Program Analysis and Code Verification

http://d3s.mff.cuni.cz

Pavel Parízek

Department of Distributed and Dependable Systems

CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE

faculty of mathematics and physics

Language

- Lectures: English
- Labs: English

- Homework: Czech/English
- Final exam: Czech/English

- Questions: Czech/English

Software bugs and errors

- Race condition
- Deadlock
- Null pointer dereference
- Array index out of bounds

  ...

- Firefox crashes
- Blue screen of death

  ...

- Train accident

Why bugs matter ?

- Mission- and safety-critical systems
  - Industry: robots, assembly lines
  - Transportation: cars, trains, airplanes

- Embedded systems
  - Mobile phones, tablets, household appliances, consumer electronics

Detecting bugs

- Software testing is not enough
  - Pros: scalable, precise, well-established (industry)
  - Cons: very expensive (people, money), selected executions, bugs depend on thread interleaving
- Program verification
  - Pros: coverage, multi-threaded programs
  - Cons: precision, scalability, performance

Tools

- Java Pathfinder (https://github.com/javapathfinder/jpf-core/wiki/)
  - exhaustive state space traversal of Java
- CHESS (https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/project/chess-find-and-reproduce-heisenbugs-in-concurrent-programs/)
  - systematic testing of multi-threaded programs in C#
- SLAM/SDV (https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/project/slam/)
  - software model checking for Windows device drivers
- KLEE (http://klee.github.io/)
  - symbolic execution for low-level C programs (e.g., Linux binutils)
- CBMC (http://www.cprover.org/cbmc/)
  - bounded model checking for system programs in C and C++
- Spec# (https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/project/spec/)
  - behavior specification language for C# + deductive methods
- Code Contracts (https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/project/code-contracts/)
  - behavior specification language for C# + abstract interpretation
- Soot, WALA and LLVM (https://sable.github.io/soot/, https://wala.github.io/, http://llvm.org/)
  - static analysis frameworks/libraries for Java and C/C++
- Infer (http://fbinfer.com/)
  - static analysis and bug-finding tool for Java, C/C++ and Objective-C

Goals of the course

- Show algorithms and tools for program analysis, verification, and bug detection

- Practical experience with selected tools

Department of Distributed and Dependable Systems

Why you should attend

- Basic knowledge of the main program analysis and verification techniques
  - Key aspects: scalability, coverage, automation, ...

- Current state of the art
  - How good or bad the tools are

Program

- Model checking of programs
- Detecting concurrency errors
- Symbolic execution
- Dynamic analysis
- Deductive methods (SAT solvers, SMT solvers)
- Bounded model checking
- Predicate abstraction and CEGAR
- Selected applications of deductive methods in software verification
  - Verification of program code against contracts
- Static analysis and its usage in program verification
- Abstract interpretation
- Combination of verification techniques
- Program termination
- Program synthesis

Theoretical limitations

Know your enemy !!

Know your enemy !!

Kurt Gödel
(1906-1978)

Alan Turing
(1912-1954)

Know your enemy !!

Completeness theorem

$T \models f \;\; \Rightarrow \;\; T \vdash f$

Incompleteness theorem

For "interesting" theories *T*

$\exists f$: ($T \nvdash f$) ∧ ($T \nvdash \neg f$)

*"Halting problem is **undecidable**"*

What do they really say ?

Completeness theorem (CT)

$T \vDash f \;\Rightarrow\; T \vdash f$

Incompleteness theorem (IT)

For "interesting" theories *T*

$\exists f: (T \nvdash f) \wedge (T \nvdash \neg f)$

Claim:

The completeness and incompleteness theorems contradict.

1) Let's take *f* from **IT**
2) Any *f* either holds or not: $(T \vDash f) \vee (T \vDash \neg f)$
3) From **CT** follows: $(T \vdash f) \vee (T \vdash \neg f)$
4) **Contradiction**

What do they really say ?

Completeness theorem (CT)

$T \vDash f \;\Rightarrow\; T \vdash f$

Incompleteness theorem (IT)

For "interesting" theories T

$\exists f$: $(T \nvdash f) \wedge (T \nvdash \neg f)$

$T \vDash f$

in all models of T, f holds

$T \vDash \neg f$

in all models of T, f doesn't hold

$T \nvDash f \wedge T \nvDash \neg f$

there is a model of T where f holds and a model where f doesn't hold

1) Let's take f from **IT**
2) ~~Any f either holds or not: $(T \vDash f) \vee (T \vDash \neg f)$~~
3) From **CT** follows: $(T \vdash f) \vee (T \vdash \neg f)$
4) **Contradiction**

What do they really say ?

Completeness theorem

$T \models f \;\Rightarrow\; T \vdash f$

Incompleteness theorem

For "interesting" theories *T*

$\exists f$: $(T \nvdash f) \wedge (T \nvdash \neg f)$

Claim:

~~*The completeness and incompleteness theorems contradict.*~~

What do they really say ?

*"Halting problem is **undecidable**"*

Claim:
*Given a program **A** and input data **D**, you can never decide whether **A**(**D**) terminates or not.*

What do they really say ?

*“Halting problem is **undecidable**”*

Claim:
*Given a program **A** and input data **D**, you can never decide whether **A**(**D**) terminates or not.*

Sometimes you can. Consider:

```
void main() {
	printf(“Going to halt right away!\n”);
}
```

What do they really say ?

*“Halting problem is **undecidable**”*

Claim:

*You can never construct a general algorithm that would for any program **A** and any input data **D** always answer YES if **A**(**D**) terminates.*

What do they really say ?

*“Halting problem is **undecidable**”*

Claim:

*You can never construct a general algorithm that would for any program **A** and any input data **D** always answer YES if **A**(**D**) terminates.*

Yes, you can (but it may not terminate). Consider:

```
void main(program A, data D) {
        ... simulate A(D) ...
        printf(“YES”);
}
```

What do they really say ?

*"Halting problem is **undecidable**"*

Claim:

There is no general algorithm that would always terminate and solve the halting problem for all programs and all inputs.

Consequences

- Program verification (analysis) is undecidable
  - Example: assertion checking for multi-threaded programs with procedures

- But, in practice, ...
  - Many interesting properties can be successfully verified for many interesting programs

Consequences

- It may take very long
  - Out of reach of current hardware and user patience
  - More than the expected age of the known universe
  - Definitely past the hard deadline of your project

- But there is still hope
  - Full verification is not always necessary
  - Search for errors (detect some bugs)

Department of Distributed and Dependable Systems

Grading

- Five homeworks
  - Each will be awarded with 0-20 points
  - No. 5: presenting research publication
- Final exam (voluntary)
  - Awarded with 0-25 points
  - Basic principles (algorithms, theory)
  - Comparing different techniques

- Result
  - 85-125 → excellent
  - 72-84 → very good
  - 60-71 → good

Homework assignments

- Deadlines are strict
  - We will deduct 10% of your points total for every calendar day your assignment is late
- You have to do homework no. 5 (presentation) and two other to get "zápočet"

- Topics
  - Java Pathfinder
    - Implement custom modules and verify given program
  - Code Contracts
    - Write specification for given program and then verify it
  - Static analysis
  - Finding real bugs
  - Presentation of research publication
    - Group homework (2-3 people)

Be active during lectures and labs !!

- Participate
- Answer questions
- Think deeply

Contact

- Web: http://d3s.mff.cuni.cz/teaching/nswi132
- Email: parizek@d3s.mff.cuni.cz
- Room 202

We are hiring

- Master thesis
- PhD studies

- Theory + Implementation

- Program verification, analysis, synthesis
- Debugging, tool support for developers
- Programming languages, concurrency
- Java, C/C++, C#, PHP, JavaScript, Scala

Department of Distributed and Dependable Systems