On Compositional safety verification with Max-SMT

Fabian Böller with David Korzeniewski

RWTH Aachen

fabian.boeller@rwth-aachen.de

SS 2017

Overview

- Introduction
- 2 Preliminaries
- Example execution
- 4 Conclusion

Terms

Safety verification

Prove that an assertion is always true at a location

Terms

Safety verification

Prove that an assertion is always true at a location

Non-compositional safety verification

Safety verification where the whole program is analyzed in one step

Terms

Safety verification

Prove that an assertion is always true at a location

Non-compositional safety verification

Safety verification where the whole program is analyzed in one step

Compositional safety verification

Safety verification where program parts are analyzed semi-independently and composed

Motivation

Scalability ← Loss in precision


$$\mathcal{L} = \{\ell_0, \ell_1, \ell_2\}$$






$$\left(l_{2}\right)$$


$$\mathcal{L} = \{\ell_0, \ell_1, \ell_2\}$$
 , $\mathcal{T} = \{t_i \mid i \in \{1, \dots, 6\}\}$




$$\mathcal{L}=\{\ell_0,\ell_1,\ell_2\}$$
 , $\mathcal{T}=\{t_i\mid i\in\{1,\dots,6\}\}$, $\mathcal{V}=\{x,y,i\},~\mathcal{V}'=\{x',y',i'\}$



$$\mathcal{L}=\{\ell_0,\ell_1,\ell_2\}$$
 , $\mathcal{T}=\{t_i\mid i\in\{1,\dots,6\}\}$, $\mathcal{V}=\{x,y,i\},~\mathcal{V}'=\{x',y',i'\}$



$$\mathcal{L}=\{\ell_0,\ell_1,\ell_2\}$$
 , $\mathcal{T}=\{t_i\mid i\in\{1,\dots,6\}\}$, $\mathcal{V}=\{x,y,i\},~\mathcal{V}'=\{x',y',i'\}$







CheckSafe

Prove that an assertion is satisfied by backtracking through all entry components



CheckSafe

Prove that an assertion is satisfied by backtracking through all entry components

CondSafe

Find a precondition for a component such that all runs satisfying the precondition always imply the postcondition



CheckSafe

Prove that an assertion is satisfied by backtracking through all entry components


CondSafe


Find a precondition for a component such that all runs satisfying the precondition always imply the postcondition

Narrowing

Manipulate the program such that new preconditions can be found


Example program






Task

Prove that the program is safe for $x \neq y$ at t_6




CheckSafe on $\{\ell_2\}$ for $x \neq y$

 t_6 does not already imply $x \neq y$ t_6 is not an initial transition Call CondSafe




$$I_{\ell_2,1}(\{x,y,i\}) \equiv i_{\ell_2,1} + i_{\ell_2,1,x} * x + i_{\ell_2,1,y} * y + i_{\ell_2,1,i} * i \le 0$$




$$\mathbb{I}_{t_2,1,1} \equiv y > x \wedge i' = i \wedge x' = x \wedge y' = y \Rightarrow I'_{\ell_2,1,1}$$






$$\mathbb{I}_{t_4,1,1} \equiv i = 0 \land i' = i \land x' = x \land y' = y \Rightarrow I'_{\ell_2,1,1}$$






$$\mathbb{C}_{t_5,1} \equiv \mathit{I}_{\ell_2,1} \land x' = x + 1 \land y' = y + 1 \land i' = i \Rightarrow \mathit{I}'_{\ell_2,1}$$






$$\mathbb{S}_1 \equiv I_{\ell_2,1} \wedge i' = i \wedge x' = x \wedge y' = y \Rightarrow x' \neq y'$$





Max-SMT on $\{\ell_2\}$ for $x \neq y$


 $\mathbb{F}_1 \equiv \mathbb{C}_{t_5,1} \wedge \mathbb{S}_1 \wedge (\mathbb{I}_{t_2,1,1} \vee \neg p_{t_2}) \wedge (\mathbb{I}_{t_4,1,1} \vee \neg p_{t_4}) \wedge [p_{t_2},1] \wedge [p_{t_4},1]$ Assume x > y does satisfy \mathbb{F}_1



CheckSafe on $\{\ell_0\}$ for x > y

 t_2 does not already imply x>y t_2 is not an initial transition


Call CondSafe



CheckSafe on $\{\ell_0\}$ for x > y

No precondition, since y > x contradicts x > yPath is maybe safe, but not for x > y


4 D > 4 D > 4 E > 4 E > E 99 P



CheckSafe on $\{\ell_1\}$ for x>y

 t_4 does not already imply x > y t_4 is not an initial transition

Call CondSafe, get $i > 0 \land x \ge y$ as precondition




CheckSafe on $\{\ell_0\}$ for i > 0

 t_1 does not already imply i > 0

 t_1 is not an initial transition


Call CondSafe, get i > 0 as precondition



CheckSafe on initial SCC for i > 0

 t_0 does already imply i > 0






CheckSafe on initial SCC for i > 0

Path is safe for i > 0






CheckSafe on $\{\ell_0\}$ for i > 0


Path is safe for i > 0






CheckSafe on $\{\ell_0\}$ for $x \ge y$

 t_1 does already imply $x \ge y$




CheckSafe on $\{\ell_0\}$ for $x \ge y$

Path is safe for $x \ge y$



CheckSafe on $\{\ell_1\}$ for x > y


Path is safe for x > y



Narrow on $\{\ell_2\}$

Add $x \leq y$ to t_2


Add $x \le y$ to t_5



CheckSafe on $\{\ell_2\}$ for $x \neq y$

Call CondSafe, get y > x instead of x > y as precondition






CheckSafe on $\{\ell_0\}$ for y > x

 t_2 does already imply y > x






CheckSafe on $\{\ell_0\}$ for y > x

Path is safe for y > x





CheckSafe on $\{\ell_0\}$ for y > x

Program is safe for $x \neq y$



Conclusion

We saw:

- The exploration of multiple entry SCCs by CheckSafe
- The effect of narrowing if a path to the SCC is proved safe and another could not be proved safe
- 3 The behavior of CheckSafe if a CII with multiple conjunctions is found

We didn't saw:

 SCCs with multiple transitions (effects consecution conditions in Max-SMT and entry locations in Narrowing)

References



Brockschmidt, Marc and Larraz, Daniel and Oliveras, Albert and Rodriguez-Carbonell, Enric and Rubio, Albert (2015)

Compositional Safety Verification with Max-SMT

Proceedings of FMCAD'15

The End