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Software Engineering Institute (SEI)

Department of Defense R&D Laboratory (FFRDC)
Created in 1984
Under contract to Carnegie Mellon University
Offices in Pittsburgh, PA; Washington, DC; and Frankfurt, Germany

SEI Mission: advance software engineering and related disciplines to ensure the development and operation of systems with predictable and improved cost, schedule, and quality.
SEI Technical Programs

Networked Systems Survivability (CERT)
- Secure Software and Systems
- Cyberthreat and Vulnerability Analysis
- Enterprise Workforce Development
- Forensics

Software Engineering Process Management (SEPM)
- Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI)
- Team Software Process (TSP)
- Software Engineering Measurement and Analysis (SEMA)

Acquisition Support (ASP)

Research, Technology, and System Solutions (RTSS)
- Architecture-Centric Engineering
- Product Line Practice
- System of Systems Practice
- System of Systems Software Assurance
- Ultra-Large-Scale (ULS) System Perspective

Independent Research and Development (IR&D)
Research, Technology, and System Solutions (RTSS) Program

Mission
Discover the mutual influences of structure and behavior for software-reliant systems at all scales to assure key quality attributes for the achievement of business and mission goals.

Vision
Assured and flexible system capabilities at all scales
Problems Faced by the DoD

DoD’s ability to rapidly develop and field software-reliant capability across a variety of systems is deficient. Part of the reason rests with DoD’s acquisition process; part of the reason is technical.

Software systems science and engineering are inadequate to

- determine how to structure and adapt systems at all scales
- manage interactions among these types of systems
- assure software-reliant capabilities that are sufficiently reliable, secure, responsive, and adaptable to change

Predict and control behavior

Assure and bound behavior

Coupling to organizational structure and practices increases
RTSS: Research Mapping

- Embedded systems
- Stand-alone systems
- Software product lines
- Systems of systems
- Ultra-large-scale systems

Product Line Practice focus

SoS Practice focus
- Engineering and technology for SoS
- Integrated practices for SoS

SoS Software Assurance focus
- Failure patterns and mitigations in SoS
- Theories, Principles, and Methods
- Barriers/incentives to assurance technology adoption

Architecture-Centric Engineering addresses all scales of systems
- Quality attribute foundations and analysis
- Architecture-centric practices
- Architecture principles for ULS systems
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Software is Everywhere
Software is Full of Bugs!

“Software easily rates as the most poorly constructed, unreliable, and least maintainable technological artifacts invented by man”

Paul Strassman, former CIO of Xerox
Software Bugs are Expensive!

Intel Pentium FDIV Bug
- Estimated cost: $500 Million

Y2K bug
- Estimated cost: >$500 Billion

Northeast Blackout of 2003
- “a programming error identified as the cause of alarm failure”
- Estimated cost: $6-$10 Billion

“The cost of software bugs to the U.S. economy is estimated at $60 B/year”
NIST, 2002
Some Examples of Software Disasters

Between 1985 and 1987, Therac-25 gave patients massive overdoses of radiation, approximately 100 times the intended dose. Three patients died as a direct consequence.

On February 25, 1991, during the Gulf War, an American Patriot Missile battery in Dharan, Saudi Arabia, failed to track and intercept an incoming Iraqi Scud missile. The Scud struck an American Army barracks, killing 28 soldiers and injuring around 100 other people.

On June 4, 1996 an unmanned Ariane 5 rocket launched by the European Space Agency forty seconds after lift-off. The rocket was on its first voyage, after a decade of development costing $7 billion. The destroyed rocket and its cargo were valued at $500 million.

Details at http://www5.in.tum.de/~huckle/bugse.html
Recent Examples

In July 2010, The Food and Drug Administration ordered Baxter International to recall all of its Colleague infusion pumps in use and provide a refund or no-cost replacement to United States customers. It has been working with Baxter since 1999 to correct numerous device flaws. Some of the issues were caused by simple buffer overflow.

In December 2010, the Skype network went down for 3 days. The source of the outage was traced to a software bug in Skype version 5.

In January 2011, two German researchers have shown that most “feature” mobile phones can be “killed” by sending a simple SMS message (SMS of Death). The attack exploits many bugs in the implementation of SMS protocol in the phones. It can potentially bring down all mobile communication…
Why so many bugs?

Software Engineering is very complex

• Complicated algorithms
• Many interconnected components
• Legacy systems
• Huge programming APIs
• …

Software Engineers need better tools to deal with this complexity!
What Software Engineers Need Are …

Tools that give better confidence than testing while remaining easy to use

And at the same time, are

• … fully automatic
• … (reasonably) easy to use
• … provide (measurable) guarantees
• … come with guidelines and methodologies to apply effectively
• … apply to real software systems
Automated Software Analysis

Program

Automated Analysis

Correct

Incorrect

Software Model Checking with Predicate Abstraction
e.g., Microsoft’s SDV

Abstract Interpretation with Numeric Abstraction
e.g., ASTREE, Polyspace
Numeric Abstract Interpretation

Analysis is restricted to a fixed Abstract Domain

Abstract Domain \(\equiv\) “a (possibly infinite) set of predicates from a fixed theory” + efficient (abstract) operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abstract Domain</th>
<th>Abstract Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>(0 &lt; x, \quad x = 0, \quad x &gt; 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box (or Interval)</td>
<td>(c_1 \leq x \leq c_2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octagon</td>
<td>(\pm x \pm y \leq c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyhedra</td>
<td>(a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3x_3 + a_4 \leq 0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

- \(x, y\) program variables
- \(c, c_i, a_i\) numeric constants
Abstract Interpretation w/ Box Domain (1)

Program

\[
x := 0
\]

while (x < 1000) {
\[
x := x + 1;
\]
}

assert (x == 1000);

Steps:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14
Abstract Domain as an Interface

**interface** AbstractDomain(V) :

- V – set of variables
- A – abstract elements
- E – expressions
- S – statements

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha : E & \rightarrow A \\
isTop : A & \rightarrow \text{bool} \\
\text{isBot} & : A \rightarrow \text{bool} \\
\text{leq} & : A \times A \rightarrow \text{bool} \\
\alphaPost & : S \rightarrow (A \rightarrow A) \\
\gamma : A & \rightarrow E \\
\text{meet} & : A \times A \rightarrow A \\
\text{join} & : A \times A \rightarrow A \\
\text{widen} & : A \times A \rightarrow A
\end{align*}
\]

All operations are over-approximations, e.g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma (a) \parallel \gamma (b) & \Rightarrow \gamma (\text{join} (a, b)) \\
\gamma (a) \&\& \gamma (b) & \Rightarrow \gamma (\text{meet} (a, b))
\end{align*}
\]
Example: Box Abstract Domain

1 ≤ x ≤ 10

\[ α \]

(1, 10)

\[ γ \]

1 ≤ x ≤ 10

**Definition of Operations**

(a, b) **meet** (c, d) = (max(a,c), min(b,d))

(1, 10) **meet** (2, 12) = (2,10)

(a, b) **join** (c, d) = (min(a,c),max(b,d))

(1, 3) **join** (7, 12) = (1,12)

\[ αPost (x := x + 1) ((a, b)) = (a+1, b+1) \]

(1, 10) + 1 = (2, 11)

**Examples**

over-approximation
Abstract Interpretation w/ Box Domain (2)

Program

\[ \text{assume } (i=1 \lor i=2) \]
\[ \text{if } (i = 1) \]
\[ x_1 := i; \]
\[ \text{else if } (i = 2) \]
\[ x_2 := -4; \]
\[ \text{if } (i = 1) \]
\[ \text{assert } (x_1 > 0); \]
\[ \text{else if } (i = 2) \]
\[ \text{assert } (x_2 < 0); \]

1 <= i <= 2

i=1

i=2

i=1 && x1=1

i=2 && x2=-4

Steps: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Loss of precision due to join

False Positive
Disjunctive Refinement of an Abstract Domain

Bounded disjunctions
- extend base domain with disjunctions of size at most k
- all operations are done by lifting corresponding base domain operations
- easy to implement by modifying program control flow graph

Finite Powerset Domain [Bagnara et al.]
- extend base domain with all finite disjunctions
- most operations are done by lifting corresponding base domain operations
- finding a good widening is complex (and often tricky)

Predicate Abstraction
- extend finite base domain with all disjunctions
- domain elements are represented by BDDs
- no widening required
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Boxes: Semantic View

Boxes are “finite union of box values”
(alternatively)
Boxes are “Boolean formulas over interval constraints”
Linear Decision Diagrams in a Nutshell*

Linear Decision Diagram

- **Decision node**
  - $x + 2y < 10$

- **Terminal**
  - True terminal
  - False terminal

- **False edge**
  - $z < 10$

- **True edge**
  - 0
  - 1

Linear Arithmetic Formula

- $(x + 2y < 10) \text{ OR } (x + 2y \geq 10 \text{ AND } z < 10)$

Compact Representation

- Sharing sub-expressions
- Local numeric reductions
- Dynamic node reordering

Operations

- Propositional (AND, OR, NOT)
- Existential Quantification

*joint work w/ Ofer Strichman
Boxes: Representation

Represented by (Interval) Linear Decision Diagrams (LDD)

- BDDs + non-terminal nodes are labeled by interval constraints + extra rules
- retain complexity of BDD operations
- canonical representation for Boxes Abstract Domain
- available at http://lindd.sf.net
### Abstract Domain Operations

Basic domain operations are implemented by LDD operations:

**meet** (semantic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$f \land g$</td>
<td>$O(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITE($h$, $f$, $g$)</td>
<td>$O(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\neg f$</td>
<td>$O(1)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**join**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$f \lor g$</td>
<td>$O(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f \Rightarrow g$</td>
<td>$O(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\exists U. f$</td>
<td>$O(</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional operations

- set difference $f \setminus g$ implemented by $f \land \neg g$
- BoxHull ($f$) – smallest Box containing $f$
- BoxJoin ($f$, $g$) – smallest Box containing the union of Box $f$ and Box $g$

**All operations are polynomial in the size of the representation**
Transfer Functions ($\alpha_{\text{Post}}$)

Boxes

\[ x := x + 1 \]

Polynomial

Expensive

\[ x \leq 1 \]

\[ x < 2 \]

\[ y < 1 \]

\[ y \leq 3 \]

\[ x \leq 1 \]

\[ x < 2 \]

\[ y < 1 \]

\[ y \leq 3 \]

\[ x \leq 2 \]

\[ x < 3 \]

\[ y < 1 \]

\[ y \leq 3 \]

\[ x \leq 2 \]

\[ x < 3 \]

\[ y < 1 \]

\[ y \leq 3 \]
Widening: The Problem

\[(x \leq 1 \land 2 \leq y \leq 3) \lor (2 \leq x \leq 3 \land 1 \leq y \leq 2)\]

(widen)

\[(x \leq 1.5 \land 1.5 \leq y \leq 3) \lor (2 \leq x \leq 3 \land 1 \leq y \leq 2)\]
A function on the reals $\mathbb{R}$ is a *step function* if it can be written as a *finite* linear combination of semi-open intervals

$$f(x) = \alpha_1 f_1(x) + \cdots + \alpha_n f_n(x)$$

where $f_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha_i(x) = 1$ if $x \in [a_i, b_i)$ and 0 otherwise, for $i=1,\ldots,n$.

Step Functions as an Abstract Domain
STEP(D) an abstract domain of step functions over an abstract domain D

- elements are step functions \( \mathbb{R} \rightarrow D \)

- order is pointwise: \( f \preceq g \) iff \( \forall x . f(x) \preceq_D g(x) \)

- join is pointwise: \( f \sqcup g \) is \( \lambda x . f(x) \sqcup_D g(x) \)

- meet is pointwise: \( f \sqcap g \) is \( \lambda x . f(x) \sqcap_D g(x) \)

- widen is pointwise: \( f \triangledown g \) is \( \lambda x . f(x) \triangledown_D g(x) \)
Pointwise Extension of Widen Diverges

1

[0,3] [0,0] [1,9]

2

[0,5] [0,0] [1,9] [1,10] [1,9]

WDN

[0,∞] [0,0] [1,9] [1,∞] [1,9]

3

[0,∞] [0,0] [1,9] [1,10] [1,∞] [1,9]

WDN

[0,∞] [0,0] [1,9] [1,∞] [1,9]

4

[0,∞] [0,0] [1,9] [1,10] [1,∞] [1,9]
Widening for Step Functions

Step 1

\[ [0, \infty] \quad [0, 0] \quad [1, \infty] \quad [1, \infty] \quad [1, 9] \]

Step 2

\[ [0, \infty] \quad [0, 0] \quad [1, \infty] \quad [1, \infty] \quad [1, \infty] \]

Step 3

\[ [0, \infty] \quad [0, 0] \quad [1, \infty] \]
Back to Boxes

Boxes are Step functions!

- 1-dim Boxes are \( \text{STEP}(\{\bot, \top\}) \) \( \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{\bot, \top\} \)
- 2-dim Boxes are \( \text{STEP} (\text{STEP}(\{\bot, \top\})) \) \( \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{\bot, \top\} \)
- \( n \)-dim Boxes are \( \text{STEP}^n (\{\bot, \top\}) \) \( \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{\bot, \top\} \)

Widen for \( \{\bot, \top\} \) is trivial

Widen for \( n \)-dim Boxes is defined recursively on dimensions

We give a polynomial time algorithm that implements this widen operator directly on LDDs. (See paper for details)
Widen: An Example

\[ \begin{align*}
\mathcal{P}_1 & \hspace{1cm} 2 \\
\mathcal{P}_2 & \hspace{1cm} 2 \\
\mathcal{P}_3 & \hspace{1cm} 2 \\
\end{align*} \]
Widening: Example

Step 1

Step 2

Step 3
Widen: An Example

\[ x \]
\[ y \]

\[ \mathcal{P}_1 \]
\[ \mathcal{P}_2 \]

\[ \mathcal{P}_3 \]
\[ \mathcal{P}_2 \]

\[ Q_2 \]
\[ Q_3 \]

\[ \text{widen} \]
## Boxes versus Finite Powersets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boxes</th>
<th>Finite Powerset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base domain</td>
<td>Box</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>Decision Diagram</td>
<td>Set / DNF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain order</td>
<td>semantic</td>
<td>syntactic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>polynomial in representation</td>
<td>polynomial in representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singleton Widen</td>
<td>Box</td>
<td>base domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen</td>
<td>Step Function</td>
<td>Multiple Choices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Our work*

Bagnara et al. Parma Polyhedra Library (PPL)
Experiments: Invariant Computation

Abstract Domains

- LDD Boxes – Our Boxes domain using LDDs
- PPL Boxes – `Pointset_Powerset<Rational_Box>` of PPL

Analyzer

- custom analyzer on top of LLVM compiler infrastructure
- computes loop invariants for all loops over all SSA variables in a function

Benchmark

- from open source software: mplayer, CUDD, make, …
- Stats: 5,727 functions
  - 9 – 9,052 variables (avg. 238, std. 492)
  - 0 – 241 loops (avg. 7, std. 12)
Results: Time

5727 functions, each run with a time limit of 60s

LDD Boxes

- Success: 88%
- Failure: 12%

Total time = 118 min

PPL Boxes

- Success: 86%
- Failure: 14%

Total time = 201 min
Results: Precision

- Incomparable: 32%
- LDD less precise: 1%
- LDD more precise: 44%
- Same result: 23%
Conclusion

Boxes: A new disjunctive abstract domain of sets of boxes
• efficient representation based on Linear Decision Diagrams
• semantic order relation
• efficient operations and widening
• more precise and efficient than finite powersets of box

A new widening scheme
• lifting widening from a base domain to the domain of step functions

Future Work
• applications
• extending the technique to richer base domains, i.e., octagons, TVPI
  – representation and base operations are easy (already exist in LDD)
  – widening?

http://lindd.sf.net
LDD Based Analysis Infrastructure

- Invariant Generator
- Software Model Checker
- Concurrency + Real Time Scheduling
- Linear Decision Diagram (LDD) Engine
- CUDD
- Linear Arithmetic Theories
- Foundations

SAS’10

FMCAD’09
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