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- Goal: Improve Factory Acceptance Testing of Control Loops
  - Reduce manual work
  - Higher test quality (coverage)

- Business Case:
  - Process Phase: Factory Acceptance Testing of a Distributed Control System
  - SUT: Control Loop (simple but many)

- Solution Approach:
  - Functional Model Based Testing
  - System modeling with state machines
  - With model reuse
Application Context: Typical Distributed Control System

- 5-10 Process Control Stations (PCS)
- Within stations 1.000s-10.000s of Control Loops
- Control Loop software modules are instantiated from a repository of design templates
Factory Acceptance Testing in a Plant Delivery Process

- Last QA step before shipping and Site Acceptance Testing
- HW & SW installed and tested without physical process devices
  - HW: Process Control Stations, Cross connections, I/Os, Buses, ...
  - SW: measurement & actuation modules, control modules, alarms, interlocks, sequences, monitoring)
- Each control loop is tested **manually** by a test technician using the system’s debugging interfaces and Basic Design documents
  - 1000s of loops ➔ very labor intensive (“~100 testers working for weeks”)
- Potential for various forms of test automation

---


- Preliminary P&IDs
- Textual process descriptions
- Preliminary instrument lists
- Motor lists (EE)
- Refined source information
- Functional requirements
- Budgetary cost information
- I/O lists
- Functional descriptions
- Control diagrams
- Interlock diagrams,
- Sequence diagrams
- Configured PLC or DCS application
About Control Loops

- Handle a group of functions: measurement – control – device actuation, alarms, interlocks
- Cyclic software applications
- Instantiated from design templates consisting of proprietary Function Blocks
  - Configured with parameters and feature switches

HMI Screens and Faceplates

- Sequences
- Control Loop LIC200
- Control Loop LIC100
- Control Loop TIC100
- Control Loop FIC100
- Control Loop PIC300
- Safety, Aux Dev & Meas

Process and Instrumentation
Example SUT: Functional Description of LIC100 Control Loop

3.1.1 LIC100, Preheater Tank (B100) Surface Level Control

Measurement

L100 is used as level measurement.

Control

Surface level of the Tank is controlled using a limit controller. Desired level should be maintained within +/-5 mm or less around setpoint.

Actuation

An on/off valve Makeup Water Valve (Y101) is used as the controlling device.

User Interface

A display in operating station is needed.

Alarms

Warnings and alarms of surface level (LL, L, H, HH) should be produced.

Interlocks

Overflow of the tank should be prevented by using the level measurement’s (L100) HH alarm and, as a backup, a separate overflow switch (L101). Either of the two should close all inlet streams, including the customer line Y305.

Signals from other functions

- Information to other loops

LL-alarm is used in Preheater Pump’s (M100) interlock.

LL-alarm is used in Heater’s (E100) interlock.

+ design template specification

⇒ source material for testing
Anatomy of the LIC100 Control Loop Implementation

- Level control for a tank (LIC100PROG).
  - Level measurement (L100),
  - Hysteresis control (LIC100),
  - On/off valve control (Y101),
  - Overflow switch (L101) and
  - Device interlocks (Y101INT) for valve.
Testing Goals

■ Validate discrete functionality
  - Alarms,
  - Interlocks,
  - Mode changes (AUTO, MAN, SEQ, LOCAL, FORCED ON/OFF)

■ Discover execution cycle level anomalies
  - A wrong output from a control loop lasting one execution cycle
  - Most bugs appear during system discontinuities, e.g. when releasing interlocks back to normal operation.
  - E.g. Auto -> Forced control -> Auto etc...
  - May appear with design templates containing certain function blocks (FB), if not configured right.
    • Proportional-Integral-Derivative control FB
    • Motor control FB
    • Magnetic valve control FB
Test Model for Control Loop LIC100

- A subset of loop’s functionality modeled for testing
- Abstraction level is low → Model looks complicated, but test adapter is straightforward.
- Cyclic SUT Execution:
  1) read inputs,
  2) execute function blocks,
  3) write outputs
- System interface: one input port and message with 8 variables, one output port and message with 9 variables
- System states: AUTO, MANUAL, FORCED_CLOSE
Example of a Successful Test for Control Loop LIC100 (Filling Valve)

- Test Case 12 shows a bug
  - **Step 1**: interlock cause exists, but interlock feature is disabled. Loop control output is true/open. Loop stays in AUTO mode.
  - **Step 2**: interlock cause still exists, but now interlock feature is enabled. The loop’s control output (Y101_CtrlOut) is forced to false/close, although controller (LIC100_CtrlOn) tries to keep it true/open. **Failure**: The loop shows AUTO mode, although the interlock should have dropped it to MANUAL (= safe state).

  (In principle, remaining in AUTO mode may be dangerous. For example, when process technician goes to solve the case and removes the interlock cause, automation could 'suddenly' reactivate the device.)

- Luckily, this failure in mode output disappeared in next execution cycle. Thus, the bug can be classified as a 'single cycle anomaly', which, however, may have other undesired consequences.

MBT for Factory Acceptance Testing (Model Reuse Concept)

- MBT modeling is done offline, based on Template library (‘domain engineering’)
- Library MBT model and tests are configured with control loop instance parameters (‘application engineering’).

![Diagram showing the process flow]

- Repository of components
- Source for MBT modeler
- Source for application designer

- Create MBT model for control loop template specification
- Configure MBT model for control loop instance
- Control loop instance data
- Load application
- Systems Under Test (control loop instances)

**Functional Requirements (Basic Design)**
- Create MBT model for control loop template specification
- Configure application
- Based on Functional Requirements
- Using library templates

**Test Management**
- Configure MBT model for control loop instance
- Control loop instance data

**Test Execution**
- Systems Under Test (control loop instances)
Integrating MBT with Automatic Test Execution

- **MBT Test Design Tool**
  - Conformiq Designer

- **Test Execution Framework**
  - Generated test suite as JUnit code
  - Test suite imported in Eclipse Java project
  - Harness code linked to test adapter with OPC UA

- **OPC Middleware**
  - UA Gateway
  - DA Server from PLC manufacturer

- **PLC Runtime**
  - SUT interface is a set of global PLC variables accessed via PLC’s OPC server
  - SUT is a PLC or DCS program or a set of programs under one cyclic execution task.
  - Execution cycle of the SUT is synchronized with test case steps (1 to 1).
Conclusions and Summary

- We have executed tests on process control loops and shown that the approach finds realistic bugs, often hard to find using manual methods.
  - Control loops in a Multiprog PLC (Aalto’s process control loop library)
  - Control loops in MetsoDNA (Metso’s template library)

- It is easy to conclude that the effort of modeling each control loop instance separately is non-feasible for FAT of 1000s of control loops.

- Control system’s reuse approach (design templates) can be followed also by MBT: Model only once on template level and configure the model for (similar groups of) control loop instances
  - Basically, configuration information is retrieved from engineering system and used to generate parts of the MBT model’s code (containing configuration parameters)
  - MBT model may also focus on some specific aspect/functionality of multiple templates. E.g. several templates share similar state behavior

- Final stage for customizing tests to control module instances is during test execution at test adaptation layer (data driven)

- Further steps:
  - Demonstrating MBT model configuration and/or data driven test execution
  - More complex control loop case to study the potential and limits of applicability
  - Allocating simple mass testing to keyword & data driven test automation
Thank you!
Questions?

elec.aalto.fi/
www.metsoautomation.com/
conformiq.com/
tekes.fi/en/
Test scope: Function Block, Case FB type AI_3

Analog input FB type has the purpose of receiving a measurement value from a specified global variable (process interface) and providing it as a (named) scaled signal to the automation application. This type also supports alarms, filtering, auto/man/sim modes and zeroing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port name</th>
<th>Port usage</th>
<th>Port data type</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TagName</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>STRING</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Name of the circuit. E.g. &quot;L100&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RngInMin</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Source signal range minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RngInMax</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Source signal range maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RngOutMin</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Measurement range minimum in engineering units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RngOutMax</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Measurement range maximum in engineering units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EngUnit</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>STRING</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Unit of produced measurement value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlLimHH</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Alarm limit in engineering units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlLimH</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-&quot;-&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlLimL</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-&quot;-&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlLimLL</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-&quot;-&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlLimHyst</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Alarm is set off when value is this much on the safe side of the limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlTxt</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>STRING</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Text string used to parsing Alarm message output.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlDelay</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Delay for alarm to trigger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FilterType</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Value selects filtering mechanism, 0: no filtering, 1: reserved, 2: reserved, N: average of N consecutive samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SetModeAuto</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>BOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Automatic mode when rising edge detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SetModeMan</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>BOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manual mode when rising edge detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SetModeSim</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>BOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation mode when true, else auto or man mode.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measin</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>UINT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Source analogue input channel for measurement data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeasMan</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measurement value, when in MAN mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZeroMeas</td>
<td>VAR_INPUT</td>
<td>BOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Force output to zero when true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CurModeVal</td>
<td>VAR_OUTPUT</td>
<td>STRING</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shows current operating mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeasVal</td>
<td>VAR_OUTPUT</td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measurement value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlrmEvtHH</td>
<td>VAR_OUTPUT</td>
<td>BOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alarm is on (MeasVal&gt;=hh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlrmEvtH</td>
<td>VAR_OUTPUT</td>
<td>BOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alarm is on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlrmEvtL</td>
<td>VAR_OUTPUT</td>
<td>BOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alarm is on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlrmEvtLL</td>
<td>VAR_OUTPUT</td>
<td>BOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alarm is on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlrmEvtQ</td>
<td>VAR_OUTPUT</td>
<td>BOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alarm for measured signal's quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlrmEvtMsg</td>
<td>VAR_OUTPUT</td>
<td>STRING</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alarm message</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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First model "Hello MBT World!"

Low abstraction, because SUT interface (FB IOs / OPC variables) was the mental starting point.

Test Model for AI_3 (analog measurement composite FB)
Control Loop LIC100 Interface and Complexity Metrics

- In: number of FB inputs (In=Par+Dyn)
- Par = Parameter inputs
- Dyn = Dynamic inputs (change during runtime)
- Out = number of FB outputs
- Out2 = relevant outputs (e.g. string messages excluded)
- FBs = number of contained Function Blocks
- CONs = number of connections / “wires”
- LOC = lines of code in user blocks implemented with ST
- FBs/IOs = FBs/(Dyn+Out2), a complexity metric of a block

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Tag Name</th>
<th>POU Type</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Par</th>
<th>Dyn</th>
<th>Out</th>
<th>Out2</th>
<th>FBs</th>
<th>CONs</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>FBs/IOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIC100PROG</td>
<td>L100</td>
<td>AI_3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>3,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIC100PROG</td>
<td>L101</td>
<td>BI_2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIC100PROG</td>
<td>LIC100</td>
<td>LC_3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIC100PROG</td>
<td>Y101</td>
<td>OOA_3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIC100PROG</td>
<td>Y101INT</td>
<td>INT_3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIC100PROG</td>
<td>LIC100PROG</td>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIC100PROG</td>
<td>LIC100PROG</td>
<td>Test Interface</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Test Model for WP Master Sequence

- First model which starts almost purely from thinking of the required behavior, instead of an existing SUT interface.
- "Test Driven Development"
- Modeler’s thinking rises more easily to a more abstract level. That is, above PLC variables.
- If S88 kind of interface existed in modelers thinking, that would probably be used in the model.
- (HPP Main Sequence is embedded in a state.)
Test Model for WP Master Sequence

- Sequence hierarchy: Master, Main, Step
- Trying to build generic models for Main and Step. Then reuse them.
- UML State Chart notation works well in this scenario
- This SUT has no implementation. The model is a draft.