

---

# Correct by Construction

---

*Author:*

J. Maree FOURIE

January 28, 2020

*“Writing is hard; writing is hard because thinking is hard. It is easier to think you are thinking.”*

Leslie Lamport

# *Abstract*

**Correct by Construction**

by J. Maree FOURIE

ToDo. ...



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Process and Technique</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Correct by Construction (CbyC)</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Overview	3
2.2	Correct by Construction Process	3
2.2.1	System Requirements Specification	4
2.2.2	Formal Specification	5
2.2.3	Formal Design	5
2.2.4	System Test Specification	5
2.2.5	INFORMED Design	6
2.2.6	Code Implementation	6
<b>3</b>	<b>Agile using Scrum</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Overview	9
3.2	Scrum roles	10
3.2.1	Product Owner	10
3.2.2	Development Team	10
3.2.3	Scrum Master	10
3.3	Scrum Events	10
3.3.1	Sprint	10
3.3.2	Daily Scrum	11
3.3.3	Sprint Review	11
3.3.4	Sprint Retrospective	11
3.4	Scrum Artefacts	11
3.4.1	Product Backlog	11
3.4.2	Sprint Backlog	11
3.4.3	Increment	11
<b>4</b>	<b>Using Correct by Construction with Agile Scrum</b>	<b>13</b>
4.1	Why not just Scrum	13
4.2	Augment Scrum with Correct by Construction	13
4.2.1	Roles	13
	Team Architect	13
4.2.2	Events	13
	Product Planning	13
	Sprint	14
4.2.3	Artefacts	14
	Increment	14
<b>5</b>	<b>Applying the methodology</b>	<b>17</b>
5.1	Mathematical Specification Language (TLA <sup>+</sup> )	17
5.2	Programming Language (C#)	17
5.2.1	Code Contracts	17

5.2.2	Verification . . . . .	17
	Property based testing . . . . .	17
<b>A</b>	<b>TLA+</b>	<b>19</b>
A.1	TLA <sup>+</sup> Toolbox . . . . .	19
A.2	More information . . . . .	19
<b>B</b>	<b>FsCheck</b>	<b>21</b>
B.1	Installing . . . . .	21
B.2	More information . . . . .	21
<b>C</b>	<b>Hoare Logic</b>	<b>23</b>
C.1	Program execution . . . . .	23
C.1.1	Axion of Assignment . . . . .	23
C.1.2	Rule of Consequence . . . . .	23
C.1.3	Rule of Composition . . . . .	23
C.1.4	Rule of Iteration . . . . .	23
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>25</b>

# List of Figures

2.1 CbyC process artefacts. . . . .	4
3.1 The Scrum workflow. . . . .	12
4.1 The Scrum workflow augmented with CbyC. . . . .	15





# List of Tables



# List of Abbreviations

<b>CbyC</b>	<b>Correct by Construction</b>
<b>TLA</b>	<b>Temporal Logic Actions</b>



## Chapter 1

# Process and Technique

Software development can be seen as having two aspects:

- process and
- technique.

Process describes the people involved in developing the software and the interactions between them. The process can describe things like team structures, work planning, reviewing work done and delivering the software.

Technique describes technical aspects of software development. Technique can describe things like what programming languages and technologies to use, how the software is structured and tested, and also how the software is delivered.

Process and technique can overlap and inform each other as in the case of software deployment. If we wanted to do continuous delivery we would have to review the completed software on an as needed basis and not a fixed schedule (process). We might then also structure the software as micro-services and not a monolith application (technique).

Some development methodologies focus more on process and others more on technique.

**Agile software development (Agile)** Agile focuses on delivering useful software in a timely manner by focusing on process. Agile's only opinion on technique is that the design should be kept simple.

**Correct by Construction (CbyC)** CbyC uses formal methods as a technique along with a process that aligns with the formal methods. Formal methods are mathematical rigorous techniques used to validate software designs and code.

If we combine Agile process with CbyC technique and process we can have a methodology that is both rigorous and productive.



## Chapter 2

# Correct by Construction (CbyC)

## 2.1 Overview

The CbyC software development methodology proposes to limit software defects by:

1. making it difficult to introduce errors, and
2. detecting and removing errors as early as possible.

CbyC technique emphasises the use of mathematically rigorous tools. CbyC proposes using mathematical formal language to define the specification and high-level design of a system. This provides a precise description of the system's behaviour and a precise model of its characteristics. Using a mathematical language also allows the use of automated tools to verify the specification and design [4].

CbyC code is designed around information flow. The information flow is defined using a contract-based notation. The contract-based notation is used to define the abstract state of the program and the information relationships across boundaries. CbyC proposes using programming languages and tools that allow for the code and contracts to be validated using static analysis [4].

## 2.2 Correct by Construction Process

The CbyC process is described in terms of the artefacts it produces (Figure 2.1):

- System requirements specification;
- Formal specification;
- Formal design;
- System test specification;
- INFORMED design;
- Code;

Using the CbyC process every process artefact can be validated. The semantic gap between process artefacts are kept small. This makes it possible to show that later process artefacts conform to earlier process artefacts [3].

We now describe each artefact and how it is created.




FIGURE 2.1: CbyC process artefacts.

### 2.2.1 System Requirements Specification

Requirements analysis identifies the needs of the stakeholders, the desired behaviour of the system, and any non-behavioural system characteristics [3].

Requirements management extends throughout the system's development, but it is most significant at the beginning, where it is used to identify [3]:

- the stakeholders, who have an interest in the development and use of the system;
- the system boundary, to clarify the scope of the project and the interfaces to external systems;
- the expected use, in terms of interactions between users and the system;
- system properties, such as security properties, performance properties, etc.

Each requirement should be traceable through every process artefact [3]. The requirements are compiled into the System Requirements Specification document.

The System Requirements Specification is created to [3]:

- early in the project clarify the system's boundary (what is in scope and what is out of scope, and the necessary interfaces to external systems);
- agree on the system requirements with all of the stakeholders;



- document the requirements with enough precision so that the Formal Specification can be developed with minimal customer input;
- clarify and document the assumptions about the behaviour of the environment external to the system;
- identify and manage conflicting expectations between stakeholders.

### 2.2.2 Formal Specification

The Formal Specification unambiguously describe what the system will do. This is to help the developer and the client gain a common understanding of the system [3].

The level of abstraction is important. The Formal Specification should not describe the system's implementation. Internal details are deliberately left abstract. Interactions with the external environment are specified, but may also be abstract [3].

The Formal Specification is written in mathematical notation with an English narrative. The specification is divided into small components that can be reasoned about individually. The small components are then combined to describe the system as a whole [3].

The Formal Specification is created because it [3]:

- provides an unambiguous description of what the system does. This is important for gaining client approval of the system's behaviour;
- can be shown to be complete;
- can be formally verified and proven consistent.

### 2.2.3 Formal Design

Formal Design elaborates on the abstract aspects of the Formal Specification to explain how the system will be implemented. The Formal Design describes the system in terms of concrete state and operations using types that are easily implementable. The Formal Design is the source of the required functional behaviour used during implementation [3].

The Formal Design is written in the same mathematical notation as the Formal Specification. This means that the Formal Design can be formally verified and errors can be uncovered before implementation starts [3].

The Formal Design is created because it [3]:

- provides an unambiguous description of how the system will accomplish what the Formal Specification requires;
- can be shown to be complete;
- can be formally verified and proven consistent.

### 2.2.4 System Test Specification

The systems tests describe in the System Test Specification has to show that the system implements the behaviours described in the Formal Specification. The system tests are more complete than acceptance tests. Acceptance tests only have to show that the system functions as described in the System Requirements Specification. System Testing aims to achieve 100% coverage of the Formal Specification so that all behaviours described in the Formal Specification are executed at least once [3].

The Formal Design is a refinement of the Formal Specification. Therefore the Test Specification can also be written against the Formal Design if you want to tests details of the design [3].

All system tests are specified in the System Test Specification before being executed. The tests are specified as scenarios that can occur during typical system usage. The System Test Specification documents the expected outcome of the test. Each system test is linked to functionality described in the Formal Specification/Design[3].

Where code coverage metrics are needed, it can be done during the System testing. This allows us to question the use of any code that cannot be covered by a system test. If the code is valid then focused unit tests should be added to cover the code [3].

System tests are specified because [3]:

- system tests focuses on testing the behaviour of the whole system against the expected (specified) behaviour;
- system tests find faults caused by interaction of the system's modules;
- system tests complement static analysis by confirming the system's dynamic behaviour.

### 2.2.5 INFORMED Design

CbyC design methodology is based on information flow. The information flow is defined using a contract-based notation. The contract-based notation is used to define the abstract state of the program and the information relationships across boundaries [4].

The **IN**formation Flow **OR**iented **ME**thod of object **D**esign (INFORMED) design provided an architectural framework in which to perform the implementation. Consideration of information flows at the design stage results in programs with the desirable properties of abstraction, encapsulation, high cohesion and loose coupling [3].

The INFORMED design aids maintenance and upgrades of the software by providing a route-map from the Formal Design to the code [3].

An INFORMED Design is created because it [3]:

- focuses on the system architecture and ensures that the architecture fits the information flow model;
- provides the mapping from the Formal Design to the Code before writing the code.
- complements the Formal Design without duplicating functional information.

### 2.2.6 Code Implementation

We start by writing the module specification. The specification is the public interface and the contracts governing the global state of the module. The contacts specify how inputs are allowed to influence outputs [3].

After writing the specification we implement the module body. The Formal Design is detailed enough to make the mapping from the design to the code simple [3].

Modules providing infrastructure are developed early. Modules are implemented in an order that allows system functionality to be added incrementally. This means that a basic system can be built as soon as possible and functionality is added in subsequent builds. This has the advantage of addressing code integration risks as early as possible [3].

By using languages that allows static analysis we can evaluate the code contracts at build time. Thus if the code builds it is correct as specified by the contracts [3].



## Chapter 3

# Agile using Scrum

### 3.1 Overview

The Manifesto for Agile Software Development sets out the overarching principles of agile software development [1]:

“We are uncovering better ways of developing software by doing it and helping others do it. Through this work we have come to value:

- **Individuals and interactions** *over* processes and tools
- **Working software** *over* comprehensive documentation
- **Customer collaboration** *over* contract negotiation
- **Responding to change** *over* following a plan

That is, while there is value in the items on the right, we value the items on the left more.”

This is further expanded on by the Twelve Principles of Agile Software [1]:

“We follow these principles:

1. Our highest priority is to satisfy the customer through early and continuous delivery of valuable software.
2. Welcome changing requirements, even late in development. Agile processes harness change for the customer’s competitive advantage.
3. Deliver working software frequently, from a couple of weeks to a couple of months, with a preference to the shorter timescale.
4. Business people and developers must work together daily throughout the project.
5. Build projects around motivated individuals. Give them the environment and support they need, and trust them to get the job done.
6. The most efficient and effective method of conveying information to and within a development team is face-to-face conversation.
7. Working software is the primary measure of progress.
8. Agile processes promote sustainable development. The sponsors, developers, and users should be able to maintain a constant pace indefinitely.
9. Continuous attention to technical excellence and good design enhances agility.

10. Simplicity—the art of maximizing the amount of work not done—is essential.
11. The best architectures, requirements, and designs emerge from self-organizing teams.
12. At regular intervals, the team reflects on how to become more effective, then tunes and adjusts its behaviour accordingly.”

Scrum is an agile project management methodology. It focuses on short feedback loops. Scrum is described in terms of roles, events, and artefacts. The Scrum process workflow is shown in Figure 3.1.

## 3.2 Scrum roles

The scrum team consists of a Product Owner, the Development Team, and a Scrum Master. The scrum team is self-organizing and cross-functional. The scrum team has all the skills necessary to complete assigned tasks without outside assistance [9].

### 3.2.1 Product Owner

The Product Owner is one person. The Product Owner may represent a committee of people, but the Product Owner must only be one person. The Product Owner is responsible for maximizing the value of the product resulting from the work done by the Development Team. The product owner is the only one responsible for managing the Product Backlog. The rest of the team may help manage the backlog but the Product Owner is the only accountable person [9].

### 3.2.2 Development Team

The Development Team is a small team consisting of between three and nine professional people. The Development Team members do the work necessary to deliver a potentially releasable increment of the product. A completed potentially releasable increment of the product is required at the Sprint Review [9].

### 3.2.3 Scrum Master

The Scrum Master is the servant-leader of the Scrum Team. The Scrum Master facilitates the interaction of outsiders with the team. The Scrum Master steers the interaction between team members to maximize the value create by the Scrum Team [9].

## 3.3 Scrum Events

Scrum Events are used the create a regular rhythm and minimize the need for irregular disrupting causing meetings [9].

### 3.3.1 Sprint

The Sprint is the core of Scrum. A Sprint is a period, no longer than a month, in which a usable and potentially releasable increment of the product is created. The length of the Sprint does not change throughout the development process. The next Sprint starts directly after the previous Sprint finishes. The sprint contains and consists of the Sprint Planning, Daily Scrum, the development work, the Sprint Review and the Sprint Retrospective [9].

### 3.3.2 Daily Scrum

The Daily Scrum is a 15 minute event for the Development Team. During the Daily Scrum the Development Team plans the work for the new 24 hours that is needed to achieve the Sprint Goal [9].

### 3.3.3 Sprint Review

A Sprint Review is held at the end of the Sprint to inspect the Product Increment and adapt the Product Backlog [9].

### 3.3.4 Sprint Retrospective

The Sprint Retrospective is held at the end of the Sprint to allow the Scrum Team an opportunity for introspection and to create a plan for improvements that can be done in the next Sprint [9].

## 3.4 Scrum Artefacts

Scrum Artifacts represent work done or provide information about the development process in order to provide transparency [9].

### 3.4.1 Product Backlog

The Product Backlog is an ordered list of every known requirement of the product. The Product Backlog is always evolving as new requirements are discovered. It is the only source of required changes to the product. The Product owner is responsible for the Product Backlog, this includes its content, availability, and ordering [9].

### 3.4.2 Sprint Backlog

The Sprint Backlog is the set of Product Backlog items selected for the Sprint and a plan for delivering the product Increment, realizing the Sprint Goal [9].

### 3.4.3 Increment

The Increment is the sum of all the Product Backlog items completed during a Sprint and the value of the increments of all previous Sprints [9].




FIGURE 3.1: The Scrum workflow.



## Chapter 4

# Using Correct by Construction with Agile Scrum

### 4.1 Why not just Scrum

The driving force behind Agile Scrum is the ability to react to changing requirements. To evaluate requested changes the changes have to be implemented. If we evaluate this against the Agile manifesto:

**Responding to change:** In order to evaluate a change: a story has to be create, and the story has to be refined and sized. Then, depending on the priority, existing work has to be moved to make resources available to implement the change.

**Working software:** We have to implement the requested change in order to validate it. If the change does not work we might end up with invalid or non-functional software. The changes then has to be rolled back.

**Customer collaboration** For a change to be actioned the team will reason through it on a whiteboard. This reasoning is based on opinion and results in arguments that cannot be resolved without implementing the change.

### 4.2 Augment Scrum with Correct by Construction

The CbyC process is designed to validate changes at every step. By augmenting Scrum with CbyC we reduce the need to implement a change before it can be validated. Figure 4.1 shows how the Scrum process can be augmented with CbyC.

#### 4.2.1 Roles

##### Team Architect

We add the Team Architect to help the Product Owner create the formal specification. This role can be shared amongst the team members and does not have to belong to a specific person.

#### 4.2.2 Events

##### Product Planning

In Scrum the Product Owner can create the Product Backlog with out assistance from the rest of the team. The Product Owner can still create the System Requirements Specification on his own, but the Formal Specification is written in a mathematical language and the Product

Owner might need help writing it. To facilitate the writing of the System Requirements Specification and the Formal Specification we add the Product Planning events. During the Product Planning event the Team Architect helps the Product Owner write the Formal Specification. Once a change has been added to the Formal Specification and verified, user stories can be added to the Product Backlog.

## **Sprint**

To the normal Sprint development work we add, from CbyC, the Formal Specification, Formal Design, System Test Specification, and the INFORMED Design. The stories in the Sprint Backlog tells us what work we are going to do to create the increment. We take the work described by the story and the specification in the Formal Specification and we then accordingly update the Formal Design, System Test Specification and INFORMED design. After verification we write the code to create/update the Increment.

### **4.2.3 Artefacts**

We add the artifacts as describe by CbyC:

1. System Requirements;
2. Formal Specification;
3. Formal Design;
4. System Test Specification;
5. INFORMED Design.

## **Increment**

We create the Increment as described by CbyC Code Implementation.




FIGURE 4.1: The Scrum workflow augmented with CbyC.



## Chapter 5

# Applying the methodology

We have now described the process we are going to follow. In this chapter we describing the technique we are going to use the create the artifacts.

To create all the artifacts we need a mathematical specification language and a programming language.

### 5.1 Mathematical Specification Language (TLA<sup>+</sup>)

### 5.2 Programming Language (C#)

#### 5.2.1 Code Contracts

CbyC program design is based on information flow expressed as code contracts [4]. C# does not have built in code contracts any more, but it is very simple to implement code contracts using standard C# language features.

#### 5.2.2 Verification

Testing is usually the main method of verification and validation. The normal testing method follows these steps:

1. test individual units;
2. integrate them and test the integration;
3. then test the system as a whole.

This approach is inefficient because unit testing is ineffective and expensive. Unit testing is ineffective because most errors are interface errors, not internal errors in units. Unit testing is expensive because you have to build test harnesses to test units in isolation [6].

A more efficient and effective approach is to incrementally built the system from the top down. Each build is a real (if small) system and the system can be completely exercised in a real environment. This reduces the integration risk [6].

#### Property based testing

C# has very little static analysis tools able to mathematically prove correctness. As an alternative we will use property based testing to exercise the code and show correctness [2] [7]. We will be using the FsCheck framework for our property based tests [5].



## Appendix A

# TLA+

### A.1 TLA<sup>+</sup> Toolbox

Use the TLA<sup>+</sup> Toolbox to evaluate your specifications. You can download the latest toolbox from the [tlaplus GitHub repository](#) [10].

There is more information about the toolbox on the TLA<sup>+</sup> website [8]

### A.2 More information





## **Appendix B**

# **FsCheck**

### **B.1 Installing**

### **B.2 More information**



## Appendix C

# Hoare Logic

### C.1 Program execution

$$\{P\}Q\{R\}$$

If the assertion  $P$  is true before the program  $Q$  executes, then the assertion  $R$  will be true after  $Q$  has executed.

#### C.1.1 Axion of Assignment

$$\vdash P_0\{x := f\}P$$

$x$  is a variable identifier;

$f$  is an expression;

$P_0$  is obtained from  $P$  by substituting  $x$  with  $f$ ;

#### C.1.2 Rule of Consequence

$$\text{If } \vdash \{P\}Q\{R\} \text{ and } \vdash R \supset S \text{ then } \vdash \{P\}Q\{S\}$$

$$\text{If } \vdash \{P\}Q\{R\} \text{ and } \vdash S \supset P \text{ then } \vdash \{S\}Q\{R\}$$

This rule allows the strengthening of the precondition and/or the weakening of the postcondition.

#### C.1.3 Rule of Composition

$$\text{If } \vdash \{P\}Q_1\{R_1\} \text{ and } \vdash \{R_1\}Q_2\{R\} \text{ then } \vdash \{P\}(Q_1; Q_2)\{R\}$$

#### C.1.4 Rule of Iteration

$$\text{If } \vdash \{P \wedge B\}S\{P\} \text{ then } \vdash \{P\} \text{ while } B \text{ do } S\{\neg B \wedge P\}$$



# Bibliography

- [1] Kent M. Beck et al. *Manifesto for Agile Software Development*. <http://agilemanifesto.org>. [Online; accessed 7-December-2019]. 2001.
- [2] Koen Claessen and John Hughes. “QuickCheck: A Lightweight Tool for Random Testing of Haskell Programs”. In: *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming, ICFP 46* (Jan. 2000). DOI: [10.1145/1988042.1988046](https://doi.org/10.1145/1988042.1988046).
- [3] David Cooper. *Tokeneer ID Station EAL5 Demonstrator: Summary Report*. <https://www.adacore.com/tokeneer>. [Online; accessed 12-December-2019]. Aug. 2008.
- [4] Martin Croxford and Dr. Roderick Chapman. “Correctness by Construction: A Manifesto for High-Integrity Software”. In: *The Journal of Defense Software Engineering* 18.12 (Dec. 2005), pp. 5–8.
- [5] *FsCheck*. <https://fscheck.github.io/FsCheck/index.html>. [Online; accessed 3-December-2019].
- [6] Anthony Hall and Roderick Chapman. “Correctness by Construction: Developing a Commercial Secure System”. In: *IEEE Software* 19.1 (Jan. 2002), pp. 18–25.
- [7] Richard Hamlet. “Random Testing”. In: *Encyclopedia of Software Engineering*. Wiley, 1994, pp. 970–978.
- [8] Leslie Lamport. *The TLA<sup>+</sup> Toolbox*. <https://lamport.azurewebsites.net/tla/toolbox.html>. [Online; accessed 4-December-2019]. 2019.
- [9] Ken Schwaber and Jeff Sutherland. *The Scrum Guide*. <https://www.scrum.org/index.php/resources/scrum-guide>. [Online; accessed 27-January-2019]. Nov. 2017.
- [10] *TLA<sup>+</sup> GitHub release*. <https://github.com/tlaplus/tlaplus/releases/latest>. [Online; accessed 4-December-2019].