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Abstract: In this paper, we propose a specification model combining interface automata, hybrid automata and Z language, named HZIA. This model can be used to describe temporal properties, hybrid properties, and data properties of hybrid software/hardware components. We also study the approximated refinement relation on HZIAs.

1 INTRODUCTION

Modern software systems are comprised of numerous components, and are made larger through the use of software frameworks. Hybrid software/hardware systems exhibit various behavioural aspects such as discrete and continuous transition, communication between components, and state transformation inside components. Formal specification techniques for such systems have to be able to describe all these aspects. Unfortunately, a single specification technique that is well suited for all these aspects is yet not available. Instead one needs various specialised techniques that are very good at describing individual aspects of system behaviour. This observation has led to research into the combination and semantic integration of specification techniques. In this paper we combine three well researched specification techniques: Interface automata, hybrid automata and Z.

Interface automaton is a light-weight automata-based languages for component specification, which was proposed in (Luca de Alfaro, 2001). An interface automaton (IA), introduced by de Alfaro and Henzinger, is an automata-based model suitable for specifying component-based systems. IA is part of a class of models called interface models, which are intended to specify concisely how systems can be used and to adhere to certain well-formedness criteria that make them appropriate for modelling component-based systems.

Hybrid automaton (Henzinger, 1996) is a formal model for a mixed discrete-continuous system. A paradigmatic example of a mixed discrete-continuous system is a digital controller of an analog plant. The discrete state of the controller is modelled by the vertices of a graph (control modes), and the discrete dynamics of the controller is modelled by the edges of the graph (control switches). The continuous state of the plant is modelled by points in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and the continuous dynamics of the plant is modelled by flow conditions such as differential equations. The behavior of the plant depends on the state of the controller: each control mode determines a flow condition, and each control switch may cause a discrete change in the state of the plant, as determined by a jump condition. Dually, the behavior of the controller depends on the state of the plant: each control mode continuously observes an invariant condition of the plant state, and by violating the invariant condition, a continuous change in the plant state will cause a control switch.

Z (Bowen, 2003; Spivey, 1998; Woodcock and Davies, 1996) is a typed formal specification notation based on first order predicate logic and set theory. The formal basis for Z is first order predicate logic extended with type set theory. Using mathemat-
ics for specification is all very well for small examples, but for more realistically sized problems, things start to get out of hand. To deal with this, Z includes the schema notation to aid the structuring and modularization of specifications. A boxed notation called schemas is used for structuring Z specifications. This has been found to be necessary to handle the information in a specification of any size. In particular, Z schemas and the schema calculus enable a structured way of presenting large state spaces and their transformation. But Z itself is cumbersome for specifying parallel systems. Its use will produce a much longer specification than if some other specification languages are used. Hence it is more convenient to use a language like CSP (Hoare, 1985) in such cases. Work has been undertaken to attempt to combine some of the features of CSP with Z (Fischer, 1996; Fischer, 1997; Fischer, 1998).

In this paper, we present a new specification language which combines interface automata, hybrid automata and Z language. Interface automata are a kind of intuitive models for interface property of software components. Hybrid automata are a model of mixed discrete-continuous systems. Z can describe the data property of states and transitions of a system. To specify mixed discrete-continuous software/hardware components, we give the definition of HZIA. Roughly speaking, a HZIA is in a style of hybrid interface automata but its states and operations are described by Z language. Furthermore, we define the approximated refinement relation between HZIAs and prove some propositions of such refinement relation. This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 gives a brief review of interface automata, hybrid automata and Z language. In Section 3, we propose a specification language-HZIA. Furthermore, the approximated refinement relation for HZIA are presented and studied. The paper is concluded in Section 4.

2 OVERVIEW OF INTERFACE AUTOMATA, HYBRID AUTOMATA AND Z LANGUAGE

In this section, we give a brief overview of interface automata, hybrid automata and Z language.

2.1 Interface Automata

An interface automaton (IA) (Luca de Alfaro, 2001), introduced by de Alfaro and Henzinger, is an automata-based model suitable for specifying component-based systems. IA is part of a class of models called interface models, which are intended to specify concisely how systems can be used and to adhere to certain well-formedness criteria that make them appropriate for modelling component-based systems. The two main characteristics of interface models are that they assume a helpful environment and support top-down design.

Definition 1. An interface automaton (IA) \( P = (V_p, V'_p, A'_p, A''_p, A'''_p, T_P) \) consists of the following elements:

1. \( V_p \) is a set of states,
2. \( V'_p \subseteq V_p \) is a set of initial states. If \( V'_p = \emptyset \) then \( P \) is called empty,
3. \( A'_p, A''_p \) and \( A'''_p \) are disjoint sets of input, output, and internal actions, respectively. We denote by \( A_p = A'_p \cup A''_p \cup A'''_p \) the set of all actions,
4. \( T_P \) is the set of transitions between states such that \( T_P \subseteq V_p \times A_p \times V_p \).

The interface automaton \( P \) is closed if it has only internal actions, that is, \( A'_p = A''_p = \emptyset \); otherwise we say that \( P \) is open.

The composition of two IAs consists of all possible interleaved transitions of the two IAs, except for those actions that are shared. Two IAs are composable if they do not take any of the same inputs, do not produce any of the same outputs and the internal actions of the two components do not overlap. An internal action is created through the composition of IA when an output action of one component is internally consumed by an input action of another component. This synchronization reduces the two actions to an internal action on a single transition.

IA \( Q \) refines IA \( P \) if \( Q \) provides the services of \( P \); it can have more inputs but no more output actions. As such, a refinement of an IA does not constrain the environment more than the original IA does.

2.2 Hybrid Automata

A hybrid system is a dynamical system with both discrete and continuous components. Hybrid automata (Henzinger, 1996) are a model of hybrid systems.

Definition 2. A hybrid automaton \( H \) consists of the following components:

1. Variables. A finite set \( X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \) of real-numbered variables. The number \( n \) is called the dimension of \( H \). We write \( X' \) for the set \( \{x'_1, \ldots, x'_n\} \) of primed variables (which represent values at the conclusion of change).
2. \( Q \) is a finite set of states.
3. \( q_0 \in Q \) is the initial state.
4. \( \Phi_{init} \in \Phi(X) \) is the initial condition.
(5) $T \subseteq Q \times \Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_{|X|}, x'_1, \ldots, x'_{|X|}) \times Q$ is a finite set of transitions. Variables $x'_1, \ldots, x'_{|X|}$ represent the new values taken by the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_{|X|}$ after the firing of the transition.

(6) $Act : Q \rightarrow \Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_{|X|}, t, x'_1, \ldots, x'_{|X|})$ is the activity function assigning to each state $q$ a formula $Act(q)$. The variable $t$ represents time elapsing.

For the sake of space, more details of Hybrid automata can be referred to the article (Henzinger, 1996).

### 2.3 Z Language

Z was introduced in the early 80’s in Oxford by Abrial as a set-theoretic and predicate language for the specification of data structure, state spaces and state transformations. The first systematic description of Z is (Spivey, 1998). Since then the language has been used in many case studies and industrial projects (e.g. (Bowen, 2003; Woodcock and Davies, 1996)).

Z includes the schema notation to aid the structuring and modularization of specifications. A boxed notation called schemas is used for structuring Z specifications.

Schemas are primarily used to specify state spaces and operations for the mathematical modelling of systems. For example, here is a schema called StateSpace:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{StateSpace} \\
\hline
x_1 : S_1; \ldots; x_n : S_n \\
\hline
\text{Inv}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)
\end{array}
\]

This schema specifies a state space in which $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are the state variables and $S_1, \ldots, S_n$ are expressions from which their types may be systematically derived. $Z$ types are sets - $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ should not occur free in $S_1, \ldots, S_n$, or if they do, they refer instead to other occurrences of these variables already in scope (e.g., globally defined variables). $Inv(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is the state invariant, relating the variables in some way for all possible allowed states of the system during its lifetime.

$Z$ makes use of identifier decorations to encode intended interpretations. A state variable with no decoration represents the current (before) state and a state variable ending with a prime (’) represents the next (after) state. A variable ending with a question mark (?) represents an input and a variable ending with an exclamation mark (!) represents an output.

The vertical form of schema

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S \\
D_1; \ldots; D_m \\
P_1; \ldots; P_n
\end{array}
\]

is equivalent to the horizontal form of schema $S \equiv [D_1; \ldots; D_m | P_1; \ldots; P_n]$.

In the following, we sometimes use the horizontal form.

In Z (Bowen, 2003; Spivey, 1998; Woodcock and Davies, 1996), there are many schema operators. For example, we write $S \cap T$ to denote the conjunction of these two schemas: a new schema formed by merging the declaration parts of $S$ and $T$ and conjoining their predicate parts. $S \Rightarrow T$ ($S \Leftrightarrow T$) is similar to $S \cap T$ except connecting their predicate parts by $\Rightarrow$ ($\Leftrightarrow$).

The hiding operation $S_1'(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ removes from the schema $S$ the components $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ explicitly listed, which must exist. Formally, $S_1'(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is equivalent to $(\exists x_1 : t_1; \ldots; x_n : t_n : S)$, where $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ have types $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ in $S$. The notation $\exists x : a \bullet S$ states that there is some object $x$ in $a$ for which $S$ is true. The notation $\forall x : a \bullet S$ states that for each object $x$ in $a$, $S$ is true.

For the sake of space, more details of Z can be referred to some books on Z (Bowen, 2003; Spivey, 1998; Woodcock and Davies, 1996).

### 3 HYBRID INTERFACE AUTOMATA WITH Z NOTATION

In many cases, systems have both discrete and continuous property. To specify hybrid systems, we now propose hybrid interface automata with Z notation, named HZIA.

#### 3.1 Model

In (Cao, 2010), we propose a model which combines interface automata and Z notation, named ZIA. In this paper, the ZIA (Cao, 2010) is extended to hybrid version of ZIA, which can be used to specify hybrid behavioural and the data structure aspects of a system.


1. $S_P$ is a set of states;
2. $S^I_P \subseteq S_P$ is a set of initial states. If $S^I_P = \emptyset$ then $P$ is called empty;
(3) $A^I_p, A^O_p$ and $A^H_p$ are disjoint sets of input, output, and internal actions, respectively. We denote by $P_n = A^I_p \cup A^O_p \cup A^H_p$ the set of all actions;

(4) $X_p = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ is a finite set of real-numbered variables; The number $n$ is called the dimension of $P$. We write $X'$ for the set $\{x_1', \ldots, x_n'\}$ of primed variables (which represent values at the conclusion of change);

(5) $V^I_p, V^O_p$ and $V^H_p$ are disjoint sets of input, output, and internal variables, respectively. We denote by $V_p = V^I_p \cup V^O_p \cup V^H_p$ the set of all variables. We have that $X_p \subseteq V_p$ which are all continuous valued variables and $V_p - X_p$ are all discrete valued variables;

(6) $C_p$ is a variable representing time, whose value is a real number, $C_p \notin V_p$;

(7) $F^I_p$ is a map, which maps any state in $S$ to a state schema $\Phi(V_p \cup \{C_p\})$ in $Z$ language;

(8) $F^B_p$ is a map, which maps any input action in $A^I_p$ to an input operation schema $\Phi(V_p)$ in $Z$ language, and maps any output action in $A^O_p$ to an output operation schema $\Phi(V_p)$ in $Z$ language, and maps any internal action in $A^H_p$ to an internal operation schema $\Phi(V_p)$ in $Z$ language;

(9) $T_p$ is the set of transitions between states such that $T_p \subseteq S_p \times A_p \times S_p$. If $(s, a, t) \in T_p$ then $[\Phi(F^I_p(s) \wedge F^B_p(a)) \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}] \leftrightarrow F^B_p(t)[\{y_1', \ldots, y_m\}]$, where $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ is the set of the variables in $F^I_p(s)$, $\{y_1', \ldots, y_m\}$ is the set of the variables in $F^B_p(t)$, the set of variables in $F^B_p(a)$ is the subset of $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \cup \{y_1', \ldots, y_n\}$.

4 APPROXIMATED REFINEMENT RELATION ON HZIAS

The refinement relation aims at formalizing the relation between abstract and concrete versions of the same component, for example, between an interface specification and its implementation.

Since HZIA have some real-numbered variables which may be measured with small errors. We should consider the measuring errors of real-numbered variables in the definition of approximated refinement relation on HZIAs. Roughly, a HZIA $P$ approximately refines a HZIA $Q$ if all the input or output actions of $P$ can be simulated by $Q$ except that some small measuring errors of real numbered variables. The precise definition must take into account the fact that the internal actions of $P$ and $Q$ are independent. For this, we need some preliminary notions. The closure of a state $s$ consists of the set of states that can be reached from $s$ by taking only internal actions.

We now give the following definition which describes the set of states after performing a sequence of internal actions from a given state.

**Definition 4.** Given a HZIA $P$ and a state $s \in S_p$, the set $\text{closure}_P(s)$ is the smallest set $U \subseteq S_p$ such that (1) $s \in U$ and (2) if $t \in U$, $a \in A^H_p$, and $(t, a, t') \in T_p$ then $t' \in U$.

The environment of a HZIA $P$ cannot see the internal actions of $P$. Consequently if $P$ is at a state $s$ then the environment cannot distinguish between $s$ and any state in $\text{closure}_P(s)$.

The following definition describes the set of states after performing several internal actions and an external action from a given state.

**Definition 5.** Consider a HZIA $P$ and a state $s \in S_p$. For an action $a$, we let $ExDest(s, a) = \{s' | \exists (t, a, t') \in T_p, t \in s \text{−} \text{closure}_P(s) \land s' \in s \text{−} \text{closure}_P(t')\}$.

In the following, we use $V^I(A)$ to denote the set of input variables in $Z$ schema $A$, $V^O(A)$ to denote the set of output variables in $Z$ schema $A$, $V^H(A)$ to denote the set of internal variables in $Z$ schema $A$, and $CV(A)$ to denote the set of real-numbered variables in $Z$ schema $A$.

In order to define the approximated refinement relation between $Z$ schemas, we need the following notation.

**Definition 6.** Given a positive real-numbered assignment $\delta$ on $\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$ which represents the measuring errors of real-numbered variables $\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$, an assignment $\rho$ on $\{v_1, \ldots, v_p\}$, where $\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$ and $\{v_1, \ldots, v_p\}$ are sets of all real-numbered variables in $\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$. We use the notation $\rho \oplus \delta$ to denote the set of assignment $\{\sigma | \sigma(v) = \rho(v) \text{ if } v \notin \{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}, \text{ and } \sigma(x) = \rho(x) + a \text{ if } x \in \{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}, \text{ where } -\delta(x) \leq a \leq \delta(x)\}$.

**Definition 7.** Consider two $Z$ schemas $A$ and $B$ with $V^I(A) = V^I(B)$, $V^O(A) = V^O(B)$, $V^H(A) = V^H(B) = \emptyset$ and $CV(A) = CV(B)$. $\delta$ is a positive real-numbered assignment on $CV(A)$. We use the notation $A \geq \delta B$ if one of the following cases holds:

1. if $V^I(A) \neq \emptyset$ and $V^O(A) \neq \emptyset$ then given an assignment $\rho$ on $V^I(A)$, for any assignment $\sigma$ on $V^O(A)$, $(\rho \cup \sigma) \models B$ implies $(\rho \cup \sigma) \oplus \delta \models A$; and given an assignment $\sigma$ on $V^O(A)$, for any assignment $\rho$ on $V^I(A)$, $(\rho \cup \sigma) \models A$ implies $(\rho \cup \sigma) \oplus \delta \models B$.

2. if $V^I(A) \neq \emptyset$ and $V^O(A) = \emptyset$ then for any assignment $\rho$ on $V^I(A)$, $\rho \models A$ implies $\rho \oplus \delta \models B$.
(3) if $V^I(A) = 0$ and $V^O(A) \neq \emptyset$ then for any assignment $\rho$ on $V^O(A)$, $\rho \models B$ implies $\rho \uplus \delta \models A$;

(4) $V^I(A) = \emptyset$ and $V^O(A) = \emptyset$.

Intuitively, $A \models B$ means that schemas $A$ and $B$ have the same input variables and the same output variables, and except of small measuring errors $\delta$ of real numbered variables, schema $B$ has bigger domains of input variables but smaller ranges of output variables than schema $A$. For example, $A \models [x : N] ! y : R \mid x \text{ is an even number, } y! = x$.

Definition 8. Consider two $Z$ schemas $A$ and $B$, we use the notation $A \models B$ if

(1) $V^I(A) \subseteq V^I(B)$, $V^O(A) \subseteq V^O(B)$, and $CV(A) \cap (V^I(A) \cup V^O(A)) = CV(B) \cap (V^I(A) \cup V^O(A));$

(2) $A \models B$, where $\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\} = V(A) - V^O(A)$, $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\} = V(B) - V^O(A)$, and $\delta$ is a positive real-numbered assignment on $CV(A) \cap (V^I(A) \cup V^O(A))$.

For example, $A \models [x : N] ! y : R \mid x \text{ is an even number, } y! = x$.

In the following, we give a approximated refinement relation between $Z$ schemas, which describe the approximated refinement relation between data structures properties of states.

Definition 9. Given a $ZIA$ $P$ and a configuration $(s, D_P) \in S_P \times R$, where $R$ is the set of real numbers, the set $\varepsilon - transitiomp((s, D_P), d)$ is the set of configurations after performing some internal actions with time delay $d$.

Definition 10. Given a $ZIA$ $P$ and a configuration $(s, D_P) \in S_P \times R$, where $R$ is the set of real numbers, the set $\varepsilon - delayp((s, D_P), d)$ is the set of configurations after performing several internal actions with time delay $d$.

Definition 11. Consider a $ZIA$ $P$ and a configuration $(s, D_P) \in S_P \times R$, where $R$ is the set of real numbers. For an action $a$, we let

$\text{ExtDestp}((s, D_P), a, d) = \{(s', D'_P) \mid (t, D'_P) \in \varepsilon - delayp((s, D_P), d), (s, D_P) \in \varepsilon - delayp((t', D'_P), d_2), (s, D_P) \in (t, a, t') \in T_P, (s', D'_P) \in (t, a, t') \in T_P, (s', D'_P) \in (t, a, t') \in T_P, d = d_1 + d_2, D_P = D'_P + d_2).$

The set $\varepsilon - delayp((s, D_P), d)$ is the set of configurations after performing several internal actions with time delay $d$.

Definition 12. Consider two $ZIA$s $P$ and $Q$. Suppose $CV_P \cap (V^I_P \cup V^O_P) = CV_Q \cap (V^I_Q \cup V^O_Q)$, where $CV_P$ ($CV_Q$) denotes the set of real-numbered variables in $ZIA$ $P$ ($Q$). $\delta$ is a positive real-numbered assignment on $CV_P \cap (V^I_P \cup V^O_P)$. A binary relation $R^A_{Q} \subseteq (S_P \times R) \times (S_Q \times R)$ is an approximated simulation from $Q$ to $P$, if for all configurations $(s, D_P) \in S_P \times R$, there exists $(t, D_Q) \in S_Q \times R$ such that $(s, D_P) R^A_{Q} (t, D_Q)$.

Definition 13. The $ZIA$ $Q$ approximately refines the $ZIA$ $P$ written $P \models_A Q$ if there is an approximated simulation $R^A_{Q} \subseteq (t, D_Q)$.
Proposition 1. (1) \( P \triangleright_{A}^{\delta} P \), where \( \delta(x) = 0 \) for any \( x \):

(2) If \( P \triangleright_{A}^{\delta} Q \) and \( \delta(x) \leq \eta(x) \) for any \( x \), then \( P \triangleright_{A}^{\eta} Q \):

(3) If \( P \triangleright_{A}^{\delta} Q \) and \( Q \triangleright_{A}^{\eta} R \), then \( P \triangleright_{A}^{(\delta+\eta)\downarrow_{\text{dom}(\delta)}} R \), where \((\delta+\eta)\downarrow_{\text{dom}(\delta)}(x)\) is the same as that of \( \delta \) and \((\delta+\eta)\downarrow_{\text{dom}(\delta)}(x) = \delta(x) + \eta(x) \) for any \( x \) in the domain of \( \delta \).

In the following, we present a simplified approximated refinement relation \( \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} \) where the appearance of time delay \( d \) in Clauses (3) and (4) in the definition of \( \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} \) is replaced by 0. Then we show the equivalence between \( \triangleright_{A}^{\delta} \) and \( \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} \).

Definition 15. Consider two HZIAs \( P \) and \( Q \). Suppose \( CV_{P} \cap (V_{P}^{S} \cup V_{P}^{D}) = CV_{Q} \cap (V_{P}^{S} \cup V_{P}^{D}) \), where \( CV_{P} \) (\( CV_{Q} \)) denotes the set of real-numbered variables in HZIA \( P \) (\( Q \)). \( \delta \) is a positive real-numbered assignment on \( CV_{P} \cap (V_{P}^{S} \cup V_{P}^{D}) \). A binary relation \( R_{S}^{\delta} \subseteq (S_{P} \times S_{Q}) \) is a simplified approximated simulation from \( Q \) to \( P \) if for all configurations \( (s, D_{P}) \in S_{P} \times R \), there exists \( (t, D_{Q}) \in S_{Q} \times R \) such that \((s, D_{P}) R_{S}^{\delta} (t, D_{Q})\) the following conditions hold:

(1) \( F_{P}^{S}(s) \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} F_{Q}^{S}(t) \);

(2) For any \((s', D_{P}) \in \varepsilon - \text{delay}_{P}(s, D_{P}), d\), there is a configuration \((t', D_{Q}) \in \varepsilon - \text{delay}_{Q}(t, D_{Q}), d\), such that \( F_{P}^{S}(s') \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} F_{Q}^{S}(t') \), and \((s', D_{P}) R_{S}^{\delta} (t', D_{Q})\);

(3) For any input action \( a \), if \((s', D_{P}) \in \text{ExtDest}_{P}(s, D_{P}, a, 0)\), there is a configuration \((t', D_{Q}) \in \text{ExtDest}_{Q}(t, D_{Q}, a, 0)\), such that \( F_{P}^{S}(a) \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} F_{Q}^{S}(a) \), \( F_{P}^{S}(s') \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} F_{Q}^{S}(t') \), and \((s', D_{P}) R_{S}^{\delta} (t', D_{Q})\);

(4) For any output action \( a \), if \((s', D_{P}) \in \text{ExtDest}_{P}(s, D_{P}, a, 0)\), there is a configuration \((t', D_{Q}) \in \text{ExtDest}_{Q}(t, D_{Q}, a, 0)\), such that \( F_{P}^{S}(a) \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} F_{Q}^{S}(a) \), \( F_{P}^{S}(s') \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} F_{Q}^{S}(t') \), and \((s', D_{P}) R_{S}^{\delta} (t', D_{Q})\).

We write \((s, D_{P}) \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} (t, D_{Q})\) if there is a simplified approximated simulation \( R_{S}^{\delta} \) such that \((s, D_{P}) R_{S}^{\delta} (t, D_{Q}).\)

Definition 15. The HZIA \( Q \) simply approximately refines the HZIA \( P \) written \( P \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} Q \) if

There is a simplified approximated simulation \( \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} \) from \( Q \) to \( P \), a configuration \((s, 0) \in S_{P}\) and a configuration \((t, 0) \in S_{Q}\) such that \((s, 0) \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} (t, 0)\).

We have the following proposition about the relation between approximated refinement relations \( \triangleright_{A}^{\delta} \) and \( \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} \).

Proposition 2. (1) \((s, D_{P}) \triangleright_{A}^{\delta} (t, D_{Q})\) if \((s, D_{P}) \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} (t, D_{Q})\) for any HZIA \( P \) and \( Q \), any state \( s \) in \( P \) and \( t \) in \( Q \), and any real number \( D_{P} \) and \( D_{Q} \):

(2) \( P \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} Q \) if \( P \triangleright_{S}^{\delta} Q \) for any HZIA \( P \) and \( Q \).

5 CONCLUSIONS

This paper proposed a specification approach of hybrid software/hardware components which is suitable to specify the hybrid behaviour and data structures properties of a system. There are several other works for such topic (Fischer, 1996; Fischer, 1997; Fischer, 1998). But the specification languages in these works are based on process calculi which are abstract and difficult to be applied by programmers. Interface automata are a kind of models for programmers to specify the behaviour properties of a system. However, it can not specify the hybrid property and data structures property of a system. In this paper, we define a combination of interface automata, hybrid automata and Z called HZIA, which can be applied to specify the behaviour and data structures properties of a hybrid system. Moreover, it is intuitive, and it is easy to be understood and to be applied by programmers. We also define the approximated refinement relation for HZIA. The properties of the approximated refinement relation for HZIA are also studied. HZIA is well suited for specification and development of hybrid software/hardware components. It provides powerful techniques to model control aspects, hybrid property and data structures in a common framework.
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