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AADL is an architectural design language aimed at embedded systems. It allows to define software and hardware components.

Ocarina is an AADL model processor targetting both C RTOS or Ada via native or Ravenscar targets.

PolyORB-HI is a high-integrity runtime with a C and an Ada implementation.
PolyORB-HI services

Services offered by PolyORB-HI:

- types and time management
- marshalling and unmarshalling facilities
- messages management
- a global queue to exchange messages between components
- patterns for periodic, sporadic tasks etc.

![Diagram showing marshalling and unmarshalling between queues](chart.png)
Proof of both runtimes (C and Ada versions):

- absence of runtime errors
- contract correctness
- using Frama-C for C and SPARK2014 for Ada

But:

the runtimes are already written (by good C and Ada programmers)

we are adding the contracts without retroengineering the code (at least we are trying…)

Moreover, some parts of the contracts depend on the AADL model:

how to fix these numbers to be representative?
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- the runtimes are already written (by good C and Ada programmers)
- we are adding the contracts without retroengineering the code (at least we are trying...)

Moreover, some parts of the contracts depend on the AADL model: number of tasks, etc.

⇒ how to fix these numbers to be representative?
Status of PolyORB-HI/Ada

PolyORB-HI/Ada leverages Ada 2012 High-Integrity profile

- arrays as first class citizen → no pointers!
- sizes of all messages known from the model → all arrays are statically bounded, no dynamic allocation!
- generics → adaptation to user-defined types made easy!
- concurrency built in SPARK 2014, using Ravenscar → deterministic and provable tasking!

Annotations generated to ensure compliance with SPARK language, proper initialization of all elements and absence of run-time errors, and annotation of key integrity property of core elements (message queues and buffer management), ensuring a Gold level!


PS: this slide has been writing by a Ada/SPARK enthusiast 😊
Status of PolyORB-HI/C

More difficult for PolyORB-HI/C:

- good C programmers have implemented the runtime, so they use `void *` pointers, unions etc.
- absence of runtime errors can be easily discharged using correct preconditions (see previous remark)
- functional correctness is more difficult:
  - we have found one (minor) bug!
  - proof implies some major refactoring of code (for instance unions)
  - `void *` pointers are problematic
  - concurrency problems between tasks have not been tackled yet...
  - some automatic proofs are very long

More on https://github.com/OpenAADL/polyorb-hi-c (check the various acsl branches).
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Why SPARK by Example?

We want our students to work on the PolyORB-HI projects, but time dedicated to research projects is short at ISAE-SUPAERO (roughly 2 months).

Good complete references are available for both languages:

- ACSL Frama-C implementation
- Frama-C user Manual
- WP manual
- SPARK 2014 User’s Guide
- Building High Integrity Applications with SPARK
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We offer to 3rd year students attending the Critical Embedded Systems track a course on formal methods in which they have to develop a small string library.

➡️ they use “ACSL by Example” a lot to learn ACSL through classical algorithms!

See https://gitlab.fokus.fraunhofer.de/verification/open-acslbyexample
SPARK by Example: the contract

The idea:

- provide a booklet in the spirit of “ACSL by Example” in which students can find classical algorithms and learn SPARK “hands-on”
- start from each function presented in “ACSL by Example”
- write a SPARK version of this function, first by translating the C function signature and then by trying to “SPARKify” the function
- compare both approaches

A good guinea pig: me!

- minimal knowledge of Ada
- rather good knowledge of C and Frama-C
- will do/have done all possible mistakes and clumsiness in SPARK
The **Equal** and the **Mismatch** functions are defined as follows:

- **Equal** verifies if two arrays are equal
- **Mismatch** returns the first index at which two arrays differ

Let us look at their specification and implementation in ACSL by example.

First, a predicate is specified to define what means “array \(a\) and array \(b\) are equal”:

```plaintext
predicate EqualRanges{K,L}(value_type* a, integer m, integer n, value_type* b, integer p) =
\let s = n - m;
\forall integer i; 0 <= i < s ==> \at(a[m+i],K) == \at(b[p+i],L);
```

Several overloaded versions of the predicate are also defined.
Mismatch can be easily specified using EqualRanges:

```plaintext
requires valid: \valid_read(a + (0..n-1));
requires valid: \valid_read(b + (0..n-1));

assigns \nothing;

behavior all_equal:
  assumes EqualRanges{Here,Here}(a, n, b);
  ensures result: \result == n;

behavior some_not_equal:
  assumes !EqualRanges{Here,Here}(a, n, b);
  ensures bound: 0 <= \result < n;
  ensures result: a[\result] != b[\result];
  ensures first: EqualRanges{Here,Here}(a, \result, b);

complete behaviors;
disjoint behaviors;
```
Finally, **Mismatch** is implemented straightforwardly:

```c
size_type
mismatch(const value_type* a, size_type n, const value_type* b) {
    /*@
    loop invariant bound: 0 <= i <= n;
    loop invariant equal: EqualRanges{Here,Here}(a, i, b);
    loop assigns i;
    loop variant n-i;
    */
    for (size_type i = 0; i < n; i++) {
        if (a[i] != b[i]) {
            return i;
        }
    }
    return n;
}
```
Defining predicates with SPARK

To define predicates with SPARK, ghost functions and expressions can be used:

```plaintext
function Equal_Ranges (A : T_Arr; Offset_A : Natural; Size_A : Natural;
                      B : T_Arr; Offset_B : Natural)
  return Boolean is
    (for all I in 0 .. Size_A - Offset_A - 1 =>
     A(A'First + I) = B(B'First + Offset_B + I));
```

but as such functions are also verified by gnatprove, preconditions must be added to prove that no overflow or index check may fail:

```plaintext
function Equal_Ranges (A : T_Arr; Offset_A : Natural; Size_A : Natural;
                      B : T_Arr; Offset_B : Natural) return Boolean is
  (for all I in 0 .. Size_A - Offset_A - 1 =>
   A(A'First + Offset_A + I) = B(B'First + Offset_B + I))
with Pre => Size_A <= A'Length and then
  Offset_A < A'Length and then
  B'Length >= Size_A and then
  Offset_B <= B'Length - Size_A + Offset_A and then
  Offset_B < B'Length;
```
Defining predicates with SPARK

Easier: use equality on arrays with no limited types provided by Ada:

```plaintext
function Equal_Ranges (A : T_Arr; B : T_Arr) return Boolean is
  (A = B);

Consequence: no predicate is needed, simply use = or a simplified version of Equal_Ranges with a slice (with SPARK Pro 17):

```plaintext
function Equal_Ranges (A : T_Arr; B : T_Arr; Offset : Natural) return Boolean is
  (A(A'First .. A'First + Offset) = B(B'First .. B'First + Offset))
with
  Pre => Offset < A'Length and then
  Offset < B'Length;
```
Mismatch is specified with contract cases, completeness and disjointness is automatically checked:

```plaintext
function Mismatch (A : T_Arr; B : T_Arr) return Natural with
  Pre => A'Length <= B'Length,
  Contract_Cases => (A = B (B'First .. B'First - 1 + A'Length) => Mismatch'Result = A'Length,
    others => (A (A'First + Mismatch'Result) /= B (B'First + Mismatch'Result))
    and then
    if (Mismatch'Result /= 0) then
      Equal_Ranges.Equal_Ranges(A, B, Mismatch'Result - 1));
```
Mismatch is classically implemented. Notice that we do not need to specify an invariant for variable bounds or frame condition:

```ada
function Mismatch (A : T_Arr; B : T_Arr) return Natural is
begin
    for I in 0 .. A'Length - 1 loop
        if (A (A'First + I) /= B (B'First + I)) then
            return I;
        end if;
    end loop;
    pragma Loop_Invariant
        (Equal_Ranges.Equal_Ranges (A, B, I));
    pragma Loop_Variant
        (Increases => I);
    return A'Length;
end Mismatch;
```
VC verifications for Mismatch

Some results for **Mismatch**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frama-C Silicon</th>
<th>SPARK Pro 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>postconditions</td>
<td>contract cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 AE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loop invariants</td>
<td>loop invariant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 AE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loop variant</td>
<td>loop variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 AE + Qed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assigns</td>
<td>preconditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Qed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behaviors</td>
<td>RTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Qed</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 AE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- for functional correctness proof, time is quasi equivalent
- overflow, index and ranges checks are numerous in SPARK due to the language
- “extra specifications” in Frama-C are easily discharged by Qed
Writing Equal using Mismatch

In ACSL by Example, Equal is written using Mismatch. We can use Mismatch as an implementation or a specification:

```haskell
function Direct_Equal (A : T_Arr; B : T_Arr) return Boolean is
  (A = B (B'First .. B'First - 1 + A'Length))
with
  Pre  => A'Length <= B'Length,
  Post => (Direct_Equal'Result =
         (Mismatch.Mismatch (A, B) = A'Length));

function Equal (A : T_Arr; B : T_Arr) return Boolean is
  (Mismatch.Mismatch (A, B) = A'Length)
with
  Pre  => A'Length <= B'Length,
  Post => (Equal'Result =
         (A = B (B'First .. B'First - 1 + A'Length))));
```
An « option » type can be easily defined to avoid using length of the first array when the two arrays mismatch:

```plaintext
(type Option is record
   Exists : Boolean;
   Value  : Natural;
end record;
```
Specification is straightforward:

```haskell
function Mismatch (A : T_Arr; B : T_Arr) return Option with
Pre => A'Length <= B'Length,
Contract_Cases => (
    A = B (B'First .. B'First - 1 + A'Length) =>
        not Mismatch'Result.Exists,
    others =>
        Mismatch'Result.Exists and then
            (A (A'First + Mismatch'Result.Value) /=
                B (B'First + Mismatch'Result.Value))
        and then
            (if (Mismatch'Result.Value /= 0) then
                Equal_Ranges.Equal_Ranges(A, B, Mismatch'Result.Value - 1));
```
function Mismatch (A : T_Arr; B : T_Arr) return Option is
    Result : Option := (Exists => False, Value => 0);
begin
    for I in 0 .. A'Length - 1 loop
        if A (A'First + I) /= B (B'First + I) then
            Result.Exists := True;
            Result.Value := I;
            return Result;
        end if;
    end loop;
    return Result;
end Mismatch;
Conclusion on SPARK by Example

What has been done:

- Jérôme has already tackled first chapters from ACSL by Example 11.1, but in “C style”
- chapter on non-mutating algorithms is OK, but needs SPARK Pro 2017 as it uses array slices

What remains to do:

- “SPARKify” the current specifications/implementations
- add the new implementations from ACSL by Example 14.1
- do not hesitate to contribute to https://github.com/tofgarion/spark_examples (GPL2016 or PRO2017 branches)