COMP4161: Advanced Topics in Software Verification

$\{P\} \ldots \{Q\}$

Gerwin Klein, June Andronick, Christine Rizkallah, Miki Tanaka

S2/2018

data61.csiro.au

Last Time

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

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
  - Inductively defined sets, rule induction [5]
  - Datatypes, recursion, induction [6, 7]
  - Hoare logic, proofs about programs, invariants [8[b],9]
  - (mid-semester break)
  - C verification [10]
  - CakeML, Isar [11[c]]
  - Concurrency [12]

[a] a1 due; [b] a2 due; [c] a3 due

Automation?

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

BUT:

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

Automation?

Invariant

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

Solution:

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

Example:

$$\{M = 0 \wedge N = 0\}$$
$$\text{WHILE } M \neq a \text{ INV } \{N = M * b\} \text{ DO } N := N + b; M := M + 1 \text{ OD}$$
$$\{N = a * b\}$$

Weakest Preconditions

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

With annotated invariants, easy to get:

$$
\begin{array}{lcl}
\text{pre SKIP } Q & = & Q \\
\text{pre } (x := a)\ Q & = & \lambda\sigma.\ Q(\sigma(x := a\sigma)) \\
\text{pre } (c_1; c_2)\ Q & = & \text{pre } c_1\ (\text{pre } c_2\ Q) \\
\text{pre } (\text{IF } b \text{ THEN } c_1 \text{ ELSE } c_2)\ Q & = & \lambda\sigma.\ (b \longrightarrow \text{pre } c_1\ Q\ \sigma) \wedge \\
 & & \quad (\neg b \longrightarrow \text{pre } c_2\ Q\ \sigma) \\
\text{pre } (\text{WHILE } b \text{ INV } I \text{ DO } c \text{ OD})\ Q & = & I
\end{array}
$$

Verification Conditions

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

These are called **verification conditions** vc c Q:

$$
\begin{array}{lcl}
\text{vc SKIP } Q & = & \text{True} \\
\text{vc } (x := a)\ Q & = & \text{True} \\
\text{vc } (c_1; c_2)\ Q & = & \text{vc } c_2\ Q \wedge (\text{vc } c_1\ (\text{pre } c_2\ Q)) \\
\text{vc } (\text{IF } b \text{ THEN } c_1 \text{ ELSE } c_2)\ Q & = & \text{vc } c_1\ Q \wedge \text{vc } c_2\ Q \\
\text{vc } (\text{WHILE } b \text{ INV } I \text{ DO } c \text{ OD})\ Q & = & (\forall \sigma.\ I\sigma \wedge b\sigma \longrightarrow \text{pre } c\ I\ \sigma) \wedge \\
& & (\forall \sigma.\ I\sigma \wedge \neg b\sigma \longrightarrow Q\ \sigma) \wedge \\
& & \text{vc } c\ I
\end{array}
$$

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

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

Demo

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.length = length a

Pointers

Choice 1

$$\begin{array}{lll} \textbf{datatype} & \text{ref} & = \text{Ref int} \mid \text{Null} \\ \textbf{types} & \text{heap} & = \text{int} \Rightarrow \text{val} \\ \textbf{datatype} & \text{val} & = \text{Int int} \mid \text{Bool bool} \mid \text{Struct\_x int int bool} \mid \ldots \end{array}$$

- ➜ hp :: heap, p :: ref
- ➜ Pointer access: *p = the_Int (hp (the_addr p))
- ➜ Pointer update: *p :== v = hp :== hp ((the_addr p) := v)

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

Pointers

Choice 2 (Burstall '72, Bornat '00)

Example: struct with next pointer and element

datatype	ref	= Ref int | Null
types	next_hp	= int ⇒ ref
types	elem_hp	= int ⇒ int

- ➜ next :: next_hp, elem :: elem_hp, p :: ref
- ➜ Pointer access: p→next = next (the_addr p)
- ➜ Pointer update: p→next :== v = next :== next ((the_addr p) := v)

In general:

- ➜ a separate heap for each struct field
- ➜ buys you p→next ≠ p→elem automatically (aliasing)
- ➜ still assumes type safe language

Demo

We have seen today ...

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

