

**Lecture 9**

# **Verification Conditions II**

Zvonimir Rakamarić  
University of Utah

# Announcements

- ▶ Project brainstorming session in class on Wednesday
  - ▶ Added more ideas on Canvas
  - ▶ Present your project ideas in 2-3 minutes
  - ▶ Informal discussion and feedback
  - ▶ Message me if more feedback needed
- ▶ Project proposals are due on Feb 28
  - ▶ Make sure to discuss your project idea with me at least a week before this due date
- ▶ Posted homework 4 – due on Feb 16 (morning)
  - ▶ Extensive homework, start early

# Last Time

- ▶ Simple command language
- ▶ Basic verification condition generation
- ▶ Weakest preconditions

# Simple Command Language

$x := E$

havoc  $x$

assert  $P$

assume  $P$

$S ; T$       [sequential composition]

$S \square T$       [choice statement]

# Weakest Preconditions Cookbook

- ▶  $\text{wp}(x := E, Q) = Q[E / x]$
- ▶  $\text{wp}(\text{havoc } x, Q) = (\forall x. Q)$
- ▶  $\text{wp}(\text{assert } P, Q) = P \wedge Q$
- ▶  $\text{wp}(\text{assume } P, Q) = P \rightarrow Q$
- ▶  $\text{wp}(S ; T, Q) = \text{wp}(S, \text{wp}(T, Q))$
- ▶  $\text{wp}(S \square T, Q) = \text{wp}(S, Q) \wedge \text{wp}(T, Q)$

# Checking Correctness with wp

{true}

$\text{wp}(x := 1, x + 2 = 3) = 1 + 2 = 3 \wedge \text{true}$

`x := 1;`

$\text{wp}(y := x + 2, y = 3) = x + 2 = 3 \wedge \text{true}$

`y := x + 2;`

$\text{wp}(\text{assert } y = 3, \text{true}) = y = 3 \wedge \text{true}$

`assert y = 3;`

{true}

Check:  $\text{true} \rightarrow 1 + 2 = 3 \wedge \text{true}$

# Structured if Statement

- ▶ Just a “syntactic sugar”:

if E then S else T

gets desugared into

(assume E ; S) □ (assume  $\neg$ E ; T)

# This Time

- ▶ Design by contract
- ▶ Procedures

# Design by Contract

- ▶ Also called **assume-guarantee reasoning**
- ▶ Developers annotate software components with **contracts** (formal specifications)
  - ▶ Document developer's intent
  - ▶ Complex system verification broken down into compositional verification of each component
- ▶ Typical contracts
  - ▶ Annotations on procedure boundaries
    - ▶ Preconditions
    - ▶ Postconditions
  - ▶ Annotations on loop boundaries
    - ▶ Loop invariants

# Design by Contract cont.

- ▶ First used in Eiffel [Bertrand Meyer]
- ▶ Native support:
  - ▶ Eiffel, Racket, SPARK Ada, Spec#, Dafny,...
- ▶ Third-party support:
  - ▶ Code Contracts project for .NET
  - ▶ Java Modeling Language
  - ▶ Contracts for Python
  - ▶ `contracts.ruby`
  - ▶ ...
- ▶ Runtime or static checking of contracts

# Code Contracts Example

```
static int BinarySearch(int[] array, int value)
{
    Contract.Requires(array != null);
    ...
}
```

# Spec# Example

```
static int BinarySearch(int[] a, int key)
requires forall{int i in (0: a.Length), int j in
    (i: a.Length); a[i] <= a[j]};
ensures 0 <= result ==> a[result] == key;
ensures result < 0 ==> forall{int i in (0:
    a.Length); a[i] != key};
{
    ...
}
```

# Java Modeling Language (JML) Example

```
class BankingExample {  
    public static final int MAX_BAL = 1000;  
    private int balance;  
    //@ invariant balance >= 0 && balance <= MAX_BAL;  
  
    //@ ensures balance == 0;  
    public BankingExample() { this.balance = 0; }  
  
    //@ requires 0 < amount && amount+balance < MAX_BAL;  
    //@ ensures balance == \old(balance) + amount;  
    public void credit(int amount) {  
        this.balance += amount;  
    }  
}
```

# Assume-Guarantee Reasoning

- ▶ Example

```
foo() {...}
```

```
bar() {...foo();...}
```

- ▶ How to verify/check bar?

# Assume-Guarantee Reasoning cont.

- ▶ Solution 1
  - ▶ Inline foo
- ▶ Solution 2
  - ▶ Write contract/specification  $P$  of foo
  - ▶ Assume  $P$  when checking bar  
bar() {...assume  $P$ ;...}
  - ▶ Guarantee  $P$  when checking foo  
foo() {...assert  $P$ ;}
- ▶ Pros/cons?

# Procedure

- ▶ Procedure is a complex user-defined command
  - ▶ `procedure M(x,y,z) returns (r,s,t)`
  - ▶ `requires P`
  - ▶ `ensures Q`
  - ▶ `{S}`
- ▶ `requires` is a `precondition`
  - ▶ Predicate P has to hold at procedure entry
- ▶ `ensures` is a `postcondition`
  - ▶ Predicate Q has to hold at procedure exit
- ▶ S is procedure body (command)
- ▶ Note: assume procedures have no side-effects

# Procedure Example

```
procedure abs(x) returns (abs_x)
requires -1000 < x && x < 1000
ensures abs_x >= 0
{
    if (x >= 0) {
        abs_x := x;
    } else {
        abs_x := -x;
    }
}
```

# Desugaring Procedure Call

- ▶ procedure  $M(x,y,z)$  returns  $(r,s,t)$   
requires  $P$   
ensures  $Q$   
{ $S$ }

- ▶ call  $a,b,c := M(E,F,G)$   
desugared into:

$x' := E; y' := F; z' := G;$

**assert**  $P'$ ;

**assume**  $Q'$ ;

$a := r'; b := s'; c := t';$

where:

- $x',y',z',r',s',t'$  are fresh variables
- $P'$  is  $P$  with  $x',y',z'$  for  $x,y,z$
- $Q'$  is  $Q$  with  $x',y',z',r',s',t'$  for  $x,y,z,r,s,t$

# Desugaring Call Example

```
procedure abs(x) returns (abs_x)
requires -1000 < x && x < 1000
ensures abs_x >= 0
{
    if (x >= 0) {
        abs_x := x;
    } else {
        abs_x := -x;
    }
}
```

```
call a := abs(b);
assert a >= 0;
```

# Desugaring Call Example

# Desugaring Procedure Implementation

- ▶ procedure  $M(x,y,z)$  returns  $(r,s,t)$   
requires  $P$   
ensures  $Q$   
{ $S$ }
- ▶ Implementation is correct if this is correct:  
assume  $P$ ;  
 $S$ ;  
assert  $Q$ ;

# Desugaring Implementation Example

```
procedure abs(x) returns (abs_x)
requires -1000 < x && x < 1000
ensures abs_x >= 0
{
    if (x >= 0) {
        abs_x := x;
    } else {
        abs_x := -x;
    }
}
```

# Desugaring Implementation Example

# Next Time

- ▶ Loops and loop invariants
- ▶ Program correctness: strategies