

Exhaustive Diagnosis of Discrete Event Systems through Exploration of the Hypothesis Space

Alban Grastien, P@trik Haslum, and Sylvie Thiébaux



Australian Government
Department of Communications,
Information Technology and the Arts
Australian Research Council

NICTA Members



NICTA Partners

Outline

- 1 Definition
- 2 Motivation of this Work
- 3 Diagnosis Tests
- 4 Exploration Strategies
- 5 Evaluation

A Definition of the Diagnosis Problem

Input

- Model D
- Observation o
- Hypothesis space \mathcal{H}

Diagnosis

$$\Delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\delta \in \mathcal{H} \mid D, o, \delta \not\models \perp\}$$

Preferred Diagnosis

Preference relation over hypotheses: $h \preceq h'$

Preferred diagnosis:

$$\Delta_{\preceq} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{\preceq}(\Delta)$$

(Model-Based) Diagnosis Approaches

“Brute force” Approaches

Two steps:

- Compute all possible system behaviours
- Extract the diagnosis information from these behaviours

Darwiche et al, Lamperti & Zanella, Cordier et al.

Test Approaches

Two steps:

- Test consistency of some propositions $(D, o, \text{Prop}_i \mid \neq \perp \}$
- Deduce the diagnosis (or test more)

(Model-Based) Diagnosis Approaches

“Brute force” Approaches

Two steps:

- Compute all possible system behaviours
- Extract the diagnosis information from these behaviours

Darwiche et al, Lamperti & Zanella, Cordier et al.

Test Approaches

Two steps:

- Test consistency of some propositions ($D, o, \text{Prop}_i \mid \neq \perp$ [?])
- Deduce the diagnosis (or test more)

This Paper

→ exhaustive diagnosis of DES with test approaches

Outline

- 1 Definition
- 2 Motivation of this Work
- 3 Diagnosis Tests
- 4 Exploration Strategies
- 5 Evaluation

“Exotic” Hypothesis Spaces

Set Hypothesis Space (classical definition)

A hypothesis is defined a set of faulty components.

Multi set hypothesis space

A hypothesis records the number of occurrences of each fault.

Sequence hypothesis space

A hypothesis records the order in which the faults occur.

“Exotic” Hypothesis Spaces

Set Hypothesis Space (classical definition)

A hypothesis is defined a set of faulty components.

Multi set hypothesis space

A hypothesis records the number of occurrences of each fault.

Sequence hypothesis space

A hypothesis records the order in which the faults occur.

Question

How does the test approach cop with such hypothesis spaces?

Remarks

Assumption

$\langle \mathcal{H}, \preceq \rangle$ is a partially ordered set

Vocabulary

$h \preceq h'$:

- h' is a descendant of h
- h is an ancestor of h'

$h \prec h' \wedge \forall h'' \in \mathcal{H}, h \preceq h'' \prec h' \Rightarrow h'' = h$

- h' is a child of h
- h is a parent of h'

Outline

- 1 Definition
- 2 Motivation of this Work
- 3 Diagnosis Tests
- 4 Exploration Strategies
- 5 Evaluation

Test

Informally

Is there a diagnosis candidate in the specified set S ?

Formally

Given a set $S \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ of hypotheses, does S intersect Δ ?

$$D, o, S \stackrel{?}{\neq} \perp$$

If so, return one such candidate $\delta \in S \cap \Delta$

Examples of Tests (1/2)

Candidacy of Hypothesis h

“Is h a candidate?”

$$S_{cand}(h) = \{h\}$$

Completeness of $D \subseteq \Delta$

“Are there (minimal) candidates besides D ?”

$$S_{find}(D) = \mathcal{H} \setminus \{h \in \mathcal{H} \mid \exists h' \in D : h' \preceq h\}$$

Examples of Tests (2/2)

Refinement of δ

"Is there a strictly better candidate than δ ?"

$$S_{\text{ref}}(\delta) = \{h \in \mathcal{H} \mid h \preceq \delta \wedge h \neq \delta\}$$

Relevance of h with respect to D

"Is there a candidate that is a descendant of h and not a descendant of a hypothesis of D ?"

$$S_{\text{ess}}(h, D) = \{h' \in \mathcal{H} \mid h \preceq h'\} \setminus \{h' \in \mathcal{H} \mid \exists h'' \in D : h'' \preceq h'\}$$

Implementations

Classical Planning

Testing = finding a sequence of actions with certain constraints on the sequence

SAT

Testing = satisfiability testing of a formula

Outline

- 1 Definition
- 2 Motivation of this Work
- 3 Diagnosis Tests
- 4 Exploration Strategies
- 5 Evaluation

Preferred-First Strategy

Principle

- Test candidacy of the preferred hypotheses first,
- When the test of h fails, generate successors from children and test candidacy of them
- If a hypothesis h is a descendant of a proven candidate, ignore h

Theorem

PFS terminates and returns the solution if the hypothesis space is finite

Preferred-First Strategy + Essentiality

Principle

- Test the preferred hypotheses first,
- When the test of h fails, generate successors from children and test them
- If a hypothesis h is a descendant of a proven candidate, ignore h
- Ignore irrelevant hypotheses (with respect to the open list and the candidates already found)

Theorem

PFS+e terminates and returns the solution if the diagnosis is finite, the set of children of each hypothesis is finite, and every hypothesis has finite depth

Preferred-Last Strategy

Principle

Iteratively, starting with $D = \emptyset$

- Test completeness of D
- Add the candidate found to D

Remove the non minimal candidates

Theorem

PLS terminates and returns the solution if the hypothesis space is well partially ordered

Preferred-Last Strategy + Refinement

Principle

Iteratively, starting with $D = \emptyset$

- Test completeness of D
- Refine the candidate found until a minimal candidate is found
- Add the candidate found to D

~~Remove the non-minimal candidates~~

Theorem

PLS+r terminates and returns the solution if the diagnosis is finite, and the hypothesis space is well-founded

Outline

- 1 Definition
- 2 Motivation of this Work
- 3 Diagnosis Tests
- 4 Exploration Strategies
- 5 Evaluation

Theoretical Comparison

Number of Tests

	PFS	PFS+e	PLS	PLS+r
Successes	n	$n \times d$	unb.	unb.
Failures	unb.	$k \times n \times d$	1	n
Types of tests	Q1	Q1 & Q4	Q2	Q2 & Q3

Parameters

- How many tests?
- How “complex” the test set?
- How hard for the test solver?

Experiments

Power Grid Alarms: runtime

Pb	#c	#a	#d	PFS+e	PLS	PLS+r
c-004	2	3	1	0.4	0.3	0.4
c-026	12	11	2	18.5	89.5	23.8
c-076	11	8	2	8.9	7.1	6
c-091	25	16	32	1412	—	785
c-111	26	16	8	358	691	173
w-132	16	7	2	14.4	10.5	8.4
w-331	62	44	16	—	—	545
w-338	42	31	2	820	—	166

Conclusion

Results

- First approach to exhaustive diagnosis of discrete-event systems based on consistency tests
- Definition of two classes of strategies

Next Step

Conflict