

# Computer Aided Extrinsic Robustness Verification

**Christèle Faure**

**Principal scientist**

**[Christele.faure@safe-river.com](mailto:Christele.faure@safe-river.com)**

## Industrial Problem

**Given the *specification of input values*,**  
**is it possible to *verify* that the source**  
**code of a program**  
**is *robust* with respect to *erroneous***  
***inputs and memory alterations*?**

# Software Robustness

- **“Art of making software behave reasonably in exceptional situations”**
- **Robustness failures lead to software false executions**
- **Come from**
  - Software bugs : Intrinsic
  - Environment of execution problems : Extrinsic
    - Sensor problems
    - Memory alterations

## Enforcement of Intrinsic Robustness

- **Implementation: Protects against false executions of dangerous operations**
- **Example: protect against division by zero**

1	<code>Assert (d != 0);</code>	<code>If (d != 0) /* error test */</code>
2	<code>e = n/d;</code>	<code>{ e = n/d; }</code>
3		<code>else { /* error handler */ };</code>

- **Intrinsic robustness enforcement**
  - A test protects against false executions of the dangerous operation
  - and branches to
    - The dangerous operation
    - The error handler

# Automatic Verification of Intrinsic Robustness

- **Dangerous events: Runtime errors (RTE)**
- **Dangerous operations lead to (not completely specified in the language norm)**
  - Undefined behavior
  - Unspecified behavior
  - Implementation defined behavior
- **Verify the absence of RTE**
  - Static analyzers based on abstract interpretation: sound , complete
  - Numerical lattices:
    - Non relational: Interval, congruency ...
    - Relational: Convex polyhedrons, ...
- **Existing tools**
  - Astrée: ENS + INRIA + Absint
  - PolySpace: The MathWorks (PolySpace Technologies)
  - Frama-C: CEA List
  - Code Hawk: Kestrel Technology (C Global Surveyor NASA)

## Extrinsic Robustness

- **Dangerous events**
  - Un-intentional erroneous input values ( $\neq$  security)
  - Memory alterations
- **Extrinsic robustness enforcement**
  - Do not trust input values
  - Check the value w. r. t. domain before consumption

## Extrinsic robustness enforcement

- Global input: Phase\_id  $\in$  [0..MAX\_PHASE]

```
{...  
11 scanf(%n, Phase_id);  
12 if ((Phase_id <0) || (Phase_id >= MAX_PHASE))  
13 { /* handle the phase identification error */ };  
14 /* else nothing to do */  
15 switch (Phase_id) {  
16     case 3 : ...;  
     case 2 : ;}  
...}
```

## Robustness enforcement rule

- **Do not trust input values**
  - Impossible to implement in practice
  - Too much extra calculation
- **Practical enforcement rule**
  - Put a robustness check (target input, correctness domain, location)
  - For each non pointer input
  - Before value consumption

<i>Target input</i>	<i>Correctness domain</i>	<i>Location</i>
<b>Global input</b>	<b>From the specification</b>	<b>After acquisition</b>
<b>Input parameter</b>	<b>To be computed</b>	<b>After function start</b>



## Robustness verification

- **No automatic tool**
- **Verification of the coherency between**
  - Actual enforcement check
  - Expected enforcement check
- **Verification (for each target input)**

<i>Check</i>	<i>Correctness property</i>	<i>Complexity</i>
<b>Input</b>	<b>Check all inputs</b>	
<b>Location</b>	<b>Protection of all consumptions</b>	
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Coherency w. r. t. global input domains</b>	

## Robustness verification

- Verification (for each target input)

<i>Check</i>	<i>Required computation</i>	<i>Mode</i>
<b>Input</b>	<b>Identification of</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Global inputs</li> <li>➤ Input parameters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Automated</li> <li>➤ Manual</li> </ul>
<b>Location</b>	<b>Identification of</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Production sites: lower bound</li> <li>➤ Consumption sites: upper bound</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Manual</li> <li>➤ Manual</li> </ul>
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Computation of</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Propagated input domain (<math>\Leftrightarrow</math> expected)</li> <li>➤ Coherency between actual and expected domains</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Automated</li> <li>➤ Automated</li> </ul>

# Automatic Computations

- **PolySpace TMW**
- **Propagation of value domains**
  - From global inputs (instrumentation by assert)
  - Function parameters
  - Extracted using Inspection Point (instrumentation by IPT)
- **Domain coherency**
  - Actual domain
  - Propagated domain
  - Coherency verification
    - Protective assert never fail (green)
    - Error handler never executed (grey)

## Conclusion

- **Intrinsic robustness  $\neq$  extrinsic robustness**
- **General method**
  - Enforcement by coding rule
  - Verification
    - No automatic tool
    - Mostly manual
    - Conclusive if domain coherency automatically verified
- **Could be automated**
  - Automatic generation of checks (program instrumentation)
  - Automatic verification of checks (program verification)

## SafeRiver industrial projects

- **Conception of critical systems**
  - THALES/RSS: train tracking
  - CSWT Ltd: tram-bus of DOUAI
- **Verification of embedded equipments**
  - DELPHI : low cost platform for car cabin equipment
  - AREVA T&D : control box for indoor switches (middle voltage)
- **Information system security**
  - THALES Communications : application of formal methods to cryptographic equipment
  - AIRBUS : Aircraft Information System Security