Static Analysis of Real-Time Embedded Systems with REK

Arie Gurfinkel¹

joint work with Sagar Chaki¹, Ofer Strichman², and Soonho Kong¹

¹Software Engineering Institute, CMU ²Technion, Israel Institute of Technology

Software Engineering Institute Carnegie Mellon

© 2013 Carnegie Mellon University

NO WARRANTY

THIS CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY AND SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE MATERIAL IS FURNISHED ON AN "AS-IS" BASIS. CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY MAKES NO WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, AS TO ANY MATTER INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, WARRANTY OF FITNESS FOR PURPOSE OR MERCHANTABILITY, EXCLUSIVITY, OR RESULTS OBTAINED FROM USE OF THE MATERIAL. CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY DOES NOT MAKE ANY WARRANTY OF ANY KIND WITH RESPECT TO FREEDOM FROM PATENT, TRADEMARK, OR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT.

Use of any trademarks in this presentation is not intended in any way to infringe on the rights of the trademark holder.

This Presentation may be reproduced in its entirety, without modification, and freely distributed in written or electronic form without requesting formal permission. Permission is required for any other use. Requests for permission should be directed to the Software Engineering Institute at permission@sei.cmu.edu.

This work was created in the performance of Federal Government Contract Number FA8721-05-C-0003 with Carnegie Mellon University for the operation of the Software Engineering Institute, a federally funded research and development center. The Government of the United States has a royalty-free government-purpose license to use, duplicate, or disclose the work, in whole or in part and in any manner, and to have or permit others to do so, for government purposes pursuant to the copyright license under the clause at 252.227-7013.



Automated Software Analysis





Software Engineering Institute CarnegieMellon

Logic and Epistemology in Assurance Cases

- We have just two sources of doubt in an assurance case
- Logic doubt: the validity of the argument
 - Can be eliminated by formal verification
 - Subject to caveats discussed elsewhere
 - Automation allows what-if experimentation to bolster reviewer confidence
 - We can allow "because I say so" proof rules
- Epistemic doubt: the accuracy and completeness of our knowledge of the world in its interaction with the system
 - This is where we need to focus
- Same distinction underlies Verification and Validation (V&V)



Motivation: Real-Time Embedded Systems

Avionics Mission System* Rate Monotonic Scheduling (RMS)

| Task | Period |
|----------------------|--------|
| weapon release | 10ms |
| radar tracking | 40ms |
| target tracking | 40ms |
| aircraft flight data | 50ms |
| display | 50ms |
| steering | 80ms |



*Locke, Vogel, Lucas, and Goodenough. "Generic Avionics Software Specification". SEI/CMU Technical Report CMU/SEI-90-TR-8-ESD-TR-90-209, December, 1990



Software Engineering Institute Carnegie Mellon

An N-task periodic program PP is a set of tasks { τ_1 , ..., τ_N } A task τ is a tuple (I, T, P, C, A), where

- I is a task identifier
- T is a task body (i.e., code)
- P is a period
- C is the worst-case execution time
- A is the release time: the time at which task becomes first enabled

Semantics of PP is given by an asynchronous concurrent program:









Software Engineering Institute | CarnegieMellon



Software Engineering Institute

Carnegie Mellon



Software Engineering Institute

Carnegie Mellon















































Case Study: A Metal Stamping Robot



a.k.a. LEGO Turing Machine

Image courtesy of Taras Kowaliw



LEGO Turing Machine



by Soonho Kong. See <u>http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~soonhok</u> for building instructions.

Software Engineering Institute Carnegie Mellon









Offene Systeme und deren Schnittstellen für die Elektronik in Kraftfahrzeugen; ("Open Systems and their Interfaces for the Electronics in Motor Vehicles")

standard software architecture for the electronic control units (ECUs) in a car





Turing Machine: Task Structure





Software Engineering Institute Carnegie Mellon

Turing Machine (Video)



http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=teDyd0d5M4o



Carnegie Mellon

Turing Machine: Properties

Tape does not move when a bit is read or written

Read sensor and Write arm can move concurrently but must not interfere with one another

Read sensor's light is off when not in use

Read task WCET is less than 25ms

reduced to checking API usage rules

No log messages are lost during USB communication

• each message is delivered to the server before a new one is produced

Software Engineering Institute Carnegie Mellon

An Example Property

When writer flips a bit, the tape motor and read motor should stop.



/* Property 3: When writer flips a bit, the tape motor and read motor should be stopped. */

/* FAILED!! with BOUND 120 */
assert(R(T_speed) == 0 && R(R_speed) == 0);



#endif

Time-Bounded Verification of Periodic Programs

Time-Bounded Verification

- Is an assertion A violated within X milliseconds of a system's execution from initial state I
 - A, X, I are user specified

Periodic Program

- Collection of periodic tasks
 - Execute concurrently with fixed-priority scheduling
 - Priorities respect RMS
 - Communicate through shared memory
 - Synchronize through preemption and priority ceiling locks

Assumptions

- System is schedulable
- WCET of each task is given

Time-Bounded Analysis of Real-Time Systems, Proc. of FMCAD 2011



Overall Approach

Supports C programs w/ tasks, priorities, priority ceiling protocol, shared variables

Works in two stages:

- 1. Sequentialization reduction to sequential program w/ prophecy variables
- 2. Bounded program analysis: bounded C model checker (CBMC, HAVOC, ...)



START Family

REK (2011)

- OSEK-based programs with Priority Ceiling locks
- small robotics case study

REK-H (2012)

- compositional sequentialization for harmonic tasks
- Turing Machine case study

REK-PIP (2013)

- Working on this now
- Support for Priority-Inheritance-Locks (difficult ☺)

REK-INF (Future)

• Extend to complete verification by finding inductive invariants

Intellectually Defensible Base for Qualification

How should automatic verifiers be qualified for certification?

What is the base for automatic program analysis (or other automatic formal methods) to replace testing?

Verify the verifier

- (too) expensive
- verifiers are often very complex tools
- difficult to continuously adapt tools to project-specific needs

Proof-producing (or certifying) verifier

- Only the proof is important not the tool that produced it
- Only the proof-checker needs to be verified/qualified
- Single proof-checker can be re-used in many projects



But things are not that simple in practice !!!



ite Carnegie Mellon



Contact Information

Presenter

Arie Gurfinkel RTSS Telephone: +1 412-268-5800 Email: arie@cmu.edu

U.S. mail: Software Engineering Institute Customer Relations 4500 Fifth Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15213-2612 USA

Web:

Customer Relations

 www.sei.cmu.edu
 Email: info@sei.cmu.edu

 http://www.sei.cmu.edu/contact.cfm
 Telephone:
 +1 412-268-5800

 SEI Phone:
 +1 412-268-5800

 SEI Fax:
 +1 412-268-6257



Software Engineering Institute Carnegie Mellon