

Formal Verification by Model Checking

Jonathan Aldrich
Carnegie Mellon University

Based on slides developed by Natasha Sharygina

*17-654/17-754: Analysis of Software Artifacts
Spring 2006*

1

Formal Verification by Model Checking

Domain: Continuously operating concurrent systems (e.g. operating systems, hardware controllers and network protocols)

- Ongoing, reactive semantics
 - Non-terminating, infinite computations
 - Manifest non-determinism

Instrument: Temporal logic [Pnueli 77] is a formalism for reasoning about behavior of reactive systems

2


Temporal Logic Model Checking

[Clarke,Emerson 81][Queille,Sifakis 82]

- Systems are modeled by **finite state machines**
- **Properties** are written in **propositional temporal logic**
- Verification procedure is an **exhaustive search of the state space** of the design
- **Diagnostic counterexamples**

3

Temporal Logic Model Checking



4

What is Model Checking?

Does model M satisfy a property P ?
(written $M \models P$)

What is “ M ”?

What is “ P ”?

What is “satisfy”?

5


What is “ M ”?

States: valuations to all variables

Initial states: subset of states

Arcs: transitions between states

Atomic Propositions:
e.g. $(x = 5, y = true)$



State Transition Graph or Kripke Model

6

What is “M”?

$$M = \langle S, S_0, R, L \rangle$$

Kripke structure:

S – finite set of states


$S_0 \subseteq S$ – set of initial states

$R \subseteq S \times S$ – set of arcs


$L : S \rightarrow 2^{AP}$ – mapping from states to a set of atomic propositions

7

Model of Computation



State Transition Graph




Infinite Computation Tree

Unwind State Graph to obtain Infinite Tree.


A *trace* is an infinite sequence of states.

8

Semantics



State Transition Graph



Infinite Computation Tree

The semantics of a FSM is a set of traces. Semantics of the composition of FSMs is the intersection of traces of individual FSMs.

9

What is "P"?

Different kinds of temporal logics

Syntax: What are the formulas in the logic?

Semantics: What does it mean for model **M** to satisfy formula **P**?

Formulas:

- Atomic propositions: properties of states
- Temporal Logic Specifications: properties of traces.

10

Computation Tree Logics

Examples: **Safety** (mutual exclusion): no two processes can be at a critical section at the same time

Liveness (absence of starvation): every request will be eventually granted

Temporal logics differ according to how they handle branching in the underlying computation tree.

In a **linear temporal logic (LTL)**, operators are provided for describing system behavior along a single computation path.

In a **branching-time logic (CTL)**, the temporal operators quantify over the paths that are possible from a given state.

11

Computation Tree Logics

Formulas are constructed from **path quantifiers** and **temporal operators**:


1. **Path Quantifiers:**
 - **A** – “for every path”
 - **E** – “there exists a path”
2. **Temporal Operator:**
 - **X α** - α holds **next** time
 - **F α** - α holds sometime in the **future**
 - **G α** - α holds **globally** in the **future**
 - **α U β** - α holds **until** β holds

12


The Logic LTL

Linear Time Logic (LTL) [Pnueli 77]: logic of temporal sequences.
Has form $\mathbf{A} f$ where f is a path formula which has no path quantifiers (\mathbf{A} or \mathbf{E})


- α : α holds in the current state




- $\mathbf{AX}\alpha$: α holds in the next state




- $\mathbf{AF}\gamma$: γ holds eventually



- $\mathbf{AG}\lambda$: λ holds from now on




- $\mathbf{A}(\alpha \mathbf{U} \beta)$: α holds until β holds




13

The Logic CTL


In a **branching-time logic** (CTL), the temporal operators quantify over the paths that are possible from a given state (s_0). Requires each temporal operator (\mathbf{X} , \mathbf{F} , \mathbf{G} , and \mathbf{U}) to be preceded by a path quantifier (\mathbf{A} or \mathbf{E}).




$$\mathbf{M}, s_0 \models \mathbf{AG} c$$



$$\mathbf{M}, s_0 \models \mathbf{AF} c$$



$$\mathbf{M}, s_0 \models \mathbf{EF} c$$



$$\mathbf{M}, s_0 \models \mathbf{EG} c$$

14


Typical CTL Formulas

- **EF** ($Started \wedge \neg Ready$): it is possible to get to a state where *Started* holds but *Ready* does not hold.
- **AG** ($Req \Rightarrow \mathbf{AF} Ack$): whenever *Request* occurs, it will be eventually *Acknowledged*.
- **AG** (*DeviceEnabled*): *DeviceEnabled* always holds on every computation path.
- **AG** (**EF** *Restart*): from any state it is possible to get to the *Restart* state.

15

Trivia


- **AG(EF p)** cannot be expressed in LTL
 - Reset property: from every state it is possible to get to *p*
 - But there might be paths where you never get to *p*
 - Different from **A(GF p)**
 - Along each possible path, for each state in the path, there is a future state where *p* holds
 - Counterexample: ababab...



16

Trivia

- **A(FG p)** cannot be expressed in CTL
 - Along all paths, one eventually reaches a point where p always holds from then on
 - But at some points in some paths where p always holds, there might be a diverging path where p does not hold
 - Different from **AF ~~AG p~~**
 - Along each possible path there exists a state such that p always holds from then on
 - Counterexample: the path that stays in s_0



17

LTL Conventions

- Often leave the initial **A** implicit
- **G** is sometimes written \square
- **F** is sometimes written \diamond

18

Linear vs. branching-time logics

some advantages of LTL

- LTL properties are preserved under “abstraction”: i.e., if \mathcal{M} “approximates” a more complex model \mathcal{M}' , by introducing more paths, then

$$\mathcal{M} \models \psi \Rightarrow \mathcal{M}' \models \psi$$
- “counterexamples” for LTL are simpler: consisting of single executions (rather than trees).
- The automata-theoretic approach to LTL model checking is simpler (no tree automata involved).
- anecdotally, it seems most properties people are interested in are linear-time properties.

some advantages of BT logics

- BT allows expression of some useful properties like ‘reset’.
- CTL, a limited fragment of the more complete BT logic CTL*, can be model checked in time linear in the formula size (as well as in the transition system). But formulas are usually far smaller than system models, so this isn’t as important as it may first seem.
- Some BT logics, like μ -calculus and CTL, are well-suited for the kind of fixed-point computation scheme used in symbolic model checking.

19

Formulas over States and Paths

- **State formulas**
 - Describe a property of a state in a model M
 - If $p \in AP$, then p is a state formula
 - If f and g are state formulas, then $\neg f$, $f \wedge g$ and $f \vee g$ are state formulas
 - If f is a path formula, then $\mathbf{E} f$ and $\mathbf{A} f$ are state formulas
- **Path formulas**
 - Describe a property of an infinite path through a model M
 - If f is a state formula, then f is also a path formula
 - If f and g are path formulas, then $\neg f$, $f \wedge g$, $f \vee g$, $\mathbf{X} f$, $\mathbf{F} f$, $\mathbf{G} f$, and $f \mathbf{U} g$ are path formulas

20

Notation

- A path π in M is an infinite sequence of states s_0, s_1, \dots such that for every $i \geq 0$, $(s_i, s_{i+1}) \in R$
- π^i denotes the suffix of π starting at s_i
- If f is a state formula, $M, s \models f$ means that f holds at state s in the Kripke structure M
- If f is a path formula, $M, \pi \models f$ means that f holds along path π in the Kripke structure M

21

Semantics of Formulas

$M, s \models p$	$\Leftrightarrow p \in L(s)$	$M, \pi \models f$	$\Leftrightarrow \pi \models s \dots \wedge M, s \models f$
$M, s \models \neg f$	$\Leftrightarrow M, s \not\models f$	$M, \pi \models \neg g$	$\Leftrightarrow M, \pi \not\models g$
$M, s \models f_1 \wedge f_2$	$\Leftrightarrow M, s \models f_1 \wedge M, s \models f_2$	$M, \pi \models g_1 \wedge g_2$	$\Leftrightarrow M, \pi \models g_1 \wedge M, \pi \models g_2$
$M, s \models f_1 \vee f_2$	$\Leftrightarrow M, s \models f_1 \vee M, s \models f_2$	$M, \pi \models g_1 \vee g_2$	$\Leftrightarrow M, \pi \models g_1 \vee M, \pi \models g_2$
$M, s \models \mathbf{E} g_1$	$\Leftrightarrow \exists \pi = s \dots \mid M, \pi \models g_1$	$M, \pi \models \mathbf{X} g$	$\Leftrightarrow M, \pi^1 \models g$
$M, s \models \mathbf{A} g_1$	$\Leftrightarrow \forall \pi = s \dots \mid M, \pi \models g_1$	$M, \pi \models \mathbf{F} g$	$\Leftrightarrow \exists k \geq 0 \mid M, \pi^k \models g$
		$M, \pi \models \mathbf{G} g$	$\Leftrightarrow \forall k \geq 0 \mid M, \pi^k \models g$
		$M, \pi \models g_1 \mathbf{U} g_2$	$\Leftrightarrow \exists k \geq 0 \mid M, \pi^k \models g_2$ $\wedge \forall 0 \leq j < k \mid M, \pi^j \models g_1$

22

CTL Model Checking

- Theorem: Any CTL formula can be expressed in terms of \neg , \vee , **EX**, **EU**, and **EG**.
 - $\mathbf{F} p = \text{true } \mathbf{U} p$
 - $\mathbf{A}[x \mathbf{U} y] = \neg(\mathbf{E}\mathbf{G} \neg y \vee \mathbf{E}[\neg y \mathbf{U} \neg(x \vee y)])$
 - $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X} p = \neg\mathbf{E}\mathbf{X} \neg p$
 - $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{G} p = \neg\mathbf{E}\mathbf{F} \neg p$
- Model checking: determine which states of M satisfy f
- Algorithm
 - Consider all subformulas of f , in order of depth of nesting
 - Initially, label each state with the atomic subformulas that are true in that state
 - For each formula, use information about the states where the immediate subformulas are true to label states with the new formula



23

Subformula Labeling

- Case $\neg f$
 - Label each state not labeled with f
- $f_1 \vee f_2$
 - Label each state which is labeled with either f_1 or f_2
- **EX** f
 - Label every state that has some successor labeled with f
- **E** $[f_1 \mathbf{U} f_2]$
 - Label every state labeled with f_2
 - Traverse backwards from labeled states; if the previous state is labeled with f_1 , label it with **E** $[f_1 \mathbf{U} f_2]$ as well
- **EG** f_1
 - Find strongly connected components where f_1 holds
 - Traverse backwards from labeled states; if the previous state is labeled with f_1 , label it with **EG** f_1 as well

24

CTL Model Checking Example

- Pressing Start will eventually result in heat

$AG (Start \rightarrow AF Heat)$

