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01.

Setting the Scene
Formal Methods in Industry: Always Applied by Expert Clique?
Some People Do Proof Every Day…

… and are

- aware of it
- using a principled (CbyC) approach
- not FM experts
- using SPARK
Why We Do It
The Prevailing V-Model

DO-178C: SRs
- User/Business Requirements
  - Software System Specification
    - High Level Design
      - Unit Level Specification
        - Implementation
  - Integration Testing
    - System Testing
      - Acceptance Testing

DO-178C: HLRs
- DO-178C: HLRs

DO-178C: LLRs
- DO-178C: LLRs
A Sweet Spot: SPARK

- User/Business Requirements
- Software System Specification
- High Level Design
- Unit Level Specification
- Implementation
- Integration Testing
- System Testing
- Acceptance Testing
02.

SPARK – What has Worked and Why?
What is SPARK?

SPARK is:

- a language
- a set of tools
- a design approach

... for development of high-integrity applications.
SPARK – Analysable Subset of Ada

- Ada features outside the SPARK subset
- Core language constructs common to Ada and SPARK
- Additional SPARK contracts

Ada

SPARK
How We Feel about Types

Will dance for TYPES
Contract Example – An Observation about Types

```plaintext
procedure Sqrt (Input : in Integer; Res: out Natural)
with
  Pre  => Input >= 0,
  Post => (Res * Res) <= Input and
          Input < (Res + 1) * (Res + 1);
```

What difference do types make?
Contract Example – An Observation about Types

With the help of types...

```plaintext
procedure Sqrt (Input : in Integer; Res: out Natural) with
  Pre  => Input >= 0,
  Post => (Res * Res) <= Input and
          Input < (Res + 1) * (Res + 1);
```

... less to write!

```plaintext
procedure Sqrt (Input : in Natural; Res: out Natural) with
  Post => (Res * Res) <= Input and
          Input < (Res + 1) * (Res + 1);
```
Mixing Test and Proof

- Dynamic Semantics – contracts can be:
  - compiled
  - checked at run time
  - thought of as “pre-assert” and “post-assert”

- Static Semantics – contracts can be:
  - interpreted in logic
  - formal pre- and post- assertions of a Hoare triplet
  - checked exhaustively by a theorem prover
Number One Killer of FM Tools Uptake?

Alarm:
Off Target

!?
Semantics of Contracts – Overflows

- Contracts have the same semantics as in Ada:

```plaintext
procedure P (X, Y : in Positive; Z : out Positive)
    with Post => (if X + Y <= Positive'Last then Z = X + Y) and
    (if X + Y > Positive'Last then Z = Positive'Last);
```

"warning: overflow check might fail"

X + Y could overflow and raise a run-time exception when the contract is executed

Is this a false alarm in your context?
SPARK 2014 Design: Overflow Checking Modes

- Different user needs
  - run-time assertion checking for contracts on/off in deliverable
  - amount of proof activity, requirements on false alarm rate
- Customisable overflow checking mode
- Options
  1. strict Ada semantics for overflow checking
  2. minimized overflow checking
  3. eliminated - no possibility of overflow (mathematical semantics)
- Specified semantics is used both at run time and for proof
SPARK - Teaching

- formal and sound contracts
- industrially used open source mature tools
- support for academic faculty
- code examples, labs, and sample answers
- excellent books: Chapin, McCormick 2015 (Barnes' book 3rd edition)
- Altran 5 day course for any and all

Consider teaching SPARK…
Lessons Learned in Research Productisation

- Successful case study?
- What about repeat usage?

Typical activities:
- Producing user-friendly wrapping software
- Patching theories (80-20% rule for research work too)
- Constructing cost-benefit arguments
- Pitching & Teaching
- Porting software
- Making resource control deterministic
- Test & build

Major investment.
03.

Current Large Scale Formal Specification
Case Study

- Air Traffic Control - iFACTS
What is iFACTS?

- Tactical medium term support to controllers:
  - Trajectory Prediction
  - Conflict Detection
  - Flight Path Monitoring

- Enhances existing ATC system:
  - Additional tools
  - Display components

- Improves airspace efficiency.
How much of iFACTS is Specified in Z?
How big is the iFACTS Z specification?

- Initially developed by a team of 12 engineers.
- Actively developed or maintained over 10 years. 
  › Supporting successful incorporation of major changes.
- The specification comprises over 40,000 lines of Z.
- The key Z documents amount to over 3,000 pages.
Why we choose Z to write specifications

- **Z models can be Abstract**
- **Z schema notation allows Structuring** of the specification through encapsulation, modularisation and composition.
- **Z is Expressive** with a large toolkit of operators
- Easy to combine English narrative with Z notation
How we use Z in specifications

System Specification

- Concurrency
- Timing Requirements
- Already Formal Requirements (e.g. Algorithms)
- HMI Look and Feel

- Z Specification
  - Behavioural Model
  - Operations
  - Data Model
    - System State
  - ICD
    - Inputs and Outputs
How we specify systems in Z

- **Z boundary** identified
- Structured **data model**
- Abstract **messages**
- System **operations**
- Detailed **partial operations**

- For large systems it is important to **structure** the specification
How we specify systems in Z – The boundary

- Right level of abstraction
- Drawing the line at the display
- What messages cross the Z boundary?
How we specify systems in Z – Data Model

- **Hierarchy** of packages

- package **static characteristics**
  - primary state
  - derived state and derivation
  - invariants on the state
  - initial state
How we specify systems in Z – Operations

- Dynamic behaviour of the whole system
  - response to a **single stimulus**
  - models **outputs**
  - state changes as **post conditions** ...
    ...
    postponed to partial operations
How we specify systems in Z – Partial Operations

- **behaviour** of one package
- the **detail** of the change
  …as post conditions on the package state

```
UpdatePositionMob---------------------
ΔMobiles
gps? : GPSMsg

mobileState' =
  mobileState
    ⊕ {Mobile | number = gps?.mobId
        ∧ gpsLocation = gps?.position
        • number ↦ 0Mobile}
```
How we specify systems in Z – Schema types

- Heavy use to aggregate properties of an entity together.
- Encapsulation is enforced stylistically.
How we specify systems in Z – Condition Hierarchies

- We apply a **divide and conquer** approach using predicate schemas
  - Schemas as guards.
  - Partial operations are decomposed into fragments.
  - Schema composition to “do A” and then “do B”

```plaintext
DisplayScreenCentre
DisplayDerivedDecs
Allocations

MyMobileExists \Rightarrow
(\exists \ mm : MOBILE \bullet \{mm\} = myMobile
\land screenCentre = (mobileState mm).gpsLocation)
\neg MyMobileExists \Rightarrow
screenCentre = defaultPosn
```

`MyMobile Exists_{Allocations}`

`myMobile \neq \emptyset`
Verification of Z specifications

- We always
  - type check our specifications.
  - review our specifications against the requirements.

- We may also prove the following:
  - existence of an initial state.
  - precondition of operations
  - properties hold of our system

- Our specifications are often too big to realistically apply these proofs.
Our experience – what is successful?

- Implementing from a Z specification.
- Developers and testers agree.
- Training software engineers to read Z.
- Requirements ambiguities found early.
- Z specification is maintainable.
Our experience – what is difficult?

- Finding good Z specification authors
- Overcoming the language gap
- Justifying the up-front investment
04.

Looking Forward
Specification Improvement Motivation

- DO-178C: SRs (User/Business Requirements)
- DO-178C: HLRs
- DO-178C: LLRs
- High Level Design
- Unit Level Specification
- Implementation
- Integration Testing
- Unit Testing
- System Testing
- Acceptance Testing
- Customer Lingo
- Developer Lingo

Risk
Cost
Warranty?
SECT-AIR Goal

“To deliver a step-change improvement in the affordability of aerospace software. This is required to secure and develop the UK as a world leader in critical and complex systems development and enable UK aerospace to build new products.”
Which Specification Technology to Choose?

Wait... let us consider semantics first!
Ontology

Focusing on *semantics*.
- Domain
- Expressiveness
- Executable or not
- Non-determinism
  - Ex: throttle is in range $t_{\text{min}} \ldots t_{\text{max}}$
- Abstraction mechanisms
- Validation possibilities
- Tool processing possibilities
Two strands of work: Evaluation & Step Change in Existing Process

1. Evaluation of ABZ languages and tools
   › No silver bullet!
   › Challenging evaluation questions: records, editors, tool maturity, structuring, refinement
   › Longer term evaluation and community effort

2. Step change in risk and cost improvement
   › Multilingual specifications
   › Natural language
   › Automatically generated V&V monitors
   › Z and fuzz based
Specification Solution Architecture
13 Years Ago in Another Verification Tool Building Team...

An example OCL specification for verification of a JavaCard program in the KeY proof system (Johannison 2005):

```
context OwnerPIN
  def: let tryCounter = self.triesLeft->at(1)

context OwnerPIN::check(pin: Sequence(Integer),
         offset: Integer, length: Integer): Boolean
  post: self.tryCounter = 0 implies result = false
  post: (self.tryCounter > 0 and pin <> null and offset >= 0 and length >= 0
         and offset+length <= pin->size())
         and Util.arrayCompare(self.pin, 0, pin, offset, length) = 0
  ) implies (result = true and self.isValidated() and tryCounter = maxTries)
  post: (self.tryCounter > 0 and not (pin <> null and offset >= 0 and length >= 0
         and offset+length <= pin->size())
         and Util.arrayCompare(self.pin, 0, pin, offset, length) = 0)
  ) implies (not self.isValidated() and self.tryCounter = tryCounter@pre-1 and
      (( not excThrown(java::lang::Exception) and result = false)
        or excThrown(java::lang::NullPointerException)
        or excThrown(java::lang::ArrayIndexOutOfBoundsException)))
```

**Fig. 1.** OCL specification from the Java Card API
First Translation Attempt

In Fig. 2 we show the translation of the OCL specification produced by an earlier version of our system. The English text is basically correct, but it is clumsy and very hard to read.

for the class OwnerPIN introduce the following definition: the tryCounter is defined as the element at index 1 of the triesLeft of the ownerPIN for the operation check (pin:Seq(Integer), offset:Integer, length:Integer): Boolean of the class javacard::framework::OwnerPIN the following holds: the following postconditions should hold: (*) if the tryCounter of the ownerPIN is equal to 0, the result is equal to false (*) if the tryCounter of the ownerPIN is greater than 0 and pin is not equal to null and offset is at least 0 and length is at least 0 and offset plus length is at most the size of pin and the query arrayCompare (the pin of the ownerPIN, 0, pin, offset, length) to Util is equal to 0, the result is equal to true and the query isValidated () holds for the ownerPIN and the tryCounter of the ownerPIN is equal to the maxTries of the ownerPIN (*) if the tryCounter of the ownerPIN is greater than 0 and it is not the case that pin is not equal to null and offset is at least 0 and length is at least 0 and offset plus length is at most the size of pin and the query arrayCompare (the pin of the ownerPIN, 0, pin, offset, length) to Util is equal to 0, it is not the case that the query isValidated () holds for the ownerPIN and the tryCounter of the ownerPIN is equal to the tryCounter of the ownerPIN at the beginning of the Operation minus 1 and it is not the case that an exception is thrown and the result is equal to false or a nullPointerException is thrown or an arrayIndexOutOfBoundsException is thrown

Fig. 2. Translation of OCL specification (before)
Improved Translation

for the class OwnerPIN introduce the following definition:

- the try counter is defined as the element at index 1 of the triesLeft attribute.

for the operation check (pin : Sequence(Integer), offset : Integer, length : Integer) : Boolean of the class javascf::framework::OwnerPIN, the following post-conditions should hold:

- if the try counter is equal to 0 then this implies that the result is equal to false
- if the following conditions are true
  - the try counter is greater than 0
  - pin is not equal to null
  - offset is at least 0
  - length is at least 0
  - offset plus length is at most the size of pin
  - the query arrayCompare (the pin, 0, pin, offset, length)\(^1\) on Util is equal to 0
  then this implies that the following conditions are true
    - the result is equal to true
    - this owner PIN is validated
    - the try counter is equal to the maximum number of tries
- if the try counter is greater than 0 and at least one of the following conditions is not true
  - pin is not equal to null
  - offset is at least 0
  - length is at least 0
  - offset plus length is at most the size of pin
  - the query arrayCompare (the pin, 0, pin, offset, length)\(^2\) on Util is equal to 0
  then this implies that the following conditions are true
    - this owner PIN is not validated
    - the try counter is equal to the previous value of the try counter minus 1
    - at least one of the following conditions is true
      - an exception is not thrown and the result is equal to false
      - a null pointer exception is thrown
      - an array index out of bounds exception is thrown
Trade-Offs in Natural Language Translation Techniques

1. Statistical methods
   › Consumer-oriented
   › Wide coverage
   › Imprecise

2. Rule-based methods
   › Producer-oriented
   › Grammar-based
   › Restricted

3. Ad-hoc methods
   › We are used to writing parsers and linearisers… can’t be that difficult?
Grammatical Framework

- Multilingual grammar formalism
- Based on type theory and functional programming
- Multilingual grammar = abstract syntax + concrete syntaxes
- Parsing: from string to abstract syntax
- Linearization: from abstract syntax to string
- Translation = parsing followed by linearization
- Abstract syntax is interlingua
Grammatical Framework Mission…

Aarne Ranta [FINMT16]
...is Grammar Engineering Without Tears

Aarne Ranta [FINMT16]
Multilingual Specifications – Progress and Future Work

- Abstract core grammar (GF) close to Spivey’s ZRM
- Concrete grammars:
  - Fuzzlisp
  - LaTeX
  - English
  - V&V Monitors in Python/SpecSPARK
Some Concluding Remarks

- Correctness by Construction is still important and hot
  - Keep teaching and improving “text-book style” formal verification

- How do we recruit and train specifiers?
  - How could we make ABZ courses for lawyers, linguists, chemical engineers, astrophysicists…?
05. Resources
SPARK Resources & Getting Started

- GAP - GNAT Academic Program
  - Open-source, GPL release of SPARK tools
  - [https://www.adacore.com/academia](https://www.adacore.com/academia)
  - Support from SPARK team for faculty
- Getting Started
  - Download the tools: [http://libre.adacore.com/download/](http://libre.adacore.com/download/)
Some More References

- Tokeneer case study: https://www.adacore.com/tokeneer
- Grammatical Framework: https://www.grammaticalframework.org/
- Digital Grammars: http://www.digitalgrammars.com/
- Fuzz typechecker for Z: http://spivey.oriel.ox.ac.uk/corner/Fuzz_typechecker_for_Z
- High Integrity Agile, our take: https://cacm.acm.org/magazines/2017/10/221329-what-can-agile-methods-bring-to-high-integrity-software-development/abstract