

AFFIRM Progress Report

Lee Pike and Benjamin Jones

April 13, 2016

AFFIRM Progress Report

Improving and Benchmarking Our OM(1)

- ▶ Inductive proof of agreement
- ▶ Hybrid fault model
- ▶ Benchmarking against Rushby's OM(1)
- ▶ Experiments with automated lemma generation

Inductive proof of agreement

Proof

We completed an inductive *proof of agreement*.

The proof was accomplished using two techniques not required for the *proof of validity*:

1. a coarse abstract state machine
2. history variables at points relevant to data flow

Abstract State Machine




Figure 1

History Variables

- ▶ History variables help the model checker reason about data flow
- ▶ They can be generated automatically as instrumentation that is useful in verification

Here is a part of the state predicate characterizing the abstract state a3.

```
FORALL (i: RELAYS, j: RECEIVERS):  
    (  
        NOT relays_done[i]  
        AND null?(cal, chan(i,j))  
        AND buffers[j][i] = missing)
```

In this piece, the relay is done, but the receiver has not read the channel.

```
OR (    relays_done[i]
      AND cal.msg[chan(i,j)] = latches[i]
      AND buffers[j][i] = missing)
```


The relay is done, the receiver has read the channel, and the message read matches the value in latches[i].

```
OR (    relays_done[i]
      AND null?(cal, chan(i,j))
      AND buffers[j][i] /= missing
      AND (NOT is_faulty?(f[i]) => buffers[j][i] = latches
```

Hybrid Fault Model

Hybrid Fault Model

In order to fairly compare Rushby's OM(1) and our calendar-based model, we enriched the fault model to include *symmetric* and *manifest* faults.

- ▶ Possible fault types for nodes are: non-faulty, byzantine, symmetric, and manifest
- ▶ Maximum fault assumption is now an inequality between the weighted sum of faulty components and the number of relays

For example, the n-relay system tolerates:

n=3	n=4
1 byzantine fault	1 byzantine & 1 manifest fault
1 symmetric fault	or 1 symmetric & 1 manifest fault
up to 2 manifest faults	or up to 3 manifest faults

Benchmarking Against Rushby's $OM(1)$

Parametrization

To compare the scalability of verification for Rushby's model and our calendar-based model, we parametrized both models over the number of relays and receivers.

- ▶ The largest of Rushby's models we've been able to check has 8 nodes
- ▶ The largest calendar-based model we've been able to check has 10 nodes
- ▶ Adding receivers increases the complexity of model checking much more than adding relays
- ▶ We see clear indication of *single exponential* time complexity for the calendar-based model (and induction proof) versus *double exponential* time complexity for Rushby's model (and symbolic proof)

Benchmark




Figure 2

Experiments with automated lemma generation

Automated Lemma Generation

- ▶ Experiments with Rockwell Collins using JKind
- ▶ Reimplemented physical-layer protocol proofs (8N1, Biphase Mark)
- ▶ Implements *IC3 Modulo Theories via Implicit Predicate Abstraction* (<http://arxiv.org/pdf/1310.6847.pdf>), k-induction
- ▶ Upshot: lemma generation only works for fixed constants, not uninterpreted constants.