

Lilian Burdy
INRIA Sophia-Antipolis
Lilian.Burdy@sophia.inria.fr

Mariela Pavlova
INRIA Sophia-Antipolis
Mariela.Pavlova@sophia.inria.fr

September 2, 2005

Abstract

We propose a framework for establishing the correctness of untrusted Java bytecode components w.r.t. to complex functional and/or security policies. To this end, we define a bytecode specification language (BCSL) and a weakest precondition calculus for sequential Java bytecode. BCSL and the calculus are expressive enough for verifying non-trivial properties of programs, and cover most of sequential Java bytecode, including exceptions, subroutines, references, object creation and method calls.

Our approach does not require that bytecode components are provided with their

code is accompanied by a proof for its safety w.r.t. to some safety property and the code receiver has just to generate the verification conditions and type check the proof against them. The proof is generated automatically by the certifying compiler for properties like well typedness or safe memory access. As the certifying compiler is designed to be completely automatic, it will not be able to deal with rich functional or security properties.

We propose a bytecode verification framework with the following features:

a bytecode specification language and a compiler from source program annotations into bytecode annotations. Thus, bytecode can benefit from the source specification and does not need to be accompanied by its own code.

verification condition generator over Java bytecode

**Java
Weakest Precondition
Calculus**

Java
Proof obligations

Check Certificate


```

public class ListArray {
    Object[] list;
    //@requires list != null;
    //@ensures \result == (\exists int i; 0 <= i &&
        i < list.length && list[i] == o ) ;
    public boolean isElem(Object obj)
    {
        int i = 0;
        //@loop_modifies i;
        //@loop_invariant i <= list.length && i >= 0
        //@  && (\forall int k; 0 <= k && k < i ==>
            list[k] != obj);
        for (i = 0; i <

```

loop frame condition, which declares the locations that can be modified during a loop iteration. We were inspired for this by the JML

the loops in a method are compiled to a unique method attribute: whose syntax is given in Fig. 4. This attribute is an array of data structures eac

program functional properties.

The proposed weakest precondition $\llbracket p \rrbracket$ supports all Java bytecode sequential instructions except for floating point arithmetic instructions and 64 bit data (long and double types), including exceptions, object creation, references and subroutines. The calculus is defined over the method control flow graph and supports BCSL annotation, i.e. bytecode method's specification like preconditions, normal and exceptional postconditions, class invariants, assertions at particular program point among which loop invariants.

In Fig. 5, we show the $\llbracket p \rrbracket$ rules for some bytecode instructions. As the examples show the $\llbracket p \rrbracket$ function takes three arguments: the instruction for which we calculate the precondition, the instruction's postcondition and the exceptional postcondition function exc which for any exception Exc returns the corresponding exceptional postcondition $\text{exc}(\text{Exc})$. The function $\llbracket p \rrbracket$ must satisfy the following property: if the instruction i starts execution in a state where the predicate $\llbracket p(i; \text{pre}; \text{exc}) \rrbracket$ holds then if it terminates normally then the poststate must satisfy the predicate post and if terminates on exception Exc then the poststate must satisfy $\text{exc}(\text{Exc})$. In the draft paper [16], we show

that the $\llbracket p \rrbracket$ function has this property (i.e. the calculus is correct). The proof is done by de

$$p(\text{invoke } m_i; \text{exc}) = \text{pre}(m) \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1:s} e_j : \text{post}(m) \wedge [v[i] = \text{st}(c+i - \text{nArg}(m))]]$$

results in the weakest predicate $\{p\}^{j} SR \{i\}^{dd}$ of the subroutine starting at index i and dd which guarantees that after its execution $\{p\}^{j}$ will hold in the normal case, otherwise if the subroutine terminates on exception Exc then $\{p\}^{exc} Exc$ will hold.

or $\{p\}^{j} SR \{i\}^{dd}$ and $\{p\}^{exc} Exc$

- [14] G. Necula. *Compensation*. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, 1998.
- [15] G. C. Necula and P. Lee. The