



## A hierarchical approach to design a V2V intersection assistance system

Hycham Aboutaleb

System Engineer, Knowledge Inside <u>hycham.aboutaleb@k-inside.com</u>

#### Samuel Boutin

President and CTO, Knowledge Inside <u>sbo@k-inside.com</u>

#### Bruno Monsuez

Associate Professor, UEI, ENSTA Paristech <u>bruno.monsuez@ensta.fr</u>





#### Introduction

 Use cases are often used as thread of events
 → Unrelated to the system

➔ Unrelated to the system design.

- Use cases are described unitarily
   → Incomplete model
- System boundaries are not clear
   → Environment integration in the model?







#### Context

- Road junctions: 40-60% of accidents
- Complex problem : Huge number of possible scenarios
- Need: Manage the combinatorial explosion of possible use cases







### **Problem Positioning**

The complexity of these systems can be classified • into two categories: Complexity in space Ο Complexity in time Ο 00 Thus we need to all the scenarii and to ٠ classify th y in sp<mark>ace and time</mark> ie dimensions.





#### **Our Methodology**

- To deal with the complexity of the problem we need several reductions:
  - Structural Reduction
    - $\circ~$  Identify the system
    - Manage topologies diversity
  - **o** Dynamical Reduction
    - o Reduce to involved elements
    - Reduce using symmetry
  - **o** Behavioral Reduction
    - o Reduce to vehicles behavior
    - o Identify scenario constraints
  - **o** Decisional Reduction
    - $\circ~$  Identify decisions for the scenario
    - o Identify actions for the scenario





#### Structural Reduction Top Level: Environment





Complex Systems Design & Management 2010





#### Dynamic Reduction (1) First Level: Selecting the Vehicles

- Vehicles that have the same interval of time-to-collision might collide.
- Matching vehicles will communicate together only.
- Complexity is reduced to a maximum of 4 vehicles







# Dynamic Reduction (2) Second Level: Selecting pairs of vehicles (1)

- We take the perspective of a vehicle arriving at the intersection and call it *Subject Vehicle* (SV).
- All other vehicles are considered *Intruder Vehicles* (IV).
- This choice is completely arbitrary and in no way determines the priority of each vehicle.







Dynamic Reduction (2)
 Second Level: Selecting pairs of vehicles (2)







#### Behavioral Reduction (1) Third Level: Identifying all the Scenarii





#### Behavioral Reduction (2) Fourth Level: Managing priorities





- For each use case, manage the transition of the two vehicles by priority for each.
- The change of priority implies the passage from one state to another.



arKitect®





#### Decisional Reduction Fifth Level: Acting and deciding (1)



ar<mark>KI</mark>tect®





#### Decisional Reduction Fifth Level: Acting and deciding (2)







## Advantages of our approach

- Strong and intuitive link between use cases and functional architecture.
- Graphical traceability to check coherence.









#### Conclusion

- Despite the fact that use cases in themselves are quite intuitive, the process around them is a much bigger.
- The top-down approach that we followed leads to greater efficiency in complex tasks.
- The model-based design is a result of this decomposition.
- It is expected that the resulting system will be applicable to a wider range of accident scenarios.





#### Future Works

- Simulate (MIL, SIL): Verify the model through simulation, which needs to model and simulate a user behavior and his reactions to MMI messages in each situation.
- Code generation: From the detailed model and based on the use cases, an automatic code generation can be performed
- Estimate software design cost: an analysis for each elementary function can be performed. The cost should be assessed according to the hierarchical decomposition (analysis, design test for each level).





# Thanks for your Attention !!

## **QUESTIONS?**

Complex Systems Design & Management 2010