

Model-Checking in the Loop Model-Based Testing for Automotive Operating Systems

Toshiaki Aoki
toshiaki@jaist.ac.jp
JAIST
Nomi, Ishikawa, JAPAN

Aritoshi Hata
Kazusato Kanamori
Satoshi Tanaka
aritoshi.hata.j2d@jp.denso.com
kazusato.kanamori.j8k@jp.denso.com
satoshi.tanaka.j7d@jp.denso.com
DENSO CORPORATION
Kariya, Aichi, JAPAN

Yuta Kawamoto
Yasuhiro Tanase
Masumi Imai
yuta.kawamoto.j8f@jpgr.denso.com
yasuhiro.tanase.j7g@jpgr.denso.com
masumi.imai.j3w@jpgr.denso.com
DENSO CREATE INC.
Nagoya, Aichi, JAPAN

Fumiya Shigemitsu
Masaki Gondo
f-shigemitsu@esol.co.jp
gondou@esol.co.jp
eSOL Co.,Ltd
Nakano-ku, Tokyo, JAPAN

Tomoji Kishi
kishi@waseda.jp
Waseda University
Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo, JAPAN

ABSTRACT

While vehicles have primarily been controlled through mechanical means in years past, an increasing number of embedded control systems are being installed and used, keeping pace with advances in electronic control technology and performance. Automotive systems consist of multiple components developed by a range of vendors. To accelerate developments in embedded control systems, industrial standards such as AUTOSAR are being defined for automotive systems, including the design of operating system and middleware technologies. Crucial to ensuring the safety of automotive systems, the operating system is foundational software on which many automotive applications are executed. In this paper, we propose an integrated model-based method for verifying automotive operating systems; our method is called Model-Checking in the Loop Model-Based Testing (MCIL-MBT). In MCIL-MBT, we create a model that formalizes specifications of automotive operating systems and verifies the specifications via model-checking. Next, we conduct model-based testing with the verified model to ensure that a specific operating system implementation conforms to the model. These verification and testing stages are iterated over until no flaws are detected. Our method has already been introduced to an automotive system supplier and an operating system vendor. Through our approach, we successfully identified flaws that were not detected by conventional review and testing methods.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM... \$15.00
<https://doi.org/TBD>

KEYWORDS

model-checking, model-based testing, automotive OS

ACM Reference Format:

Toshiaki Aoki, Aritoshi Hata, Kazusato Kanamori, Satoshi Tanaka, Yuta Kawamoto, Yasuhiro Tanase, Masumi Imai, Fumiya Shigemitsu, Masaki Gondo, and Tomoji Kishi. 2024. Model-Checking in the Loop Model-Based Testing for Automotive Operating Systems. In *Proceedings of* . ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/TBD>

1 INTRODUCTION

The reliability and safety of automotive systems represent an increasingly important concern in our society. Although vehicles have largely been controlled through mechanical means in the past, many electronic embedded control systems are now utilized to keep pace with advances in electronic control technology and performance. While the use of such electronic control technology makes for more convenient and safer vehicles, electronic parts unfortunately introduce problems of reliability and safety due to increasingly complex and larger-scale interoperable software components. In particular, highly electronic automotive systems have received increased attention with respect to their reliability and safety. For example, in 2010, electronic throttle systems were suspected of having issues and therefore inspected by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) agencies in the United States based on unintended acceleration problems in Toyota model cars [3]. According to such concerns regarding reliability and safety, functional safety standards for automotive systems were proposed by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) [1, 2].

With safety and reliability in mind, we focus on the operating system (OS), foundational software running on any computer system, including present-day automotive systems. The quality of an OS is of critical importance since it serves as such foundational software on top of which other software executes. With various automotive systems built on top of an OS, the quality of the OS

directly affects those other software systems. Further, such software systems are safety-critical systems in which fatal accidents may occur if flaws in the software or underlying OS exist. Given this, we have focused our work on automotive OS verification to ensure the reliability and safety of automotive systems. In our previous work, we verified a commercial OS developed by Renesas Electronics [36], which conforms to *de facto* standard OSEK/VDX [4]. At present, it has been inherited by AUTOSAR, with an automotive OS standard called *AUTOSAR OS* being developed [6]. The task management functions of AUTOSAR OS are the same as those in the original OSEK/VDX, though new functionality has been incorporated for protection and support for multi-core processors. Conventional priority-based scheduling is used in AUTOSAR OS because such an approach focuses on real-time systems; however, many-core processors are increasingly being used for automotive systems, which, given their scale and complexity, are causing conventional priority-based scheduling to no longer be suitable.

As more flexible and scalable scheduling is required, a new automotive OS standard called the *Adaptive AUTOSAR OS* [7] is being developed. This Adaptive AUTOSAR OS is based on the Portable Operating System Interface (POSIX) family of standards that employs flexible scheduling techniques involving migration between processor cores. Given these evolving circumstances, the scheduling mechanisms of automotive OS implementations have become even more complicated, causing their development and verification to be challenging. Note here that since the basic scheduling scheme employed by the AUTOSAR OS, which was inherited from OSEK/VDX, differs from that of the Adaptive AUTOSAR OS, the former is referred to as the *Classic AUTOSAR OS*. In this paper, we will use these two terms (i.e., Adaptive and Classic) to refer to these two implementations; further, when we write just AUTOSAR OS, we are referring to both the Adaptive and Classic AUTOSAR OS implementations. Also note that a concurrent unit is called a *task* in the Classic AUTOSAR OS, whereas it is called a *thread* in the Adaptive AUTOSAR OS. For simplicity, we use the term task throughout this paper to refer to either a task or a thread.

Although the AUTOSAR OS standard documentation primarily describes the roles and behavior of the OS application programming interfaces (APIs), including return values, error codes, and so on, an exact mechanism for determining how a task is to be dispatched is not described. Instead, only execution examples of tasks are shown, and it is impossible to deduce the exact scheduling behavior from such examples. These ambiguities make it difficult to check whether a developed OS conforms to the standard and may also introduce discrepancies between the OS development side and users. In general, when we verify whether the scheduling of tasks conforms to the standard, we test it against execution sequences of tasks; however, it is difficult to cover all possible variations of execution sequences because the number of variations can be huge.

Given the above, in this paper, we propose an integrated method called *Model-Checking in the Loop Model-Based Testing (MCIL-MBT)* that combines both model-checking and specific model-based testing stages to verify automotive OS implementations, in particular, their scheduling. The fundamental intent of MCIL-MBT is to provide a means of conducting acceptance testing. The target automotive OS is treated as a black box in that the actual code that implements the OS cannot be observed or analyzed; instead, we

can feed inputs to the system and verify the resulting outputs. In MCIL-MBT, we develop a formal model, verify the formal model with model-checking, and conduct model-based testing in order to remove the ambiguities as well as exhaustively cover variations of execution sequences.

The remainder of our paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present related work. In Section 3, we present our MCIL-MBT approach, which, as noted above, has already been used by DENSO and eSOL and applied to commercial OS implementations developed by eSOL. In Section 4, we describe our results, with a discussion provided in Section 5. Finally, in Section 6, we offer our conclusions and avenues for future work.

2 RELATED WORK

For related work, we start with a joint project spanning from 2006 to 2015 that was conducted by JAIST with DENSO and Renesas Electronics organizations to verify a commercial OSEK/VDX-compliant automotive OS developed by Renesas Electronics using formal conventional methods [36]. This OS was already installed in many vehicles, and for this joint project, a design model of the OS was developed and verified. Here, testing was conducted to ensure that the OS implementation conformed to the given design model [33]. Verification of the design model was achieved through theorem proving [35] and satisfiability-modulo-theories (SMT) solvers [32, 34], as well as model-checking. Unlike our black box strategy, these approaches used a white box approach.

More generally, formal OS verification has been studied extensively, as widely surveyed by Klein [17]. The most notable study in recent years is the formal verification of an L4 kernel [18], with the verified kernel released as the seL4 kernel [19, 20]. The specifications of the L4 kernel are described in Haskell, with its functional correctness, safety, and security proven by Isabelle/HOL [21]. An instruction-level formal description of an ARM processor, which is called ARM in HOL [22], was used in the verification. The approach taken here was to formally prove the correctness of the kernel implementation via theorem proving. We instead make use of model-checking and MBT, though these approaches should be complementary to one another.

Embedded OS implementations are specialized to support concurrent multi-task or multi-thread scheduling since real-time properties are crucial to embedded systems. In [23], Penix *et al.* verified an embedded OS scheduler called DEOS by using a model-checking tool called SPIN [9], which was developed for aerospace systems by Honeywell. There are a number of studies, as summarized below, that focused on verifying OSEK/VDX-based OS implementations. In [24–26], Choi *et al.* verified the safety of the source code for Trampoline [27], an open source OS, by applying model-checking tools SPIN and SMV [12]. Huang *et al.* [28] and Shin *et al.* [29] verified a commercial OS called ORIENTAIS, which was developed by iSoft using a process algebra [14], a model-checking tool [15], and an automatic theorem proving-based verification tool [13]. Tigori *et al.* [26] proposed a method to generate a minimum amount of source code that contains the functionality required to run a target application based on a model-checking tool [16]. The above works applied a white box approach that analyzes the source code of the given OS, develops a model by reverse-engineering the code, and

then verifies the model. Unlike the above, our method adopts a black box approach in which we develop formal specifications of the OS from the perspective of a user, i.e., a company that accepts and verifies the OS against given specifications. Further, we not only verify the model, but also conduct exhaustive model-based testing by executing the actual OS.

Finally, Godefroid *et al.* proposed a tool called SAGE [30] and its platform, SAGAN [31], to apply fuzz testing to OS implementations. SAGE analyzes the source code of the OS and randomly generates a large number of test cases, with the OS tested on a daily basis. The progress and results of this testing are monitored and managed by SAGAN. Since it is difficult to obtain accurate expected results, simple properties such as system crashes are checked as part of the fuzz testing. Unlike fuzz testing, our method focuses on scheduling-related properties, such as which task is active and what the corresponding task states are, all of which provides a more accurate picture than obtained via fuzz testing.

3 MODEL-CHECKING IN THE LOOP WITH MODEL-BASED TESTING

3.1 Overview

MCIL-MBT consists of (1) model development, (2) review and model-checking, and (3) MBT. In (1), we develop a model for a target OS that both OS developers and OS users can agree upon. Next, in (2), we conduct a review and model-checking of the model from (1) to confirm that it works as expected. In (3), we then confirm that the behavior of an actual OS implementation is the same as the model by applying MBT. If we detect a flaw during our MBT, the flaw is fixed and we iterate over these steps until all test cases generated by the MBT are passed.

3.2 Development of an OS Model

Scheduling details for each of AUTOSAR OS implementations are specified in each specification document. Figure 1 shows a portion of the Classic AUTOSAR OS specifications document[4]. In the figure, the upper side shows that there is a queue for each task priority level, while the lower side shows the state changes that occur for two tasks T1 and T2 as time progresses left-to-right in the diagram. How these states are changed is determined based on the queues shown in the upper side of the figure. If the priority of T1 is higher than that of T2 and they are fully preemptive, if T1 is activated while T2 is running, T1 will change to the running state while T2 will change to the ready state. If instead two tasks with the same priority are activated, the first activated task enters the running state, as determined by the queues. As is evident from the examples shown, the scheduling of tasks in all cases is specified as a computation based on the priorities and queues; however, the document does not define scheduling results in all cases.

From the above, we note that it is certainly difficult to describe scheduling decisions in all cases in a specification document. It is far preferable to represent the scheduling algorithm in an executable form. Therefore, in MCIL-MBT, we specify scheduling as an executable description using PROMELA, a specification language for the model-checking tool SPIN. More specifically, the PROMELA description provides a formal specification of an OS, and this formal specification allows us to remove ambiguities at a very early




Figure 1: OS Specifications

phase of development, thereby avoiding flaws introduced by such ambiguities in succeeding phases [37]. In MCIL-MBT, creating the formal specification greatly reduces the risk of backtracking in the development process caused by the discovery of flaws at a later phase of development—especially at the end-phase in which users accept the OS. In this paper, we refer to this formal specification as the *OS model*. The behaviors defined by the APIs that make up the OS are described in the OS model. For example, the behavior of `ActivateTask`, which is one of Classic AUTOSAR OS APIs, is described as calculating the state changes of tasks by enqueueing a task ID provided as an argument to a queue according to its priority.

3.3 Review and Model-Checking

The quality of an OS model must be as high as possible since the OS plays a central role in MCIL-MBT. The OS model determines the state changes of tasks caused by OS API calls with priorities and queues. As such, this determination is complex, and it can be difficult to achieve a high level of confidence in the correctness of the model by only reviewing the OS model. Therefore, we construct state models that are simpler than the OS model; we call these simpler models *use case models*.

Figure 2 shows an example of these use case models in which there are two tasks T1 and T2. Here, T2 has a higher priority than T1, T1 is preemptive, and both tasks are executed on the same core. Initially, T1 is activated via the `SActivateTask(T1)` API call and subsequently executed. Next, T2 is executed when T2 is activated by T1, i.e., we have `T1:ActivateTask(T2)`. Finally, T1 resumes its execution when T2 terminates, as initiated by `T2:TerminateTask()`. The expected state changes of the tasks are also shown in the figure as nodes with SUS, RUN, and RDY indicating task states. Here, SUS indicates a suspended state in which a task is not active, RUN indicates a running state in which a task is being executed, and RDY indicates a ready state in which a task is waiting for execution. In the figure, the first element of each pair represents the expected state of T1, while the second element represents the expected state

must be the same for both an OS developer who implements an OS and a user who makes use of that OS. The user expects that the OS implemented by the OS developer correctly realizes the scheduling algorithm that the user had in mind when the OS was accepted. Given this, two types of flaws can be detected here, i.e., either a bug in the implementation or a discrepancy between user and developer expectations—in other words, how tasks are scheduled is interpreted differently by the user and the developer.

OS acceptance testing is usually conducted when an implemented OS is ready for users to perform their testing. It is difficult to exhaustively test the behavior of an OS during acceptance testing because the user may only test via black box testing; further, there is an excessively large number of behavioral variations within even a rudimentary OS implementation. Therefore, in our MCIL-MBT approach, the behavior of the OS is agreed upon in advance by users and developers based on a formally described OS model. Next, we use MBT to exhaustively check whether the OS implementation conforms to the agreed upon OS model or not.

If a flaw is found during the MBT, the flaw is handled according to its type. If caused by a bug in the OS implementation, the MBT is conducted again after fixing this bug. Otherwise, if the bug is caused by a discrepancy in what the developer and the what the user expects in terms of behavior, the OS model and use case models are modified after coming to a consensus. Next, model-checking and MBT are conducted again based on the modified OS model and use case models. The quality of the OS implementation is improved as a result of fixing flaws and resolving discrepancies via the iterative approach of modifying the OS model, performing model-checking, and conducting MBT. The OS implementation is finally accepted after all MBT test cases pass.

4 MCIL-MBT RESULTS

4.1 Organization

We applied MCIL-MBT in conjunction with DENSO and eSOL, which represent the user and developer sides, respectively. DENSO primarily developed OS models and corresponding use case models based on AUTOSAR OS specifications, then reviewed and verified them. DENSO contacted eSOL to determine the exact behavior of OS implementations in developing the OS models if unknown behaviors were encountered. DENSO CREATE dispatched engineers to develop and review the OS models and use case models whenever additional human resources were necessary. We applied our MCIL-MBT approach to eMCOS OS implementations [11], which are commercial automotive OS implementations developed by eSOL. As there are various specifications for the eMCOS OS implementations, in this paper, we focus on two of them, i.e., eMCOS AUTOSAR and eMCOS POSIX, which are Classic AUTOSAR OS and a POSIX OS, respectively.

4.2 Workflow

Figure 4 shows the workflow of our MCIL-MBT approach. We divide this workflow into the following three key phases: (A) an OS model development phase; (B) a review and model-checking phase; and (C) a MBT phase. Corresponding to the figure, in phase (A), an OS model (A1) and use case models (A2) are developed in parallel. In phase (B), the OS model and use case models are reviewed (B1).

Note that we backtrack to phase (A) if we find a bug in the OS model or in the understanding of the OS specifications (*Decision*₁); in this case, the review is conducted again after the OS model and use case models are modified to address the discrepancy or fix the bug (*Loop*₁). If this review is passed, we perform model-checking (B2). And similar to the above, we backtrack to phase (A) and re-execute phase (B) if a flaw is found during model-checking (*Loop*₁).

Once we are confident of the correctness of the OS model (*Decision*₂), we perform preliminary testing (C1) in which we test an OS implementation using a small number of fairly typical test cases. This is to detect simple flaws in advance since the full execution of MBT takes a substantial amount of time. As noted above, there are two types of flaws we again look for at this stage (*Decision*₃), namely a bug in the OS implementation or a discrepancy in the understanding of the OS specifications. If the former, we execute (C1) again after fixing the flaw in the OS (*Loop*₂); and if the latter, we backtrack to phase (A), modify the OS model and use case models, then perform phases (B) and (C1) again (*Loop*₁).

Moving forward from here, we perform MBT if the preliminary testing stage passed (*Decision*₃). And once again, there are two types of flaws that we might encounter here (*Decision*₄); as with *Decision*₃, we have either a bug in the OS implementation or a discrepancy in the understanding of the OS specifications. These are treated in the same way as shown for *Decision*₃. In the former, we execute (C1) and (C2) again after fixing the flaw in the OS (*Loop*₂), while in the latter, we backtrack to phase (A), modify the OS model and use case models, then perform phases (B), (C1), and (C2) again (*Loop*₁). Finally, MCIL-MBT terminates successfully if all test cases are passed in (C2).

There are two loops shown in the workflow, i.e., *Loop*₁ and *Loop*₂. Here, *Loop*₁ goes back to phase (A) if we detect a flaw in the OS model due to a discrepancy in the understanding of the OS specifications. For *Loop*₂, we perform preliminary testing and exhaustive MBT again if a bug in the OS implementation is detected. These critical looping mechanisms motivated us to come up with the *Model-Checking in the Loop* portion of MCIL-MBT, i.e., we perform model-checking to verify the OS model and employ MBT, which uses a model-checking algorithm for testing the OS implementation.

4.3 Results

4.3.1 OS Models. Our MBT results are summarized in Table 1. We divided the functionality of a target OS into multiple features, then created an OS model and performed MBT for each of these target OS implementations in an effort to reduce the number of test cases. We created five OS models for eMCOS AUTOSAR, which we represent in the table as Classic(S,B), Classic(S,A), Classic(M,B), Classic(M,A), and Classic(M,P). Here, the eMCOS OS can be configured according to a target platform. The Classic(S,B) and Classic(S,A) rows show results with a configuration in which eMCOS AUTOSAR works as a single-core OS. The former focuses on basic (B) scheduling functions, whereas the latter focuses on alarm (A) functions. The Classic(M,B), Classic(M,A), and Classic(M,P) rows represent results with a configuration in which eMCOS AUTOSAR works as a multi-core OS focused on basic (B) scheduling functions, alarm (A) functions, and spinlock (P) functions, respectively. Note that MBT




Figure 4: MCIL-MBT Workflow

Table 1: MBT Results

target	model	tc	total time	node time	nodes (sim procs)	flaws(OS)	flaws(spec)
Classic(S,B)	1755	185741	5156413s (\approx 59.7d)	14378.03s (\approx 4h)	29 (20)	0	1
Classic(S,A)	2134	135081	4349349s (\approx 50.3d)	6795.59s (\approx 1.9h)	54 (20)	0	0
Classic(M,B)	1879	134756	1464166s (\approx 16.94d)	2100.61s (\approx 35m)	54 (20)	0	0
Classic(M,A)	2183	117263	1428272s (\approx 16.53d)	2073.23 (\approx 0.57h)	54 (20)	0	0
Classic(M,P)	2840	625863	27360149s (\approx 216.66d)	28825.96 (\approx 8h)	84 (20)	2	0
Adaptive(M,B)	3941	183537	98029724 (\approx 1134.60d)	93548s (\approx 1d1h59m8s)	52 (23)	4	4
Adaptive(M,N)	4102	261571	221703978s (\approx 2566.02d)	226317s (\approx 2d14h51m57s)	52 (23)	5	1

results are shown for Classic(S,B), Classic(S,A), and Classic(M,P); however, other data such as the details of the flaws detected were unfortunately lost due to failures in our external storage system. We also created two OS models for eMCOS POSIX, represented as Adaptive(M,B) and Adaptive(M,N), which focused on basic (B) scheduling functions of Adaptive AUTOSAR OS (AMP version) and eMCOS POSIX native (N) functions, respectively. We did not focus on the SMP feature of eMCOS POSIX this time. AUTOSAR OSs are highly configurable with respect to the scheduling. We did not focus on all of possible configurations but the ones that user sides, that is, DENSO use in their developments.

4.3.2 Review and Model-Checking Results. An OS model was developed for each of the OS features. In Table 1, the *model* column shows the number of lines for each OS model. We also developed use case models for each of the OS features, as detailed in Table 2; the *num*, *api*, and *cost* columns show the number of use case models developed, the average number of API invocations in each use case model, and the cost in person-months required to develop

and review the use case models, respectively. The use cases were constructed in the following two steps. Firstly, we made a use case model for each functionality of AUTOSAR OS. Then, we analyzed interactions of multiple functionalities. If the interaction affects the scheduling, we made another use case model for it.

We described the use case models using state machine diagrams created via a UML drawing tool called PlantUML [8]. These use case models were automatically converted into PROMELA descriptions and combined with the OS models for automated model-checking via SPIN. In Table 2, the *line* and *time* columns show the average number of lines of the PROMELA descriptions and the time (in minutes) required to complete the model-checking, respectively. Note that the PC used for model-checking was a 64-bit Windows 10 Enterprise machine with an Intel Core i7-7700 3.60GHz CPU and 16 GB of memory.

We regularly reviewed the OS models and use case models. Further, we verified that the behavior of the OS models conformed to the use case models by feeding them into SPIN after manually reviewing them. Table 3 describes the number of flaws found in

Table 2: Use Case Models

	num	api	cost	line	time (min)
Adaptive(M,B)	498	6.2	3.7	75.7	approx. 5
Adaptive(M,N)	496	6.4	1.25	79.1	approx. 10

Table 3: Review and Model-Checking Results

Adaptive(M,B)				
	flaw(UC)	flaw(OS)	spec(UC)	spec(OS)
Review	5	37	0	1
MC	0	1	1	0
Adaptive(M,N)				
	flaw(UC)	flaw(OS)	spec(UC)	spec(OS)
Review	5	0	2	0
MC	0	0	0	0

the review and model-checking steps for the Adaptive(M,B) and Adaptive(M,N) models. Here, the *Review* row shows the number of flaws found in the review, while the *MC* row shows the number of flaws found in model-checking. The *flaw(UC)* and *flaw(OS)* columns show the number of flaws found in the use case models and OS models, respectively. Likewise, the *spec(UC)* and *spec(OS)* columns show the number of discrepancies in the understanding of the OS specifications found in the use case models and OS models, respectively. Note that the Adaptive(M,N) OS model was developed by modifying and extending the Adaptive(M,B) model. We observe that the number of detected flaws in the Adaptive(M,N) model was small since the already verified Adaptive(M,B) model was reused to develop it. Further, the number of flaws found in the use case models (i.e., *flaw(UC)*) in the Adaptive(M,N) model was relatively large because a new member of the team was assigned to develop these use case models and was initially unfamiliar with them.

4.3.3 MBT Results. As noted previously, for our MBT, we used a large-scale computer cluster called StarBED that consisted of more than 1000 PCs. We developed a mechanism to conduct our MBT in parallel and store results in an external storage system after installing a simulator of a target CPU on top of a CentOS instance on each PC. Preparing StarBED did not require much time, only one day.

Back to Table 1, the *tc* column shows the number of test cases generated from an OS model. Further, the *nodes* column shows the number of nodes (i.e., PCs) used to perform MBT. Note that each node was a Dell PowerEdge C6220 with a dual Intel Xeon E5-2650 processor (2.00GHz/8 core) and 128 GB of memory. Given this configuration, MBT was conducted in parallel. Multiple simulator processes were executed on each node with test programs run on each simulator process. In the table, the *nodes (sim procs)* column shows the number of nodes used in the execution of the test programs, with the number of simulator processes executed on each node shown in parentheses. The *total time* column shows the time taken to run all test programs, which is essentially the sum of CPU times on all of the PC nodes; in other words, this column

represents how long it takes to run all test programs if they are executed sequentially. The *node time* column shows the average time spent in each node, which essentially represents the actual time required to complete our MBT. Finally, the *flaw(OS)* and *flaw(spec)* columns show the numbers of flaws detected in our MBT, representing bugs in the OS implementation itself and discrepancies in the understanding of the OS specifications, respectively.

Finally, in Table 4, we present details regarding the detected flaws. Flaws are shown by the *type* column to be either OS or Spec flaws representing either bugs in the OS implementation or discrepancies in the understanding of the OS specifications, respectively. We also show the minimum (*min*), maximum (*max*), and average (*ave*) number of steps required to find each of the flaws since multiple test cases failed in order for us to identify a single flaw during our MBT. Note that only the minimum number of steps are shown for the Spec(2) through Spec(4) rows because these flaws were identified during preliminary testing. The *api* and *rc* columns show the API in which each flaw occurred and the specific factor that caused it, respectively. For the *rc* column, *ercd*, *priority*, and *run* represent flaws in error codes, priority changes, and execution control of tasks such as blocking/unblocking a task, respectively.

Table 4: Flaws Encountered

Adaptive(M,B)					
type	min	max	ave	api	rc
OS(1)	4	7	4.4	mutex_trylock	ercd
OS(2)	25	28	25.009	mutex_lock	priority
OS(3)	11	34	24.7	mutex_lock	priority
OS(4)	11	34	24.7	mutex_unlock	run
OS(5)	25	36	28.0	mutex_timedlock	priority
Spec(1)	47	81	61.4	mutex_lock	ercd
Spec(2)	9	NA	NA	cond_wait	run
Spec(3)	3	NA	NA	cond_signal	run
Spec(4)	3	NA	NA	setschedprio	priority
Adaptive(M,N)					
type	min	max	ave	api	rc
OS(6)	3	NA	NA	mutex_lock	ercd
OS(7)	8	NA	NA	mutex_unlock	priority
OS(8)	11	NA	NA	mutex_lock	run
Spec(5)	22	45	37.6	mutex_unlock	run

4.4 Iterations

As noted previously, MCIL-MBT is an iterative approach. More specifically, we iterate over *Loop*₁ to modify the OS models and use case models, where as we iterate over *Loop*₂ to modify the OS implementation. In Table 5, we summarize the number and time periods of such iterations. Since we did not initially record precise data while conducting MCIL-MBT, we determined these results by interviewing engineers who participated in the practice about their specific experiences. Note that in the table, the *Decision*₁ through *Decision*₄ points represent decision points shown in Figure 4 above. Further, each iteration is represented as a *Decision*_{*i*}-*Loop*_{*j*} pairs, where $1 \leq i \leq 4$ and $j = 1, 2$; each pair indicates that *Loop*_{*j*} occurred in *Decision*_{*i*}. Note that *Loop*₁ occurred in *Decision*_{*i*}, where $1 \leq i \leq 4$,

Table 5: Iteration Results

point	iterations	period
<i>Decision</i> ₁ - <i>Loop</i> ₁	1 - 3	1 - 7 day(s)
<i>Decision</i> ₂ - <i>Loop</i> ₁	1 - 3	1 - 7 day(s)
<i>Decision</i> ₃ - <i>Loop</i> ₁	1 - 3	5 - 10 days
<i>Decision</i> ₃ - <i>Loop</i> ₂	1 - 3	NA
<i>Decision</i> ₄ - <i>Loop</i> ₁	2 - 5	5 - 10 days
<i>Decision</i> ₄ - <i>Loop</i> ₂	2 - 5	NA

while *Loop*₂ occurred only in *Decision*₃ and *Decision*₄. The *iterations* and *period* columns show the number of iterations and the time period (in days) required to modify the OS models and use case models, respectively. Here, the time period is not shown for *Loop*₂ because it depended on the outside of MCIL-MBT, that is, the timing to modify the OS implementation by eSOL.

4.5 Examples of Detected Flaws

In this section, we share a few example flaws that we detected via our MCIL-MBT approach. First, we show an example of a discrepancy in the understanding of the OS specifications; in this example, the API call is ChainTask(), an event mask in eMCOS AUTOSAR. If ChainTask is invoked with an argument that designates the next task to be dispatched, the task which invokes it is terminated, and the designated task changes to a ready state. For example, given tasks T1 and T2 in the running and suspended states, respectively, an invocation of ChainTask(T2) changes T1 to a suspended state and T2 to a ready state. The argument to ChainTask() can be the same as the task that invokes ChainTask(), i.e., ChainTask(T1) can be invoked by T1. The behavior of ChainTask() is described in the Classic AUTOSAR OS (OSEK OS) documentation as follows:

- If the succeeding task is identical with the current task, this does not result in multiple requests. The task is not transferred to the suspended state, but will immediately become ready again.
- When an extended task is transferred from suspended state into ready state all its events are cleared.

The understanding by the users was that the event would not be cleared if task T1 invokes ChainTask(T1) because T1 does not enter the suspended state. Conversely, the understanding by the developers was that the event would be cleared in this case because it should work the same as the reactivation of T1, i.e., the state of T1 is changed from suspended to ready after it is changed from ready to suspended.

This flaw was detected in the test case shown in Figure 5. In the figure, API invocations are preceded with a sequential number that represents the order in which each step is invoked. Steps 1 through 3 declare an event and two tasks. These tasks have IDs 1 and 2, and we refer to these tasks as T1 and T2 here, respectively. T1 and T2 run on the same core, both with the same priority of 2. Steps 7 through 10 represent startup procedures. More specifically, in Step 7 specifies that T1 is activated with an expected return value of E_OK, which is a return code that indicates a successful activation. In Steps 8 and 9, CheckState(x, y, z) means that task x checks whether the state of task y is z or not. In Step 10, CheckEvent(x, y, z) means

```

1:ECUSAR_DeclareEvent(1,1)
2:ECUSAR_DeclareTask(1,2,1,1,0,1)
3:ECUSAR_DeclareTask(2,2,1,1,0,0)
4:SCheckState(1,SUSPENDED)
5:SCheckState(2,SUSPENDED)
6:SCheckEvent(1,-1)
7:SActivateTask(1)=E_OK
8:CheckState(1,1,RUNNING)
9:CheckState(1,2,SUSPENDED)
10:CheckEvent(1,1,0)
11:SetEvent(1,1,1)=E_OK
12:CheckState(1,1,RUNNING)
13:CheckState(1,2,SUSPENDED)
14:CheckEvent(1,1,1)
15:ChainTask(1,1)=E_OK
16:CheckState(1,1,RUNNING)
17:CheckState(1,2,SUSPENDED)
18:CheckEvent(1,1,1)

```

Figure 5: Generated Test Case that Detected a Flaw

that task x checks whether the mask of event y is z or not. Similarly, in Steps 11 and 15, SetEvent and ChainTask are invoked, with their expected return values checked in Steps 12 through 14 and Steps 16 through 18. The checking of the various expected values are converted into assertions in the automatically generated test programs. Here, an assertion violation is reported at Step 18 when a test program converted from the test case is executed. Finally, we present an example implementation bug involving the acquisition of a spinlock in eMCOS AUTOSAR. In the Classic AUTOSAR OS, if multiple spinlock resources exist, the order in which they are acquired within the same core is specified as part of the configuration, a setting that has to be maintained at runtime. Here, error code E_OS_NESTING_DEADLOCK is returned if the order is violated at runtime. We detected a case in which this error code was not returned even though the order was indeed violated. We omit the details of the test case because it was too long to show in this paper—it consisted of 37 distinct steps.

5 DISCUSSION

5.1 Flaw Detection

Applying our MCIL-MBT approach, 17 flaws were detected even though the target OS implementations were already verified by the OS developers in advance. We conclude that by applying MCIL-MBT, we were able to detect flaws that were difficult to detect via conventional methods typically used in industry. In the subsections that follow, we discuss detected flaws from two distinct points of view, i.e., flaws caused by discrepancies in the understanding of the OS specifications and flaws caused by bugs in the OS implementation.

5.1.1 Discrepancies in the understanding of the OS specifications.

As shown in Table 4 above, most of the flaws caused by discrepancies in the understanding of the OS specifications were detected at early phases, including the development of the OS models and preliminary testing. We therefore infer that by writing formal specifications of the OS, these OS models worked effectively in detecting flaws; however, there were exceptions, i.e., flaws Spec(1) and Spec(5) shown in Table 4 above were detected later in our MBT. In Table 5, the number of iterations caused by *Decision*₄ was greater than the number of iterations caused by other decisions. These observations imply that flaws caused by discrepancies in the understanding of the OS specifications can be missed if only typical sequences of API invocations are considered. Further, it is difficult to detect flaws using conventional methods here since the number of steps in the corresponding test cases is quite long.

The DENSO/DENSO CREATE sides asked the eSOL side about unknown behavior in the OS models, then modified the OS models such that they agreed with one another. Although it is desirable that both sides develop and review the OS models, it is difficult from a practical point of view to successfully collaborate on those activities since developers and users belong to different companies and have different development styles. Applying our MCIL-MBT approach made it possible to more readily detect discrepancies.

As noted previously, only typical execution examples are described in the AUTOSAR OS specifications. In fact, only 10 execution examples are described in the OSEK/VDX specifications. A document on conformance testing titled MODISTARC [5] is provided for an OSEK/VDX-compliant OS. In MODISTARC, there are 139 test cases that cover invocations of OS APIs, with each test case defined as a single API invocation and its corresponding precondition. In DENSO, test cases were created to cover typical API invocations in conventional acceptance testing, and 95 test cases were used to test OS implementations for the behaviors that we focused on in our MCIL-MBT approach. Here, it was necessary to take invocation sequences of APIs into account in order to accurately test the scheduling of an OS since scheduling depends on the state of the OS, which varies according to the order in which API invocations are made. Conversely, it is challenging to define all such API invocation sequences. Therefore, in our MCIL-MBT approach, we did not directly define the invocation sequences, letting the OS models generate them instead. Such OS models allow us to share more accurate specifications of the given OS between developers and users, thereby further encouraging detection of any discrepancies in the understanding of the OS specifications.

When engineers develop applications that run on an OS, they assume that the OS works according to its specification. The quality of the applications may decrease if their understanding of the specification is ambiguous. Certainly OS models are useful for such developers to clearly understand the expected behavior of the OS.

5.1.2 Bugs in the OS implementation. Applying our MCIL-MBT method successfully detected OS implementation bugs that were not already detected in advance. More specifically, use of our MCIL-MBT approach was able to detect such bugs since it generates test cases not typically covered by conventional testing methodologies. More specifically, our MBT took various combinations of API invocations based on OS models into account, generating corresponding invocation sequences. As shown in Table 4 above, the average number of steps per test case that successfully detected flaws was approximately 25, and the minimum number of steps in a test case was more than 11 except for OS(1), OS(6), and OS(7). Although it is very difficult to manually construct such test cases, our MCIL-MBT approach was able to uncover and detect these bugs.

In acceptance testing, we usually perform black box testing that inherently does not allow us to view or analyze the code of a given OS implementation. While we know it is theoretically impossible for black box testing to cover all states of a system we are testing [38] and therefore also impossible to cover all states of an OS implementation using our MCIL-MBT approach, MCIL-MBT covers all possible combinations of API invocations from the point of view of the OS specifications. Using such a detailed and specialized

approach was very effective in detecting implementation bugs. In other words, even though testing was based solely on the OS specifications, our approach effectively detected implementation bugs not found using conventional methods.

5.2 Ensuring Quality in the OS Models

As another important conclusion from our work described above, we note that the quality of the OS models must be high because these models play such a crucial role in our MCIL-MBT method. Given that the OS models ranged from 1755 to 4102 lines, as shown in Table 1 above, it is difficult to ensure a high level of quality only via a manual review process. Therefore, we adopted model-checking to verify the OS models. In our model-checking approach, expected properties must be described as temporal logic, but it is difficult for engineers to describe them exactly. Although a method for defining typical temporal logic formulas as patterns and then using these patterns in practice has been proposed in [39], such patterns are not suitable for scheduling properties, because we need to check state changes step by step based on invocation sequences. Therefore, instead of using temporal logic formulas, we used observers that invoke the APIs described in the OS models and synchronously observe their subsequent state changes. This technique is known as using *versatile synchronous observers* and is described as being easy to use in practice [40].

If the observers are too complex, it is difficult to have confidence in their correctness. Therefore, we defined an observer as a simple use case model in our MCIL-MBT approach. As shown in Table 2 above, the average number of API invocations in each use case model was approximately six. It is easy for engineers to create and review these simpler use case models, because the complexity here is equivalent to that of the examples that appear in the AUTOSAR OS specifications. Further, although there are a large number of use case models, reviewing them does not require expertise in model-checking and could be distributed out to several engineers.

As shown in Table 3 above, most flaws in the OS models and use case models were detected by the review process, with only a few flaws detected by model-checking. We therefore conclude that model-checking worked effectively as these were flaws that were not detected during the review. Further, the number of flaws detected in the review was smaller than that of the OS models despite the fact that the total number of lines in the use case models is much larger than that of the OS models. We conclude that the use case models are more reliable than the OS models given their relative scales. Therefore, we think that the quality of the OS models can be practically increased by verifying the OS models against the use case models via model-checking.

5.3 Testing OS

As shown in Table 1 above, hundreds of thousands of test cases for each of the OS models were generated using our MCIL-MBT approach. This implies that a huge number of states must be taken into account when conducting OS implementation testing; further, it is practically impossible to define the accurate behavior of OS implementations based on their execution sequences. From our results, the total time taken to complete the testing ranged from weeks to months for the Classic AUTOSAR OS up to several years

for the Adaptive AUTOSAR OS, if such testing was performed sequentially. As noted previously, we performed testing in parallel on the large-scale computer cluster StarBED since each test program can be executed independently. Without a doubt, StarBED allowed us to complete the testing much more quickly, i.e., in several hours for the Classic AUTOSAR OS and across a few days for the Adaptive AUTOSAR OS. As such, StarBED was a good and reasonable choice for the practical use of our MCIL-MBT approach.

As part of our present work, we needed to generate a test program from a test case such that the test program can invoke APIs in the same order defined in the test case. The AUTOSAR OS supports multi-cores, and tasks assigned to different cores are independently executed on these cores. In such multi-core OS implementations, simply ordering API invocations of tasks in the test program does not realize the order defined in the test case. To correctly realize it, we inserted *busy-waits* between the API invocations of the test program. We call such a test a *sequence test*, noting that sequence tests make it easier to detect logical flaws, such as specification violations, which are important for acceptance testing. More specifically here, we need to execute the same test program numerous times to invoke the APIs in a specific order without the use of busy-waits [41]. Beyond the use of sequence tests, there are other ways to test OS implementations based on the OS model. For example, we can execute OS implementations freely and check whether results of the execution conform to the OS models or not. Currently, we are investigating other ways to test OS implementations based on the OS models.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed an integrated verification and testing methodology called MCIL-MBT for verifying automotive OS implementations. Our method consists of OS modeling, reviewing and model-checking of these created OS models, and MBT of specific OS implementations. For the MCIL portion of our approach, OS models are verified using model-checking, test cases are automatically generated using a model-checking algorithm, and these generated test cases are iterated over until OS implementations are accepted by users. Our MCIL-MBT approach was successfully applied by DENSO and eSOL and also applied to commercial OS implementations developed by eSOL. Although those OS implementations were verified by conventional methods, we succeeded in applying our MCIL-MBT approach to detect additional flaws not already detected in advance. DENSO, the user side, has primarily focused on conducting development and review of OS models and MBT of OS implementations. In the future, eSOL, the OS developer side, plans to apply MCIL-MBT before such OS implementations are released. We also plan to expand target OS implementations, in particular, the SMP version of the Adaptive AUTOSAR OS.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was carried out on the StarBED computer cluster infrastructure provided by the National Institute of Information and Communications Technology (NICT).

REFERENCES

- [1] IEC 61508: Functional safety of electrical/electronic/programmable electronic safety-related systems, 1998.

- [2] ISO 26262 Road vehicles - functional safety, 2011.
- [3] Technical Assessment of Toyota Electronic Throttle Control Systems, NHTSA, 2011.
- [4] OSEK/VDX Operating System Specification 2.2.3, 2005.
- [5] OSEK/VDX OS Test Plan 2.0, 1999.
- [6] Specification of Operating System, R20-11, AUTOSAR, 2020.
- [7] Specification of Operating System, R20-11, Adaptive Platform, AUTOSAR, 2020.
- [8] <https://plantuml.com/>
- [9] G. Holzmann: Spin Model Checker: the Primer and Reference Manual, Addison-Wesley, 2003.
- [10] <http://starbed.nict.go.jp/en/index.html>
- [11] https://www.esol.com/embedded/lineup_rtos.html
- [12] K. L. McMillan: Symbolic Model Checking: An Approach to the State Explosion Problem, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993.
- [13] E. Cohen, M. Dahlweid et al.: VCC: A practical system for verifying concurrent C, Theorem Proving in Higher Order Logics, pages 23–42. Springer, 2009.
- [14] C. A. R. Hoare: Communicating sequential processes, Communications of ACM, Vol. 21, No.8, pp.666–677, 1978.
- [15] J. Sun, Y. Liu et al.: PAT: Towards Flexible Verification under Fairness, International Conference on Computer Aided Verification, pp.709–714, 2009.
- [16] J. Bengtsson, K. Larsen et al.: UPPAAL – a Tool Suite for Automatic Verification of Real-time Systems, DIMACS/SYCON Workshop on Hybrid Systems III, pp.232–243, 1996.
- [17] G. Klein: Operating System Verification - An Overview, Sādhanā , 34(1), pp.26–69, 2009.
- [18] J. Liedtke: On μ -kernel construction, Symposium on Operating System Principles, Operating System Review 29(5), pp. 237–250, 1995.
- [19] G. Klein et al.: seL4: Formal verification of an OS kernel, ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, pp.207–220, 2009.
- [20] G. Klein et al.: Comprehensive formal verification of an OS microkernel ACM Transactions on Computer Systems, Volume 32 Issue 1, pp.1–70, 2014.
- [21] T. Nipkow, L. Paulson et al.: Isabelle/HOL – A Proof Assistant for Higher-Order Logic, vol. 2283, LNCS, Springer, 2002.
- [22] A. Fox and M. Myreen: A Trustworthy Monadic Formalization of the ARMv7 Instruction Set Architecture. International Conference on Interactive Theorem Proving, pp.243–258, 2010.
- [23] J. Penix et al.: Verifying Time Partitioning in the DEOS Scheduling Kernel, Formal Methods in System Design, Vol.26, No.2, pp.103–135, 2005.
- [24] Y. Choi: Model checking trampoline OS: a case study on safety analysis for automotive software. Softw. Test. Verif. Reliab. 24(1), pp.38–60, 2014.
- [25] Y. Choi and T. Byun: Constraint-based test generation for automotive operating systems, Software & Systems Modeling, vol.16, no.1, pp.7–24, 2017.
- [26] K. T. G. Tigori, J-L Bèchenec et al.: Formal Model-Based Synthesis of Application-Specific Static RTOS, ACM Trans. Embed. Comput. Syst., vol.16, no.4, pp.97:1–97:25, 2017.
- [27] J. L. Bechenec, M. Briday et al.: Trampoline An Open Source Implementation of the OSEK/VDX RTOS Specification, Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation, pp. 62–69, 2006.
- [28] Y. Huang, Y. Zhao et al.: Modeling and verifying the code-level OSEK/VDX operating system with CSP, TASE, pp. 142–149, 2011.
- [29] J. Shi, J. He et al.: ORIENTAIS: formal verified OSEK/VDX real-time operating system, international conference on engineering of complex computer systems, pp.293–301, 2012.
- [30] P. Godefroid, M. Y. Levin, and D. Molnar: Automated Whitebox Fuzz Testing, Network and Distributed Systems Security, pp. 151–166, 2008.
- [31] E. Bounimova, P. Godefroid, and D. Molnar: Billions and billions of constraints: Whitebox fuzz testing in production, 35th International Conference on Software Engineering pp. 122–131, 2013.
- [32] K. Yatake and T. Aoki: Automatic Generation of Model Checking Scripts based on Environment Modeling, SPIN Workshop on Model Checking of Software, pp.58–75, 2010.
- [33] J. Chen and T. Aoki: Conformance Testing for OSEK/VDX Operating System Using Model Checking, APSEC, pp.274–281, 2011.
- [34] K. Yatake and T. Aoki: Model Checking of OSEK/VDX OS Design Model Based on Environment Modeling, ICTAC, pp.183–197, 2012.
- [35] D. H. Vu, Y. Chiba et al.: Verifying OSEK/VDX OS Design using Its Formal Specification, TASE, pp.81–88, 2016.
- [36] T. Aoki, M. Satoh et al.: Combined Model Checking and Testing Create Confidence-A Case on Commercial Automotive Operating System, pp.109–132, Cyber-Physical System Design from an Architecture Analysis Viewpoint, Springer, 2017.
- [37] A. Hall: Seven myths of formal methods, IEEE Software, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 11–19, Sept. 1990.
- [38] D. Lee. and M. Yannakakis: Principles and methods of testing finite state machines a survey, in Proceedings of the IEEE, vol. 84, no. 8, pp. 1090–1123, 1996.
- [39] M. B. Dwyer, G. S. Avrunin, and J. C. Corbett: Patterns in Property Specifications for Finite-state Verification, International Conference on Software Engineering, pp. 411–420, 1999.

[40] J. Rushby : The Versatile Synchronous Observer, Specification, Algebra, and Software. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 8373. pp.110–128, Springer, 2014.

[41] N. H. Tran, and T. Aoki: Conformance Testing of Schedulers for DSL-based Model Checking, International Symposium on Model Checking of Software, pp. 208-225, 2019.