

#### Institut Supérieur de l'Aéronautique et de l'Espace



#### **Teaching formal methods through Frama-C & SPARK** Frama-C and SPARK day 2019

Christophe Garion and Jérôme Hugues (and others) ISAE-SUPAERO – DISC/IpSC

#### Outline



#### **1** Context: ISAE-SUPAERO engineering program

#### **SPARK** by Example

- 3 Formal methods course in critical systems major
- Conclusion

ISAE-SUPAERO is one of the leading French "Grandes Écoles", mainly focused on **aerospace**, albeit offering other possibilities.



ISAE-SUPAERO is one of the leading French "Grandes Écoles", mainly focused on **aerospace**, albeit offering other possibilities.



 40h lecture on Algorithms and Programming in C: algorithms, C programming, data structures (linked lists, BST, binary heaps, graphs)

ISAE-SUPAERO is one of the leading French "Grandes Écoles", mainly focused on **aerospace**, albeit offering other possibilities.



- 40h lecture on Object Oriented Design and Programming in Java
- 10h lecture on Integer Linear Programming in S3

ISAE-SUPAERO is one of the leading French "Grandes Écoles", mainly focused on **aerospace**, albeit offering other possibilities.



S2 and S4 are dedicated to projects and 30h elective courses e.g.

- functional and logic programming languages
- implementation of control systems
- systems architecture

ISAE-SUPAERO is one of the leading French "Grandes Écoles", mainly focused on **aerospace**, albeit offering other possibilities.



Most students do a gap year between S4 and S5 with various experiences: academic, internships, personal projects.

ISAE-SUPAERO is one of the leading French "Grandes Écoles", mainly focused on **aerospace**, albeit offering other possibilities.



- field of application (140h): aircraft operations & design, space systems, energy, autonomous systems, decision systems, complex systems modeling & simulation
- major of expertise (240h) e.g. critical system architecture

# Teaching formal methods at SUPAERO?

Why?

- as the main industrial sector of SUPAERO is **aerospace**, it seems legitimate
- the students in the **critical system architecture** major should be exposed to formal methods
- it gives more visibility to CS as a science

# Teaching formal methods at SUPAERO?

Why?

- as the main industrial sector of SUPAERO is **aerospace**, it seems legitimate
- the students in the **critical system architecture** major should be exposed to formal methods
- it gives more visibility to CS as a science

Difficulties?

- the "average" student has only be exposed to **90h of Computer Science** before the last year
- other scientific courses in the common core mainly use **continuous mathematics**
- (almost) no background in useful mathematics for formal methods: mathematical logic, calculability theory, SAT/SMT solving etc.



- SPARK by Example with two 2nd year students during semester 4
- "classic" formal methods lecture in critical system architecture major

## Outline



#### **2** SPARK by Example

3 Formal methods course in critical systems major

#### Conclusion

#### Learning how to prove programs with SPARK

How to learn how to prove complex programs with SPARK?

```
function Inc (X : Integer) return Integer with
  Pre => X < Integer'Last - 1,
  Post => Inc'Result = X + 1,
  SPARK_Mode is
  begin
    return X + 2 - 1;
  end Inc;
```



Dross, Claire and Yannick Moy (2017).
 "Auto-Active Proof of Red-Black Trees in SPARK".
 In: NASA Formal Methods .

# Available material for learning

For the moment, there are several resources for learning SPARK:

- SPARK 2014 User's Guide by AdaCore
  - requires familiarity with Ada and some previous knowledge on formal verification
- Building High Integrity Applications with SPARK by John McCormick and Peter Chapin

➡ focuses on programming rather than verifying with SPARK

 Introduction to SPARK by AdaCore, an interactive tutorial available on https://learn.adacore.com/

## Available material for learning

For the moment, there are several resources for learning SPARK:

- SPARK 2014 User's Guide by AdaCore
  - requires familiarity with Ada and some previous knowledge on formal verification
- Building High Integrity Applications with SPARK by John McCormick and Peter Chapin
  - ➡ focuses on programming rather than verifying with SPARK
- Introduction to SPARK by AdaCore, an interactive tutorial available on https://learn.adacore.com/

#### Our impression

Still need a "recipe" document that shows how to develop and prove SPARK programs through classic CS algorithms.

# In the C world

There is of course a platform for deductive verification of C programs specified by ACSL, namely Frama-C.

Good references are also available:

- ACSL Frama-C implementation
- Frama-C user manual
- WP plugin manual

# In the C world

There is of course a platform for deductive verification of C programs specified by ACSL, namely Frama-C.

Good references are also available:

- ACSL Frama-C implementation
- Frama-C user manual
- WP plugin manual

Jens Gerlach and al. at Fraunhofer Institute have produced a guide, "ACSL by Example":

- specification, implementation and proof of classic CS algorithms extracted from the C++ *Standard Template Library*
- see https://fraunhoferfokus.github.io/acsl-by-example/

#### 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

## Guinea pigs: our students

Fortunately, we have plenty of students that can be used as guinea pigs to experiment with SPARK



Léo Creuse



Joffrey Huguet

- some background knowledge in theoretical CS (automata, propositional logic), functional programming (Caml) and maths
- no previous knowledge of formal methods, Ada nor SPARK
- small introduction to Floyd-Hoare logic and how to specify programs in SPARK

Christophe Garion and Jérôme Hugues (and others)

#### Objective

Will Léo and Joffrey be able to implement, prove and document all algorithms from *ACSL by Example* in SPARK with the 2018 Community Edition of SPARK during a 5-months internship?

#### Objective

Will Léo and Joffrey be able to implement, prove and document all algorithms from *ACSL by Example* in SPARK with the 2018 Community Edition of SPARK during a 5-months internship?

#### Answer

Yes, they did it in less than 3 months!

Creuse, Léo et al. (2018). "SPARK by Example: an introduction to formal verification through the standard C++ library". In: Proceedings of HILT 2018 .

Algorithms presented in ACSL by Example and SPARK by Example are extracted from the C++ Standard Template Library (STL):

 non-mutating algorithms: find first occurrence of an element in an array, count the number of occurrences of an element in an array etc.

- **non-mutating** algorithms: find first occurence of an element in an array, count the number of occurrences of an element in an array etc.
- maxmin algorithms return the maximum and minimum value of an array

- **non-mutating** algorithms: find first occurence of an element in an array, count the number of occurrences of an element in an array etc.
- maxmin algorithms return the maximum and minimum value of an array
- **i binary search** algorithms

- **non-mutating** algorithms: find first occurence of an element in an array, count the number of occurrences of an element in an array etc.
- maxmin algorithms return the maximum and minimum value of an array
- binary search algorithms
- mutating algorithms: copy an array, swap values, replace value etc.
  - first chapter with significant differences between ACSL by Example and SPARK by Example
  - using lemmas functions in proofs

- non-mutating algorithms: find first occurrence of an element in an array, count the number of occurrences of an element in an array etc.
- maxmin algorithms return the maximum and minimum value of an array
- binary search algorithms
- mutating algorithms: copy an array, swap values, replace value etc.
  - first chapter with significant differences between ACSL by Example and SPARK by Example
  - using lemmas functions in proofs
- Inumeric algorithms
  - focuses on overflow errors

- non-mutating algorithms: find first occurrence of an element in an array, count the number of occurrences of an element in an array etc.
- maxmin algorithms return the maximum and minimum value of an array
- binary search algorithms
- mutating algorithms: copy an array, swap values, replace value etc.
  - first chapter with significant differences between ACSL by Example and SPARK by Example
  - using lemmas functions in proofs
- Inumeric algorithms
  - focuses on overflow errors
- **()** heap: a classical implementation of a binary heap with an array
  - the most difficult chapter

- non-mutating algorithms: find first occurrence of an element in an array, count the number of occurrences of an element in an array etc.
- maxmin algorithms return the maximum and minimum value of an array
- binary search algorithms
- mutating algorithms: copy an array, swap values, replace value etc.
  - first chapter with significant differences between ACSL by Example and SPARK by Example
  - using lemmas functions in proofs
- Inumeric algorithms
  - focuses on overflow errors
- **()** heap: a classical implementation of a binary heap with an array
  - the most difficult chapter
- Sorting algorithms: quick chapter

Algorithms presented in ACSL by Example and SPARK by Example are extracted from the C++ Standard Template Library (STL):

- non-mutating algorithms: find first occurence of an element in an array, count the number of occurrences of an element in an array etc.
- maxmin algorithms return the maximum and minimum value of an array
- binary search algorithms
- mutating algorithms: copy an array, swap values, replace value etc.
  - first chapter with significant differences between ACSL by Example and SPARK by Example
  - using lemmas functions in proofs
- Inumeric algorithms
  - focuses on overflow errors
- **()** heap: a classical implementation of a binary heap with an array
  - the most difficult chapter
- Sorting algorithms: quick chapter
- classic sorting: selection sort, insertion sort, heap sort

Frama-C/SPARK 19



• it is possible to prove (relatively) **complex algorithms** without previous knowledge of formal methods...

- it is possible to prove (relatively) **complex algorithms** without previous knowledge of formal methods...
- ... but with help of the community (thanks Claire, Yannick and people from the spark2014-discuss mailing list!)

- it is possible to prove (relatively) **complex algorithms** without previous knowledge of formal methods...
- ... but with help of the community (thanks Claire, Yannick and people from the spark2014-discuss mailing list!)
- only SMT solvers were used to prove all algorithms (no need to learn Coq for instance)

- it is possible to prove (relatively) **complex algorithms** without previous knowledge of formal methods...
- ... but with help of the community (thanks Claire, Yannick and people from the spark2014-discuss mailing list!)
- only SMT solvers were used to prove all algorithms (no need to learn Coq for instance)
- two difficult points:

- it is possible to prove (relatively) **complex algorithms** without previous knowledge of formal methods...
- ... but with help of the community (thanks Claire, Yannick and people from the spark2014-discuss mailing list!)
- only SMT solvers were used to prove all algorithms (no need to learn Coq for instance)
- two difficult points:
  - using **lemmas** through ghost functions to help automatic provers when proving complex functions
    - $\blacktriangleright$  you have to discover the mathematical proof

- it is possible to prove (relatively) **complex algorithms** without previous knowledge of formal methods...
- ... but with help of the community (thanks Claire, Yannick and people from the spark2014-discuss mailing list!)
- only SMT solvers were used to prove all algorithms (no need to learn Coq for instance)
- two difficult points:
  - using **lemmas** through ghost functions to help automatic provers when proving complex functions
    - $\blacktriangleright$  you have to discover the mathematical proof
  - understanding how SMT solvers work
    - ➡ quantifiers nesting
    - understand triggers
    - understand counterexamples

## Outline



#### 2 SPARK by Example

#### **3** Formal methods course in critical systems major

Conclusion

#### Content of the critical systems major



FITR304 "Model-Based Engineering" is a 55h lecture with two parts:

- a 38h part on SysML and SCADE
- a 17h slot for formal methods for validation...

#### Content of the formal method part

- introduction lecture: what are formal methods, industrial use, programming languages semantics
- the students choose one particular formal method through a track (4 students per track):
  - model checking (J. Brunel ONERA)
  - abstract interpretation (P.-L. Garoche ONERA)
  - deductive methods with SPARK (C. Dross AdaCore)
  - deductive methods with Frama-C (C. Garion ISAE-SUPAERO)
- for each track, 6 2h sessions mixing theoretical concepts and labs
  - ➡ each track has a specific project to do
- each student group has 30 minutes to present to the other groups the principles of the technique they used, their result, what was difficult etc.
- a 2h industrial feedback made by S. Duprat (ATOS) on how (aerospace) industry uses formal methods

## Frama-C tracks content

A very classic presentation:

- what is a proof? Formal systems for prop. logic and FOL
- Floyd-Hoare logic
- manual annotation of small algorithms (factorial, GCD etc.) to understand weakest-preconditions
- Frama-C and WP plugin presentation
- gradual hands-on labs to discover Frama-C/WP from basics to axiomatization, pointers, memory separation etc.
- **top-down presentation:** from theory to practise

# SPARK track content

Claire has a more incremental approach using stronger and stronger levels of verification.





**stone level** valid SPARK





bronze level init. + data flow

silver level AoRTE

gold level contracts

#### bottom-up presentation

#### Associated projects

Two (similar) projects are done in both tracks.

• Frama-C track: develop a tiny library on strings

```
int strlen(const char *str);
void strsubstring(char *dst, const char *src, int start, int length);
void strappend(char *dst, const char *src);
```

An (incomplete) axiomatization for strlen is given to students. They have to **specify**, **implement** and **prove** the three functions.

• SPARK track: prove a small part of Ada.Strings.Fixed GNAT library

```
function Index
(Source : String;
Set : Maps.Character_Set;
Test : Membership := Inside;
Going : Direction := Forward) return Natural;
....
```

Students have to specify and prove 12 functions.

#### Pros

- students complete both projects
- it is cool for them to prove programs
- industrial feedback is important

#### Pros

- students complete both projects
- it is cool for them to prove programs
- industrial feedback is important

#### Cons

- in such a small amount of time, top-down approach is not efficient
  - better to quickly use Frama-C/SPARK and present theory when needed
- it is not cool for them to write specifications
- they lack theoretical background for complex specifications

## Outline

- 1 Context: ISAE-SUPAERO engineering program
- 2 SPARK by Example
- **3** Formal methods course in critical systems major
- 4 Conclusion

## Conclusion

It is possible for non-experts to use  $\mathsf{Frama-C}/\mathsf{SPARK}$  to prove "relatively complex" programs.

But they sometimes lack knowledge/background to:

- understand how SMT solvers work and why they may fail
- understand what is decidable or not
- write complex specifications

## Conclusion

It is possible for non-experts to use  $\mathsf{Frama-C}/\mathsf{SPARK}$  to prove "relatively complex" programs.

But they sometimes lack knowledge/background to:

- understand how SMT solvers work and why they may fail
- understand what is decidable or not
- write complex specifications

Industrial feedback by S. Duprat and also C. Dross is important to confort students that these techniques are used in real life.

It is possible for non-experts to use  $\mathsf{Frama-C}/\mathsf{SPARK}$  to prove "relatively complex" programs.

But they sometimes lack knowledge/background to:

- understand how SMT solvers work and why they may fail
- understand what is decidable or not
- write complex specifications

Industrial feedback by S. Duprat and also C. Dross is important to confort students that these techniques are used in real life.

Some ideas:

- begin with Why3 and WhyML instead of "real" programming languages
- add more formal methods with TLA+ in the distributed algorithms course
- create a S4 30h optional course on reliable software

# Coffee is just waiting for you, but you can ask questions!

