Verification of the Detailed Design

Istvan Majzik majzik@mit.bme.hu

Budapest University of Technology and Economics Dept. of Measurement and Information Systems



Recap: Module design (detailed design)



Overview

- Preparation of the detailed design
 - Software construction
 - Module (component) design
- Verification techniques
 - Verification criteria
 - Static and dynamic techniques
- Introduction to formal verification

 Formal syntax and semantics
 Categorization of techniques

Preparation of the detailed design

Software construction Module (component) design

4

Software construction



Software construction

- To be designed:
 - System level algorithms for the interaction of modules
 - Global data structures
 - Refinement of module structure if needed
- Design (description) language:
 - Capturing interactions and information exchange (ordering, timeliness)
 - Representing (abstract / concrete) data structures
 - Characterized by modularity, abstraction, precision
 - Formal, semi-formal, structured languages
- Specific characteristics (in critical systems):
 - Fully defined interfaces
 - Module and parameter size / complexity limits
 - Information hiding

Software module (component) design



Software module design

- Detailed design of software modules
 - Algorithms
 - Data structures
- Design (description) language
 - Languages closer to implementation
 - Pseudo-code can also be used
 - Formal, semi-formal, structured languages
 - Description of the behavior is important: control flow automata, state machines, statecharts, activity diagrams

Verification techniques

Verification criteria Static checking Dynamic checking



Criteria for the verification of the detailed design

- Local characteristics of the design
 - Completeness, consistency, verifiability, feasibility
- Conformance to the outputs of previous steps
 - Behavioral properties specified earlier
 - Safety properties: "Something bad never happens"
 - Liveness properties: "Something good will eventually happen"
 - Conformance of abstract and refined behavior
 - Simulation, bisimulation, refinement relations
- Completeness of test plans

Static checking of the detailed design

- Review: Checklist, error guessing
- Structure based analysis
 - Control flow: complexity (e.g., McCabe metrics), structure (e.g., unreachable states), ...
 - Data flow: initialization and use of variables, ordering of access, ...
 - Boundary values: switching to different behavior
- Analysis of unwanted behavior
 - Potential unwanted influences, e.g. through reserved resources (CPU, memory)
- Symbolic execution
 - Identifying and checking inputs that lead to the execution of given program path(s)

Dynamic checking of the detailed design

- Prototype implementation and animation
 - Detection of problematic cases that require particular care in further analysis
- Simulation
 - Can we simulate all possible executions?
- Formal verification
 - \odot For proving properties
 - "Exhaustive" checking of the complete behavior
 - Formal methods
 - Formal languages: formal syntax and semantics
 - Formal techniques for verification

Introduction to formal verification

Formal syntax and semantics Categorization of techniques

Formal verification

- Use of mathematically precise techniques for verification (esp. from discrete mathematics, mathematical logic)
 - Formal language: Formal syntax and semantics
 - **Design** description (structure, behavior)
 - **Property** description (property specification)
 - Mathematical algorithm for verification
 - Checking design properties (e.g., ambiguity)
 - Checking changes in design (e.g., refinement)
 - Conformance of behavior and property descriptions
- Crucial aspect: Formalization of the real problem
 - Manual task
 - Simplification, abstraction is needed (it has to be validated)

Formal syntax

- Mathematical description: KS = (S, R, L) and AP, where $AP = \{P, Q, R, ...\}$ $S = \{s_1, s_2, s_3, ...s_n\}$ $R \subseteq S \times S$ $L: S \rightarrow 2^{AP}$
- BNF: BL ::= true | false | p∧q | p∨q
- Metamodel:
 - Abstract syntax: grammar rules
 - Concrete syntax: representation



Formal semantics (overview)

The meaning of the model following the syntax:

- Operational semantics: "for programmers"
 - Defines what happens during operation (computation)
 - Builds on simple notions of execution: states, events, actions, ...
 - E.g., to describe the state space for verification
- Axiomatic semantics: "for correctness proofs"
 - Predicate language + set of axioms + inference rules
 - E.g., for automated theorem prover tools
- Denotational semantics: "for compilers"
 - Mapping to a known domain, driven by the syntax
 - Known mathematical domain, e.g., computation sequence, control-flow graph, state set, ... and their operations (union, concatenation, etc.)
 - Analysis of the model: analysis of the underlying domain
 - E.g., for synthesis tasks

Models for formal verification

- Design models (with operational semantics)
 - Engineering (design) models:
 - E.g., DSL, SysML, UML with (semi-)formal semantics
 - Higher-level formal models:
 - Control oriented: automata, Petri nets, ...
 - Data processing oriented: dataflow networks, ...
 - Communication oriented: process algebra, ...
 - Basic mathematical models:
 - KS, KTS, LTS, finite state automata, Büchi automata
- Property descriptions
 - Higher level:
 - Time diagram, message sequence chart (MSC) variants
 - Lower level:
 - First order logic, temporal logic, reference automaton

Typical formal verification techniques

Models / techniques	Behavior description (basic model)	Property description (basic property)
Model checking	Kripke structure (KS), Kripke transition system (KTS)	Temporal logics, first order logics
Equivalence / refinement checking	Labeled transition system (LTS), finite automata	LTS, automata (as reference behavior)
Theorem proving	Deduction system	Theorem to be proved (first order logic)
Static analysis (abstract interpretation)	Kripke transition system, Control Flow Automaton (extracted from the program)	Assertion (first order logic)

The role of formal verification techniques



<u>м ú е д у</u> е т е м 1 7 8 2

Advantages and limitations of the techniques

- Model checking, equivalence/refinement checking
 - ☺ Fully automated, exhaustive checking
 - ☺ Construction of diagnostic trace (for debugging)
 - ^(C) State space exploration (handled partially)

Theorem proving

- ☺ Scalable for complex systems (e.g., by induction)
- \odot High expressive power
- Interactive (need hints, e.g., to find a proof strategy)
- ^(C) There is no diagnostic trace (counter-example)
- Static analysis (abstract interpretation)
 - ☺ Handling state space explosion by abstraction
 - 😕 Abstraction is hard to automate

Our goal



