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Formal Methods Education

Formal specification and verification of programs/algorithms.

- Specification $S$, program/algorithm $P^A$ with annotations $A$.
  - $S$: Pre- and post-conditions.
  - $A$: Loop invariants, termination measures.
- Derive set of verification conditions $VC = vc(P^A, S)$.
  - Verification condition generator $vc$.
- Proof of $VC$ often fails because it is actually invalid.
  - Error in program.
  - Specification does not match program.
  - Loop invariant too strong or too weak.

Most time spent in trying to prove something which is not true.
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Program Verification (Classical)

Annotated Program $P^A$

Specification $S$

Verification Conditions $VC_i$

Only when proving $VC_i$, we learn whether $P, A, S$ “match”.

$P^A + S \rightarrow VC_i$
Soundness of Verification

- **Program** $P \ldots$ command
  - Program semantics $\llbracket P \rrbracket \subseteq \text{State} \times \text{State}$

- **Specification** $S \ldots$ formula
  - Specification semantics $\llbracket S \rrbracket \subseteq \text{State} \times \text{State}$

- **Verification Condition** $VC_i \ldots$ formula
  - Condition semantics $\llbracket VC_i \rrbracket \in \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$

$$\llbracket VC_i \rrbracket \Rightarrow \forall s, s' \in \text{State} : \llbracket P \rrbracket(s, s') \Rightarrow \llbracket S \rrbracket(s, s')$$

If the verification conditions are valid, the state transitions performed by the program are allowed by the specification.
Program Reasoning (Alternative)

\[ \begin{align*}
P^A & \rightarrow \mathcal{Q} \quad F \\
\downarrow & \\
& F + S \rightarrow F \Rightarrow S \\
& TC_1 \\
& \ldots \\
& TC_n
\end{align*} \]

- Annotated program \( P^A \)
- Transition formula \( F \)
- Specification \( S \)
- Verification Condition \( F \Rightarrow S \)
- Translation Conditions \( TC_1, \ldots, TC_n \)

\( F \) is the “semantic essence” of \( P^A \) open for investigation.
Soundness of Translation

- **Program** $P \ldots$ command
  - Program semantics $[P] \subseteq State \times State$

- **Formula** $F \ldots$ formula
  - Formula semantics $[F] \subseteq State \times State$

- **Translation Conditions** $TC_i \ldots$ formula
  - Condition semantics $[TC_i] \in \{true, false\}$

\[
[TC_i] \Rightarrow \forall s, s' \in State : [P](s, s') \Rightarrow [F](s, s')
\]

If the translation conditions are valid, the state transitions performed by the program are captured by the formula.
We introduce formulas that denote state relations.

- Talk about a pair of states (the pre-state and the post-state).
- old $x$: “the value of program variable $x$ in the pre-state”.
- $\text{var } x$: “the value of program variable $x$ in the post-state”.

We introduce the logical judgment $c : \left[ f \right]_{g,h}^{xs}$

- If the execution of $c$ terminates normally, the resulting post-state is related to the pre-state as described by $f$.
- Every variable $y$ not listed in the set of variables $xs$ has the same value in the pre-state and in the post-state.

$$c : f \land \text{var } y = \text{old } y \land \ldots$$

- VCs $g$ (state relation) and $h$ (state condition).

$x := x + 1 : [ \text{var } x = \text{old } x + 1 ]^x$

$x := x+1 : \text{var } x = \text{old } x+1 \land \text{var } y = \text{old } y \land \text{var } z = \text{old } z \land \ldots$
State Relation Rules

\[
\begin{align*}
&c: [f]^{xs}_{g,h} \quad x \notin xs \\
&c: \left[ f \land \text{var } x = \text{old } x \right]^{xs \cup \{x\}}_{g,h}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
e \simeq_h t \\
x = e: [\text{var } x = t]^{\{x\}}_{\text{true}, h}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&c: [f]^{xs}_{g,h} \\
&\{\text{var } x; c\}: \left[ \exists x_0, x_1: f[x_0/\text{old } x, x_1/\text{var } x] \right]^{xs\setminus x}_{g, \forall x: h[x/\text{old } x]}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&c_1: [f_1]^{xs}_{g_1,h_1} \\
&c_2: [f_2]^{xs}_{g_2,h_2} \\
&\text{PRE}(c_1, h_2) = h_3 \\
&\{c_1; c_2\}: \left[ \exists ys: f_1[ys/\text{var } xs] \land f_2[ys/\text{old } xs] \right]^{xs}_{g_1 \land g_2, h_1 \land h_3}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&e \simeq_h f_e \\
&c_1: [f_1]^{xs}_{g_1,h_1} \\
&c_2: [f_2]^{xs}_{g_2,h_2} \\
&\text{if (e) then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2: [\text{if } f_e \text{ then } f_1 \text{ else } f_2]^{xs}_{g_1 \land g_2, h \land \text{if } f_e \text{ then } h_1 \text{ else } h_2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&e \simeq_h f_e \\
&c: [f_e]^{xs}_{g_c,h_c} \\
&g \equiv \forall xs, ys, zs: f[xs/\text{old } xs, ys/\text{var } xs] \land f_e[ys/\text{old } xs] \land f_c[ys/\text{old } xs, zs/\text{var } xs] \Rightarrow h[ys/\text{old } xs] \land f[xs/\text{old } xs, zs/\text{var } xs]
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{while (e)}^{f,t} c: [f \land \neg f_e[\text{var } xs/\text{old } xs]]^{xs}_{f_c \land g, h \land f[\text{old } xs/\text{var } xs]}
\end{align*}
\]
The program computes for non-negative $n$ the sum from 1 to $n$. 
The RISC ProgramExplorer

- An integrated program reasoning environment.
  - Programming language MiniJava.
  - Theory/specification language in the style of PVS/CVC.
  - Semi-automatic proving assistant RISC ProofNavigator.

- Semantics view.
  - Semantics of a method body.
  - Pre/post-condition reasoning.

- Analyze view (verification tasks).
  - Type checking conditions.
  - Statement preconditions.
  - Loop invariants.
  - Method frame preservation.
  - Method termination.
  - Method postcondition.

- Verify view.
  - Proof construction and management.
The RISC ProgramExplorer

http://www.risc.jku.at/research/formal/software/ProgramExplorer
1. The RISC ProgramExplorer

2. The RISC Algorithm Language (RISCAL)

3. Conclusions
Verifying via Checking Finite Instances

A step-wise approach to verification.

  - Parameter $n \in \mathbb{N}$ bounds size of variable domain $D[n]$.
    - May have different bounds for different domains.
  - Value of parameter is arbitrarily large (not fixed in program).
- Program operates over a finite domain.
  - Can be executed for all inputs of the domain.
- Specification and annotations are decidable.
  - By evaluating their semantics over the domain.

Structure of program/specification can be used for the validation of correctness before its actual verification.
Verifying via Checking Finite Instances


- **Testing**
  - Run $P[c]$ with some input $i \in D[c]$ and watch output.
  - Validate informal correctness of program for some inputs.

- **Runtime assertion checking**
  - Additionally evaluate $A[c]$ and $S[c]$ and report violations.
  - Validate formal correctness of program for some inputs.

- **Model checking**
  - Runtime assertion checking for every input $i \in D[c]$.
  - Validate formal correctness for all inputs in $D[c]$.
    - May detect that $A[c]$ respectively $S[c]$ is too strong.

- **Generate verification condition** $VC[c] = vc(P^A[c], S[c])$.
  - Decidable by evaluation or SMT solver.
    - May detect that $A[c]$ is too weak.

Verifying via Checking Finite Instances


- Prove $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \ VC[n]$
  - Computer-assisted reasoning again.
  - But now, by previous validation, high chance of being valid.

The RISC Algorithm Language (RISCAL)

- Formal theory and algorithm specification language.
  - Static type system with parameterized domains $T[n]$.
  - Functions (implicit, explicit, recursive).
  - Predicates (explicit, recursive).
  - Theorems (predicates claimed to be always true).
  - Procedures (functions defined by commands).
  - Pre-/post-conditions, loop invariants, termination measures.

- Non-deterministic semantics.
  - Implicit function definitions and non-deterministic choices.

- Formulas currently decided by evaluation.
  - (Parallel) model checker to validate theories and algorithms.

- Future work on generation of VCs and their verification.
  - Decidable by evaluation and by SMT solvers.

- Ultimately extension to proof-based verification.

Implementation based on semantics of programs and formulas.
Example

val n: ℕ;
type Literal = ℤ[-n,n];
...
type Formula = Set[Clause];
...
theorem notValid(f:Formula) … ⇐ valid(f) ⇐ ¬satisfiable(not(f));
pred satisfiable(f:Formula) ⇐ ∃v:Valuation. valuation(v) ∧ satisfies(v,f);
fun substitute(f:Formula,l:Literal):Formula = {c\{-l} | c ∈ f with ¬(l ∈ c)};
...
multiple pred DPLL(f:Formula)
   requires formula(f); ensures result ⇐ satisfiable(f);
   decreases |literals(f)|;
   ⇐
   if f = ⊘[Clause] then
     ⊤
   else if ⊘[Literal] ∈ f then
     ⊥
   else
     choose l ∈ literals(f) in
     DPLL(substitute(f,l)) ∨ DPLL(substitute(f,-l));
Semantics-based Implementation

\[ \text{ComSem} := \text{Single} + \text{Multiple} \]

\[ \text{Single} := \text{Command} \rightarrow (\text{Context} \rightarrow \text{Context}) \]

\[ \text{Multiple} := \text{Command} \rightarrow (\text{Context} \rightarrow \text{Seq}(\text{Context})) \]

\[ \text{Seq}(T) := \text{Unit} \rightarrow (\text{Null} + \text{Next}(T, \text{Seq}(T))) \]

```java
public static interface ComSem {
    public interface Single extends ComSem, Function<Context, Context> { }
    public interface Multiple extends ComSem, Function<Context, Seq<Context>> { }
}
public interface Seq<T> extends Supplier<Seq.Next<T>> { 
    // public Seq.Next<T> get();
    public final static class Next<T> {
        public final T head; public final Seq<T> tail;
        ...
    }
}
```

Non-deterministic semantics based on lazy sequences.
The RISCAL Software

http://www.risc.jku.at/research/formal/software/RISCAL
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Conclusions

- RISC ProgramExplorer in use since 2011.
  - Regular course “Formal Methods in Computer Science” for master students of computer science and mathematics.
  - Students master specifications and verifications of moderate to medium difficulty.
  - Main challenge is to get the invariants right.
  - Some profit from formal semantics view, but also quite a few seem to consider this as a superfluous “extra”.
  - Soon to be used in the course mentioned above.
  - Sample contents currently being developed by students (discrete mathematics, computer algebra, number theory).
  - Very positive feedback due to “full automation”.
  - Further development in the frame of LOGTECHEDU.
    - LIT: Linz Institute of Technology of the JKU.