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Abstract: The compositional interchange format for hybrid systems is syntactically and semantically defined in terms of an interchange automaton in an abstract format, allowing among others differential algebraic equations, variables that can be internal or external, operators for parallel composition, action hiding, variable hiding and urgent actions, synchronization by means of shared labels, and communication by means of shared variables and CSP channels. A concrete format is defined for modeling. Its semantics is defined in terms of a mapping to the abstract format. The concrete format adds inputs, outputs and open and closed scopes to enable modular and hierarchical specifications. The concrete format is illustrated by means of a bottle filling line example.

1. INTRODUCTION

In Beek et al. [2007a] and Beek et al. [2007b] the foundations of a compositional interchange format for hybrid systems (CIF) have been defined, along with a detailed discussion of design considerations, and the CIF has been related to previous work on interchange formats for hybrid systems: MoBIES team [2002], Pinto et al. [2006], Cairano et al. [2006]. The main requirements for the interchange format, as defined in Beek et al. [2007a], are summarized below.

1. It should have a formal and compositional semantics, based on (hybrid) transition systems, and allow property preserving model transformations.
2. Its concepts should be based on mathematics, and independent of implementation aspects such as equation sorting, and numerical equation solving algorithms.
3. It should support arbitrary differential algebraic equations (DAEs), including fully implicit equations, higher index systems, algebraic loops, steady state initialization, switched systems such as piecewise affine systems, and DAEs with discontinuous right hand sides.
4. It should support a wide range of urgency concepts, such as used in hybrid automata, including 'urgency predicates', 'deadline predicates', 'triggering guard semantics', and 'urgent actions'.
5. It should support parallel composition with synchronization by means of shared variables and shared actions.
6. It should support hierarchy and modularity to allow the definition of parallel modules and modules that contain other modules (hierarchy), and to allow the definition of variables and actions as being local to a module, or shared between modules.

The contribution of this article is twofold:

1. The abstract syntax of the CIF, as defined in Beek et al. [2007a] is extended with channels to allow a CSP style communication (see Hoare [1985]), such as used in the Chi language (see Beek et al. [2006], Man and Schiffelers [2006]) and as used in UPPAAL (see Larsen et al. [1997]), although the latter restricts CSP to pure synchronization (no communication of data).

2. A concrete format, that is used for modeling, is defined. The semantics of the concrete format is formally defined by means of a mapping to the abstract format (as defined in Beek et al. [2007a]). The language elements of the abstract format are mathematical constructs, such as sets, partial functions etc. chosen to facilitate the definition of the semantics. It consists of a small number of orthogonal language elements. For modelling purposes, however, the abstract syntax is rather cumbersome. The concrete syntax is chosen to facilitate modelling. For example, instead of defining a set of variables, a partial function to define their dynamic type (see Section 2), and a predicate defining their initial values, a variable declaration mechanism as used in many modelling languages is used. Furthermore, the concrete syntax extends the abstract syntax with constructs for modeling, including amongst others

- **clocks** that are added for compatibility with timed automata,
- **input and output variables** that are added for compatibility with languages such as Simulink (see The MathWorks, Inc [2005]) and PHAVER (see Frehse [2005]), and to enable compositional verification in the form of assume-guarantee reasoning (e.g. see Henzinger et al. [2000], Frehse et al. [2001]),
- **open and closed scopes** that allow the definition of variables, channels, clocks and actions as being local to facilitate hierarchy and modularity,
- **automaton definition and instantiation** that facilitate re-use of automata.

* Work partially done in the framework of the HYCON Network of Excellence, contract number FP6-IST-511368; as part of the Darwin project under the responsibility of the Embedded Systems Institute, partially supported by the Netherlands Ministry of Economic Affairs under the BSIK program; and as part of the ITEA project Twins 05004.
The remainder of this article is organized as follows: Section 2 defines the abstract syntax of the CIF, Section 3 formally explains the semantics of the abstract syntax, Sections 4 and 6 define the concrete syntax and its mapping to the abstract syntax, respectively, Section 5 presents a bottle filling system example and Section 7 presents concluding remarks.

2. ABSTRACT SYNTAX OF INTERCHANGE AUTOMATA

First some notations are defined. A set \( V \) of variables, a set of basic action labels \( L_{\text{basic}} \), which does not include the predefined non-synchronizing action \( \tau \), a set of channel labels \( \mathcal{H} \), and a set of values \( A \) are assumed. The set \( L_{\text{dom}} \) denotes the set of CSP action labels. It is defined as \( L_{\text{dom}} = \{ h!cs, h?cs, h!?cs \mid h \in \mathcal{H}, cs \in \Lambda^* \} \), where \( h \in \mathcal{H} \) denotes a channel, and \( cs \in \Lambda^* \) denotes a list \([c_1, \ldots, c_n] \) of values \((c_i \in \Lambda, 1 \leq i \leq n)\). The CSP actions \( h!cs, h?cs, h!?cs \) are called send action label, receive action label, and communication action label, respectively. We assume the set of basic action labels and the set of CSP action labels to be disjoint: \( L_{\text{basic}} \cap L_{\text{dom}} = \emptyset \).

### Definition 2. (Interchange automaton)

The set of interchange automata \( \mathcal{A} \) is defined by the following grammar for the interchange automaton \( \alpha \in \mathcal{A} \):

\[
\alpha ::= \alpha_{\text{atom}} \mid \alpha \parallel \alpha \mid \text{hidevar}_{h_{\alpha}}(\alpha, \sigma_{h_{\alpha}}) \mid \text{hideact}_{L_{\alpha}}(\alpha) \mid \text{urgent}_{L_{\alpha}}(\alpha) \mid \text{encap}_{L_{\alpha}}(\alpha)
\]

where

- \( \alpha_{\text{atom}} \) denotes an atomic interchange automaton;
- \( X_{h_{\alpha}} \subseteq V \) denotes a set of variables to hide and \( \sigma_{h_{\alpha}} : X_{h_{\alpha}} \to A \) denotes a (partial) valuation for the hidden state variables of interchange automaton \( \alpha \);
- \( L_{\alpha} \subseteq L \) denotes a set of actions to hide;
- \( L_{u} \subseteq L \) denotes a set of nondelayable actions;
- \( L_{e} \subseteq L \) denotes a set of actions that are blocked.

3. SEMANTICS OF THE ABSTRACT SYNTAX

The informal semantics of the abstract syntax is defined below. The complete formal semantics, including CSP channels, is defined in Beek et al. [2007b]. The semantics without CSP communication has appeared in Beek et al. [2007a].

### 3.1 Atomic automata

**Variables**

The interchange automaton defines three classes of variables: the discrete and continuous variables, and in addition the algebraic variables. The main differences are as follows: First, the values of discrete variables remain constant when model time progresses, the values of continuous variables may change according to a continuous function of time when model time progresses, and the values of algebraic variables may change according to a discontinuous function of time. Second, the values of the discrete and continuous variables do not change in action transitions unless such changes are explicitly specified, for example by assigning a new value. The values of algebraic variables can change arbitrarily in action transitions, unless such changes are explicitly restricted, for example by assigning a new value. Third, there is a difference between the different classes of variables with respect to how the resulting values of the variables in a transition relate to the starting values of the variables in the next transition. The resulting value of a discrete or continuous variable in a transition always equals its starting value in the next transition. For algebraic variables there is no such relation. In most models, the values of discrete
variables are defined by assignments, whereas the values of algebraic variables are defined by invariants ((in)equalities).

**Predicates in a location** The initial condition should hold initially, whereas the invariant should hold at all times. The time can progress (tcp) predicate allows passing of time in a location for as long as the condition is true, or in other words, until the time-point when the condition is false. Differential algebraic equations (DAEs) can be specified in the invariants of an interchange automaton, since such invariants are predicates over all variables, including the dotted variables. Flow clauses are supported for reasons of compatibility with existing hybrid automata. The result for not enforcing a separation between invariants (over non-dotted variables) and flow clauses (over dotted variables), as in existing hybrid automata, is that such a separation is absent in the mathematical theory of dynamical systems, including control theory. In many cases, fully implicit DAEs, cannot even be rewritten to a form where the algebraic constraints and the differential constraints are separated.

In the formal semantics, three kinds of transitions are defined for interchange automata: action transitions, time transitions and consistency transitions. Action transitions and time transitions are well known in hybrid automata. Consistency transitions in the CIF ensure that when one of the automata does an action transition in a parallel composition, the initial conditions and invariants of the automata that do not synchronize hold.

### 3.2 Operators

**Parallel composition operator** There are no compatibility requirements for the parallel composition of interchange automata: any pair of interchange automata can be composed by the parallel composition operator. The parallel composition operator synchronizes on external actions that the arguments share. CSP actions synchronize on the basis of pairs of send ($h!e$) and receive ($h?x$) actions. The CSP communication action $h?e$ := $e$ is the result of elimination of parallel composition as defined in Beek et al. [2007b]. All other actions may be interleaved (under the condition that they maintain the consistency of the other automaton). Time transitions must be synchronized, and consistency is established only if both automata agree on it. The external state variables that are shared by the argument automata need to have the same values (all the time).

**Hiding operators** The action hiding operator applied to an automaton, $\text{hide}_{L_u} (\alpha)$, hides (abstracts from) the actions from set $L_u$ by replacing them by the internal action $\tau$. This only affects the action behavior of $\alpha$; its delay behavior and consistency remain unchanged. Transitions contain, amongst others, information about the variables, such as their values or, in case of a time transition, their trajectories. The variable hiding operator applied to an automaton, $\text{hidevar}_{X_h} (\alpha, \sigma_h)$, hides the variables from set $X_h$ by removing the information about them from the transitions of $\alpha$. The values of the hidden state variables after a transition are stored in valuation $\sigma_h$.

**Urgent action operator** The urgent action operator applied to an automaton, $\text{urgent}_{L_u} (\alpha)$, gives actions from the set $L_u$ priority over time passing. The action behavior and consistency of $\alpha$ are not affected by the urgent action operator. Time transitions are allowed only if at the current state, and at each intermediate state while delaying, no actions from the set $L_u$ are possible.

**Action encapsulation operator** The action encapsulation operator applied to an automaton, $\text{encap}_{L_e} (\alpha)$, blocks actions from the set $L_e$. The delay behavior and consistency behavior of $\alpha$ are not affected. Send and receive actions on channels from a set $H_c$ can be blocked by means of $\text{encap}_{p(h!e, h?x) \in H_c, \text{enc} \in X_e} (\alpha)$. In this way, only the the synchronous execution of matching send and receive actions via channels from the set $H_c$ can take place.

### 4. CONCRETE SYNTAX DEFINITION

In this section, the concrete syntax of CIF models is defined using a Backes-Naur (BNF) like notation. The symbol | defines choice, and notation [Z] defines Z as being optional.
Both concepts of scoping can be found in modeling languages. The concept of open scoping is often used in different syntactic forms, such as the “for loop” used in many programming and modeling languages. It uses a local iterator that can be used in the body of the for loop together with the variables that are declared at a more global level. This local iterator is essentially a local variable declared in an open scope in which the body of the for loop is executed. The concept of closed scopes can be found in many modeling languages, such as Modelica (see Modelica Association [2002]), where interfaces specify the interaction points (ports) of components explicitly, and connectors are used to connect these ports. The ports and connectors can be mapped to the external variables and connect sets, respectively, of the CIF.

When scopes are nested, inner scopes may declare variables using a name (identifier) that is already used in a variable declaration in an outer scope. A variable used in an automaton binds to the declaration of that variable in the smallest enclosing scope that declares the variable. The search for this variable declaration starts in the smallest enclosing scope of the automaton. If the variable declaration is not found in an open scope, the search proceeds one level up in the scope hierarchy. If it is not found in a closed scope, the model is erroneous, because closed scopes may not have free variables.

By means of connect sets, variables from different(!) closed automata (BNF non-terminal $\texttt{Automaton}$) may be connected such that the connected variables refer to the same variable. The following connections are possible:

- Hierarchical connections: The internal and external variables of a closed automaton can be connected to external variables of the contained closed automata.
- Parallel connections: In a parallel composition of closed automata, the external variables of each closed automaton can be connected to external variables of the other closed automata.

Variables $x$ and $y$ are connected if they both occur in a connect set $\{x, y\}$ or if they occur in different connect sets for which the intersection is non-empty, for example $\{x, z\}$, $\{y, z\}$. Within a connect set declaration, it is not allowed that two or more variables that are declared in the same scope are connected. Action labels and channels can be connected to other action labels and channels, respectively, in a similar way as connections between variables are specified.

Section 5 presents several examples of the use of open and closed scopes, together with examples of the use of connect sets, internal and external variables and channels.

5. EXAMPLE: BOTTLE FILLING SYSTEM

The bottle filling system as shown in Figure 1 consists of a liquid storage tank, two identical bottle filling lines, and a bottle supply (see Man and Schiffelers [2006]).

The bottles are filled with liquid from the storage tank. A control system keeps the volume $V_T$ in the storage tank between 2 and 10, and the pH level (acidity) of the liquid in the storage tank between 7 and 7.1. The liquid in the storage tank slowly becomes less acidic ($pH$ level increases). To correct this, a strong acid is dripped into the storage tank when the acidity of the liquid becomes too low ($pH \geq 7.1$).
The acid and liquid supply processes are not modeled, since we consider the acid and liquid always to be available, and we are not interested in the amount of acid or liquid that is used.

The storage tank and the two bottle filling lines are connected by means of the variables \( Q_{Fl} \) and \( Q_{Fr} \), respectively. The volume of the storage tank is available in both bottle filling lines (variable \( V_T \)) to prevent filling of the bottles when the storage tank is empty.

The molar quantity and molar concentration of the acid in the storage tank are denoted by \( n \) and \( c \), respectively, where \( n = cV \). The incoming flows of liquid and acid of the liquid storage tank \( T \) are denoted by \( Q_u \) and \( Q_a \), respectively. Acid leaves the tank in outgoing flows \( Q_{Fl} \) and \( Q_{Fr} \). The gradual reduction of the acidity of the liquid is modeled by means of a constant \( K_{loss} \), which leads to \( n = c_u Q_u + c_a Q_a - c Q_{Fl} = c Q_{Fr} - K_{loss} V \), where \( c_u \) and \( c_a \) denote the concentrations of acid in the flows \( Q_u \) and \( Q_a \). Taking into account that the units of \( c \) are in \([\text{mol/m}^3]\) instead of \([\text{mol/L}]\), the \( pH \) is given by \( pH = -\log c/1000 \).

In the CIF specification of the liquid storage tank, symbols \( \text{Qseta} \), \( \text{Qsetu} \), \( c_a \), \( c_u \), and \( K_{loss} \) denote constants. The behavior of the liquid storage tank is explained as follows. Initially, the \( pH \) of the liquid in the storage tank equals 7. It is assumed that the \( pH \) level of the incoming liquid is 7 or more, since the acidity controller can only make the acidity of the storage tank increase, causing the \( pH \) to decrease. If the \( pH \) value exceeds the maximum value (\( pH \geq 7.1 \)), the acid valve is opened \((\text{alpha}:=1)\) so that acid is dribbled into the tank. Dribbling of the acid continues until the \( pH \) value comes back at 7, and the valve is closed \((\text{alpha}:=0)\). In a similar way, the controller tries to keep the level of the storage tank between 2 and 10.

The filling controller is explained as follows. When a new crate of bottles arrives, \((\text{bottles}?n)\), where \( n \) denotes the number of bottles in a crate, the bottle volume is reset to 0.3, and filling of a bottle is started \((\text{vb},\text{gamma}) := (0,1))\). The valve switching the flow \( Q_{F} \) is modeled by means of the discrete variable \( \gamma \). Filling stops when the volume in the storage tank drops below 0.5 (when \( VT <= 0.5 \) now do \( \gamma := 0 \)). Filling resumes when the volume in the storage tank is at least 0.7. Filling also stops when the bottle is full (when \( VB >= 1 \) now do \( \gamma := 0 \)).
for each urgent edge, the time can progress predicate of an omitted flow denotes the flow true, an omitted label denotes the (non-synchronizing) label, an omitted tcp predicate denotes the tcp predicate true, an omitted invariant denotes the invariant true, an update assignment.
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This section defines the formal semantics of a CIF model specified in concrete syntax by means of a mapping to the abstract format. First the concrete syntax is preprocessed as described in Section 6.1. The mapping of the concrete syntax to the abstract syntax is defined by means of function T. It takes the preprocessed CIF model as input, and returns an automaton specified in the abstract syntax. This function is defined in Section 6.2.

6.1 Preprocessing

First, declarations of the form input var varlids : type are replaced by extern var varlids : alg type and declarations of the form output var varDecls are replaced by extern var varDecls. All closed scopes, open scopes and automaton instantiations that occur in the body of the top-level closed scope which are not prefixed with an automaton identifier are prefixed with a fresh identifier.

Using a bottom-up approach, each closed scope prefixed with an automaton identifier is replaced with the same closed scope in which all variables, clocks, channels and actions (including those in nested scopes) are prefixed with the automaton identifier and a dot ( '.') . The automaton identifier is removed from the closed scope. A similar approach is used for replacing open scopes and automaton instantiations. In this way, all variables, clocks, channels and actions occurring in the body of the top-level closed scope are made unique. The external variable declarations are grouped w.r.t. their dynamic type into three different lists. The lists discvars<ext>, contvars<ext> and algvars<ext> denote a comma separated list of external variables declared with dynamic type disc, cont, and alg, respectively. Each entry in such a list is of the form x : t = e, where x denotes a variable, t denotes its static type, and e denotes its initial value if the initial value is specified at the declaration. The declared external channels are grouped in list chans<ext>, where each entry in the list is either of the form c ! : t, c ? : t, or c : t, where c denotes a channel, and t denotes its type. Notation x<sub>0</sub> : l<sub>0</sub> = e<sub>0</sub>, . . . , x<sub>n</sub> : l<sub>n</sub> = e<sub>n</sub> denotes the list

\{ x<sub>0</sub>, . . . , x<sub>n</sub> \} , and notation \( e<sub>0</sub>\otimes e<sub>i</sub> \otimes e<sub>n</sub> \) , where \( e<sub>i</sub> \in \{ !, ?, \} \) for \( i \in \{ 0, . . . , n \} \) denotes the list

\( e<sub>0</sub>, . . . , e<sub>n</sub> \). The clocks and actions are grouped into respective lists clocks<ext>, and acts<ext>. A similar notation is used for the internal declarations. Connect set declarations are combined into new connect set declarations that specify the same connections between the identifiers such that each identifier occurs at most in one connect set (for example the connect set declaration connect \{ x, z \} \{ y, z \} is replaced by connect \{ x, y, z \} \} \} . Finally, all automaton instantiations occurring in the model are flattened using the automaton definitions of the specification: Let

\begin{align*}
\text{automaton } l(p<sub>0</sub>: t<sub>0</sub>, . . . , p<sub>n</sub>: t<sub>n</sub>) =
& \{ \text{extern var discvars}<sub>ext</sub>, contvars<sub>ext</sub>, algvars<sub>ext</sub> \\
& , \text{clock clocks}<sub>ext</sub>, \text{chan chans}<sub>ext</sub>, \text{act acts}<sub>ext</sub> \\
& , \text{intern var discvars}<sub>int</sub>, contvars<sub>int</sub>, algvars<sub>int</sub> \\
& , \text{clock clocks}<sub>int</sub>, \text{chan chans}<sub>int</sub>, \text{act acts}<sub>int</sub> \\
& , \text{connect set1}, . . . , seth \\
& \} \\
\end{align*}

be the automaton definition associated with automaton definition identifier l, then automaton instantiation \( l(e<sub>0</sub>, . . . , e<sub>n</sub>) \) denotes the following automaton:

\begin{align*}
\{ \text{extern var discvars}<sub>ext</sub>, contvars<sub>ext</sub>, algvars<sub>ext</sub> \\
& , \text{clock clocks}<sub>ext</sub>, \text{chan chans}<sub>ext</sub>, \text{act acts}<sub>ext</sub> \\
& , \text{intern var discvars}<sub>int</sub>, contvars<sub>int</sub>, algvars<sub>int</sub> \\
& , \text{clock clocks}<sub>int</sub>, \text{chan chans}<sub>int</sub>, \text{act acts}<sub>int</sub> \\
& , \text{connect set1}, . . . , seth \\
& \} \\
\end{align*}

The parameter variables \( p<sub>0</sub>, . . . , p<sub>n</sub> \) of the automaton definition are declared as internal discrete variables inside the closed scope automaton, with initial values \( e<sub>0</sub>, . . . , e<sub>n</sub> \). Then, the possibly incomplete atomic automaton constructs that occur in automaton are made complete according to the following defaults/transformations:

- an omitted invariant denotes the invariant true,
- an omitted flow denotes the flow true,
- an omitted tcp predicate denotes the tcp predicate true,
- an omitted guard denotes the guard true,
- for each urgent edge, the time can progress predicate of the source mode is augmented with the disjunction of negation the guard of this edge. Then, the keyword now is removed from the edge.
- an omitted label denotes the (non-synchronizing) label \( r \),
- an update assignment \( x := e \) is replaced by \( \{ x \} : x = e^{-} \) , an omitted update denotes the empty update \( \emptyset : \text{true} \), i.e. the values of the discrete and continuous variables and the clocks are not changed.

6.2 Function T

The translation of a specification is defined as follows:

\[ T'(\text{model } m = \text{closedScope}) = \text{enCap}_{\text{cont}}(\text{encap}_{\text{disc}}(T''(m)(\emptyset, \emptyset\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)))(\text{closedScope})) \]

Function \( T' \) takes two parameters: the first parameter contains variables, the dynamic type of variables, clocks, actions, and an initialization predicate over variables that are defined at a higher level than the second parameter. The second parameter contains elements of the preprocessed concrete syntax.
Closed scope A closed scope (BNF non-terminal \textit{closedScope}) is mapped to an abstract CIF automaton as follows:

$$
\mathcal{T}_{\text{env}}(\| \text{extern var } \text{discvars}_\text{ext}, \text{contvars}_\text{ext}, \text{algvars}_\text{ext}, \\
\text{channel } \text{chans}_\text{ext}, \text{act} \in \text{acts}_\text{ext}, \\
\text{intern var } \text{discvars}_\text{int}, \text{contvars}_\text{int}, \text{algvars}_\text{int}, \\
\text{channel } \text{chans}_\text{int}, \text{act} \in \text{acts}_\text{int}, \\
\text{connect } \text{set}_1, \ldots, \text{set}_h \\
\text{: automaton}) = \\
\text{hidevar} \setminus (\text{var}) ( \\
\text{hideact}(\mathcal{L}_\text{basic} \cup \mathcal{L}_\text{comb})((\\text{actext}) \cup \text{charactext})) ( \\
\text{encap}(\mathcal{L}_\text{comb} \setminus \text{charactext})(\mathcal{T}_{\text{env}}(\text{automaton'}))) \), \sigma_h)
$$

where

- \(\text{vars}_\text{ext} = \{\text{discvars}_\text{ext}, \text{contvars}_\text{ext}, \text{algvars}_\text{ext}\}\)
- \(\text{vars}_\text{int} = \{\text{discvars}_\text{int}, \text{contvars}_\text{int}, \text{algvars}_\text{int}\}\)
- \(\text{charactext} = \{h \in \text{acts}_\text{ext}, h \in \text{acts}_\text{int}, h \in \text{acts}\} | h \in \text{set}_1, \ldots, \text{set}_h\}
- \(\text{env'} = (\text{vars}, \text{dtyper}, \text{acts}, \text{clocks}, \text{init})\)
- \(\text{vars} = \text{vars}_\text{ext} \cup \text{vars}_\text{int}\)
- \(\text{dtyper} = \{x \mapsto \text{disc } | x \in \text{discvars}_\text{ext}, \text{discvars}_\text{int}\} \cup \{x \mapsto \text{cont } | x \in \text{contvars}_\text{ext}, \text{contvars}_\text{int}\} \cup \{x \mapsto \text{alg } | x \in \text{algvars}_\text{ext}, \text{algvars}_\text{int}\}\)
- \(\text{acts} = (\text{acts}_\text{ext}) \cup (\text{acts}_\text{int})\)
- \(\text{clocks} = (\text{clocks}_\text{ext}) \cup (\text{clocks}_\text{int})\)
- \(\text{init} = \{x \mapsto \text{value}_\text{vars}(x) \neq \bot : x = \text{value}_\text{vars}(x)\}\)
- \(\text{automaton'} = \text{automaton}[\text{Id}_1, \ldots, \text{Id}_h, \text{set}_1, \ldots, \text{set}_h]\)

- \(\text{dom}(\sigma_h) = \emptyset\)

where function application \(\text{value}_\text{vars}(x)\) returns the initial value for variable \(x\) that is specified in \(\text{vars}\) or \(\bot\) otherwise. Notation \(\text{automaton}[\text{Id}_1, \ldots, \text{Id}_h, \text{set}_1, \ldots, \text{set}_h]\) denotes the automaton where all occurrences of identifiers from \(\text{set}_i\) in \(\text{automaton}\) are replaced with identifier \(\text{Id}_i\) for \(i \in \{1, \ldots, h\}\). Identifier \(\text{Id}_i\) is defined as \(\text{Id}_i \in \text{set}_i \cap (\text{vars} \cup \text{acts} \cup \text{chans}_\text{ext} \cup \text{chans}_\text{int})\) if \(\text{set}_i \cap (\text{vars} \cup \text{acts} \cup (\text{chans}_\text{ext} \cup \text{chans}_\text{int}) \neq \emptyset, \text{and freshId}_i\) otherwise, where \(\text{freshId}_i\) denotes a fresh identifier.

Note that for a closed scope, the environment \(\text{env}\) is irrelevant, and its elements are not used in the automaton. An automaton can be a closed scope, an atomic automaton, an open scope, or a parallel composition of automata. In the next subsections, the mapping of the latter three is described.

Atomic automaton An atomic automaton (BNF non-terminal \textit{atomicAut}), is mapped to an abstract CIF automaton as follows:

$$
\mathcal{T}_{\text{vars}, \text{dtyper}, \text{acts}, \text{clocks}, \text{init}}( \\
\| \text{init = init}_{\text{init}} \\
, \text{mode}_1 = \text{inv}_1 \text{flow } f_1 \text{ tcp } u_1 \\
\text{when } g_{11}, \text{act } a_{11} \text{ do } a_{11}, \text{goto } V_{11} \\
\vdots \\
\text{when } g_{1i}, \text{act } a_{1i} \text{ do } a_{1i}, \text{goto } V_{1i} \\
\vdots \\
)\)

Fig. 2. Graphical representation of the CIF model representing the bottle filling system.
modeV_n = inv i_flow f_{etcp} u_n
\text{when \, } g_{n_j} \text{, } act \, a_{n_j} \text{ do } up_{n_j} \text{ goto } V_{n_j}
\vdots
\text{when \, } g_{n_k} \text{, } act \, a_{n_k} \text{ do } up_{n_k} \text{ goto } V_{n_k}
\vdots
\text{v_0}

}) = (X, \emptyset, dt\, type, V, v_0, \text{init, flow, inv, tcp, acts, } E)

where

- \( X = vars \cup clocks \)
- \( V = \{ V_1, \ldots, V_n \} \)
- \( \text{init} = \text{init} \land (\land \forall x; \exists \text{clocks} : x = 0) \)
- \( \text{dom(flow)} = \text{dom(inv)} = \text{dom(tcp)} = V \)
- \( \forall i,j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} : \text{flow}(V_i) = f_i \land (\land \forall x; \exists \text{clocks} : x = 1) \)\)
- \( \text{inv}(V_i) = i_i \)
- \( \text{tcp}(V_i) = u_i \)
- \( E = \{(V_i, g_j, a_j, up_j, V_j) \mid i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, j \in \{1, \ldots, k_i\}\} \)

Open scope An open scope (BNF non-terminal \text{openScope}) is mapped to an abstract CIF automaton as follows: Let \( env = (vars, \text{dt}, \text{asy}, \text{acts}, clocks, \text{init}) \), then\)

\[ T_{env}' (\{(\text{extern vars, vars, acts, clock vars}) \} \cdot \text{act vars} \cdot \text{ext vars}) \cdot \text{clock vars} \cdot \text{chan vars} \cdot \text{acts, clock vars}) \cdot \text{connect set}_{1, \ldots, set_h} \cdot \text{dom(automaton)} \)

\[ \text{hidervars}(\text{hideact}(\text{acts})) \cdot \text{chanvars}(\text{encap}_x)(T_{env}'(\text{dom(automaton)))}, \sigma_h \)\]

where

- \( \text{vars}_{int} = \{\text{discvars}_{ext}, \text{contvars}_{ext}, \text{algvars}_{int}\} \)
- \( \text{chanvars}_{int} = \{h; c, h; c, h; c, h; c, h\} \mid h \in \text{chars}_{int}, cs \in \Lambda^* \}
- \( env' = (vars, \text{dt}, \text{asy}, \text{acts}, \text{clocks, init}) \)
- \( vars = vars \cup vars_{int} \)
- \( \text{dt} = \text{type} \cup \text{disc, cont} \mid x \in [\text{discvars}_{int}] \cup \{x \mapsto \text{alg} \mid x \in [\text{algvars}_{int}]\} \)
- \( \text{acts = acts} \cup [\text{acts}_{int}] \)
- \( \text{clocks} = \text{clocks} \cup [\text{clocks}_{int}] \)
- \( \text{init} = \text{init} \land (\land \forall x; \exists \text{runs}, \text{value}_{vars}(x) \neq \perp : x = \text{value}_{vars}(x)) \)
- \( \text{automaton} = \text{automaton}[I_{d1}, \ldots, I_{dh}/set_1, \ldots, set_h, \text{dom}(\sigma_h) = \emptyset] \)

Parallel composition Function \( T_{env} \) distributes over parallel composition:\n\[ T_{env}(\text{automaton}_1 \parallel \text{automaton}_n) = T_{env}(\text{automaton}_1) \parallel T_{env}(\text{automaton}_n) \]

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The presented concrete format consists of the major building blocks required for hybrid system specification. Future work entails, among others, a further concretization of the syntax, including the definition of compound data types, and the definition of the syntax of expressions and equations; extending the concrete format with urgent actions, urgent channels and OR-super states; and possibly extending the interchange format with stochastic model primitives. The development of translations to and from other languages and simulator implementations will be done by different partners in a) Work Package 3 of the HYCON NoE (see HYCON Network of Excellence [2005]), and in b) the new FP7 STREPS MULTIFORM project.
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