Software Engineering using Formal Methods Verification with SPIN

Wolfgang Ahrendt & Richard Bubel & Wojciech Mostowski

6 September 2011

SPIN : Previous Lecture vs. This Lecture

Previous lecture SPIN appeared as a PROMELA simulator This lecture Intro to SPIN as a model checker

Model Checker (MC) is designed to prove the user wrong.

MC does *not* try to prove correctness properties. It tries the opposite.

MC tuned to find counter example to correctness property.

Model Checker (MC) is designed to prove the user wrong.

MC does *not* try to prove correctness properties. It tries the opposite.

MC tuned to find counter example to correctness property.

Why can an MC also prove correctness properties?

Model Checker (MC) is designed to prove the user wrong.

MC does *not* try to prove correctness properties. It tries the opposite.

MC tuned to find counter example to correctness property.

Why can an MC also prove correctness properties?

MC's search for counter examples is exhaustive.

Model Checker (MC) is designed to prove the user wrong.

MC does *not* try to prove correctness properties. It tries the opposite.

MC tuned to find counter example to correctness property.

Why can an MC also prove correctness properties?

MC's search for counter examples is exhaustive.

 \Rightarrow Finding no counter example proves stated correctness properties.



resolving non-determinism in all possible ways



resolving non-determinism in all possible ways

For model checking PROMELA code, two kinds of non-determinism to be resolved:



For model checking $\operatorname{PROMELA}$ code,

two kinds of non-determinism to be resolved:

explicit, local:

 $\mathbf{i}\mathbf{f}/\mathbf{d}\mathbf{o}$ statements

- :: guardX -> ...
- :: guardY -> ...



For model checking $\operatorname{PROMELA}$ code,

two kinds of non-determinism to be resolved:

explicit, local:

 $\mathbf{i}\mathbf{f}/\mathbf{d}\mathbf{o}$ statements

- :: guardX -> ...
- :: guardY -> ...
- implicit, global:

scheduling of concurrent processes (see next lecture)

SPIN: "Simple Promela Interpreter"

SPIN: "Simple Promela Interpreter"

The name is a serious understatement!

SPIN: "Simple Promela Interpreter"

The name is a serious understatement!

main functionality of SPIN:

- simulating a model (randomly/interactively)
- generating a verifier

SPIN: "Simple Promela Interpreter"

The name is a serious understatement!

main functionality of $\operatorname{SPIN}:$

- simulating a model (randomly/interactively)
- generating a verifier

verifier generated by SPIN is a C program performing

SPIN: "Simple Promela Interpreter"

The name is a serious understatement!

main functionality of $\operatorname{SPIN}:$

- simulating a model (randomly/interactively)
- generating a verifier

verifier generated by $\ensuremath{\mathrm{SPIN}}$ is a C program performing model checking:

SPIN: "Simple Promela Interpreter"

The name is a serious understatement!

main functionality of $\operatorname{SPIN}:$

- simulating a model (randomly/interactively)
- generating a verifier

verifier generated by $\ensuremath{\mathrm{SPIN}}$ is a C program performing model checking:

exhaustively checks PROMELA model against correctness properties

SPIN: "Simple Promela Interpreter"

The name is a serious understatement!

main functionality of SPIN:

- simulating a model (randomly/interactively)
- generating a verifier

verifier generated by $\ensuremath{\mathrm{SPIN}}$ is a C program performing model checking:

- exhaustively checks PROMELA model against correctness properties
- in case the check is negative: generates a failing run of the model

SPIN: "Simple Promela Interpreter"

The name is a serious understatement!

main functionality of SPIN:

- simulating a model (randomly/interactively/guided)
- generating a verifier

verifier generated by $\ensuremath{\mathrm{SPIN}}$ is a C program performing model checking:

- exhaustively checks PROMELA model against correctness properties
- in case the check is negative: generates a failing run of the model, to be simulated by SPIN





Rehearsal: Simulation Demo

run example, random and interactive interleave.pml, zero.pml



- Be R_M the set of all possible runs of M.
- ► For each correctness property C_i , R_{M,C_i} is the set of all runs of M satisfying C_i . $(R_{M,C_i} \subseteq R_M)$

- Be R_M the set of all possible runs of M.
- ► For each correctness property C_i , R_{M,C_i} is the set of all runs of M satisfying C_i . $(R_{M,C_i} \subseteq R_M)$
- *M* is correct wrt. C_1, \ldots, C_n iff

- Be R_M the set of all possible runs of M.
- ► For each correctness property C_i , R_{M,C_i} is the set of all runs of M satisfying C_i . $(R_{M,C_i} \subseteq R_M)$
- *M* is correct wrt. C_1, \ldots, C_n iff $R_M = (R_{M,C_1} \cap \ldots \cap R_{M,C_n})$.

- Be R_M the set of all possible runs of M.
- ► For each correctness property C_i , R_{M,C_i} is the set of all runs of M satisfying C_i . $(R_{M,C_i} \subseteq R_M)$
- *M* is correct wrt. C_1, \ldots, C_n iff $R_M = (R_{M,C_1} \cap \ldots \cap R_{M,C_n})$.
- ▶ If *M* is not correct, then each $r \in (R_M \setminus (R_{M,C_1} \cap ... \cap R_{M,C_n}))$ is a counter example.

Given PROMELA model M, and correctness properties C_1, \ldots, C_n .

- Be R_M the set of all possible runs of M.
- ► For each correctness property C_i , R_{M,C_i} is the set of all runs of M satisfying C_i . $(R_{M,C_i} \subseteq R_M)$
- *M* is correct wrt. C_1, \ldots, C_n iff $R_M = (R_{M,C_1} \cap \ldots \cap R_{M,C_n})$.
- ▶ If *M* is not correct, then each $r \in (R_M \setminus (R_{M,C_1} \cap ... \cap R_{M,C_n}))$ is a counter example.

We know how to write models M.

Given PROMELA model M, and correctness properties C_1, \ldots, C_n .

- Be R_M the set of all possible runs of M.
- ► For each correctness property C_i , R_{M,C_i} is the set of all runs of M satisfying C_i . $(R_{M,C_i} \subseteq R_M)$
- *M* is correct wrt. C_1, \ldots, C_n iff $R_M = (R_{M,C_1} \cap \ldots \cap R_{M,C_n})$.
- ▶ If *M* is not correct, then each $r \in (R_M \setminus (R_{M,C_1} \cap ... \cap R_{M,C_n}))$ is a counter example.

We know how to write models *M*. But how to write Correctness Properties?

Stating Correctness Properties









stating properties within model , using

assertion statements



stating properties within model , using

- assertion statements
- meta labels
 - end labels
 - accept labels
 - progress labels



stating properties within model , using

- assertion statements
- meta labels
 - end labels
 - accept labels
 - progress labels

stating properties outside model, using

- never claims
- temporal logic formulas



stating properties within model , using

- assertion statements (today)
- meta labels
 - end labels (today)
 - accept labels
 - progress labels

stating properties outside model , using

- never claims
- temporal logic formulas

Assertion Statements

Definition (Assertion Statements)

Assertion statements in PROMELA are statements of the form assert(*expr*) were *expr* is any PROMELA expression.

Assertion Statements

Definition (Assertion Statements)

Assertion statements in PROMELA are statements of the form assert(*expr*) were *expr* is any PROMELA expression.

Typically, *expr* is of type bool.
Assertion Statements

Definition (Assertion Statements)

Assertion statements in PROMELA are statements of the form assert(*expr*) were *expr* is any PROMELA expression.

Typically, *expr* is of type bool.

assert(expr) can appear wherever a statement is expected.

Assertion Statements

Definition (Assertion Statements)

Assertion statements in PROMELA are statements of the form assert(*expr*) were *expr* is any PROMELA expression.

Typically, *expr* is of type bool.

assert(expr) can appear wherever a statement is expected.

```
stmt1;
assert(max == a);
stmt2;
```

Assertion Statements

Definition (Assertion Statements)

Assertion statements in PROMELA are statements of the form assert(*expr*) were *expr* is any PROMELA expression.

Typically, *expr* is of type bool.

assert(expr) can appear wherever a statement is expected.

```
...
stmt1;
assert(max == a);
stmt2;
...
if
if
:: b1 -> stmt3;
assert(x < y)
:: b2 -> stmt4
...
```

Meaning of **Boolean** Assertion Statements

assert(expr)

- has no effect if expr evaluates to true
- triggers an error message if expr evaluates to false

This holds in both, simulation and model checking mode.

assert(expr)

- has no effect if expr evaluates to non-zero value
- triggers an error message if expr evaluates to 0

This holds in both, simulation and model checking mode.

assert(expr)

- has no effect if expr evaluates to non-zero value
- triggers an error message if expr evaluates to 0

This holds in both, simulation and model checking mode.

Recall:

bool true false is syntactic sugar for

assert(expr)

- has no effect if expr evaluates to non-zero value
- triggers an error message if expr evaluates to 0

This holds in both, simulation and model checking mode.

Recall:

bool true false is syntactic sugar for bit 1 0

assert(expr)

- has no effect if expr evaluates to non-zero value
- triggers an error message if expr evaluates to 0

This holds in both, simulation and model checking mode.

Recall:

bool true false is syntactic sugar for bit 1 0

 \Rightarrow general case covers Boolean case

Instead of using 'printf's for Debugging ...

Instead of using 'printf's for Debugging ...

Command Line Execution

(simulate, inject faults, add assertion, simulate again)

```
> spin [-i] max.pml
```

```
/* after choosing a,b from {1,2,3} */
if
    :: a >= b -> max = a
    :: a <= b -> max = b
fi;
assert( max == (a>b -> a : b) )
```

```
/* after choosing a,b from {1,2,3} */
if
    :: a >= b -> max = a
    :: a <= b -> max = b
fi;
assert( max == (a>b -> a : b) )
```

Now, we have a first example with a formulated correctness property.

```
/* after choosing a,b from {1,2,3} */
if
    :: a >= b -> max = a
    :: a <= b -> max = b
fi;
assert( max == (a>b -> a : b) )
```

Now, we have a first example with a formulated correctness property.

We can do model checking, for the first time!

```
/* after choosing a,b from {1,2,3} */
if
    :: a >= b -> max = a
    :: a <= b -> max = b
fi;
assert( max == (a>b -> a : b) )
```

Now, we have a first example with a formulated correctness property.

We can do model checking, for the first time!

(Historic moment in the course.)

Generate Verifier in C



Command Line Execution

Generate Verifier in C

> spin -a max.pml

 SPIN generates Verifier in C , called pan.c

(plus helper files)

Compile To Executable Verifier



Command Line Execution

compile to executable verifier

Compile To Executable Verifier



Command Line Execution compile to executable verifier > gcc -o pan pan.c

C compiler generates executable verifier pan

Compile To Executable Verifier





C compiler generates executable verifier pan

pan: historically "protocol analyzer", now "process analyzer"



Command Line Execution

run verifier pan

>./pan or > pan



Command Line Execution

- >./pan or > pan
 - prints "errors: 0"



Command Line Execution

run verifier pan

>./pan or > pan

▶ prints "errors: 0" ⇒ Correctness Property verified!



Command Line Execution

- >./pan or > pan
 - prints "errors: 0", or
 - prints "errors: n" (n > 0)



Command Line Execution

- >./pan or > pan
 - prints "errors: 0", or
 - ▶ prints "errors: n" $(n > 0) \Rightarrow$ counter example found!



Command Line Execution

- >./pan or > pan
 - prints "errors: 0", or
 - ▶ prints "errors: n" (n > 0) ⇒ counter example found! records failing run in max.pml.trail

Guided Simulation

To examine failing run: employ simulation mode, "guided" by trail file.



Command Line Execution

inject a fault, re-run verification, and then:

> spin - t - p - l max.pml

Output of Guided Simulation

can look like:

Output of Guided Simulation

can look like:

assignments in the run

Output of Guided Simulation

can look like:

assignments in the run values of variables whenever updated

What did we do so far?

following whole cycle (most primitive example, assertions only)



What did we do so far?

following whole cycle (most primitive example, assertions only)



Further Examples: Integer Division

```
int dividend = 15;
 int divisor = 4:
 int quotient, remainder;
 quotient = 0;
 remainder = dividend;
do
                   :: remainder > divisor ->
                                           quotient++;
                                            remainder = remainder - divisor
                   :: else \rightarrow
                                          hreak
od:
 \operatorname{print} f("%d_1) \operatorname{divided} (by_1) %d_1 = (%d_1) \operatorname{remainder} (by_1) %d_1 = (%d_1) \operatorname{remainder} (by_1) %d_1 = (%d_1) %d_1 = (
                                                             dividend, divisor, quotient, remainder)
```

Further Examples: Integer Division

```
int dividend = 15;
 int divisor = 4:
 int quotient, remainder;
 quotient = 0;
 remainder = dividend;
do
                   :: remainder > divisor ->
                                           quotient++;
                                            remainder = remainder - divisor
                   :: else \rightarrow
                                          hreak
od:
 \operatorname{print} f("%d_1) \operatorname{divided} (by_1) %d_1 = (%d_1) \operatorname{remainder} (by_1) %d_1 = (%d_1) \operatorname{remainder} (by_1) %d_1 = (%d_1) %d_1 = (
                                                             dividend, divisor, quotient, remainder)
```

simulate, put assertions, verify, change values, ...

```
int x = 15, y = 20;
int a, b;
a = x; b = y;
do
    :: a > b -> a = a - b
    :: b > a -> b = b - a
    :: a == b -> break
od;
printf("The_GCD_of_%d_and_%d_=_%d\n", x, y, a)
```

full functional verification not possible here (why?)

full functional verification not possible here (why?) still, assertions can perform sanity check

full functional verification not possible here (why?) still, assertions can perform sanity check

```
\Rightarrow typical for model checking
```
typical command line sequences:

random simulation

spin name.pml

typical command line sequences:

random simulation

spin name.pml

interactive simulation

spin -i name.pml

```
typical command line sequences:

random simulation

spin name.pml

interactive simulation

spin -i name.pml

model checking

spin -a name.pml

gcc -o pan pan.c

./pan
```

```
typical command line sequences:
random simulation
            spin name.pml
interactive simulation
            spin -i name.pml
model checking
            spin -a name.pml
            gcc -o pan pan.c
            ./pan
            and in case of error
            spin -t -p -l -g name.pml
```

$\mathrm{SPIN}\ Reference\ Card$

Ben-Ari produced Spin Reference Card, summarizing

- typical command line sequences
- options for
 - ► Spin
 - gcc
 - pan
- PROMELA
 - datatypes
 - operators
 - statements
 - guarded commands
 - processes
 - channels
- temporal logic syntax

$\mathrm{SPIN}\ Reference\ Card$

Ben-Ari produced Spin Reference Card, summarizing

- typical command line sequences
- options for
 - ► Spin
 - gcc
 - pan
- PROMELA
 - datatypes
 - operators
 - statements
 - guarded commands
 - processes
 - channels
- temporal logic syntax

 \Rightarrow available from course page (see 'Links, Papers, and Software')

- SPIN targets software, instead of hardware verification ("Software Engineering using Formal Methods")
- 2001 ACM Software Systems Award (other winning software systems include: Unix, TCP/IP, WWW, Tcl/Tk, Java)
- used for safety critical applications
- distributed freely as research tool, well-documented, actively maintained, large user-base in academia and in industry
- ▶ annual SPIN user workshops series held since 1995
- \blacktriangleright based on standard theory of $\omega\textsc{-}automata$ and linear temporal logic

- ▶ PROMELA and SPIN are rather simple to use
- good to understand a few systems really well, rather than many systems poorly
- availability of good course book (Ben-Ari)
- availability of front end JSPIN (also Ben-Ari)

- graphical user interface for SPIN
- developed for pedagogical purposes
- written in JAVA
- simple user interface
- SPIN options automatically supplied
- fully configurable
- supports graphics output of transition system

- graphical user interface for SPIN
- developed for pedagogical purposes
- written in JAVA
- simple user interface
- SPIN options automatically supplied
- fully configurable
- supports graphics output of transition system
- makes back-end calls transparent

Command Line Execution

calling $_{\rm JSPIN}$

> java -jar /usr/local/jSpin/jSpin.jar

(with path adjusted to your setting) or use shell script:

> jspin

Command Line Execution

calling JSPIN

> java -jar /usr/local/jSpin/jSpin.jar

(with path adjusted to your setting) or use shell script:

> jspin

play around with similar examples ...

quoting from file max2.pml:

quoting from file max2.pml:

simulate a few times

quoting from file max2.pml:

simulate a few times \Rightarrow crazy "timeout" message sometimes

quoting from file max2.pml:

simulate a few times ⇒ crazy "timeout" message sometimes

generate and execute pan

quoting from file max2.pml:

simulate a few times \Rightarrow crazy "timeout" message sometimes

```
generate and execute pan \Rightarrow reports "errors: 1"
```

quoting from file max2.pml:

simulate a few times ⇒ crazy "timeout" message sometimes

```
generate and execute pan \Rightarrow reports "errors: 1"
```

```
????
```

quoting from file max2.pml:

simulate a few times \Rightarrow crazy "timeout" message sometimes

```
generate and execute pan \Rightarrow reports "errors: 1"
```

Note: no assert in max2.pml.

Further inspection of **pan** output:

```
pan: invalid end state (at depth 1)
pan: wrote max2.pml.trail
...
```

Legal and Illegal Blocking

A process may legally block, as long as some other process can proceed.

Blocking for letting others proceed is useful, and typical, for concurrent and distributed models (i.p. protocols).

Blocking for letting others proceed is useful, and typical, for concurrent and distributed models (i.p. protocols).

But

it's an error if a process blocks while no other process can proceed

Blocking for letting others proceed is useful, and typical, for concurrent and distributed models (i.p. protocols).

But

it's an error if a process blocks while no other process can proceed

 \Rightarrow "Deadlock"

Blocking for letting others proceed is useful, and typical, for concurrent and distributed models (i.p. protocols).

But

it's an error if a process blocks while no other process can proceed

 \Rightarrow "Deadlock"

in max2.pml, there exists a run where no process can take over.

Definition (Valid End State)

An end state of a run is valid iff the location counter of each processes is at an end location.

Definition (Valid End State)

An end state of a run is valid iff the location counter of each processes is at an end location.

Definition (End Location)

End locations of a process P are:

P's textual end

Definition (Valid End State)

An end state of a run is valid iff the location counter of each processes is at an end location.

Definition (End Location)

End locations of a process P are:

- P's textual end
- each location marked with an end label: "endxxx:"

Definition (Valid End State)

An end state of a run is valid iff the location counter of each processes is at an end location.

Definition (End Location)

End locations of a process P are:

- P's textual end
- each location marked with an end label: "endxxx:"

End labels not useful in **max2.pml**, but elsewhere, they are. Example: end.pml

Literature for this Lecture

Ben-Ari Chapter 2, Sections 4.7.1, 4.7.2

