Security Engineering 4th Problem Set

Prof Stefan Lucks, Nathalie Jolanthe Dittrich

<first>.<middle>.<lastname>(at)uni-weimar.de

Bauhaus-Universität Weimar

Dec 07, 2018

4th Problem Set

- gcov/lcov
 - "Measure" the quality of your tests

- gcov/lcov
 - "Measure" the quality of your tests
- Data and Control Flow
 - Repetition (for formal verification)

- gcov/lcov
 - "Measure" the quality of your tests
- Data and Control Flow
 - Repetition (for formal verification)
- Get familiar with Hoare logic
 - Preparation for formal verification with SPARK =)

- gcov/lcov
 - "Measure" the quality of your tests
- Data and Control Flow
 - Repetition (for formal verification)
- Get familiar with Hoare logic
 - Preparation for formal verification with SPARK =)
- Access types and data structures

gcov and lcov

gcov and lcov

Mini Project

Hoare Logic I

Hoare Logic I

Mini Project

Hoare Logic II

Hoare Logic II

Mini Project

Recap

■ Rule 1: Empty Statement

$$\frac{\mathsf{True}}{\{P\}\mathsf{null};\{P\}}$$

■ Rule 2: Assignment

$$\frac{\mathsf{True}}{\{P[\mathsf{Expr} \to v]\}v := \mathsf{Expr}; \{P\}}$$

■ Rule 3: Composition

$$\frac{\{P\}S_1\{R\},\{R\}S_2\{Q\}}{\{P\}S_1;S_2;\{Q\}}$$

Recap

Rule 4: If-Then-Else

$$\frac{\{P,B\}S_1\{Q\},\{P,\neg B\}S_2\{Q\}}{\{P\} \text{ if } B \text{ then } S_1; \text{ else } S_2; \text{ end if}; \{Q\}}$$

Rule 5: While

$$\frac{\{P,B\}S\{P\}}{\{P\} \text{ while } B \text{ loop } S; \text{ end loop; } \{P,\neg B\}}$$

Rule 6: Conclusion

$$\frac{P \implies P', \{P'\}S\{Q'\}, Q' \implies Q}{\{P\}S\{Q\}}$$

Access Types and Data Structures

Binary Tree

Mini Project

5th Problem Set

Recap: What You Already Learnt

- Get to know basics of Ada: √
- Get familiar with at least one testing tool:
- Learn how-to do white-box and black-box testing:
- Practicing test coverage: √
- Get familiar with formal verification logic: √
- Get familiar with access types and data structures: ✓

Up to come:

- Get familiar with SPARK 2014
- Parallel programming with Tasks in Ada
- Scheduling algorithms

Formal verification with SPARK 2014

- Practice annotations for proving correct data flow
- Use your pre and post-conditions from Ada 2012
- Write shortened helper functions
- Prove small programs

Get familiar with gnatprove

- The usage is simple: qnatprove -P\$(projectfile)
- The project file needs -mode=[flow|prove|check|all] -report=[all|fail]
- You may need a config .adc (or -gnato13 for gnatmake)
- You need pragma Spark_Mode (On) to activate proving

An Example Project File

```
project Ps5 P2 Prove is
   type Modes is ("Compile", "Analyze");
   Mode : Modes := External ("MODE", "Compile");
   for Main use ("main.adb");
  for Source Dirs use ("src");
   for Object Dir use "bin":
  package Compiler is
      case Mode is
         when "Compile" =>
            for Switches ("Ada") use ("-g", "-gnato", "-gnatwa", "-gnatQ",
               "-gnat12");
         when "Analyze" =>
            for Switches ("Ada") use ("-q", "-j2", "-qnato", "-qnatwa",
               "-gnat0", "-gnat12", "-gnat013");
     end case;
   end Compiler:
  package Prove is
       for Switches use ("--report=all", "--proof=progressive",
                         "--warnings=continue", "--timeout=5", "--mode=all");
   end Prove;
  package Builder is
      for Default Switches ("ada") use ();
   end Builder:
end Ps5 P2 Prove;
```

Hints for Working with gnatprove

```
% gnatprove -Pps5_p2_prove.gpr
Phase 1 of 3: frame condition computation ...
Phase 2 of 3: analysis and translation to intermediate language ...
Phase 3 of 3: generation and proof of VCs ...
warning: no bodies have been analyzed by GNATprove
enable analysis of a body using SPARK_Mode
```

No errors does **not** always mean you're done! The above means nothing has been tested!

- Implement your package
- Write tests to verify the correctness of your code
- 3 Copy your tests to a main (AUnit may give conflicts)
- Use your main for proving with gnatprove
- 5 Check the output gnatprove.out

More Hints for Working with gnatprove

- If in doubt: You are wrong and gnatprove is right
 - gnatprove often sees edge cases we overlooked...
- Find appropriate Loop_Invariant s
- Add range checks! If necessary, include edge cases in your pre-/postconditions in an (if <edge case>) or (not <edge case> and <post-condition>)
- Use helper functions to manage the complexity
- Inline helper functions

```
function Contains(A: Natural_Array; Value: Natural;
  From: Natural; To: Natural) return Boolean is
  (for some I in From..To =>
        (if I in A'Range then A(I) = Value else False));
```

- Go step by step forwards
- Be patient...it's experimental

Use Your Resources Well

- The lecture slides
- The AdaCore introduction to SPARK 2014
- Read about Depends and Globals for proving flow:

```
procedure Initialize(Num_Voters: Natural) with
Global => (
    Input => (Num_Votes_Made), -- Globals that are only read
    In_Out => (Num_Votes_Made), -- Globals that are read and written
    Proof_In => (Num_Votes_Made), -- Globals that are only read,
    -- and only listed for stopping gnatprove from nagging
    Output => (Num_Votes_Made) -- Globals that are only written
),
Depends => (
    X => (<The variables that X depends on>),
    Y => null, -- Y depends on nothing
    ...
),
Pre => (...),
```

- Read about pragma Loop_Invariant(...))
- Read about Contract_Cases
 - It may simplify life when you have many cases in post conditions

Questions?