



**HAL**  
open science

## Resilience of Timed Systems

S Akshay, Blaise Genest, Loïc Hélouët, S Krishna, Sparsa Roychowdhury

► **To cite this version:**

S Akshay, Blaise Genest, Loïc Hélouët, S Krishna, Sparsa Roychowdhury. Resilience of Timed Systems. FSTTCS 2021 - 41st IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, IARCS, Dec 2021, Virtual Conference due to COVID, India. pp.1-22, 10.4230/LIPIcs.FSTTCS.2021.33 . hal-03439247

**HAL Id: hal-03439247**

**<https://inria.hal.science/hal-03439247v1>**

Submitted on 22 Nov 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Resilience of Timed Systems

S. Akshay  

IIT Bombay, Mumbai, India

Blaise Genest  

Univ. Rennes, CNRS, IRISA, Rennes, France

Loïc Hélouët  

Univ. Rennes, INRIA, IRISA, Rennes, France

S. Krishna  

IIT Bombay, Mumbai, India

Sparsa Roychowdhury  

IIT Bombay, Mumbai, India

---

## Abstract

This paper addresses reliability of timed systems in the setting of *resilience*, that considers the behaviors of a system when unspecified timing errors such as missed deadlines occur. Given a fault model that allows transitions to fire later than allowed by their guard, a system is *universally resilient* (or self-resilient) if after a fault, it always returns to a timed behavior of the non-faulty system. It is *existentially resilient* if after a fault, there exists a way to return to a timed behavior of the non-faulty system, that is, if there exists a controller which can guide the system back to a normal behavior. We show that universal resilience of timed automata is undecidable, while existential resilience is decidable, in EXPSPACE. To obtain better complexity bounds and decidability of universal resilience, we consider untimed resilience, as well as subclasses of timed automata.

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Theory of computation → Timed and hybrid models

**Keywords and phrases** Timed automata; Fault tolerance; Integer-resets; Resilience

**Digital Object Identifier** 10.4230/LIPIcs.FSTTCS.2021.33

**Funding** Work supported by the DST/CEFIPRA/INRIA associated team EQuaVE and by the ANR Project Maveriq

## 1 Introduction

Timed automata [2] are a natural model for cyber-physical systems with real-time constraints that have led to an enormous body of theoretical and practical work. Formally, timed automata are finite-state automata equipped with real valued variables called clocks, that measure time and can be reset. Transitions are guarded by logical assertions on the values of these clocks, which allows for the modeling of real-time constraints, such as the time elapsed between the occurrence of two events. A natural question is whether a real-time system can handle unexpected delays. This is a crucial need when modeling systems that must follow a priori schedules such as trains, metros, buses, etc. Timed automata are not a priori tailored to handle unspecified behaviors: guards are mandatory time constraints, i.e., transition firings must occur within the prescribed delays. Hence, transitions cannot occur late, except if late transitions are explicitly specified in the model. This paper considers the question of resilience for timed automata, i.e., study whether a system returns to its normal specified timed behavior after an unexpected but unavoidable delay.

Several works have addressed timing errors as a question of *robustness* [10, 8, 7], to guarantee that a property of a system is preserved for some small imprecision of up to  $\epsilon$  time units. Timed automata have an ideal representation of time: if a guard of a transition



© S. Akshay, B. Genest, L. Hélouët, S. Krishna, S. Roychowdhury;  
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

41st IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS 2021).

Editors: Mikołaj Bojańczyk and Chandra Chekuri; Article No. 33; pp. 33:1–33:23



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

	Universal Resilience	Existential Resilience
Timed	Undecidable for TA (Prop. 18) EXPSPACE-C for IRTA (Thm. 20)	EXPSPACE (Thm. 14) PSPACE-Hard (Thm. 15, Thm. 32)
Untimed	EXPSPACE-C (Thm. 21)	PSPACE-C (Thm. 16, Rmk. 17)

■ **Table 1** Summary of results for resilience.

44 contains a constraint of the form  $x = 12$ , it means that this transition occurs *exactly* when  
 45 the value of clock  $x$  is 12. Such an arbitrary precision is impossible in an implementation [10].  
 46 One way of addressing this is through guard enlargement, i.e., by checking that there exists  
 47 a small value  $\epsilon > 0$  such that after replacing guards of the form  $x \in [a, b]$  by  $x \in [a - \epsilon, b + \epsilon]$ ,  
 48 the considered property is still valid, as shown in [7] for  $\omega$ -regular properties. In [15], robust  
 49 automata are defined that accept timed words and their neighbors i.e., words whose timing  
 50 differences remain at a small distance, while in [16, 12, 19, 1], the authors consider robustness  
 51 via modeling clock drifts. Our goal is different: rather than being robust w.r.t. to slight  
 52 imprecisions, we wish to check the capacity to recover from a *possibly large* time deviation.  
 53 Thus, for a bounded number of steps, the system can deviate arbitrarily, after which, it must  
 54 return to its specified timed behavior.

55 The first contribution of this paper is a formalization of resilience in timed automata.  
 56 We capture delayed events with *faulty transitions*. These occur at dates deviating from the  
 57 original specification and may affect clock values for an arbitrarily long time, letting the  
 58 system diverge from its expected behavior. A system is *resilient* if it recovers in a finite  
 59 number of steps after the fault. More precisely, we define two variants. A timed automaton  
 60 is  *$K$ - $\forall$ -resilient* if for *every* faulty timed run, the behavior of the system  $K$  steps after the  
 61 fault cannot be distinguished from a non-faulty behavior. In other words, the system *always*  
 62 repairs itself in at most  $K$  steps after a fault, whenever a fault happens. This means that,  
 63 after a fault happens, *all* the subsequent behaviors (or extensions) of the system are restored  
 64 to normalcy within  $K$  steps. A timed automaton is  *$K$ - $\exists$ -resilient* if for every timed run  
 65 ending with a fault, there exists an extension in which, the behavior of the system  $K$  steps  
 66 after the fault cannot be distinguished from a non-faulty behavior. There can still be some  
 67 extensions which are beyond repair, or take more than  $K$  steps after fault to be repaired,  
 68 but there is a guarantee of at least one repaired extension within  $K$  steps after the fault.  
 69 In the first case, the timed automaton is fully self-resilient, while in the second case, there  
 70 exist controllers choosing dates and transitions so that the system gets back to a normal  
 71 behavior. We also differentiate between timed and untimed settings: in timed resilience  
 72 recovered behaviors must be indistinguishable w.r.t. actions and dates, while in untimed  
 73 resilience recovered behaviors only need to match actions.

74 Our results are summarized in Table 1: we show that the question of universal resilience  
 75 and inclusion of timed languages are inter-reducible. Thus *timed* universal resilience is  
 76 undecidable in general, and decidable for classes for which inclusion of timed languages  
 77 is decidable and which are stable under our reduction. This includes the class of Integer  
 78 Reset Timed Automata (IRTA) [18] for which we obtain EXPSPACE containment. Further,  
 79 *untimed* universal resilience is EXPSPACE-Complete in general.

80 Our main result concerns existential resilience, which requires new non-trivial core  
 81 contributions because of the  $\forall\exists$  quantifier alternation. The classical region construction  
 82 is not precise enough: we introduce *strong regions* and develop novel techniques based on  
 83 these, which ensure that all runs following a strong region have (i) matching integral time  
 84 elapses, and (ii) the fractional time can be re-timed to visit the same set of locations and  
 85 (usual) regions. Using this technique, we show that existential timed resilience is decidable,  
 86 in EXPSPACE. We also show that untimed existential resilience is PSPACE-Complete.

87 **Related Work:** Resilience has been considered with different meanings: In [13], faults  
 88 are modeled as conflicts, the system and controller as *deterministic* timed automata, and  
 89 avoiding faults reduces to checking reachability. This is easier than universal resilience which  
 90 reduces to timed language inclusion, and existential resilience which requires a new notion of  
 91 regions. In [14] a system, modeled as an untimed I/O automaton, is considered “sane” if its  
 92 runs contain at most  $k$  errors, and allow a sufficient number  $s$  of error-free steps between two  
 93 violations of an LTL property. It is shown how to synthesize a sane system, and compute  
 94 (Pareto-optimal) values for  $s$  and  $k$ . In [17], the objective is to synthesize a transducer  $E$ ,  
 95 possibly with memory, that reads a timed word  $\sigma$  produced by a timed automaton  $\mathcal{A}$ , and  
 96 outputs a timed word  $E(\sigma)$  obtained by deleting, delaying or forging new timed events, such  
 97 that  $E(\sigma)$  satisfies some timed property. A related problem, shield synthesis [5], asks given a  
 98 network of deterministic I/O timed automata  $\mathcal{N}$  that communicate with their environment, to  
 99 synthesize two additional components, a pre-shield, that reads outputs from the environment  
 100 and produces inputs for  $\mathcal{N}$ , and a post-shield, that reads outputs from  $\mathcal{N}$  and produces  
 101 outputs to the environment to satisfy timed safety properties when faults (timing, location  
 102 errors,...) occur. Synthesis is achieved using timed games. Unlike these, our goal is not to  
 103 avoid violation of a property, but rather to verify that the system *recovers within boundedly*  
 104 *many steps*, from a possibly large time deviation w.r.t. its behavior. Finally, *faults* in timed  
 105 automata have also been studied in a diagnosis setting, e.g. in [6], where faults are detected  
 106 within a certain delay from partial observation of runs.

## 107 2 Preliminaries

108 Let  $\Sigma$  be a finite non-empty alphabet and  $\Sigma^\infty = \Sigma^* \cup \Sigma^\omega$  a set of finite or infinite words over  
 109  $\Sigma$ .  $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{N}$  respectively denote the set of real numbers, non-negative reals, rationals,  
 110 and natural numbers. We write  $(\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^\infty = (\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^* \cup (\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^\omega$  for finite or infinite  
 111 timed words over  $\Sigma$ . A finite (infinite) timed word has the form  $w = (a_1, d_1) \dots (a_n, d_n)$  (resp.  
 112  $w = (a_1, d_1) \dots$ ) where for every  $i$ ,  $d_i \leq d_{i+1}$ . For  $i \leq j$ , we denote by  $w_{[i,j]}$ , the sequence  
 113  $(a_i, d_i) \dots (a_j, d_j)$ . The *untiming* of a timed word  $w \in (\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^\infty$  denoted  $Unt(w)$ , is its  
 114 projection on the first component, and is a word in  $\Sigma^\infty$ . A *clock* is a real-valued variable  $x$   
 115 and an *atomic clock constraint* is an inequality of the form  $a \bowtie_l x \bowtie_u b$ , with  $\bowtie_l, \bowtie_u \in \{\leq, <\}$ ,  
 116  $a \in \mathbb{N}, b \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ . An atomic *diagonal constraint* is of the form  $a \bowtie_l x - y \bowtie_u b$ , where  
 117  $x$  and  $y$  are different clocks. *Guards* are conjunctions of atomic constraints on a set  $X$  of  
 118 clocks.

119 ► **Definition 1.** A *timed automaton*[2] is a tuple  $\mathcal{A} = (L, I, X, \Sigma, T, F)$  with finite set of  
 120 locations  $L$ , initial locations  $I \subseteq L$ , finitely many clocks  $X$ , finite action set  $\Sigma$ , final locations  
 121  $F \subseteq L$ , and transition relation  $T \subseteq L \times \mathcal{G} \times \Sigma \times 2^X \times L$  where  $\mathcal{G}$  are guards on  $X$ .

122 A *valuation* of a set of clocks  $X$  is a map  $\nu : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  that associates a non-negative real  
 123 value to each clock in  $X$ . For every clock  $x$ ,  $\nu(x)$  has an integral part  $\lfloor \nu(x) \rfloor$  and a fractional  
 124 part  $\text{frac}(\nu(x)) = \nu(x) - \lfloor \nu(x) \rfloor$ . We will say that a valuation  $\nu$  on a set of clocks  $X$  satisfies  
 125 a guard  $g$ , denoted  $\nu \models g$  if and only if replacing every  $x \in X$  by  $\nu(x)$  in  $g$  yields a tautology.  
 126 We will denote by  $[g]$  the set of valuations that satisfy  $g$ . Given  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , we denote by  $\nu + \delta$   
 127 the valuation that associates value  $\nu(x) + \delta$  to every clock  $x \in X$ . A *configuration* is a pair  
 128  $C = (l, \nu)$  of a location of the automaton and valuation of its clocks. The semantics of a  
 129 timed automaton is defined in terms of discrete and timed moves from a configuration to the  
 130 next one. A *timed move of duration*  $\delta$  lets  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  time units elapse from a configuration  
 131  $C = (l, \nu)$  which leads to configuration  $C' = (l, \nu + \delta)$ . A *discrete move* from configuration

132  $C = (l, \nu)$  consists of taking one of the transitions leaving  $l$ , i.e., a transition of the form  
 133  $t = (l, g, a, R, l')$  where  $g$  is a guard,  $a \in \Sigma$  a particular action name,  $R$  is the set of clocks  
 134 reset by the transition, and  $l'$  the next location reached. A discrete move with transition  $t$  is  
 135 allowed only if  $\nu \models g$ . Taking transition  $t$  leads the automaton to configuration  $C' = (l', \nu')$   
 136 where  $\nu'(x) = \nu(x)$  if  $x \notin R$ , and  $\nu'(x) = 0$  otherwise.

137 ► **Definition 2** (Runs, Maximal runs, Accepting runs). *An (infinite) run of a timed automaton*  
 138  $\mathcal{A}$  *is a sequence*  $\rho = (l_0, \nu_0) \xrightarrow{(t_1, d_1)} (l_1, \nu_1) \xrightarrow{(t_2, d_2)} \dots$  *where every pair*  $(l_i, \nu_i)$  *is a configuration,*  
 139 *and there exists an (infinite) sequence of timed and discrete moves*  $\delta_1.t_1.\delta_2.t_2\dots$  *in*  $\mathcal{A}$  *such*  
 140 *that*  $\delta_i = d_{i+1} - d_i$ , *and a timed move of duration*  $\delta_i$  *from*  $(l_i, \nu_i)$  *to*  $(l_i, \nu_i + \delta_i)$  *and a discrete*  
 141 *move from*  $(l_i, \nu_i + \delta_i)$  *to*  $(l_{i+1}, \nu_{i+1})$  *via transition*  $t_i$ . *A run is maximal if it is infinite, or if*  
 142 *it ends at a location with no outgoing transitions. A finite run is accepting if its last location*  
 143 *is final, while an infinite run is accepting if it visits accepting locations infinitely often.*

144 We assume that all runs start from a configuration  $(l_0, \nu_0)$ , where  $l_0 \in I$  and  $\nu_0$  is the  
 145 initial valuation, assigning value 0 to every clock of  $X$ . One can associate a finite/infinite  
 146 *timed word*  $w_\rho = (a_1, d_1) (a_2, d_2) \dots (a_n, d_n) \dots$ , where  $a_i$  is  
 147 the action in transition  $t_i$  and  $d_i$  is the time stamp of  $t_i$  in  $\rho$ . A (finite/infinite) *timed word*  
 148  $w$  is accepted by  $\mathcal{A}$  if there exists a (finite/infinite) accepting run  $\rho$  such that  $w = w_\rho$ . The  
 149 *timed language* of  $\mathcal{A}$  is the set of all timed words accepted by  $\mathcal{A}$ , and is denoted by  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ .  
 150 The *untimed language* of  $\mathcal{A}$  is the language  $Unt(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})) = \{Unt(w) \mid w \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})\}$ . As shown  
 151 in [2], the untimed language of a timed automaton can be captured by an abstraction called  
 152 the *region automaton*. Formally, given a clock  $x$ , let  $c_x$  be the largest constant in an atomic  
 153 constraint of a guard of  $\mathcal{A}$  involving  $x$ . Two valuations  $\nu, \nu'$  of clocks in  $X$  are *equivalent*,  
 154 written  $\nu \sim \nu'$  if and only if:

- 155 i)  $\forall x \in X$ , either  $\lfloor \nu(x) \rfloor = \lfloor \nu'(x) \rfloor$  or both  $\nu(x) \geq c_x$  and  $\nu'(x) \geq c_x$
- 156 ii)  $\forall x, y \in X$  with  $\nu(x) \leq c_x$  and  $\nu(y) \leq c_y$ ,  $\text{frac}(\nu(x)) \leq \text{frac}(\nu(y))$  iff  $\text{frac}(\nu'(x)) \leq \text{frac}(\nu'(y))$
- 157 iii) For all  $x \in X$  with  $\nu(x) \leq c_x$ ,  $\text{frac}(\nu(x)) = 0$  iff  $\text{frac}(\nu'(x)) = 0$ .

158 A *region*  $r$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  is the equivalence class induced by  $\sim$ . For a valuation  $\nu$ , we denote by  $[\nu]$   
 159 the region of  $\nu$ , i.e., its equivalence class. We will also write  $\nu \in r$  ( $\nu$  is a valuation in region  $r$   
 160 when  $r = [\nu]$ ). For a given automaton  $\mathcal{A}$ , there exists only a finite number of regions, bounded  
 161 by  $2^K$ , where  $K$  is the size of the constraints set in  $\mathcal{A}$ . It is well known for a clock constraint  
 162  $\psi$  that, if  $\nu \sim \nu'$ , then  $\nu \models \psi$  if and only if  $\nu' \models \psi$ . A region  $r'$  is a *time successor* of another  
 163 region  $r$  if for every  $\nu \in r$ , there exists  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  such that  $\nu + \delta \in r'$ . We denote by  $Reg(X)$   
 164 the set of all possible regions of the set of clocks  $X$ . A region  $r$  satisfies a guard  $g$  if and only if  
 165 there exists a valuation  $\nu \in r$  such that  $\nu \models g$ . The region automaton of a timed automaton  
 166  $\mathcal{A} = (L, I, X, \Sigma, T, F)$  is the untimed automaton  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}) = (S_R, I_R, \Sigma, T_R, F_R)$  that recognizes  
 167 the untimed language  $Unt(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}))$ . States of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$  are of the form  $(l, r)$ , where  $l$  is a location  
 168 of  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $r$  a region, i.e.,  $S_R \subseteq L \times Reg(X)$ ,  $I_R \subseteq I \times Reg(X)$ , and  $F_R \subseteq F \times Reg(X)$ .  
 169 The transition relation  $T_R$  is such that  $((l, r), a, (l', r')) \in T_R$  if there exists a transition  
 170  $t = (l, g, a, R, l') \in T$  such that there exists a time successor region  $r''$  of  $r$  such that  $r''$   
 171 satisfies the guard  $g$ , and  $r'$  is obtained from  $r''$  by resetting values of clocks in  $R$ . The size of  
 172 the region automaton is the number of states in  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$  and is denoted  $|\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})|$ . For a region  $r$   
 173 defined on a set of clocks  $Y$ , we define a projection operator  $\Pi_X(r)$  to represent the region  $r$   
 174 projected on the set of clocks  $X \subseteq Y$ . Let  $\rho = (l_0, \nu_0) \xrightarrow{(t_1, d_1)} (l_1, \nu_1) \dots$  be a run of  $\mathcal{A}$ , where  
 175 every  $t_i$  is of the form  $t_i = (l_i, g_i, a_i, R_i, l'_i)$ . The *abstract run*  $\sigma_\rho = (l_0, r_0) \xrightarrow{a_1} (l_1, r_1) \dots$  of  $\rho$   
 176 is a path in the region automaton  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$  such that,  $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $r_i = [\nu_i]$ . We represent runs using  
 177 variables  $\rho, \pi$  and the corresponding abstract runs with  $\sigma_\rho, \sigma_\pi$  respectively. The automaton  
 178  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$  can be used to prove non-emptiness of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ , as  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$  iff  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$  accepts some word.

### 3 Resilience Problems

179

180 We define the semantics of timed automata when perturbations can delay the occurrence  
 181 of an action. Consider a transition  $t = (l, g, a, R, l')$ , with  $g ::= x \leq 10$ , where action  $a$  can  
 182 occur as long as  $x$  has not exceeded 10. Timed automata have an idealized representation of  
 183 time, and do not consider perturbations that occur in real systems. Consider, for instance  
 184 that ‘ $a$ ’ is a physical event planned to occur at a maximal time stamp 10: a water tank  
 185 reaches its maximal level, a train arrives in a station etc. These events can be delayed, and  
 186 nevertheless occur. One can even consider that uncontrollable delays are part of the normal  
 187 behavior of the system, and that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$  is the ideal behavior of the system, when all delays  
 188 are met. In the rest of the paper, we propose a fault model that assigns a maximal error to  
 189 each fireable action. This error model is used to encode the fact that an action might occur  
 190 at a greater date than allowed in the original model semantics.

191 **► Definition 3 (Fault model).** A fault model  $\mathcal{P}$  is a map  $\mathcal{P} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$  that associates to  
 192 every action in  $a \in \Sigma$  a possible maximal delay  $\mathcal{P}(a) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ .

193 For simplicity, we consider only executions in which a single timing error occurs. The  
 194 perturbed semantics defined below easily adapts to a setting with multiple timing errors.  
 195 With a fault model, we can define a new timed automaton, for which every run  $\rho =$   
 196  $(l_0, \nu_0) \xrightarrow{(t_1, d_1)} (l_1, \nu_1) \xrightarrow{(t_2, d_2)} \dots$  contains at most one transition  $t_i = (l, g, a, r, l')$  occurring  
 197 later than allowed by guard  $g$ , and agrees with a run of  $\mathcal{A}$  until this faulty transition is taken.

198 **► Definition 4 (Enlargement of a guard).** Let  $\phi$  be an inequality of the form  $a \bowtie_l x \bowtie_u b$ ,  
 199 where  $\bowtie_l, \bowtie_u \in \{\leq, <\}$ . The enlargement of  $\phi$  by a time error  $\delta$  is the inequality  $\phi_{\triangleright \delta}$  of the  
 200 form  $a \bowtie_l x \leq b + \delta$ . Let  $g$  be a guard of the form

$$201 \quad g = \bigwedge_{i \in 1..m} \phi_i = a_i \bowtie_{l_i} x_i \bowtie_{u_i} b_i \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in 1..q} \phi_j = a_j \bowtie_{l_j} x_j - y_j \bowtie_{u_j} b_j.$$

202 The enlargement of  $g$  by  $\delta$  is the guard  $g_{\triangleright \delta} = \bigwedge_{i \in 1..m} \phi_{i \triangleright \delta} \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in 1..q} \phi_j$

203 For every transition  $t = (l, g, a, R, l')$  with enlarged guard

$$204 \quad g_{\triangleright \mathcal{P}(a)} = \bigwedge_{i \in 1..m} \phi_i = a_i \bowtie_{l_i} x_i \leq b_i + \mathcal{P}(a) \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in 1..q} \phi_j = a_j \bowtie_{l_j} x_j - y_j \bowtie_{u_j} b_j,$$

205 we can create a new transition  $t_{f, \mathcal{P}} = (l, g_{f, \mathcal{P}}, a, R, l')$  called a faulty transition such that,

$$206 \quad g_{f, \mathcal{P}} = \bigwedge_{i \in 1..m} \phi_i = b_i \bar{\bowtie}_{l_i} x_i \leq b_i + \mathcal{P}(a) \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in 1..q} \phi_j = a_j \bowtie_{l_j} x_j - y_j \bowtie_{u_j} b_j \text{ with } \bar{\bowtie}_{l_i} \in \{<, \leq\} \setminus \bowtie_{u_i}$$


207 Diagonal constraints remain unchanged under enlargement, as the difference between clocks  
 208  $x$  and  $y$  is preserved by time elapsing, and operator  $\bar{\bowtie}_{l_i}$  guarantee that normal and faulty  
 209 behaviors occur at different dates. From now, we fix a fault model  $\mathcal{P}$  and write  $t_f$  and  $g_f$   
 210 instead of  $t_{f, \mathcal{P}}$  and  $g_{f, \mathcal{P}}$ . Clearly,  $g$  and  $g_f$  are disjoint, and  $g \vee g_f$  is equivalent to  $g_{\triangleright \delta}$ .  
 211 We take this particular definition of enlargement to consider late events as faults. We can  
 212 easily adapt the definition to handle early events, or any variation where non-specified faulty  
 213 transitions can be identified through a guard  $g_f$  disjoint from  $g$ , without harming the results  
 214 shown in the rest of the paper.

215 **► Definition 5 (Enlargement of automata).** Let  $\mathcal{A} = (L, I, X, \Sigma, T, F)$  be a timed automaton.  
 216 The enlargement of  $\mathcal{A}$  by a fault model  $\mathcal{P}$  is the automaton  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} = (L_{\mathcal{P}}, I, X, \Sigma, T_{\mathcal{P}}, F_{\mathcal{P}})$ , where

217  $\blacksquare$   $L_{\mathcal{P}} = L \cup \{\dot{l} \mid l \in L\}$  and  $F_{\mathcal{P}} = F \cup \{\dot{l} \mid l \in F\}$ . A location  $\dot{l}$  indicates that an unexpected  
 218 delay has occurred.

219  $\blacksquare$   $T_{\mathcal{P}} = T \cup \dot{T}$  such that,  $\dot{T} = \{(l, g_f, a, R, \dot{l}') \mid (l, g, a, R, l') \in T\} \cup \{(\dot{l}, g, a, R, \dot{l}') \mid$   
 220  $(l, g, a, R, l') \in T\}$  i.e.,  $\dot{T}$  is the set of transitions occurring after a fault.





■ **Figure 1** Model of a train system with a mechanism to recover from delays

221 A run of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$  is *faulty* if it contains a transition of  $\dot{T}$ . It is *just faulty* if its last transition  
 222 belongs to  $\dot{T}$  and all other transitions belong to  $T$ . Note that while faulty runs can be finite  
 223 or infinite, *just faulty* runs are always finite prefix of a faulty run, and end in a location  $\dot{l}$ .

224 ► **Definition 6** (Back To Normal (BTN)). Let  $K \geq 1$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  be a timed automaton with fault  
 225 model  $\mathcal{P}$ . Let  $\rho = (l_0, \nu_0) \xrightarrow{(t_1, d_1)} (l_1, \nu_1) \xrightarrow{(t_2, d_2)} \dots$  be a (finite or infinite) faulty accepting run  
 226 of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$ , with associated timed word  $(a_1, d_1)(a_2, d_2) \dots$  and let  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  be the position of the faulty  
 227 transition in  $\rho$ . Then  $\rho$  is back to normal (BTN) after  $K$  steps if there exists an accepting  
 228 run  $\rho' = (l'_0, \nu'_0) \xrightarrow{(t'_1, d'_1)} (l'_1, \nu'_1) \xrightarrow{(t'_2, d'_2)} \dots$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  with associated timed word  $(a'_1, d'_1)(a'_2, d'_2) \dots$   
 229 and an index  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $(a'_\ell, d'_\ell)(a'_{\ell+1}, d'_{\ell+1}) \dots = (a_{i+K}, d_{i+K})(a_{i+K+1}, d_{i+K+1}) \dots$   
 230  $\rho$  is untimed back to normal (untimed BTN) after  $K$  steps if there exists an accepting run  $\rho' =$   
 231  $(l'_0, \nu'_0) \xrightarrow{(t'_1, d'_1)} (l'_1, \nu'_1) \xrightarrow{(t'_2, d'_2)} \dots$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  and an index  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $a'_\ell a'_{\ell+1} \dots = a_{i+K} a_{i+K+1} \dots$


232 In other words, if  $w$  is a timed word having a faulty accepting run (i.e.,  $w \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})$ ), the  
 233 suffix of  $w$ ,  $K$  steps after the fault, matches with the suffix of some word  $w' \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ . Note  
 234 that the accepting run of  $w'$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  is not faulty, by definition. The conditions in untimed  
 235 BTN are simpler, and ask the same sequence of actions, but not equality on dates. Words  $w$   
 236 and  $w'$  need not have an identical prefix: this means that a BTN run has returned to *some*  
 237 normal behavior, but not necessarily *the* behavior originally planned before the fault.

238 Our current definition of back-to-normal in  $K$  steps means that a system recovered from  
 239 a fault (a primary delay) in  $\leq K$  steps and remained error-free. We can generalize our  
 240 definition, to model real life situations where more than one fault happens due to time delays,  
 241 but the system recovers from each one in a small number of steps and eventually achieves its  
 242 fixed goal (a reachability objective, some  $\omega$ -regular property...). A classical example of this is  
 243 a metro network, where trains are often delayed, but nevertheless recover from these delays  
 244 to reach their destination on time. This motivates the following definition of resilience.

245 ► **Definition 7** (Resilience). A timed automaton  $\mathcal{A}$  is  
 246 ■ (untimed)  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilient if every finite faulty accepting run is (untimed) BTN in  $K$  steps.  
 247 ■ (untimed)  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilient if every just faulty run  $\rho_{j,f}$  can be extended into a maximal  
 248 accepting run  $\rho_f$  which is (untimed) BTN in  $K$  steps.

249 Intuitively, a faulty run of  $\mathcal{A}$  is BTN if the system has definitively recovered from a fault,  
 250 i.e., it has recovered and will follow the behavior of the original system after its recovery.  
 251 The definition of existential resilience considers maximal (infinite, or finite but ending at a  
 252 location with no outgoing transitions) runs to avoid situations where an accepting faulty run  
 253  $\rho_f$  is BTN, but all its extensions i.e., suffixes  $\rho_f \cdot \rho'$  are such that  $\rho_f \cdot \rho'$  is not BTN.

254 ► **Example 8.** We model train services to a specific destination such as an airport. On an  
 255 average, the distance between two consecutive stations is covered in  $\leq 4$  time units. At  
 256 each stop in a station, the dwell time is in between 1 and 2 time units. To recover from a  
 257 delay, the train is allowed to skip an intermediate station (as long as the next stop is not the  
 258 destination). Skipping a station is a choice, and can only be activated if there is a delay. We



■ **Figure 2** Enlarged automaton for the train system (with recovery) model of Figure 1

259 model this system with the timed automaton of Figure 1. There are 5 locations:  $l_1$ , and  $l_2$   
 260 represent the normal behavior of the train and  $l_3, l_4, l_5$  represent the skipping mechanism.  
 261 These locations can only be accessed if the faulty transition (represented as a red dotted  
 262 arrow in Figure 1) is fired. A transition  $t_{ij}$  goes from  $l_i$  to  $l_j$ , and  $t_{21}^\bullet$  denotes the faulty  
 263 transition from  $l_2$  to  $l_1$ . The green locations represent the behavior of the train without  
 264 any delay, and the red locations represent behaviors when the train chooses to skip the next  
 265 station to recover from a delay. This mechanism is invoked once the train leaves the station  
 266 where it arrived late (location  $l_3$ ). When it departs,  $x$  is reset as usual; the next arrival to a  
 267 station (from location  $l_4$ ) happens after skipping stop at the next station. The delay can  
 268 be recovered since the running time since the last stop (covering 2 stations) is between 6  
 269 and 8 units of time. Formally, verifying that this system can recover from a delay within  $K$   
 270 steps can be done by setting as fault model  $\mathcal{P}(arr) = 2$ , and then checking a  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilience  
 271 problem. It then amounts to asking if the enlarged automaton of Figure 2 can recognize a  
 272 suffix of a word recognized by the automaton of Figure 1,  $K$  steps after visiting location  $l_1$ .

273 Consider the faulty run  $\rho_f = (l_1, 0|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{12}, 2)} (l_2, 0|2) \xrightarrow{(t_{21}, 8)} (l_1, 6|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{13}, 8)} (l_3, 6|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{34}, 10)}$   
 274  $(l_4, 0|2) \xrightarrow{(t_{45}, 10)} (l_5, 0|2) \xrightarrow{(t_{51}, 18)} (l_1, 8|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{12}, 19)} (l_2, 0|1)$  reading  $(dep, 2)(arr, 8)(late, 8)(dep, 10)$   
 275  $(skip, 10)(arr, 18)(dep, 19)$ . Run  $\rho_f$  is BTN in 4 steps. It matches the non-faulty run  $\rho =$   
 276  $(l_1, 0|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{12}, 2)} (l_2, 0|2) \xrightarrow{(t_{21}, 6)} (l_1, 4|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{12}, 8)} (l_2, 0|2) \xrightarrow{(t_{21}, 12)} (l_1, 4|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{12}, 14)} (l_2, 0|2) \xrightarrow{(t_{21}, 18)}$   
 277  $(l_1, 4|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{12}, 19)} (l_2, 0|1)$  reading  $(dep, 2)(arr, 6)(dep, 8)(arr, 12)(dep, 14)(arr, 18)(dep, 19)$ . This  
 278 automaton is  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilient for  $K = 4$  and fault model  $\mathcal{P}$ , as skipping a station after a  
 279 delay of  $\leq 2$  time units allows to recover the time lost. It is not  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilient, for any  $K$ ,  
 280 as skipping is not mandatory, and a train can be late for an arbitrary number of steps. In  
 281 Appendix A we give another example that is 1- $\forall$ -resilient.

282  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilience always implies  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilience. In case of  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilience, every faulty run  
 283  $\rho_w$  has to be BTN in  $\leq K$  steps after the occurrence of a fault. This implies  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilience  
 284 since, any just faulty run  $\rho_w$  that is the prefix of an accepting run  $\rho$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$  is BTN in less  
 285 than  $K$  steps. The converse does not hold:  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$  can have a pair of runs  $\rho_1, \rho_2$ , sharing a  
 286 common just faulty run  $\rho_f$  as prefix such that  $\rho_1$  is BTN in  $K$  steps, witnessing existential  
 287 resilience, while  $\rho_2$  is not. Finally, an accepting run  $\rho = \rho_f \rho_s$  in  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$  s.t.,  $\rho_f$  is just faulty  
 288 and  $|\rho_s| < K$ , is BTN in  $K$  steps since  $\varepsilon$  is a suffix of a run accepted by  $\mathcal{A}$ .

## 289 4 Existential Resilience

290 In this section, we consider existential resilience both in the timed and untimed settings.

291 **Existential Timed Resilience.** As the first step, we define a product automaton  $\mathcal{B} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$



292 that recognizes BTN runs. Intuitively, the product synchronizes runs of  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  as soon as  
 293  $\mathcal{B}$  has performed  $K$  steps after a fault, and guarantees that actions performed by  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are  
 294 performed at the same date in the respective runs of  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ . Before this synchronization,  
 295  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  take transitions or stay in the same location, but let the same amount of time  
 296 elapse, guaranteeing that synchronization occurs after runs of  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of identical durations.  
 297 The only way to ensure this with a timed automaton is to track the global timing from the  
 298 initial state of both automata  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  till  $K$  steps after the fault, even though we do not  
 299 need the timing for individual actions till  $K$  steps after the fault.

300 ► **Definition 9 (Product).** Let  $\mathcal{A} = (L_A, I_A, X_A, \Sigma, T_A, F_A)$  and  $\mathcal{B} = (L_B, I_B, X_B, \Sigma, T_B, F_B)$   
 301 be two timed automata, where  $\mathcal{B}$  contains faulty transitions. Let  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  be an integer. Then,  
 302 the product  $\mathcal{B} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$  is a tuple  $(L, I, X_A \cup X_B, (\Sigma \cup \{*\})^2, T, F)$  where  $L \subseteq \{L_B \times L_A \times [-1, K]\}$ ,  
 303  $F = L_B \times F_A \times [-1, K]$ , and initial set of locations  $I = I_B \times I_A \times \{-1\}$ . Intuitively,  
 304  $-1$  means no fault has occurred yet. Then we assign  $K$  and decrement to 0 to denote  
 305 that  $K$  steps after fault have passed. The set of transitions  $T$  is as follows: We have  
 306  $((l_B, l_A, n), g, \langle x, y \rangle, R, (l'_B, l'_A, n')) \in T$  if and only if either:

- 307 ■  $n \neq 0$  (no fault has occurred, or less than  $K$  steps of  $\mathcal{B}$  have occurred), the action is  
 308  $\langle x, y \rangle = \langle a, * \rangle$ , we have transition  $t_B = (l_B, g, a, R, l'_B) \in T_B$ ,  $l_A = l'_A$  (the location  
 309 of  $\mathcal{A}$  is unchanged) and either:  $n = -1$ , the transition  $t_B$  is faulty and  $n' = K$ , or  $n = -1$ ,  
 310 the transition  $t_B$  is non faulty and  $n' = -1$ , or  $n > 0$  and  $n' = n - 1$ .
- 311 ■  $n = n' \neq 0$  (no fault has occurred, or less than  $K$  steps of  $\mathcal{B}$  have occurred), the action  
 312 is  $\langle x, y \rangle = \langle *, a \rangle$ , we have the transition  $t_A = (l_A, g, a, R, l'_A) \in T_A$ ,  $l_B = l'_B$  (the  
 313 location of  $\mathcal{B}$  is unchanged).
- 314 ■  $n = n' = 0$  (at least  $K$  steps after a fault have occurred), the action is  $\langle x, y \rangle = \langle a, a \rangle$   
 315 and there exists two transitions  $t_B = (l_B, g, a, R_B, l'_B) \in T_B$  and  $t_A = (l_A, g_A, a, R_A, l'_A) \in$   
 316  $T_A$  with  $g = g_A \wedge g_B$ , and  $R = R_B \cup R_A$  ( $t_A$  and  $t_B$  occur synchronously).

317 Runs of  $\mathcal{B} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$  are sequences of the form  $\rho^\otimes = (l_0, l_0^A, n_0) \xrightarrow{(t_1, t_1^A), d_1} \dots \xrightarrow{(t_k, t_k^A), d_k} (l_k, l_k^A, n_k)$   
 318 where each  $(t_i, t_i^A) \in (T_B \cup \{t_*\}) \times (T_A \cup \{t_*^A\})$  defines uniquely the transition of  $\mathcal{B} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$ ,  
 319 where  $t_*$  corresponds to the transitions with action  $*$ . Transitions are of types  $(t_i, t_i^A)$  or  
 320  $(t_*, t_*^A)$  up to a fault and  $K$  steps of  $T_B$ , and  $(t_i, t_i^A) \in T_B \times T_A$  from there on.

321 For any timed run  $\rho^\otimes$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$ , the projection of  $\rho^\otimes$  on its first component is a timed  
 322 run  $\rho$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$ , that is projecting  $\rho^\otimes$  on transitions of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$  and remembering only location and  
 323 clocks of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$  in states. In the same way, the projection of  $\rho^\otimes$  on its second component is a  
 324 timed run  $\rho'$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Given timed runs  $\rho$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $\rho'$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ , we denote by  $\rho \otimes \rho'$  the timed  
 325 run (if it exists) of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$  such that the projection on the first component is  $\rho$  and the  
 326 projection on the second component is  $\rho'$ . For  $\rho \otimes \rho'$  to exist, we need  $\rho, \rho'$  to have the same  
 327 duration, and for  $\rho_s$  the suffix of  $\rho$  starting  $K$  steps after a fault (if there is a fault and  $K$   
 328 steps,  $\rho_s = \varepsilon$  the empty run otherwise),  $\rho_s$  needs to be suffix of  $\rho'$  as well.

329 A run  $\rho^\otimes$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$  is accepting if its projection on the second component ( $\mathcal{A}$ ) is  
 330 accepting (i.e., ends in an accepting state if it is finite and goes through an infinite number  
 331 of accepting state if it is infinite). We can now relate the product  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$  to BTN runs.

- 332 ► **Proposition 10.** Let  $\rho_f$  be a faulty accepting run of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$ . The following are equivalent:
- 333 i  $\rho_f$  is BTN in  $K$ -steps
  - 334 ii there is an accepting run  $\rho^\otimes$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$  s.t., the projection on its first component is  $\rho_f$

335 Let  $\rho$  be a finite run of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$ . We denote by  $T_\rho^{\otimes K}$  the set of configurations of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$   
 336 such that there exists a run  $\rho^\otimes$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$  ending in this configuration, whose projection  
 337 on the first component is  $\rho$ . We then define  $S_\rho^{\otimes K}$  as the set of states of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A})$

338 corresponding to  $T_\rho^{\otimes K}$ , i.e.,  $S_\rho^{\otimes K} = \{(s, [\nu]) \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}_P \otimes_K \mathcal{A}) \mid (s, \nu) \in T_\rho^{\otimes K}\}$ . If we can  
 339 compute the set  $\mathbb{S} = \{S_\rho^{\otimes K} \mid \rho \text{ is a finite run of } \mathcal{A}_P\}$ , we would be able to solve *timed* universal  
 340 resilience, because from this set, one can check existence of a run accepted by  $\mathcal{A}_P$  and not  
 341 by  $\mathcal{A}$ . Proposition 18 shows that universal resilience is undecidable. Hence, computing  $\mathbb{S}$  is  
 342 impossible. Roughly speaking, it is because this set depends on the exact timing in a run  $\rho$ ,  
 343 and in general one cannot use the region construction.

344 We can however show that in some restricted cases, we can use a *modified* region  
 345 construction to build  $S_\rho^{\otimes K}$ , which will enable decidability of timed existential resilience.  
 346 First, we restrict to *just faulty runs*, i.e., consider runs of  $\mathcal{A}_P$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  of equal durations,  
 347 but that did not yet synchronize on actions in the product  $\mathcal{A}_P \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$ . For a timed run  $\rho$ ,  
 348 by its duration, we mean the time-stamp or date of occurrence of its last event. Second,  
 349 we consider abstract runs  $\tilde{\sigma}$  through a so-called *strong region automaton*, as defined below.  
 350 Intuitively,  $\tilde{\sigma}$  keeps more information than in the usual region automaton to ensure that for  
 351 two timed runs  $\rho_1 = (t_1, d_1)(t_2, d_2) \dots$ , and  $\rho_2 = (t_1, e_1)(t_2, e_2) \dots$  associated with the same  
 352 run of the strong region automaton, we have  $\lfloor e_i \rfloor = \lfloor d_i \rfloor$  for all  $i$ . Formally, we build the  
 353 strong region automaton  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{B})$  of a timed automaton  $\mathcal{B}$  as follows. We add a virtual  
 354 clock  $x_\iota$  to  $\mathcal{B}$  which is reset at each integral time point, add constraint  $x_\iota < 1$  to each  
 355 transition guard, and add a virtual self loop transition with guard  $x_\iota = 1$  resetting  $x_\iota$  on  
 356 each state. Standard regions are equivalence classes for clock values, but not for elapsed  
 357 time. Adding a virtual clock resetting at every integral time point allows to consider the  
 358 fractional part of elapsed global time in regions. Lemma 12 below shows that if two abstract  
 359 runs  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$  visit the same sequence of strong regions, then there are two runs of identical  
 360 duration that have  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$  as abstractions. We then make the usual region construction on  
 361 this extended timed automaton to obtain  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{B})$ . The strong region construction thus  
 362 has the same complexity as the standard region construction. Let  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{B}))$  be the  
 363 language of this strong region automaton, where these self loops on the virtual clock are  
 364 projected away. These additional transitions capture ticks at integral times, but do not  
 365 change the behavior of  $\mathcal{B}$ , i.e., we have  $Unt(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B})) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{B})) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B})) = Unt(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}))$   
 366 so  $Unt(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{B}))$ .

367 For a finite abstract run  $\tilde{\sigma}$  of the *strong* region automaton  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_P)$ , we define the set  
 368  $S_\sigma^{\otimes K}$  of states of  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_P \otimes_K \mathcal{A})$  (the virtual clock is projected away, and our region is  
 369 w.r.t original clocks) such that there exists a run  $\tilde{\sigma}^\otimes$  through  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_P \otimes_K \mathcal{A})$  ending in  
 370 this state and whose projection on the first component is  $\tilde{\sigma}$ . Let  $\tilde{\sigma}_\rho$  be the run of  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_P)$   
 371 associated with a run  $\rho$  of  $\mathcal{A}_P$ . It is easy to see that  $S_\rho^{\otimes K} = \bigcup_{\rho \mid \tilde{\sigma}_\rho = \tilde{\sigma}} S_\rho^{\otimes K}$ . For a *just faulty*  
 372 timed run  $\rho$  of  $\mathcal{A}_P$ , we have a stronger relation between  $S_\rho^{\otimes K}$  and  $S_{\tilde{\sigma}_\rho}^{\otimes K}$ :

373 ► **Proposition 11.** *Let  $\rho$  be a just faulty run of  $\mathcal{A}_P$ . Then  $S_\rho^{\otimes K} = S_{\tilde{\sigma}_\rho}^{\otimes K}$ .*

374 **Proof.** First, notice that given a just faulty timed run  $\rho$  of  $\mathcal{A}_P$  and a timed run  $\rho'$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  of  
 375 same duration, the timed run  $\rho \otimes \rho'$  (the run of  $\mathcal{A}_P \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\rho$  is the projection on  
 376 the first component and  $\rho'$  on the second component) exists.

377 To show that  $S_\rho^{\otimes K} = S_{\tilde{\sigma}_\rho}^{\otimes K}$ , we show that for any pair of just faulty runs  $\rho_1, \rho_2$  of  $\mathcal{A}_P$  with  
 378  $\tilde{\sigma}_{\rho_1} = \tilde{\sigma}_{\rho_2}$ , we have  $S_{\rho_1}^{\otimes K} = S_{\rho_2}^{\otimes K}$ , which yields the result as  $S_{\tilde{\sigma}_\rho}^{\otimes K} = \bigcup_{\rho' \mid \tilde{\sigma}_{\rho'} = \tilde{\sigma}_\rho} S_{\rho'}^{\otimes K}$ . Consider  
 379  $\rho_1, \rho_2$ , two just faulty timed runs of  $\mathcal{A}_P$  with  $\tilde{\sigma}_{\rho_1} = \tilde{\sigma}_{\rho_2}$  and let  $(l_{\mathcal{A}_P}, l_{\mathcal{A}}, K, r) \in S_{\rho_1}^{\otimes K}$ . Then,  
 380 this implies that there exists  $\nu_1 \models r$  and a timed run  $\rho'_1$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  with the same duration as  $\rho_1$ ,  
 381 such that  $\rho_1 \otimes \rho'_1$  ends in state  $(l_{\mathcal{A}_P}, l_{\mathcal{A}}, K, \nu_1)$ . The following lemma completes the proof:

382 ► **Lemma 12.** *There exists  $\nu_2 \models r$  and a timed run  $\rho'_2$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  with the same duration as  $\rho_2$ ,  
 383 such that  $\rho_2 \otimes \rho'_2$  ends in state  $(l_{\mathcal{A}_P}, l_{\mathcal{A}}, K, \nu_2)$ .*

384 The main idea of the proof is to show that we can construct  $\rho'_2$  which will have the  
 385 same transitions as  $\rho'_1$ , with same integral parts in timings (thanks to the information from  
 386 the strong region automaton), but possibly different timings in the fractional parts, called  
 387 a re-timing of  $\rho'_1$ . Notice that  $\rho_2$  is a re-timing of  $\rho_1$ , as  $\tilde{\sigma}_{\rho_1} = \tilde{\sigma}_{\rho_2}$ . We translate the  
 388 requirement on  $\rho'_2$  into a set of constraints (which is actually a partial ordering) on the  
 389 fractional parts of the dates of its transitions, and show that we can indeed set the dates  
 390 accordingly. This translation follows the following idea: the value of a clock  $x$  just before  
 391 firing transition  $t$  is obtained by considering the date  $d$  of  $t$  minus the date  $d^x$  of the latest  
 392 transition  $t^x$  at which  $x$  has been last reset before  $t$ . In particular, the difference  $x - y$   
 393 between clocks  $x, y$  just before firing transition  $t$  is  $(d - d^x) - (d - d^y) = d^y - d^x$ . That is, the  
 394 value of a clock or its difference can be obtained by considering the difference between two  
 395 dates of transitions. A constraint given by  $x - y \in (n, n + 1)$  is equivalent with the constraint  
 396 given by  $d^y - d^x \in (n, n + 1)$ , and similar constraints on the fractional parts can be given.

397 **Proof.** Let  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  be the sequence of transitions of  $\rho_1, \rho_2$  taken respectively, at dates  
 398  $d_1, \dots, d_n$  and  $e_1, \dots, e_n$ . Similarly, we will denote by  $t'_1, \dots, t'_k$  the sequence of transitions  
 399 of  $\rho'_1$ , taken at dates  $d'_1, \dots, d'_k$ . Run  $\rho'_2$  will pass by the same transitions  $t'_1, \dots, t'_k$ , but with  
 400 possibly different dates  $e'_1, \dots, e'_k$  such that:

- 401 ■ the duration of  $\rho'_2$  is the same as the duration of  $\rho_2$ ,
- 402 ■  $\tilde{\sigma}_{\rho'_2}$  follows the same sequence of states of  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A})$  as  $\tilde{\sigma}_{\rho'_1}$  (in particular,  $\rho'_2$  is a valid  
 403 run as it fulfils the guards of its transitions, which are the same as those of  $\rho'_1$ ).
- 404 ■  $\tilde{\sigma}_{\rho_2 \otimes \rho'_2}$  reaches the same state of  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A})$  as  $\tilde{\sigma}_{\rho_1 \otimes \rho'_1}$ .

405 We translate these into three requirements on the dates  $(e'_i)_{i \leq k}$  of  $\rho'_2$ :

- 406 R1. We have  $e'_k = e_n$ ,
- 407 R2. For every  $i \leq k$ , the integral part  $\lfloor e'_i \rfloor = \lfloor d'_i \rfloor$ . Remark that we already have  $\lfloor e'_k \rfloor =$   
 408  $\lfloor e_n \rfloor = \lfloor d_n \rfloor = \lfloor d'_k \rfloor$  by R1 and by the hypothesis,
- 409 R3. Fractional parts  $(\text{frac}(e'_i))_{i \leq k}$  satisfy a set of constraints, defined hereafter as a partial  
 410 ordering on  $(\text{frac}(e'_i))_{i \leq k} \cup (\text{frac}(e_i))_{i \leq n}$ .

411 Notice that the value of a clock  $x$  just before firing transition  $t_i$  is obtained by considering  
 412 the date  $d_i$  of  $t_i$  minus the date  $d_i^x$  of the latest transition  $t_j, j < i$  at which  $x$  has been  
 413 last reset before  $i$ . In particular, the difference  $x - y$  between clocks  $x, y$  just before firing  
 414 transition  $t_i$  is  $(d_i - d_i^x) - (d_i - d_i^y) = d_i^y - d_i^x$ . That is, the value of a clock or its difference  
 415 can be obtained by considering the difference between two dates of transitions. A constraint  $c$   
 416 given by  $x - y \in (n, n + 1)$  is equivalent with the constraint  $d(c)$  given by  $d_i^y - d_i^x \in (n, n + 1)$ .

417 We then characterize the conditions required for the run  $\rho_2 \otimes \rho'_2$  to reach the same region  
 418  $r$  of  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A})$  which was reached by  $\rho_1 \otimes \rho'_1$ . These conditions are described as on  
 419 region  $r$  in the following equivalent ways:

- 420 1. A set of constraints  $C$  on the disjoint union  $X'' = X_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}} \uplus X_{\mathcal{A}}$  of clocks of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$ , of  
 421 the form  $x - y \in (n, n + 1)$  or  $x - y = n$  or  $x - y > Max$  (possibly considering a null  
 422 clock  $y$ ) for  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,
- 423 2. The associated set of constraints  $C' = \{d(c) \mid c \in C\}$  on  $D = \{d_x \mid x \in X_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}}\} \uplus \{d'_x \mid$   
 424  $x' \in X_{\mathcal{A}}\}$ , with  $d_x$  the date of the latest transition  $t_j^{\otimes}$  that resets the clock  $x \in X_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}}$ , and  
 425  $d'_x$  the date of the latest transition  $t_i^{\otimes}$  that resets clock  $x' \in X_{\mathcal{A}}$ ,
- 426 3. An ordering  $\leq'$  over  $FP = \{\text{frac}(\tau) \mid \tau \in D\}$  defined as follows: for each constraint  
 427  $\tau - \tau' \in (n, n + 1)$  of  $C'$ , if  $\lfloor \tau \rfloor = \lfloor \tau' \rfloor + n$  then  $\text{frac}(\tau) <' \text{frac}(\tau')$ , and if  $\lfloor \tau \rfloor = \lfloor \tau' \rfloor + n + 1$   
 428 then  $\text{frac}(\tau') <' \text{frac}(\tau)$ .

429 For each constraint  $\tau - \tau' = n$  of  $C'$ , then  $\text{frac}(\tau') = ' \text{frac}(\tau)$ .

430 For each constraint  $\tau - \tau' > c_{\max}$  of  $C'$  such that  $\lfloor \tau \rfloor = \lfloor \tau' \rfloor + c_{\max}$ , we have  $\text{frac}(\tau') >$   
 431  $\text{frac}(\tau)$  (if  $\lfloor \tau \rfloor \geq \lfloor \tau' \rfloor + c_{\max} + 1$ , then we dont need to do anything), where  $c_{\max} =$   
 432  $\max(\{c_x \mid x \in X\})$ .

433 Further, path  $\rho'_2$  needs to visit the regions  $r_1, \dots, r_k$  visited by  $\rho'_1$ . For each  $i$ , visiting  
 434 region  $r_i$  is characterized by a set of constraints  $C_i$ , which we translate as above as an  
 435 ordering  $\leq'_i$  on  $FP' = \{\text{frac}(d'_i) \mid i \leq k\}$ .

436 Thus, finally, we can collect all the requirements for having  $\rho'$  with required properties by  
 437 defining  $\leq''$  over  $FP' \cup FP$  (notice that it is not a disjoint union) as the transitive closure of  
 438 the union of all  $\leq'_i$  and of  $\leq'$ . As the union of constraints on  $C'_i$  and on  $C'$  is satisfied by the  
 439 dates  $(d_i)_{i \leq n}$  and  $(d'_i)_{i \leq k}$  of  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho'_1$ , the union of constraints is satisfiable. Equivalently,  
 440  $\leq''$  is a partial ordering, respecting the total natural ordering  $\leq$  on  $FP \cup FP'$ . We will  
 441 denote  $\tau ='' \tau'$  whenever  $\tau \leq'' \tau'$  and  $\tau' \leq'' \tau$ , and  $\tau <'' \tau'$  if  $\tau \leq'' \tau'$  but we dont have  
 442  $\tau ='' \tau'$ . Because  $\leq''$  is a partial ordering, there is no  $\tau, \tau'$  with  $\tau <'' \tau' <'' \tau$ .

443 Note that there is only one way of fulfilling the first two requirements R1. and R2; namely  
 444 by matching  $e'_k$  and  $e_n$ , and by witnessing dates with the same integral parts in  $e'_k, e_n$  as  
 445 well as  $d'_k, d_n$ . While this takes care of the last values, to obtain the remaining values, we  
 446 can apply any greedy algorithm fixing successively  $\text{frac}(e'_{k-1}) \dots \text{frac}(e'_1)$  and respecting  $\leq''$   
 447 to yield the desired result. We provide a concrete such algorithm for completeness:


448 We will start from the fixed value of  $\text{frac}(e'_{k-1})$  and work backwards. Let us assume  
 449 inductively that  $\text{frac}(e'_{k-1}) \dots \text{frac}(e'_{i+1})$  have been fixed. We now describe how to obtain  
 450  $\text{frac}(e'_i)$ . If  $\text{frac}(d'_i) ='' \text{frac}(d'_j)$ ,  $j > i$  then we set  $\text{frac}(e'_i) = \text{frac}(e'_j)$ . If  $\text{frac}(d'_i) ='' \text{frac}(d_j)$ ,  
 451 then we set  $\text{frac}(e'_i) = \text{frac}(e_j)$ . Otherwise, consider the sets  $L_i = \{\text{frac}(e_j) \mid j \leq n, \text{frac}(d_j) <''$   
 452  $\text{frac}(d'_i)\} \cup \{\text{frac}(e'_j) \mid i < j \leq n, \text{frac}(d'_j) <'' \text{frac}(d'_i)\}$ . Also, consider  $U_i = \{\text{frac}(e_j) \mid j \leq$   
 453  $n, \text{frac}(d_j) >'' \text{frac}(d'_i)\} \cup \{\text{frac}(e'_j) \mid i < j \leq n, \text{frac}(d'_j) >'' \text{frac}(d'_i)\}$ . We let  $l_i = \max(L_i)$   
 454 and  $u_i = \min(U_i)$ . We then set  $\text{frac}(e'_i)$  to any value in  $(l_i, u_i)$ . It remains to show that we  
 455 always have  $l_i < u_i$ , which will show that such a choice of value for the fractional part of  $e'_i$   
 456 is indeed possible.

457 By contradiction, consider that there exists  $i$  such that  $l_i \geq u_i$ , and consider the  
 458 maximal (first) such  $i$ . First, assume that both  $l_i$  and  $u_i$  are of the form  $\text{frac}(e_j), \text{frac}(e_k)$   
 459 respectively, i.e. corresponds to clock values in the last regions of  $\rho_2$ . The contradiction  
 460 hypothesis is  $l_i = \text{frac}(e_j) \geq u_i = \text{frac}(e_k)$ . By definition of  $L_i$  and  $U_i$ , we also have  
 461  $\text{frac}(d_j) <'' \text{frac}(d'_i) <'' \text{frac}(d_k)$ . In particular,  $\text{frac}(d_j) < \text{frac}(d_k)$ . This is a contradiction  
 462 with  $\tilde{\sigma}_{\rho_1} = \tilde{\sigma}_{\rho_2}$ , as the strong region reached by  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  are the same. A contradiction.

463 Otherwise, at least one of  $l_i, u_i$  is of the form  $\text{frac}(e'_j)$ , with  $j > i$  (consider  $j$  minimal  
 464 if both are of this form). By symetry, let say  $l_i = \text{frac}(e'_j) \geq u_i$ . Let say  $u_i = \text{frac}(e_k)$ ,  
 465 as  $u_i = \text{frac}(e'_k)$  with  $k > j$  is similar since it has been fixed before  $\text{frac}(e'_j)$ . We have  
 466  $\text{frac}(d'_j) <'' d'_i <'' \text{frac}(d_k)$  by definition of  $L_i, U_i$ . In particular  $\text{frac}(d'_j) <'' \text{frac}(d_k)$ : That  
 467 is,  $k \in U_j$ , and by construction, and as  $j > i$ , we have  $l_i = \text{frac}(e'_j) < \text{frac}(e_k) = u_i$ , a  
 468 contradiction.  $\blacktriangleleft$

469 Lemma 12 completes the proof of Proposition 11 immediately. Indeed, the lemma implies  
 470 that  $(l_{A_p}, l_A, K, r) \in S_{\rho_2}^{\otimes K}$  from which we infer that  $S_{\rho_1}^{\otimes K} \subseteq S_{\rho_2}^{\otimes K}$ . By a symmetric argument  
 471 we get the other containment also, and hence we conclude that  $S_{\rho_1}^{\otimes K} = S_{\rho_2}^{\otimes K}$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

472 Lemma 12, which is crucial for our decidability results for existential timed resilience, shows  
 473 that a timed run can be re-timed, i.e., it shows the existence of a timed run with the  
 474 same transitions but possibly different timestamps. For this, the global time-stamps  $(d_j)$   
 475 of actions need to be fixed, and in particular the ordering between their fractional parts  
 476  $\text{frac}(d_j)$ . The normal region automaton only ensures ordering between the differences of



■ **Figure 3** Example timed automaton (left) and its strong timed automaton (right)

477  $(d_j)$ 's, but not  $(d_j)$  themselves. Let us illustrate this with an concrete example of a TA  
 478 c.f., Figure 3 (left), having 3 locations  $s_1, s_2, s_3$ , 2 clocks  $y, z$  and transitions  $t_1 = (y <$   
 479  $1, z := 0), t_2 = (y := 0), t_3 = (z := 0), t_4 = (1 < y < 2, z < 1)$  such that  $t_1$  goes from  
 480 location  $s_1$  to  $s_2$ ,  $t_2, t_3$  are loops at  $s_2$  and  $t_4$  goes from  $s_2$  to  $s_3$ . We can see the run in the  
 481 standard region automaton  $\sigma = (s_1, [\{0\}, \{0\}]) \xrightarrow{t_1} (s_2, [(0, 1), \{0\}]) \xrightarrow{t_2} (s_2, [\{0\}, (0, 1)]) \xrightarrow{t_3}$   
 482  $(s_2, [(0, 1), \{0\}]) \xrightarrow{t_4} (s_3, [(1, 2), (0, 1), \text{frac}(y) < \text{frac}(z)])$ . The following two timed runs  
 483  $\rho_1 = (t_1, d_1 = 0.8)(t_2, d_2 = 1.2)(t_3, d_3 = 1.9)(t_4, d_4 = 2.4)$  and  $\rho_2 = (t_1, d'_1 = 0.9)(t_2, d'_2 =$   
 484  $1.89)(t_3, d'_3 = 2.69)(t_4, d'_4 = 3.39)$  correspond to abstract run  $\sigma$ . Note that  $\text{frac}(d_2) < \text{frac}(d_3)$   
 485 but  $\text{frac}(d'_2) > \text{frac}(d'_3)$ .

486 We build the strong region automaton by adding a virtual clock  $x_i$  reset at all integer  
 487 points (reset  $x$  when  $x_i = 1$ ) c.f., Figure 3 (right). As explained above, concrete runs  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$   
 488 have the same abstract run  $\sigma$  in the standard region automaton. Now, if we consider abstract  
 489 runs in the strong region automaton (i.e. with the addition of a clock  $x_i$  reset at integral time  
 490 points), the concrete run  $\rho_1$  will correspond to abstract run  $\sigma_1 = (s_1, [\{0\}, \{0\}, \{0\}]) \xrightarrow{t_1}$   
 491  $(s_2, [(0, 1), (0, 1), \{0\}, \text{frac}(x_i) = \text{frac}(y)]) \xrightarrow{t_2} (s_2, [(0, 1), \{0\}, (0, 1), \text{frac}(x_i) < \text{frac}(z)]) \xrightarrow{t_3}$   
 492  $(s_2, [(0, 1), (0, 1), \{0\}, \text{frac}(y) < \text{frac}(x_i)]) \xrightarrow{t_4} (s_3, [(0, 1), (1, 2), (0, 1), \text{frac}(y) < \text{frac}(x_i) <$   
 493  $\text{frac}(z)])$ , and the concrete run  $\rho_2$  will correspond to abstract run  $\sigma_2 = (s_1, [\{0\}, \{0\}, \{0\}]) \xrightarrow{t_1}$   
 494  $(s_2, [(0, 1), (0, 1), \{0\}, \text{frac}(x_i) = \text{frac}(y)]) \xrightarrow{t_2} (s_2, [(0, 1), \{0\}, (0, 1), \text{frac}(x_i) < \text{frac}(z)]) \xrightarrow{t_3}$   
 495  $(s_2, [(0, 1), (0, 1), \{0\}, \text{frac}(x_i) < \text{frac}(y)]) \xrightarrow{t_4} (s_3, [(0, 1), (1, 2), (0, 1), \text{frac}(x_i) < \text{frac}(y) <$   
 496  $\text{frac}(z)])$ . The abstract run  $\sigma_1$  ends with a relation  $\text{frac}(y) < \text{frac}(x_i) < \text{frac}(z)$  on fractional  
 497 parts of clocks  $x_i, y, z$ , the abstract runs  $\sigma_2$  end with the relation  $\text{frac}(x_i) < \text{frac}(y) < \text{frac}(z)$ .  
 498 Thus,  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$ , do not have the same abstract “strong” run.

499 **Algorithm to solve Existential Timed Resilience.** We can now consider existential  
 500 timed resilience, and prove that it is decidable thanks to Propositions 10 and 11. The  
 501 main idea is to reduce the existential resilience question to a question on the sets of regions  
 502 reachable after just faulty runs. Indeed, focusing on just faulty runs means that we do not  
 503 have any actions to match, only the duration of the run till the fault, whereas if we had tried  
 504 to reason on faulty runs in general, actions have to be synchronized  $K$  steps after the fault  
 505 and then we cannot compute the set of  $S_{\rho_f}^{\otimes K}$ . We can show that reasoning on  $S_{\rho_f}^{\otimes K}$  for just  
 506 faulty runs is sufficient. Let  $\rho_f$  be a just faulty timed run of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$ . We say that  $s \in S_{\rho_f}^{\otimes K}$  is  
 507 *safe* if there exists a (finite or infinite) maximal accepting run of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$  from  $s$ , and that  
 508  $S_{\rho_f}^{\otimes K}$  is safe if there exists  $s \in S_{\rho_f}^{\otimes K}$  which is safe.

509 ► **Lemma 13.** *There exists a maximal accepting extension of a just faulty run  $\rho_f$  that is*  
 510 *BTN in  $K$ -steps iff  $S_{\rho_f}^{\otimes K}$  is safe. Further, deciding if  $S_{\rho_f}^{\otimes K}$  is safe can be done in PSPACE.*

511 **Proof.** Let  $\rho_f$  a just faulty run. By Proposition 10, there exists an extension  $\rho$  of  $\rho_f$  that is  
 512 BTN in  $K$  steps if and only if there exists an accepting run  $\rho^{\otimes K}$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\rho_f$   
 513 is a prefix of the projection of  $\rho^{\otimes K}$  on its first component, if and only if there exists a just  
 514 faulty run  $\rho_f^{\otimes K}$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$  such that its projection on the first component is  $\rho_f$ , and such  
 515 that an accepting state of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A}$  can be reached after  $\rho_f^{\otimes K}$ , if and only if  $S_{\rho_f}^{\otimes K}$  is safe.



516 Safety of  $S_{\rho_f}^{\otimes K}$  can be verified using a construction similar to the one in Theorem 16: it is  
 517 hence a reachability question in a region automaton, solvable with a PSPACE complexity. ◀

518 This lemma means that it suffices to consider the set of  $S_{\rho_f}^{\otimes K}$  over all  $\rho_f$  just faulty, which  
 519 we can compute using region automaton thanks to Prop. 11, which gives:

520 ▶ **Theorem 14.**  *$K$ - $\exists$ -resilience of timed automata is in EXPSPACE.*

521 **Proof.** Lemma 13 implies that  $\mathcal{A}$  is not  $K$ -timed existential resilient if and only if there exists  
 522 a just faulty run  $\rho_f$  such that  $S_{\rho_f}^{\otimes K}$  is not safe. This latter condition can be checked. Let us  
 523 denote by  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}) = (S_{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})}, I_{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})}, \Sigma, T_{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})}, F_{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})})$  the strong region automaton  
 524 associated with  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$ . We also denote  $\mathcal{R}_{\otimes K} = (S_{\mathcal{R}_{\otimes K}}, I_{\mathcal{R}_{\otimes K}}, \Sigma, T_{\mathcal{R}_{\otimes K}}, F_{\mathcal{R}_{\otimes K}})$  the strong region  
 525 automaton  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A})$ . Let  $\rho_f$  be a just faulty run, and let  $\sigma = \tilde{\sigma}_{\rho_f}$  denote the run  
 526 of  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})$  associated with  $\rho_f$ . Thanks to Proposition 11, we have  $S_{\rho_f}^{\otimes K} = S_{\sigma}^{\otimes K}$ , as  $S_{\rho_f}^{\otimes K}$   
 527 does not depend on the exact dates in  $\rho_f$ , but only on their regions, i.e., on  $\sigma$ . So it suffices to  
 528 find a reachable witness  $S_{\sigma}^{\otimes K}$  of  $\mathcal{R}_{\otimes K}$  which is not safe, to conclude that  $\mathcal{A}$  is not existentially  
 529 resilient. For that, we build an (untimed) automaton  $\mathfrak{B}$ . Intuitively, this automaton follows  
 530  $\sigma$  up to a fault of the region automaton  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})$ , and maintains the set  $S_{\sigma}^{\otimes K}$  of regions  
 531 of  $\mathcal{R}_{\otimes K}$ . This automaton stops in an accepting state immediately after occurrence of a  
 532 fault. Formally, the product subset automaton  $\mathfrak{B}$  is a tuple  $(S_{\mathfrak{B}}, I, \Sigma, T, F)$  with set of states  
 533  $S_{\mathfrak{B}} = S_{\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})} \times 2^{S_{\mathcal{R}_{\otimes K}}} \times \{0, 1\}$ , set of initial states  $I = I_{\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})} \times \{I_{\mathcal{R}_{\otimes K}}\} \times \{0\}$ , and  
 534 set of final states  $F = S_{\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})} \times 2^{S_{\mathcal{R}_{\otimes K}}} \times \{1\}$ . The set of transitions  $T \subseteq S_{\mathfrak{B}} \times \Sigma \times S_{\mathfrak{B}}$   
 535 is defined as follows,

- 536 ■  $((l, r, S, 0), a, (l', r', S', b)) \in T$  if and only if  $t_R = ((l, r), a, (l', r')) \in T_{\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})}$  and  
 537  $b = 1$  if and only if  $t_R$  is faulty and  $b = 0$  otherwise.
- 538 ■  $S'$  is the set of states  $s'$  of  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} \otimes_K \mathcal{A})$  whose first component is  $(l', r')$  and such  
 539 that there exists  $s \in S, (s, a, s') \in T_{\mathcal{R}(\otimes_K)}$ .


540 Intuitively, 0 in the states means no fault has occurred yet, and 1 means that a fault has  
 541 just occurred, and thus no transition exists from this state. We have that for every prefix  
 542  $\sigma$  of a just faulty abstract run of  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})$ , ending on a state  $(l, r)$  of  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{strong}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})$  then,  
 543 there exists a unique accepting path  $\sigma^{\otimes}$  in  $\mathfrak{B}$  such that  $\sigma$  is the projection of  $\sigma^{\otimes}$  on its first  
 544 component. Let  $(l, r, S, 1)$  be the state reached by  $\sigma^{\otimes}$ . Then  $S_{\sigma}^{\otimes K} = S$ . Thus, non-existential  
 545 resilience can be decided by checking reachability of a state  $(l, r, S, 1)$  such that  $S$  is not safe  
 546 in automaton  $\mathfrak{B}$ . Recall (from Lemma 13) that checking safety of  $S$  is in PSPACE. As  $\mathfrak{B}$  is  
 547 of doubly exponential size, reachability can be checked in EXPSPACE. As EXPSPACE is  
 548 closed under complement, checking existential resilience is in EXPSPACE. ◀

549 While we do not have a matching lower bound, we complete this subsection with following  
 550 (easy) hardness result (we leave the details in Appendix B due to lack of space).

551 ▶ **Theorem 15.** *The  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilience problem for timed automata is PSPACE-Hard.*

552 **Proof.** We proceed by reduction from the language emptiness problem, which is known  
 553 to be PSPACE-Complete for timed automata. We can reuse the gadget  $\mathcal{G}_{und}$  of Figure 4.  
 554 We take any automaton  $\mathcal{A}$  and collapse its initial state to state  $s_1$  in the gadget. We  
 555 recall that  $s_1$  is accessible at date 15 only after a fault. We add a self loop with transition,  
 556  $t_e = (s_2, \sigma, \text{true}, \emptyset, s_2)$  for every  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ . This means that after reaching  $s_2$ , which is accessible  
 557 only at date 15 if no fault has occurred, the automaton accepts any letter with any timing.  
 558 Then, if  $\mathcal{A}$  has no accepting word, there is no timed word after a fault which is a suffix  
 559 of a word in  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ , and conversely, if  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$ , then any word recognized from  $s_1$  is also  
 560 recognized from  $q_e$ . So the language emptiness problem reduces to 2- $\exists$ -resilience. ◀





■ **Figure 4** The gadget automaton  $\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}}$  (left) and the gadget  $\mathcal{G}_{und}$  (right)

561 **Existential Untimed Resilience.** We next address untimed existential resilience, which  
 562 we show can be solved by enumerating states  $(l, r)$  of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$  reachable after a fault, and for  
 563 each of them proving existence of a BTN run starting from  $(l, r)$ . This enumeration and the  
 564 following check uses polynomial space, yielding PSPACE-Completeness of  $K\text{-}\exists\text{-resilience}$ .

565 ► **Theorem 16.** *Untimed  $K\text{-}\exists\text{-resilience}$  is PSPACE-Complete.*

566 **Proof (sketch).** *Membership :*  $\mathcal{A}$  is untimed  $K\text{-}\exists\text{-resilient}$  if and only if for all states  
 567  $q = (l, r)$  reached by a just faulty run of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})$ , there exists a maximal accepting path  $\sigma$   
 568 from  $q$  such that its suffix  $\sigma_s$  after  $K$  steps is also the suffix of a path of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$ . This property  
 569 can be verified in PSPACE. A detailed proof is provided in Appendix B.

570 *Hardness :* We can now show that untimed  $K\text{-}\exists\text{-resilience}$  is PSPACE-Hard. Consider a  
 571 timed automaton  $\mathcal{A}$  with alphabet  $\Sigma$  and the construction of an automata that uses a gadget  
 572 shown in Figure 4 (left). Let us call this automaton  $\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}}$ . This automaton reads a word  
 573  $(a, 1)(b, 1)(c, 11)$  and then accepts all timed words 2 steps after a fault, via  $\Sigma$  loop on a  
 574 particular accepting state  $q_e$ . If  $\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}}$  takes the faulty transition (marked in dotted red)  
 575 then it resets all clocks of  $\mathcal{A}$  and behaves as  $\mathcal{A}$ . The accepting states are  $q_e \cup F$ . Then,  $\mathcal{A}$   
 576 has an accepting word if and only if  $\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}}$  is untimed  $2\text{-}\exists\text{-resilient}$ . Since the emptiness  
 577 problem for timed automata is PSPACE-Complete, the result follows. ◀

578 ► **Remark 17.** The hardness reduction in the proof of Theorem 16 holds even for deterministic  
 579 timed automata. It is known [2] that PSPACE-Hardness of emptiness still holds for  
 580 deterministic TAs. Hence, considering deterministic timed automata will not improve  
 581 the complexity of  $K\text{-}\exists\text{-resilience}$ . Considering IRTAs does not change complexity either, as  
 582 the gadget used in Theorem 16 can be adapted to become an IRTA (as shown in Appendix C).

## 583 5 Universal Resilience

584 In this section, we consider the problem of universal resilience and show that it is very close to  
 585 the language inclusion question in timed automata, albeit with a few subtle differences. One  
 586 needs to consider timed automata with  $\varepsilon$ -transitions [11], which are strictly more expressive  
 587 than timed automata. First, we show a reduction from the language inclusion problem.

588 ► **Proposition 18.** *Language inclusion for timed automata can be reduced in polynomial time  
 589 to  $K\text{-}\forall\text{-resilience}$ . Thus,  $K\text{-}\forall\text{-resilience}$  is undecidable in general for timed automata.*

590 **Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{A}_1 = (L_1, \{l_{0_1}\}, X_1, \Sigma_1, T_1, F_1)$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2 = (L_2, \{l_{0_2}\}, X_2, \Sigma_2, T_2, F_2)$  be two timed  
 591 automata with only one initial state (w.l.o.g). We build a timed automaton  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  
 592  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_1) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_2)$  if and only if  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $2\text{-}\forall\text{-resilient}$ .

593 We first define a gadget  $\mathcal{G}_{und}$  that allows to reach a state  $s_1$  at an arbitrary date  $d_1 = 15$   
 594 when a fault happens, and a state  $s_2$  at date  $d_2 = d_1 = 15$  when no fault occur. This gadget  
 595 is shown in Fig 4(right).  $\mathcal{G}_{und}$  has 6 locations  $s_0, s_i, s_{i,1}, s_1, s_2 \notin L_1 \cup L_2$ , three new clocks  
 596  $x, y, z \notin X_1 \cup X_2$ , three new actions  $a, b, c \notin \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2$ , and 5 transitions  $t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4 \notin$

597  $T_1 \cup T_2$  defined as:  $t_0 = (s_0, a, g_0, \{y\}, s_i)$  with  $g_0 ::= x \leq 10$ ,  $t_1 = (s_i, b, g_1, \emptyset, s_{i,1})$  with  
 598  $g_1 ::= x > 11 \wedge y < 1$ ,  $t_2 = (s_i, b, g_2, \emptyset, s_{i,2})$  with  $g_2 ::= x \leq 10$ ,  $t_3 = (s_{i,1}, c, g_3, X_1, s_1)$   
 599 with  $g_3 ::= z = 15$ , and  $t_4 = (s_{i,2}, c, g_4, X_2, s_2)$  with  $g_4 ::= z = 15$ . Clearly, in this gadget,  
 600 transition  $t_1$  can never fire, as a configuration with  $x > 11$  and  $y < 1$  is not accessible.

601 We build a timed automaton  $\mathcal{B}$  that contains all transitions of  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$ , but preceded  
 602 by  $\mathcal{G}_{und}$  by collapsing the initial location of  $\mathcal{A}_1$  i.e.,  $l_{0,1}$  with  $s_1$  and the initial location of  $\mathcal{A}_2$   
 603 i.e.,  $l_{0,2}$  with  $s_2$ . We also use a fault model  $\mathcal{P} : a \rightarrow [0, 2]$ , that can delay transitions  $t_0$  with  
 604 action  $a$  by up to 2 time units. The language  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B})$  is the set of words:

$$605 \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}) = \{ (a, d_1)(b, d_2)(c, 15)(\sigma_1, d_3) \dots (\sigma_n, d_{n+2}) \mid (d_1 \leq 10) \wedge (d_2 \leq 10) \wedge (d_2 - d_1 < 1) \\ \wedge \exists w = (\sigma_1, d'_3) \dots (\sigma_n, d'_{n+2}) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_2), \forall i \in 3..n+2, d'_i = d_i - 15 \}$$

606 The enlargement of  $\mathcal{B}$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{P}}$ . The words in  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{P}})$  is the set of words in  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B})$   
 607 (when there is no fault) plus the set of words in:

$$608 \mathcal{L}^F(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{P}}) = \{ (a, d_1)(b, d_2)(c, 15)(\sigma_1, d_3) \dots (\sigma_n, d_{n+2}) \mid (10 < d_1 \leq 12) \wedge d_2 > 11 \\ \wedge (d_2 - d_1 < 1) \wedge \exists w = (\sigma_1, d'_3) \dots (\sigma_n, d'_{n+2}) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_1), \forall i \in 3..n+2, d'_i = d_i - 15 \}$$

609 Now,  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilient for  $K = 2$  if and only if every word in  $\mathcal{L}^F(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{P}})$  is BTN after 2  
 610 steps ( $K = 2$ ), i.e., for every word  $w = (a, d_1)(b, d_2)(c, 15)(\sigma_1, d_3) \dots (\sigma_n, d_{n+2})$  in  $\mathcal{L}^F(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{P}})$ ,  
 611 if there exists a word  $w = (a, d'_1)(b, d'_2)(c, 15)(\sigma_1, d_3) \dots (\sigma_n, d_{n+2})$  in  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B})$ . This means that  
 612 every word of  $\mathcal{A}_1$  is a word of  $\mathcal{A}_2$ . So  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_1) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_2)$  if and only if  $\mathcal{B}$  is 2- $\forall$ -resilient.

613 As language inclusion for timed automata is undecidable [2], an immediate consequence  
 614 is that  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilience of timed automata is undecidable.  $\blacktriangleleft$

615 Next we show that the reduction is also possible in the reverse direction.

616 **► Proposition 19.**  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilience can be reduced in polynomial time to language inclusion  
 617 for timed automata with  $\varepsilon$ -transitions.

618 **Proof.** Given a timed automaton  $\mathcal{A} = (L, I, X, \Sigma, T, F)$ , we can build a timed automaton  
 619  $\mathcal{A}^S$  that recognizes all suffixes of timed words recognized by  $\mathcal{A}$  (see Appendix B, Figure 7  
 620 for an example). Formally,  $\mathcal{A}^S$  contains the original locations and transitions of  $\mathcal{A}$ , a copy of  
 621 all location, a copy of all transitions where letters are replaced by  $\varepsilon$ , and a transition from  
 622 copies to original locations labeled by their original letters.

623 We have  $\mathcal{A}^S = (L^S, I^S, X, \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}, T^S, F)$ , where  $L^S = L \cup \{l' \mid l \in L\}$ ,  $I^S = \{l' \in L_S, l \in$   
 624  $I\}$   $T^S = T \cup \{(l'_1, g, \varepsilon, R, l'_2) \mid \exists (l_1, g, \sigma, R, l_2) \in T\} \cup \{(l'_1, g, \sigma, R, l_2) \mid \exists (l_1, g, \sigma, R, l_2) \in T\}$ .  
 625 Obviously, for every timed word  $(a_1, d_1)(a_2, d_2) \dots (a_n, d_n)$  recognized by  $\mathcal{A}$ , and every  
 626 index  $k \in 1..n$ , the words  $(\varepsilon, d_1)(\varepsilon, d_k)(a_{k+1}, d_{k+1}) \dots (a_n, d_n) = (a_{k+1}, d_{k+1}) \dots (a_n, d_n)$  is  
 627 recognized by  $\mathcal{A}^S$ .

628 Given a timed automaton  $\mathcal{A}$  and a fault model  $\mathcal{P}$ , we build an automaton  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{P}}$  which  
 629 remembers if a fault has occurred, and how many transitions have been taken since a fault  
 630 (see Definition 9 in Appendix B). Then, we can build an automaton  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{P}, \varepsilon}$  by re-labeling every  
 631 transition occurring before a fault and until  $K$  steps after the fault by  $\varepsilon$ , keeping the same  
 632 locations, guards and resets, and leave transitions occurring more than  $K$  steps after a fault  
 633 unchanged. The relabeled transitions are transitions starting from a location  $(l, n)$  with  
 634  $n \neq 0$ . Accepting locations of  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{P}, \varepsilon}$  are of the form  $(l, 0)$  where  $l$  is an accepting locations  
 635 of  $\mathcal{A}$  occurring after a fault in  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{P}}$ . Then, every faulty run accepted by  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{P}, \varepsilon}$  is associated  
 636 with a word of the form  $\rho = (t_1, d_1) \dots (t_f, d_f)(t_{f+1}, d_{f+1}) \dots (t_{f+K}, d_{f+K}) \dots (t_n, d_n)$  where  
 637  $t_1, \dots, t_{f+K}$  are  $\varepsilon$  transitions. A run  $\rho$  is BTN if and only if  $(a_{f+K+1}, d_{f+K+1}) \dots (a_n, d_n)$  is  
 638 a suffix of a timed word of  $\mathcal{A}$ , i.e., is recognized by  $\mathcal{A}^S$ .

639 Now one can check that every word in  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{P}, \varepsilon}$  (reading only  $\varepsilon$  before that fault) is recognized  
 640 by the suffix automaton  $\mathcal{A}^S$ , i.e. solve a language inclusion problem for timed automata with  
 641  $\varepsilon$  transitions.  $\blacktriangleleft$

642 We note that  $\varepsilon$ -transitions are critical for the reduction of Proposition 19. To get  
 643 decidability of  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilience, it is thus necessary (but not sufficient) to be in a class with  
 644 decidable timed language inclusion, such as Event-Recording timed automata [3], Integer  
 645 Reset timed automata (IRTA) [18], or Strongly Non-Zeno timed automata [4]. However,  
 646 to obtain decidability of  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilience using Proposition 19, one needs also to ensure  
 647 that inclusion is still decidable for automata in the presence of  $\varepsilon$  transitions. When a  
 648 subclass  $C$  of timed automata is closed by enlargement (due to the fault model), and if timed  
 649 language inclusion is decidable, even with  $\varepsilon$  transitions, then Proposition 19 implies that  
 650  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilience is decidable for  $C$ . We show that this holds for the case of IRTA and leave  
 651 other subclasses for future work. For IRTA [18], we know that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B})$  is decidable  
 652 in EXPSPACE when  $\mathcal{B}$  is an IRTA [18] (even with  $\varepsilon$  transitions), from which we obtain an  
 653 upper bound for  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilience of IRTA. The enlargement of guards due to the fault can add  
 654 transitions that reset clocks at non-integral times, but it turns out that the suffix automaton  
 655  $\mathcal{A}^S$  of Proposition 19 is still an IRTA. A matching lower bound is obtained by encoding  
 656 inclusion for IRTA with  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilience using a trick to replace the gadget in Proposition 18  
 657 by an equivalent IRTA. Thus, we have Theorem 20 (proof in Appendix C).

658 ► **Theorem 20.**  *$K$ - $\forall$ -resilience is EXPSPACE-Complete for IRTA.*

659 Finally, we conclude this section by remarking that universal *untimed* resilience is decidable  
 660 for timed automata in general, using the reductions of Propositions 18 and 19:

661 ► **Theorem 21.** *Untimed  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilience is EXPSPACE-Complete.*

662 **Proof.** Recall that untimed language inclusion of timed automata is EXPSPACE-Complete [9].  
 663 The lower bound is readily obtained by using the reduction of Proposition 18.

664 For the upper bound, we will use the construction of automata  $\mathcal{A}^S$  and  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{P},\varepsilon}$  built during  
 665 the reduction of Proposition 19. We however need inclusion of TA with  $\varepsilon$  transitions, and  
 666 thus we adapt the EXPSPACE algorithm in the presence of  $\varepsilon$  transitions:


667 We can consider  $\varepsilon$  transitions as transitions labeled by any letter, and build the region  
 668 automata  $\mathcal{A}_{\#} = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}^S)$  and  $\mathcal{B}_{\#} = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{P},\varepsilon})$ . The size of these untimed automata is exponential  
 669 in the number of clocks, with  $\varepsilon$  transitions. We can perform an  $\varepsilon$  reduction on  $\mathcal{A}_{\#}$  to obtain  
 670 an automaton  $\mathcal{A}_{\#}^S$  with the same number of states as  $\mathcal{A}_{\#}$  that recognizes untimed suffixes of  
 671 words of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Similarly, we can perform an  $\varepsilon$  reduction on  $\mathcal{B}_{\#}$  to obtain an automaton  $\mathcal{B}_{\#}^{\mathcal{P}}$   
 672 with the same number of states as  $\mathcal{B}_{\#}$  that recognizes suffixes of words played  $K$  steps after a fault.  
 673 We then check  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_{\#}^{\mathcal{P}}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_{\#}^S)$  with a usual PSPACE inclusion algorithm, which yields the  
 674 EXPSPACE upper bound, as  $\mathcal{A}_{\#}^S, \mathcal{B}_{\#}^{\mathcal{P}}$  have an exponential number of states w.r.t.  $|\mathcal{A}|$ . ◀

## 675 **6 Conclusion**

676 Resilience allows to check robustness of a timed system to unspecified delays. A universally  
 677 resilient timed system recovers from any delay in some fixed number of steps. Existential  
 678 resilience guarantees the existence of a controller that can bring back the system to a normal  
 679 behavior within a fixed number of steps after an unexpected delay. Interestingly, we show  
 680 that existential resilience enjoys better complexities/decidability than universal resilience.  
 681 Universal resilience is decidable only for well behaved classes of timed automata such as IRTA,  
 682 or in the untimed setting. A future work is to investigate resilience for other determinizable  
 683 classes of timed automata, and a natural extension of resilience called *continuous resilience*,  
 684 where a system recovers within some fixed duration rather than within some number of steps.  
 685 Another natural question is to consider resilience questions when  $K$  is not fixed, i.e., check  
 686 existence of a value for  $K$  such that  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilient (resp.  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilient).

687 — **References** —

- 688 1 S. Akshay, B. Bollig, P. Gastin, M. Mukund, and K. Narayan Kumar. Distributed timed  
689 automata with independently evolving clocks. *Fundam. Informaticae*, 130(4):377–407, 2014.
- 690 2 R. Alur and D.L. Dill. A theory of timed automata. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 126(2):183–235,  
691 1994.
- 692 3 R. Alur, L. Fix, and T.A. Henzinger. Event-clock automata: A determinizable class of timed  
693 automata. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 211(1-2):253–273, 1999.
- 694 4 C. Baier, N. Bertrand, P. Bouyer, and T. Brihaye. When are timed automata determinizable?  
695 In *Proc. of ICALP’09*, volume 5556 of *LNCS*, pages 43–54, 2009.
- 696 5 Roderick Bloem, Peter Gjøøl Jensen, Bettina Könighofer, Kim Guldstrand Larsen, Florian  
697 Lorber, and Alexander Palmisano. It’s time to play safe: Shield synthesis for timed systems.  
698 *CoRR*, abs/2006.16688, 2020.
- 699 6 P. Bouyer, F. Chevalier, and D. D’Souza. Fault diagnosis using timed automata. In *Proc. of*  
700 *FOSSACS 2005*, pages 219–233, 2005.
- 701 7 P. Bouyer, N. Markey, and O. Sankur. Robust model-checking of timed automata via pumping  
702 in channel machines. In *Proc. of FORMATS 2011*, volume 6919 of *LNCS*, pages 97–112, 2011.
- 703 8 P. Bouyer, N. Markey, and O. Sankur. Robustness in timed automata. In *International*  
704 *Workshop on Reachability Problems*, volume 8169 of *LNCS*, pages 1–18, 2013.
- 705 9 R. Brenguier, S. Göller, and O. Sankur. A comparison of succinctly represented finite-state  
706 systems. In *Proc. of CONCUR 2012*, volume 7454 of *LNCS*, pages 147–161. Springer, 2012.
- 707 10 M. De Wulf, L. Doyen, N. Markey, and J-F Raskin. Robust safety of timed automata. *Formal*  
708 *Methods Syst. Des.*, 33(1-3):45–84, 2008.
- 709 11 V. Diekert, P. Gastin, and A. Petit. Removing epsilon-transitions in timed automata. In  
710 *Proceedings of the 14th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, STACS  
711 ’97, page 583–594, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1997. Springer-Verlag.
- 712 12 Catalin Dima. Dynamical properties of timed automata revisited. In *Formal Modeling and*  
713 *Analysis of Timed Systems, 5th International Conference, FORMATS 2007, Salzburg, Austria,*  
714 *October 3-5, 2007, Proceedings*, volume 4763 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages  
715 130–146. Springer, 2007.
- 716 13 D. D’Souza, M. Gopinathan, S. Ramesh, and P. Sampath. Conflict-tolerant real-time features.  
717 In *Fifth International Conference on the Quantitative Evaluation of Systems (QEST 2008)*,  
718 pages 274–283. IEEE Computer Society, 2008.
- 719 14 Rüdiger Ehlers and Ufuk Topcu. Resilience to intermittent assumption violations in reactive  
720 synthesis. In Martin Fränzle and John Lygeros, editors, *17th International Conference on*  
721 *Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control (part of CPS Week), HSCC’14, Berlin, Germany,*  
722 *April 15-17, 2014*, pages 203–212. ACM, 2014.
- 723 15 V. Gupta, T.A. Henzinger, and R. Jagadeesan. Robust timed automata. In *Proc. Of HART’97,*  
724 *Hybrid and Real-Time Systems*, volume 1201 of *LNCS*, pages 331–345, 1997.
- 725 16 A. Puri. Dynamical properties of timed automata. In *DEDS*, 10(1-2):87–113, 2000.
- 726 17 Matthieu Renard, Yliès Falcone, Antoine Rollet, Thierry Jéron, and Hervé Marchand. Optimal  
727 enforcement of (timed) properties with uncontrollable events. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.*,  
728 29(1):169–214, 2019.
- 729 18 P. V. Suman, P.K. Pandya, S.N. Krishna, and L. Manasa. Timed automata with integer resets:  
730 Language inclusion and expressiveness. In *Proc. of FORMATS’08*, volume 5215 of *LNCS*,  
731 pages 78–92, 2008.
- 732 19 M. Swaminathan, M. Fränzle, and J-P. Katoen. The surprising robustness of (closed) timed  
733 automata against clock-drift. In *Fifth IFIP International Conference On Theoretical Computer*  
734 *Science - TCS 2008, IFIP 20th World Computer Congress, TC 1, Foundations of Computer*  
735 *Science, September 7-10, 2008, Milano, Italy*, volume 273 of *IFIP*, pages 537–553. Springer,  
736 2008.




■ **Figure 5**  $\mathcal{A}$  on the left; Enlargement  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$  on the right,  $\mathcal{P}(a) = 2, \mathcal{P}(b) = 0$ .

### 737 **A** Example for Universal Resilience

738 ► **Example 22.** Consider the automaton  $\mathcal{A}$  in Figure 5, with two locations  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$ , a  
 739 transition  $t_{12}$  from  $\ell_1$  to  $\ell_2$  and a transition  $t_{21}$  from  $\ell_2$  to  $\ell_1$ . The enlarged automaton  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$  has  
 740 two extra locations  $\dot{\ell}_1, \dot{\ell}_2$ , extra transitions between  $\dot{\ell}_1$  and  $\dot{\ell}_2$ , and from  $\dot{\ell}_1$  to  $\dot{\ell}_2$  and from  $\dot{\ell}_2$  to  
 741  $\dot{\ell}_1$  respectively. We represent a configuration of the automata with a pair  $(\ell, \nu(x)|\nu(y))$  where,  
 742  $\ell$  belongs to the set of the locations and  $\nu(x)$  (resp.  $\nu(y)$ ) represents the valuation of clock  $x$   
 743 (resp. clock  $y$ ). Let  $\rho_f = (\ell_1, 0|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{12},6)} (\ell_2, 6|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{21},13)} (\dot{\ell}_1, 0|7) \xrightarrow{(t_{12},19)} (\dot{\ell}_2, 4|0)$  be a *faulty*  
 744 *run* reading the faulty word  $(a, 6)(b, 13)(a, 19) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})$ . This run is 1-BTN since the run  $\sigma =$   
 745  $(\ell, 0|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{12},6)} (\ell_2, 6|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{21},12)} (\ell_1, 0|6) \xrightarrow{(t_{12},19)} (\ell_2, 7|0)$  is an accepting run of  $\mathcal{A}$ , reading timed  
 746 word  $w_\sigma = (a, 6)(b, 12)(a, 19) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ . Similarly, the run  $\rho' = (\ell, 0|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{12},14)} (\dot{\ell}_2, 14|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{21},20)}$   
 747  $(\dot{\ell}_1, 0|6) \xrightarrow{(t_{12},31)} (\dot{\ell}_2, 11|0)$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$  reading word  $(a, 14)(b, 20)(a, 31)$  is 1-BTN because of run  
 748  $\sigma' = (\ell_1, 0|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{12},10)} (\ell_2, 10|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{21},15)} (\ell_1, 0|5) \xrightarrow{(t_{12},19)} (\ell_2, 4|0) \xrightarrow{(t_{21},20)} (\ell_1, 0|1) \xrightarrow{(t_{12},31)} (\ell_2, 11|0)$   
 749 reading the word  $w_{\sigma'} = (a, 10)(b, 15)(a, 19)(b, 20)(a, 31)$ . One can notice that  $\rho'$  and  $\sigma'$  are  
 750 of different lengths. In fact, we can say something stronger, namely it is 1- $\forall$ -resilient (and  
 751 hence 1- $\exists$ -resilient) as explained below.

752 The example consists of a single  $(a.b)^*$  loop, where action  $a$  occurs between 3 and 12 time  
 753 units after entering location  $\ell_1$ , and action  $b$  occurs less than 7 time units after entering  $\ell_2$ . A  
 754 fault occurs either from  $\ell_1$ , in which case action  $a$  occurs  $12 + d$  time units after entering  $\ell_1$ ,  
 755 with  $d \in [0, 2]$ , or from  $\ell_2$ , i.e., when  $b$  occurs exactly 7 time units after entering  $\ell_2$ . Once a  
 756 fault has occurred, the iteration of  $a$  and  $b$  continues on  $\dot{\ell}_1$  and  $\dot{\ell}_2$  with non-faulty constraints.  
 757 Consider a just faulty run  $\rho_f$  where fault occurs on event  $a$ . The timed word generated in  $\rho_f$   
 758 is of the form  $w_f = (a, d_1).(b, d_2) \dots (a, d_k).(b, d_{k+1}).(a, d_{k+2})$ , where  $d_{k+2} = d_{k+1} + 12 + x$   
 759 with  $x \in [0, 2]$ . The word  $w = (a, d_1).(b, d_2) \dots (a, d_k).(b, d_{k+1}).(a, d_{k+1} + 5).(b, d_{k+1} + 5 +$   
 760  $x).(a, d_{k+1} + 5 + x + 7)$  is also recognized by the normal automaton, and ends at date  
 761  $d_{k+1} + 12 + x$ . Hence, for every just faulty word  $w_f$  which delays action  $a$ , there exists a word  
 762  $w$  such for every timed word  $v$ , if  $w_f.v$  is accepted by the faulty automaton,  $w.v$  is accepted  
 763 by the normal automaton. Now, consider a fault occurring when playing action  $b$ . The just  
 764 faulty word ending with a fault is of the form  $w_f = (a, d_1).(b, d_2) \dots (a, d_k).(b, d_k + 7)$ . All  
 765 occurrences of  $a$  occur at a date between  $d_j + 3$  and  $d_j + 12$  for some date  $d_j$  at which location  $\ell_1$   
 766 is reached, (except the first time stamp  $d_1 \in (5, 12)$ ) and all occurrences of  $b$  at a date strictly  
 767 smaller than  $d_i + 7$ , where  $d_i$  is the date of last occurrence of  $a$ . Also, for any value  $\epsilon \leq 7$  the  
 768 word  $w_\epsilon = (a, d_1).(b, d_2) \dots (a, d_k).(b, d_k + 7 - \epsilon)$  is non-faulty. Let  $v_1 = 12 - d_1$ , recall that  
 769  $d_1 \in (5, 12)$ . If we choose  $\epsilon < v_1$  then the run  $w_\epsilon^+ = (a, d_1 + \epsilon).(b, d_2 + \epsilon) \dots (a, d_k + \epsilon).(b, d_k + 7)$   
 770 is also non-faulty because  $5 < d_1 + \epsilon < d_1 + v_1 = 12$ . Clearly, we can extend  $w_\epsilon^+$  to match  
 771 transitions fired from  $w_\epsilon$  hence, the automaton of the example is 1- $\forall$ -resilient.

772 **B**  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilience and untimed  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilience



773 **Figure 6** The gadgets  $\mathcal{G}$  (left) and  $\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}}$  (right) which is untimed 2- $\exists$ -resilient iff  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$ .

774 **Theorem 16** *Untimed  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilience is PSPACE-Complete.*

775 **Proof. Membership :** For every run of  $\mathcal{A}$ , there is a path in  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$ . So,  $\mathcal{A}$  is untimed  
 776  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilient if and only if, for all states  $q$  reached by a just faulty run, there exists a  
 777 maximal accepting path  $\sigma$  from  $q$  such that,  $K$  steps after, the sequence of actions on its  
 778 suffix  $\sigma_s$  agrees with that of an accepting path  $\sigma$  in  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$ . We now prove that this property  
 can be verified in PSPACE.

779 Let  $q = (l, r)$  be a state of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})$  reached after a just faulty run.  $K$  steps after reaching  
 780  $q = (l, r)$  of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})$ , one can check in PSPACE, if there exists a path  $\sigma_s$  whose sequence  
 781 of actions is the same as the suffix of an accepting path  $\sigma$  of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$ . That is, either both  
 782 these end in a pair of accepting states from which no transitions are defined (both paths are  
 783 maximal), or visit a pair of states twice such that the cyclic part of the path contains both  
 784 an accepting state of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})$  and an accepting state of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$ . To find these paths  $\sigma, \sigma_s$ , one  
 785 just needs to guess them, i.e., build them synchronously by adding a pair of transitions to  
 786 the already built path only if they have the same label. One needs to remember the current  
 787 pair of states reached, and possibly guess a pair of states  $(s_{\mathcal{A}}, s_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}})$  on which a cycle starts,  
 788 and two bits  $b_{\mathcal{A}}$  (resp.  $b_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}}$ ) to remember if an accepting state of  $\mathcal{A}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$ ) has been seen  
 789 since  $(s_{\mathcal{A}}, s_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}})$ . A maximal finite path or a lasso can be found on a path of length smaller  
 790 than  $|\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})| \times |\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})|$ , and the size of the currently explored path can be memorized with  
 791  $\log_2(|\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})| \times |\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})|)$  bits. This can be done in PSPACE. The complement of this, i.e.,  
 792 checking that no maximal path originating from  $q$  with the same labeling as a suffix of a  
 793 word recognized by  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$   $K$  steps after a fault exists, is in PSPACE too.

794 Now, to show that  $\mathcal{A}$  is *not* untimed  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilient, we simply have to find one untimed  
 795 non- $K$ - $\exists$ -resilient witness state  $q$  reachable immediately after a fault. To find it, non  
 796 deterministically guess such a witness state  $q$  along with a path of length not more than the  
 797 size of  $|\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}})|$  and apply the PSPACE procedure above to decide whether it is a untimed  
 798 non- $K$ - $\exists$ -resilience witness. Guess of  $q$  is non-deterministic, which gives an overall NPSpace  
 799 complexity, but again, using Savitch's theorem, we can say that untimed  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilience is  
 800 in PSPACE.

801 **Hardness :** We can now show that untimed  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilience is PSPACE-Hard. Consider a  
 802 timed automaton  $\mathcal{A}$  with alphabet  $\Sigma$  and the construction of an automata that uses a gadget  
 803 shown in Figure 6 (right). Let us call this automaton  $\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}}$ . This automaton reads a word  
 804  $(a, 1).(b, 1).(c, 11)$  and then accepts all timed words 2 steps after a fault, via  $\Sigma$  loop on a  
 805 particular accepting state  $q_e$ . If  $\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}}$  takes the faulty transition (marked in dotted red)  
 806 then it resets all clocks of  $\mathcal{A}$  and behaves as  $\mathcal{A}$ . The accepting states are  $q_e \cup F$ . Then,  $\mathcal{A}$   
 807 has an accepting word if and only if  $\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}}$  is untimed 2- $\exists$ -resilient. Since the emptiness  
 808 problem for timed automata is PSPACE-Complete, the result follows.  $\blacktriangleleft$






Figure 7 An example automaton  $\mathcal{A}$  (left) and its suffix automaton  $\mathcal{A}^S$  (right)

809 **Definition 23** (Counting automaton). Let  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}} = (L, I, X, \Sigma, T, F)$  and be a timed automaton  
 810 with faulty transitions. Let  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  be an integer. Then, the faulty automaton  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{P}}$  is a tuple  
 811  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{P}} = (L^{\mathcal{P}}, I^{\mathcal{P}}, X, \Sigma, T^{\mathcal{P}}, F^{\mathcal{P}})$  where  $L^{\mathcal{P}} \subseteq \{L \times \{0\}\}$ ,  $F^{\mathcal{P}} = F \times [-1, K]$ , and initial set of  
 812 states  $I^{\mathcal{P}} = I \times \{-1\}$ . Intuitively,  $-1$  means no fault has occurred yet. Then we assign  $K$   
 813 and decrement to  $0$  to denote that  $K$  steps after fault have passed. The set of transitions  $T^{\mathcal{P}}$   
 814 is as follows: We have  $((l, n), g, a, R, (l', n')) \in T^{\mathcal{P}}$  if and only if either:

- 815  $\blacksquare$   $n \neq 0$  (no fault has occurred, or less than  $K$  steps of  $\mathcal{B}$  have occurred), we have transition  
 816  $t = (l, g, a, R, l) \in T$ , and either:  $n = -1$ , the transition  $t$  is faulty and  $n' = K$ , or  
 817  $n = -1$ , the transition  $t$  is non faulty and  $n' = -1$ , or  $n > 0$  and  $n' = n - 1$ .
- 818  $\blacksquare$   $n = n' = 0$  (at least  $K$  steps after a fault have occurred), and there exists a transition  
 819  $t = (l, g, a, R, l') \in T$ .

## 820 C Resilience of Integer Reset Timed Automata

821 Let us recall some elements used to prove decidability of language inclusion in IRTA. For  
 822 a given IRTA  $\mathcal{A}$  we can define a map  $f : \rho \rightarrow w_{unt}$  that maps every run  $\rho$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  to an  
 823 untimed word  $w_{unt} \in (\{\checkmark, \delta\} \cup \Sigma)^*$ . For a real number  $x$  with  $k = \lfloor x \rfloor$ , we define a map  
 824  $dt(x)$  from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\{\checkmark, \delta\}^*$  as follows :  $dt(x) = (\delta.\checkmark)^k$  if  $x$  is integral, and  $dt(x) = (\delta.\checkmark)^k.\delta$   
 825 otherwise. Then, for two reals  $x < y$ , the map  $dte(x, y)$  is the suffix that is added to  $dt(x)$   
 826 to obtain  $dt(y)$ . Last, the map  $f$  associates to a word  $w = (a_1, d_1) \dots (a_n, d_n)$  the word  
 827  $f(w) = w_1.a_1.w_2.a_2 \dots w_n.a_n$  where each  $w_i$  is the word  $w_i = dte(d_{i-1}, d_i)$ . The map  $f$  maps  
 828 global time elapse to a word of  $\checkmark$  and  $\delta$  but keeps actions unchanged. We define another map  
 829  $f_{\downarrow} : w \rightarrow \{\checkmark, \delta\}^*$  that maps every word  $w$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  to a word in  $\{\checkmark, \delta\}^*$  dropping the actions from  
 830  $f(w)$ . Consider for example, a word  $w = (a, 1.6)(b, 2.7)(c, 3.4)$  then,  $f(w) = \delta\checkmark\delta a\checkmark\delta b\checkmark\delta c$ ,  
 831 and  $f_{\downarrow}(w) = \delta\checkmark\delta\checkmark\delta\checkmark\delta$ . It is shown in [18] for two timed words  $\rho_1, \rho_2$  with  $f(\rho_1) = f(\rho_2)$   
 832 then  $\rho_1 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$  if and only if  $\rho_2 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ . It is also shown that we can construct a Marked  
 833 Timed Automaton (MA) from  $\mathcal{A}$  with one extra clock and polynomial increase in the number  
 834 of locations such that  $Unt(\mathcal{L}(MA)) = f(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}))$ . The MA of  $\mathcal{A}$  duplicates transitions of  $\mathcal{A}$  to  
 835 differentiate firing at integral/non integral dates, plus transitions that make time elapsing  
 836 visible using the additional clock which is reset at each global integral time stamp.

837 **Definition 24** (Marked Timed Automaton (MA)). Given a timed automaton  $\mathcal{A} = (L, L_0, X, \Sigma, T, F)$   
 838 the Marked Timed Automaton of  $\mathcal{A}$  is a tuple  $MA = (L', L'_0, X \cup \{n\}, \Sigma \cup \{\checkmark, \delta\}, T', F')$  such  
 839 that

- 840 i)  $n \notin X$   
 841 ii)  $L' = L^0 \cup L^+$  where for  $\alpha \in \{0, +\}$ ,  $L^\alpha = \{l^\alpha \mid l \in L\}$   
 842 iii)  $L'_0 = \{l^0 \mid l \in L_0\}$ ,  $F' = \{l^0, l^+ \mid l \in F\}$  and  

$$T' = \{(l^0, a, g \wedge n = 0?, R, l^0) \mid (l, a, g, R, l') \in E\}$$
  
 843 iv)  $T'$  is defined by  

$$\cup \{(l^+, a, g \wedge 0 < n < 1?, R, l^+) \mid (l, a, g, R, l') \in E\}$$
  

$$\cup \bigcup_{l \in L} \{(l^0, \delta, 0 < n < 1, \emptyset, l^+)\} \cup \bigcup_{l \in L} \{(l^+, \surd, n = 1?, \{n\}, l^0)\}$$

844 Then we have the following results.

845 ► **Theorem 25** ([18]Thm.5). *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a timed automaton and  $MA$  be its marked automaton.*  
 846 *Then  $Unt(\mathcal{L}(MA)) = f(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}))$*

847 ► **Remark 26.** The marked timed automaton of an IRTA is also an IRTA.

848 The proofs of resilience for IRTA will also rely on the following properties,

849 ► **Theorem 27** (Thm.3, [18]). *If  $\mathcal{A}$  is an IRTA and  $f(w) = f(w')$ , then  $w \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$  if and*  
 850 *only if  $w' \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$*

851 ► **Lemma 28.** *The timed suffix language of an IRTA  $\mathcal{A}$  can be recognized by an  $\varepsilon$ -IRTA  $\mathcal{A}^S$*

852 **Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{A} = (L, X, \Sigma, T, \mathcal{G}, F)$  be a timed automaton. We create an automaton  $\mathcal{A}^S =$   
 853  $(L^S, X, \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}, T^S, \mathcal{G}, F)$  as follows. We set  $L^S = L \cup L_\varepsilon$ , where  $L_\varepsilon = \{l_\varepsilon \mid l \in L\}$  i.e.,  $L^S$   
 854 contains a copy of locations in  $\mathcal{A}$  and another ‘‘silent’’ copy. The initial location of  $\mathcal{A}^S$  is  $l_{0,\varepsilon}$ .  
 855 We set  $T^S = T \cup T_\varepsilon \cup T'_\varepsilon$ , where  $T_\varepsilon = \{(l_\varepsilon, \varepsilon, true, \emptyset, l) \mid l \in L\}$  and  $T'_\varepsilon = \{(l_\varepsilon, \varepsilon, g, R, l'_\varepsilon) \mid$   
 856  $\exists (l, a, g, R, l') \in T\}$ . Clearly, for every timed word  $w = (a_1, d_1) \dots (a_i, d_i)(a_{i+1}, d_{i+1}) \dots (a_n, d_n)$   
 857 of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$  and index  $i$ , the word  $w' = (\varepsilon, d_1) \dots (\varepsilon, d_i)(a_{i+1}, d_{i+1}) \dots (a_n, d_n) = (a_{i+1}, d_{i+1}) \dots (a_n, d_n)$   
 858 is a recognized by  $\mathcal{A}^S$ , and it is easy to verify that  $\mathcal{A}^S$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -IRTA. ◀

859 ► **Lemma 29.** *For two IRTA  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  and their corresponding marked automata  $\mathcal{A}_M$  and*  
 860  *$\mathcal{B}_M$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B})$  if and only if  $untime(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_M)) \subseteq untime(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_M))$ .*


861 **Proof.** ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Assume,  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B})$  and assume there exists a word  $w \in untime(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_M))$ , but  
 862  $w \notin untime(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_M))$ . Now, there exists a timed word  $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$  such that,  $f(\rho) = w$ . Clearly,  
 863  $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B})$ , then clearly  $f(\rho) = w \in untime(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_M))$  a contradiction. So,  $untime(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_M)) \subseteq$   
 864  $untime(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_M))$ .

865 ( $\Leftarrow$ ) Assume,  $untime(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_M)) \subseteq untime(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_M))$ , and  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B})$ . Then, there  
 866 exists a timed word  $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$  such that  $\rho \notin \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B})$ . Assume  $f(\rho) = w$ , then clearly,  
 867  $w \in untime(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_M))$  and  $w \in untime(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_M))$ . So, there exists a timed word  $\rho' \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$   
 868 such that,  $f(\rho') = w = f(\rho)$ . According to Theorem 27 we can conclude that,  $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B})$  a  
 869 contradiction. ◀

870 ► **Remark 30.** Lemma 29 shows that the timed and untimed language inclusion problems  
 871 for IRTA are in fact the same problem. So, as we can solve the timed language inclusion  
 872 problem by solving an untimed language inclusion problem of IRTA and vice-versa, the  
 873 untimed language inclusion for IRTA is also EXPSPACE-Complete.

874 ► **Theorem 31.** *Timed  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilience of IRTA is EXPSPACE-Hard.*

875 **Proof.** We proceed by a reduction from the language inclusion problem of IRTA, known  
 876 to be EXPSPACE-Complete [4]. The idea of the proof follows the same lines as the  
 877 untimed  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilience of timed automata. Assume we are given IRTA  $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ .  $a, b, c$  are  
 878 symbols not in the alphabets of  $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ . Consider  $\mathcal{B}$  in Figure 8 (left). It is easy to see that




■ **Figure 8** The automaton  $B$  (left) and the faulty automaton  $B_{\mathcal{P}}$  (right)

879  $L(\mathcal{B}) = (a, 1)(b, 1)(c, 11)(L(\mathcal{A}_1) + 11)$ , where  $L(\mathcal{A}_1) + k = \{(a_1, d_1 + k)(a_2, d_2 + k) \dots (a_n, d_n + k) \mid$   
 880  $(a_1, d_1) \dots (a_n, d_n) \in L(\mathcal{A}_1)\}$ . Associate a fault model  $\mathcal{P}(a) = 1$ , where the fault of  $a$  is 1.  
 881 We construct an IRTA  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{P}}$  as shown in Figure 8 (right). Notice that in general, IRTAs are  
 882 not closed under the fault insertion; the enlarged transition in  $\mathcal{B}$  has guard  $1 \leq x \leq 2$ , and  
 883 resets  $y$ . This violates the integer reset condition; however, since a value  $1 < x < 2$  when  
 884 resetting  $y$  clearly does not lead to acceptance in  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{P}}$ , we prune away that transition resulting  
 885 in  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{P}}$  as in Figure 8 (right). This resulting faulty automaton is an IRTA.

886 The language accepted by  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{P}}$  is  $L(\mathcal{B}) \cup (a, 2)(b, 2)(c, 11)(L(\mathcal{A}_2) + 11)$ . Considering  $K = 2$ ,  
 887  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{P}}$  is BTN in 2 steps after the fault if and only if  $L(\mathcal{A}_2) \subseteq L(\mathcal{A}_1)$ . The EXPSPACE  
 888 hardness of the timed  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilience of IRTA follows from the EXPSPACE completeness of  
 889 the inclusion of IRTA. ◀

890 ▶ **Theorem 32.**  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilience for IRTA is PSPACE-Hard.

891 **Proof.** Consider an IRTA  $\mathcal{A}$  with alphabet  $\Sigma$  and the construction of an automata that  
 892 uses a gadget shown below in Figure 9 (left). Let us call this automaton  $\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}}$ . It  
 893 is easy to see that the  $L(\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}}) = (a, 1)(b, 1)(c, 11)((\Sigma \times \mathbb{R})^* + 11)$ , where  $L(\mathcal{A}_1) + k =$   
 894  $\{(a_1, d_1 + k)(a_2, d_2 + k) \dots (a_n, d_n + k) \mid (a_1, d_1) \dots (a_n, d_n) \in L(\mathcal{A}_1)\}$ . The  $\Sigma$  loop on a  
 895 particular accepting state  $q_e$  is responsible for acceptance of all timed word. Now, associate a  
 896 fault model  $\mathcal{P}(a) \rightarrow 1$  with  $\mathcal{B}$ , where the fault of  $a$  is 1. Let us call this enlarged automaton  
 897  $\mathcal{B}_{(\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A})_{\mathcal{P}}}$ . We can prune away the transition  $1 < x < 2$  resetting  $y$  which does not lead  
 898 to acceptance, and resulting in an IRTA with the same language, represented in Figure 9  
 899 (right). The language accepted by  $\mathcal{B}_{(\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A})_{\mathcal{P}}}$  is  $L(\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}}) \cup (a, 2)(b, 2)(c, 11)(L(\mathcal{A}) + 11)$ .  
 900 The accepting states are  $q_e \cup F$ , where  $F$  is the set of final states of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then  $\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}}$  is  
 901  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilient if and only if  $L(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$ . ◀



■ **Figure 9** The IRTA  $\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}}$  (left) and the faulty IRTA  $\mathcal{B}_{(\Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{A})_{\mathcal{P}}}$  (right)

902 ▶ **Remark 33.** The untimed language inclusion problem is shown to be EXPSPACE-Complete  
 903 in Remark 30. The emptiness checking of timed automata is done by checking the emptiness  
 904 of its untimed region automaton. So, to show the hardness of untimed  $K$ - $\forall$ -resilient or  
 905  $K$ - $\exists$ -resilient problems for IRTA, it is sufficient to reduce the untimed language inclusion  
 906 problem and untimed language emptiness problem of IRTA respectively. This reduction can  
 907 be done by using the same gadget as shown in Theorem 31 and Theorem 32 respectively.