



COMP 4161
NICTA Advanced Course

Advanced Topics in Software Verification

Gerwin Klein, June Andronick, Toby Murray, Rafal Kolanski

$\{P\} \dots \{Q\}$

Slide 1



Last Time

- Syntax of a simple imperative language
- Operational semantics
- Program proof on operational semantics
- Hoare logic rules
- Soundness of Hoare logic

Slide 2



Content

- Intro & motivation, getting started [1]
- Foundations & Principles
 - Lambda Calculus, natural deduction [1,2]
 - Higher Order Logic [3^a]
 - Term rewriting [4]
- Proof & Specification Techniques
 - Isar [5]
 - Inductively defined sets, rule induction [6^b]
 - Datatypes, recursion, induction [7^c, 8]
 - Calculational reasoning, code generation [9]
 - Hoare logic, proofs about programs [10^d, 11, 12]

^aa1 due; ^ba2 due; ^csession break; ^da3 due

Slide 3



Automation?

Last time: Hoare rule application is nicer than using operational semantic.

BUT:

- it's still kind of tedious
- it seems boring & mechanical

Automation?

Slide 4

Invariant



Problem: While – need creativity to find right (invariant) P

Solution:

- annotate program with invariants
- then, Hoare rules can be applied automatically

Example:

$$\{M = 0 \wedge N = 0\}$$

$$\text{WHILE } M \neq a \text{ INV } \{N = M * b\} \text{ DO } N := N + b; M := M + 1 \text{ OD}$$

$$\{N = a * b\}$$

Slide 5

Weakest Preconditions



pre $c Q$ = weakest P such that $\{P\} c \{Q\}$

With annotated invariants, easy to get:

$$\text{pre SKIP } Q = Q$$

$$\text{pre } (x := a) Q = \lambda\sigma. Q(\sigma(x := a\sigma))$$

$$\text{pre } (c_1; c_2) Q = \text{pre } c_1 (\text{pre } c_2 Q)$$

$$\text{pre } (\text{IF } b \text{ THEN } c_1 \text{ ELSE } c_2) Q = \lambda\sigma. (b \rightarrow \text{pre } c_1 Q \sigma) \wedge (\neg b \rightarrow \text{pre } c_2 Q \sigma)$$

$$\text{pre } (\text{WHILE } b \text{ INV } I \text{ DO } c \text{ OD}) Q = I$$

Slide 6

Verification Conditions



$\{\text{pre } c Q\} c \{Q\}$ only true under certain conditions

These are called **verification conditions** $\text{vc } c Q$:

$$\text{vc SKIP } Q = \text{True}$$

$$\text{vc } (x := a) Q = \text{True}$$

$$\text{vc } (c_1; c_2) Q = \text{vc } c_2 Q \wedge (\text{vc } c_1 (\text{pre } c_2 Q))$$

$$\text{vc } (\text{IF } b \text{ THEN } c_1 \text{ ELSE } c_2) Q = \text{vc } c_1 Q \wedge \text{vc } c_2 Q$$

$$\text{vc } (\text{WHILE } b \text{ INV } I \text{ DO } c \text{ OD}) Q = (\forall\sigma. I\sigma \wedge b\sigma \rightarrow \text{pre } c I \sigma) \wedge (\forall\sigma. I\sigma \wedge \neg b\sigma \rightarrow Q \sigma) \wedge \text{vc } c I$$

$$\text{vc } c Q \wedge (P \Rightarrow \text{pre } c Q) \Rightarrow \{P\} c \{Q\}$$

Slide 7

Syntax Tricks



- $x := \lambda\sigma. 1$ instead of $x := 1$ sucks
- $\{\lambda\sigma. \sigma x = n\}$ instead of $\{x = n\}$ sucks as well

Problem: program variables are functions, not values

Solution: distinguish program variables syntactically

Choices:

- declare program variables with each Hoare triple
 - nice, usual syntax
 - works well if you state full program and only use vcg
- separate program variables from Hoare triple (use extensible records), indicate usage as function syntactically
 - more syntactic overhead
 - program pieces compose nicely

Slide 8

Records in Isabelle

Records are a tuples with named components

Example:

```
record A = a :: nat
          b :: int
```

- Selectors: $a :: A \Rightarrow \text{nat}$, $b :: A \Rightarrow \text{int}$, $a \ r = \text{Suc } 0$
- Constructors: $(\lambda a = \text{Suc } 0, b = -1)$
- Update: $r(\lambda a := \text{Suc } 0)$

Records are extensible:

```
record B = A +
          c :: nat list
```

$(\lambda a = \text{Suc } 0, b = -1, c = [0, 0])$

Slide 9



Arrays

Depending on language, model arrays as functions:

- Array access = function application:
 $a[i] = a \ i$
- Array update = function update:
 $a[i] := v = a := a[i := v]$

Use lists to express length:

- Array access = nth:
 $a[i] = a \ ! \ i$
- Array update = list update:
 $a[i] := v = a := a[i := v]$
- Array length = list length:
 $a.\text{length} = \text{length } a$

Slide 10



Pointers

Choice 1

```
datatype ref = Ref int | Null
```

```
types heap = int  $\Rightarrow$  val
```

```
datatype val = Int int | Bool bool | Struct_x int int bool | ...
```

- $hp :: \text{heap}$, $p :: \text{ref}$
- Pointer access: $*p = \text{the_Int } (hp \ (\text{the_addr } p))$
- Pointer update: $*p := v = hp := hp \ ((\text{the_addr } p) := v)$

- a bit klunky
- gets even worse with structs
- lots of value extraction (the_Int) in spec and program

Slide 11



Pointers

Choice 2 (Burstall '72, Bornat '00)

struct with next pointer and element

```
datatype ref = Ref int | Null
```

```
types next_hp = int  $\Rightarrow$  ref
```

```
types elem_hp = int  $\Rightarrow$  int
```

- $\text{next} :: \text{next_hp}$, $\text{elem} :: \text{elem_hp}$, $p :: \text{ref}$
- Pointer access: $p \rightarrow \text{next} = \text{next } (\text{the_addr } p)$
- Pointer update: $p \rightarrow \text{next} := v = \text{next} := \text{next } ((\text{the_addr } p) := v)$

- a separate heap for each struct field
- buys you $p \rightarrow \text{next} \neq p \rightarrow \text{elem}$ automatically (aliasing)
- still assumes type safe language

Slide 12





DEMO

Slide 13

We have seen today ...



- Weakest precondition
- Verification conditions
- Example program proofs
- Arrays, pointers

Slide 14