



COMP 4161
NICTA Advanced Course

Advanced Topics in Software Verification

Toby Murray, June Andronick, Gerwin Klein

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

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
 - Inductively defined sets, rule induction [5]
 - Datatypes, recursion, induction [6, 7]
 - Hoare logic, proofs about programs, C verification [8^b,9]
 - (mid-semester break)
 - Writing Automated Proof Methods [10]
 - Isar, codegen, typeclasses, locales [11^c,12]

^aa1 due; ^ba2 due; ^ca3 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 vc
- separate program variables from Hoare triple (use extensible records), indicate usage as function syntactically
 - more syntactic overhead
 - program pieces compose nicely

Slide 8



DEMO

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:
 $a.length = length\ a$

Slide 10



Pointers



Choice 1

datatype $ref = Ref\ int\ | \ Null$
types $heap = int \Rightarrow val$
datatype $val = Int\ int\ | \ Bool\ bool\ | \ Struct_x\ int\ int\ bool\ | \dots$

- $hp :: heap, p :: ref$
- 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

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 $elem_hp = int \Rightarrow int$

- $next :: next_hp, elem :: elem_hp, p :: ref$
- Pointer access: $p \rightarrow next = next\ (the_addr\ p)$
- Pointer update: $p \rightarrow next := v = next := next\ ((the_addr\ p) := v)$
- a separate heap for each struct field
- buys you $p \rightarrow next \neq p \rightarrow elem$ 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