# **NICTA**

NICTA

# COMP 4161 NICTA Advanced Course

# Advanced Topics in Software Verification

Gerwin Klein, June Andronick, Toby Murray, Rafal Kolanski

С

Slide 1

Last Time

- ➔ Weakest preconditions
- ➔ Verification conditions
- ➔ Arrays, pointers
- → Hard part: finding invariants

| Content  |                                      |
|--|--------------------------------------|
|  | NICIA                                |
| → Intro & motivation, getting started                              | [1]                                  |
| → Foundations & Principles   |                                      |
| <ul> <li>Lambda Calculus, natural deduction</li> </ul>             | [1,2]                                |
| Higher Order Logic   | [3]                                  |
| Term rewriting   | [4 <sup><i>a</i></sup> ]             |
| → Proof & Specification Techniques                                 |                                      |
| <ul> <li>Inductively defined sets, rule induction</li> </ul>       | [5]                                  |
| <ul> <li>Datatypes, recursion, induction</li> </ul>                | [6, 7]                               |
| <ul> <li>Automated proof and disproof</li> </ul>                   | [7]                                  |
| <ul> <li>Hoare logic, proofs about programs, refinement</li> </ul> | [8 <sup>b</sup> ,9 <sup>c</sup> ,10] |
| Isar, locales  | [11 <sup>d</sup> ,12]                |

<sup>a</sup>a1 due; <sup>b</sup>a2 due; <sup>c</sup>session break; <sup>d</sup>a3 due

Slide 3

# Program Verification



# So far:

- → have verified functional programs written in HOL
- → learned about verifying imperative programs with Hoare Logic

# Next few lectures:

→ real C programs

Slide 2

Slide 4

1



# Main new problems in verifying C programs:

- → expressions with side effects
- → more control flow (do/while, for, break, continue, return)
- → local variables and blocks
- ➔ functions & procedures
- → concrete C data types
- → C memory model and C pointers

C is not a nice language for reasoning.

Things are going to get ugly.

Slide 5

# Approach NICTA

# Approach for verifying C programs:

Translate into existing, clean imperative language in Isabelle.

### Simpl:

- → generic imperative language by Norbert Schirmer, TU Munich
- → state space and basic expressions/statements can be instantiated
- → has operational semantics
- $\label{eq:hoare}$  Hoare logic with soundness and completeness proof
- → automated vcg
- → available from the Archive of Formal Proofs http://afp.sf.net



NICTA

type\_synonym 's bexp = "'s set"

Commands in Simpl

| datatype ('s, 'p, 'f) com =          |               |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Skip                                 |               |
| Basic "'s => 's"                     |               |
| Spec "('s * 's) set"                 |               |
| Seq "('s ,'p, 'f) com" "('s,'p,'f) c | om"           |
| Cond "'s bexp" "('s,'p,'f) com" "('  | s,'p,'f) com" |
| While "'s bexp" "('s,'p,'f) com"     |               |
| Call 'p                              |               |
| DynCom "'s => ('s,'p,'f) com"        |               |
| Guard 'f "'s bexp" "('s,'p,'f) com"  |               |
| Throw                                |               |
| Catch "('s,'p,'f) com" "('s,'p,'f) c | om"           |

's = state, 'p = procedure names, 'f = faults

Slide 7



DEMO: SIMPL



Almost all of C can be translated into Simpl.

This is the plan for today.

# Control flow



do { c } while (condition);

# Already can treat normal while-loops! Automatically translate into:

c; while (condition) { c }

### Similarly:

for (init; condition; increment) { c }

# becomes

}

init; while (condition) { c; increment; }

Slide 11

Slide 9



More control flow: break/continue NICTA while (condition) { foo; if (Q) continue; bar; if (P) break; Non-local control flow: continue goes to condition, break goes to end. Can be modelled with exceptions: → throw exception continue, catch at end of body.

→ throw exception break, catch after loop.

Slide 10

# Exceptions NICTA

Do not exist in C, but can be used to model C constructs.

Exceptions can be modelled with two kinds kinds of state:

- → normal states as before
- → abrupt states an exception was raised, normal commands are skipped.

### Simpl commands:

- → throw: switch to abrupt state
- → try { c1 } catch { c2 }: if c1 terminates abruptly, execute c2, otherwise execute only c1.

Use state to store which exception was thrown.

Slide 13

# Break/continue Dreak/continue example becomes: try { while (condition) { try { foo; if (Q) { exception = 'continue'; throw; } bar; if (P) { exception = 'break'; throw; } } catch { if (exception == 'continue') SKIP else throw; } } } catch { if (exception == 'break') SKIP else throw; }

# This is not C any more. But it models C behaviour!

Need to be careful that only the translation has access to exception state.

Slide 14

# Return



if (P) return x; foo; return y;

# Similar non-local control flow. Similar solution: use throw/try/catch

```
try {
    if (P) { return_val = x; exception = 'return'; throw; }
    foo;
    return_val = y; exception = 'return'; throw;
} catch {
    SKIP
}
```

Slide 15

# Hoare Rules for Exceptions



Need new kind of Hoare triples to model normal and abrupt state:

# $\{P\}\;f\;\{Q\},\{E\}$

- If P holds initially, and
- $\rightarrow$  f terminates in state Normal s, then Q s;
- $\rightarrow$  f terminates in state Abrupt s, then E s

# Hoare Rules:





call init body restore result =

DynCom ( $\lambda$ s. init; body; DynCom ( $\lambda$ t. restore s t; result t))

**Example:** for procedure  $f(x) = \{ r = x + 2 \}$ 

 $y = \text{CALL } f(7) \quad \equiv \text{call } (x = 7) \ (r = x + 2) \ (\lambda s \ t. \ s \ (| \ \text{globals} := \text{globals} \ t \ |)) \ (\lambda t. \ y = r \ t)$ 

# Slide 20

# Verifying Procedures NICTA

Simple idea: replace/inline body. Does not work for recursion.

### Instead:

- → introduce assumed specifications for procedures
- → outside call: no specification known, user provided
- → but: can assume current specification for recursive call
- ➔ works like induction
- → is proved by induction on the recursive call depth

We have seen today ..



- → C control flow
- → Exceptions with Hoare logic rules
- → C functions and procedures with Hoare logic rules

Slide 21 Slide 23

DEMO: PROCEDURES