as a building block for obtaining supervisory control, via transport operator actions, to mitigate congestion.
7.8. An Algebraic View of Space/Belief and Extrusion/Utterance for Concurrency/Epistemic Logic

In [29] we enrich spatial constraint systems with operators to specify information and processes moving from a space to another. We shall refer to these new structures as spatial constraint systems with extrusion. We shall investigate the properties of this new family of constraint systems and illustrate their applications. From a computational point of view the new operators provide for process/information extrusion, a central concept in formalisms for mobile communication. From an epistemic point of view extrusion corresponds to a notion we shall call utterance; a piece of information that an agent communicates to others but that may be inconsistent with the agent’s beliefs. Utterances can then be used to express instances of epistemic notions, which are common place in social media, such as hoaxes or intentional lies. Spatial constraint systems with extrusion can be seen as complete Heyting algebras equipped with maps to account for spatial and epistemic specifications.

7.9. Preserving Partial Order Runs in Parametric Time Petri Nets

Parameter synthesis for timed systems aims at deriving parameter valuations satisfying a given property. In [22] we target concurrent systems; it is well known that concurrency is a source of state-space explosion, and partial order techniques were defined to cope with this problem. Here we use partial order semantics for parametric time Petri nets as a way to significantly enhance the result of an existing synthesis algorithm. Given a reference parameter valuation, our approach synthesizes other valuations preserving, up to interleaving, the behavior of the reference parameter valuation. We show the applicability of our approach using acyclic asynchronous circuits.

7.10. Non-Atomic Transition Firing in Contextual Nets

The firing rule for Petri nets assumes instantaneous and simultaneous consumption and creation of tokens. In the context of ordinary Petri nets, this poses no particular problem because of the system’s asynchronicity, even if token creation occurs later than token consumption in the firing. With read arcs, the situation changes, and several different choices of semantics are possible. The step semantics introduced by Janicki and Koutny can be seen as imposing a two-phase firing scheme: first, the presence of the required tokens is checked, then consumption and production of tokens happens. Pursuing this approach further, we develop in [28] a more general framework based on explicitly splitting the phases of firing, allowing to synthesize coherent steps. This turns out to define a more general non-atomic semantics, which has important potential for safety as it allows to detect errors that were missed by the previous semantics. Then we study the characterization of partial-order processes feasible under one or the other semantics.

8. Bilateral Contracts and Grants with Industry

8.1. Bilateral Contracts with Industry

At present, our industrial cooperations are centered in the IRT SystemX, see below; there are currently no bilateral agreements.

9. Partnerships and Cooperations

9.1. Regional Initiatives: IRT

9.1.1. SystemX

Participants: Simon Theissing, Yann Duplouy, Serge Haddad.
We participate in the projects
- MIC on multi-modal transport systems with in the IRT System X, with academic partners UPMC, IFSTTAR and CEA, and several industrial partners including Alstom (project leader), COSMO and Renault. MIC is scheduled to be completed late in 2016, and
- the project SVA (Simulation pour la Sécurité du Véhicule Autonome ), where the PhD Thesis of Yann Duplouy targets the application of formal methods to the development of embedded systems for autonomous vehicles.

9.2. National Initiatives
We have not yet been notified about acceptance of our ANR submissions.

9.3. European Initiatives
In preparation.

9.3.1. FP7 & H2020 Projects
Serge Haddad is participating in the ERC EQualIS, 'Enhancing the Quality of Interacting Systems’, directed by Patricia Bouyer.

9.4. International Initiatives

9.4.1. Inria International Labs projects
LIA INFORMEL with CMI, Chennai, India ; see below.

9.4.2. Inria International Partners

9.4.2.1. Informal International Partners
1. The CMI (Chennai Mathematical Institute) is a long-standing partner of our team. The project Île de France/Inde in the ARCUS program from 2008 to 2011 has allowed several exchange visits between Cachan and Chennai, organizations of ACTS workshops with french and indian researchers in Chennai, internships in Cachan, and two theses in co-tutelle (Akshay Sundararaman, defended in 2010) and Aiswarya Cyriac (defended in 2014). Currently, Paul Gastin is co-head (with Madhavan Mukund) of the CNRS International Associated Laboratory (LIA) INFORMEL (INdo-French FORmal Methods Lab, http://projects.lsv.ens-cachan.fr/informel/), see below.
2. We have been exchanging visits for several years between MExICo the computer science and electrical engineering departments at Newcastle University, UK , with visits in both directions; they involve in particular Maciej Koutny, Alex Yakovlev, Victor Khomenko and Andrey Mokhov, as well as Anil Wipat, co-director of the center for Synthetic Biology and the Bioeconomy at Newcastle University.
3. Exchanges are frequent with Rolf Hennicker from LMU and Javier Esparza at TUM, both in Munich, Germany.

9.5. International Research Visitors

9.5.1. Visits of International Scientists
- 5 – 31 March 2015: Prakash Saivasan (CMI) visits LSV to work with Paul Gastin on nested words for higher-order pushdown systems
- 19 May – 6 June 2015: S. Krishna and S. Akshay visit LSV to work with Paul Gastin on split-width techniques for the analysis of timed systems.
• 10 June – 4 July 2015: K. Narayan Kumar (CMI) visit France to pursue several collaborations: with Paul Gastin (LSV) on bounded time-stamping for message passing systems, with Ahmed Bouajjani (LIAFA) on analysis of multi-pushdown systems, and with Pascal Weil (LaBRI) on bounded reachability analysis for shared memory systems.

9.5.1.1. Internships

Georgios Christodoulis
Date: May 2015 - Jul 2015
Institution: National University Athens (Greece)
Supervisor: Stefan Haar

Sougata Bose
Date: May 2015 - Jul 2015
Institution: CMI (India)
Supervisor: Benedikt Bollig and Paul Gastin

9.5.2. Visits to International Teams

9.5.2.1. Short stays abroad

• In July 2015, Serge Haddad visited U of Turin, Italy, for a research cooperation with Prof. Giuliana Franceschinis.
• Stefan Haar visited Newcastle University (UK), TU of Eindhoven (NL) and University of Luxemburg for short visits.
• 29 November – 20 December 2015: Paul Gastin (LSV) visits S. Krishna and S. Akshay (IIT Bombay) to work on tree automata techniques for timed-systems.

10. Dissemination

10.1. Promoting Scientific Activities

10.1.1. LIA INFORMEL

The Indo-French Formal Methods Lab is an International Associated Laboratory (LIA) fostering the scientific collaboration between India and France in the domain of formal methods and applications to the verification of complex systems. Our research focuses on theoretical foundations of games, automata, and logics, three important tools in formal methods. We study applications to the verification of safety-critical systems, with an emphasis on quantitative aspects (time, cost, energy, etc.), concurrency, control, and security protocols. The Laboratory was founded in 2012 by a consortium of researchers from the French Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS), Ecole Normale Supéérieure de Cachan (ENS Cachan), Université Bordeaux 1, the Institute of Mathematical Sciences Chennai (IMSc), the Chennai Mathematical Institute (CMI), and the Indian Institute of Science Bangalore (IISc). It is directed by Paul Gastin (ENS Cachan, MExICO team) and Madhavan Mukund (CMI). The LIA has been scientifically extremely active and productive since its creation. The LIA has supported numerous scientific exchanges and joint research papers, see http://projects.lsv.ens-cachan.fr/informel/. Among many other activities, the LIA organised another edition of the ACTS workshop, see here. The renewal beyond 2015 has been approved by CNRS’ national committee, the FSD’s approval is pending.

10.1.2. Scientific events organisation

10.1.2.1. General chair, scientific chair

Serge Haddad is a member of the steering committee for ICATPN.
10.1.3. Scientific events selection

10.1.3.1. Chair of conference program committees
- Stefan Haar was co-chair of the program committee of the conference Application of Concurrency to System Design (ACSD) 2015 [38].

10.1.3.2. Member of the conference program committees
- Thomas Chatain was a member of the program committee of the conference Application of Concurrency to System Design (ACSD) 2015 [38].
- Paul Gastin was a member of the program committee of the workshop ACTS 2015.
- Stefan Haar was a member of the program committees of the ETFA 2015 workshop, the CIIA 2015 workshop, and of the SAFEPROCESS 2015 Symposium and the ICTAC 2015 conference.
- Stefan Schwoon was a member of the PCs for ICATPN 2015 and SPIN 2015.
- Serge Haddad was a member of the PCs of the workshops
  - FOR-MOVES, associated with ICSOC 2015, Goa, India;
  - VECOS 2015, Bejaia, Algeria;
  - ADECS and PNSE, both associated with ICATPN 2015, Brussels, Belgium.

10.1.3.3. Reviewer
- Stefan Haar was a reviewer for CSL 2015, ACC 2015
- Stefan Schwoon was a reviewer for the 2015 editions of SODA, TAMC, POPL, and TACAS.
- Paul Gastin, Benedikt Bollig and Serge Haddad are regularly reviewers for many international conferences.

10.1.4. Journal

10.1.4.1. Member of the editorial boards
- Serge Haddad was Editor of one edition of the TOPNOC journal (LNCS 8910).
- Stefan Haar is an associate editor for the Journal of Discrete Event Dynamic systems.

10.1.4.2. Reviewer - Reviewing activities
- Stefan Haar was a reviewer for Automatica, Journal of Computer and System Sciences, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, Computer Journal and TOPNOC. He is also a regular reviewer for AMS Mathematical Reviews.
- Thomas Chatain was a reviewer for reviewer for ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems.
- Stefan Schwoon acted as reviewer for the journals TCS, Fundamenta, STTT, FAOC (Formal Aspects of Computing), and ToPNOC.
- Paul Gastin, Benedikt Bollig and Serge Haddad are regularly reviewers for many international journals.

10.1.5. Invited talks
- Serge Haddad gave invited talks
  - on ’Active Diagnosis’, July 7, 2015, Turin University;
  - on ’Time and Stochastic Petri Nets’, June 22, during the Petri Nets tutorials at ICATPN 2015, Brussels, Belgium;
  - on ’Polynomial Interrupt Timed Automata’ at Inria Rennes, Sept. 17,

- Paul Gastin was an invited speaker for
  - Gossip: Maintaining latest information beyond channel bounds. Invited talk at *ALFA’15*, Bordeaux (France), June 15 - 17, 2015, and talk at *FRIDA’15*, Grenoble (France,) June 5, 2015.

- Benedikt Bollig was an invited speaker
  - at the 22nd International Symposium on Temporal Representation and Reasoning (TIME 2015), Kassel, Germany
  - at the 20th International Conference on Implementation and Application of Automata (CIAA 2015), Umeå, Sweden
  - at the 2nd Workshop on Parameterized Verification, Madrid, Spain
  - at ALFA 15: Automata, Logic, Formal languages, Algebra, Bordeaux, France
  - at Automata, Concurrency and Timed Systems (ACTS 2015), Chennai, India

- Stefan Schwoon gave a talk in the CASSTING workshop in Brussels on May 18th, 2015.

### 10.1.6. Scientific expertise

- Serge Haddad was member of a selection committee for a professor’s position at U. Paris 6, and an external expert for the evaluation of ONERA’s DCPS department in November 2015.

### 10.1.7. Research administration

- Paul Gastin is director of the LIA INFORMEL.
  - Stefan Haar is the Saclay Inria center’s correspondent for european partnerships. He also was a member of DIGITEO’s project selection committee, and will be directing the SCILEX axis of the LABEX DIGICOSME.

All members of the team reviewed numerous papers for numerous international conferences.

### 10.2. Teaching - Supervision - Juries

#### 10.2.1. Teaching

Note: We only list here the teaching activities of researchers, not the courses of full-time teachers in the team.

- Licence : Stefan Haar, *Théorie des Langages*, 22.3 h (EQTD) L2, Université Paris-René Descartes, France
- Master : Benedikt Bollig, *Non-Sequential Theory of Distributed Systems*, 22.5 h (EQTD), M2, Parisian Master of Research in Computer Science (MPRI), France

We further note that as of September 2015, Serge Haddad is no longer the coordinator of the M1 level but has become the director of the computer science department of ENS Cachan, as the successor of Paul Gastin in this position; and Stefan Schwoon has become the coordinator of the L3 level.
10.2.2. Supervision

- PhD in progress :
  - Engel Lefaucheux, *controlling information in probabilistic systems*, Co-supervisors Serge Haddad and Nathalie Bertrand (Inria Rennes, SUMO team);
  - Yann Duplouy, *application of formal methods to the development of embedded systems for autonomous vehicles*, since Sept. 2015, Supervisor Serge Haddad (with Béatrice Berard, UPMC).
  - Simon Theissing, *Supervision for Multi-Modal Transport Systems*, since September 2013, Supervisor Stefan Haar
  - Salim Perchy (Ecole Polytechnique), *D-spaces*, since November 2013, co-supervisor Stefan Haar, Supervisor Franck Valencia (Note : S. Perchy belongs to the COMETE team, not MExICO).

10.2.3. Juries

- Benedikt Bollig was a member of the PhD committee of Mathieu Caralp, "Problèmes de bornes pour les automates et les transducteurs à pile visible", December 18, 2015 at Université Marseille.

- Paul Gastin was
  - President of the PhD committee for Jad Hamza at University Paris-Diderot, on November 27, 2015;
  - Reviewer for the theses of Roy Mennicke, Universität Ilmenau (Germany), and of Vitaly Perevoshchikov, Universität Leipzig (Germany);
  - a member of the HdR committees of Nathalie Bertrand, Rennes, November 16 and of Benedikt Bollig, ENS Cachan, June 2, 2015;
  - reviewer of the HDR of Olivier Serre, University Paris-Diderot, March 10, 2015

- Serge Haddad was a member of the PhD committees of M. Amziani at Telecom SudParis in June 2015, and of D. Paquereau at INSA Lyon in March 2015.

- On May 27, 2015, Thomas Chatain was a member of the jury in the competition for recruitment of Master’s level students at ENS Rennes.

- Stefan Haar was a reviewer of the thesis by Kari Kähkönen on Automated Systematic Testing Methods for Multithreaded Programs, defended on February 2, 2015, at Aalto University, Finland.

- Stefan Haar was a member of the PhD examination board of the Thesis of Houssame-Eddine Gougam on Analyse de l’impact du temps sur la diagnosticabilité des systèmes à événements discrets, defended on Sep 28, INSA Toulouse.
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