$\Gamma, K \rightarrow L, L \rightarrow M \vdash \Delta$ $\Gamma, K \rightarrow L, L \rightarrow M, K \rightarrow M \vdash \Delta, (K \rightarrow M) \equiv (L \rightarrow M, K \rightarrow H)$ **Soundness and Completeness Warnings in ESC/Java2**

Joe Kiniry, Alan Morkan, and Barry Denby

presented by David Cok



» by design, neither sound nor complete

- popularity of similar tools growing as (lightweight) static analysis tools become more widely used (e.g, Eclipse & FindBugs)
- developer comprehension and confidence are paramount (*program* safety via *programmer* safety)
- complaints from "soundationalists" drives a desire for "tool honesty" and disclosure

Systems Research Group School of Computer Science and Informatics University College Dublin

 $\Gamma, K \to L, L$



* a fast, automatic tool must "cheat" * many scientific and engineering trade-offs * several sources of soundness and completeness problems * Java and JML semantic incompleteness * unsound verification methodology Imitations of dependent tools (provers) * problems with user specifications

Systems Research Group School of Computer Science and Informatics University College Dublin

 ΓK

Requirements on New $\Gamma, K \rightarrow L$ **Warning Subsystem** $K \rightarrow L$

* contextually warn the user (in detail) about potential soundness and incompleteness

* e.g., must take into account the program code, annotations, execution path in tool, and theorem prover in use

* provide "tunable" feedback so as to not overwhelm the user with warnings

» be itself sound and complete

* have no false positives or negatives





- * manually analyze and classify all soundness and completeness issues
- * define a type- and annotation-aware AST pattern match for each issue
- * each issue implemented as a single "smart" visitor pattern (separation of concerns)
- customized warning levels, messages, and criticality per issue



































Soundness Warning: Heuristics for class invariant analysis are not sound.

I, K → L
public class CreditCard {
 //@(invariant balance <= maxCredit;)
 public double balance = 0, (maxCredit = 100000;)
 public static int STANDARD = 1, SILVER = 2, GOLD = 4;
 private int accountType = 1;
 //@ ensures accountType == 4;
 public void goldCard()
 { accountType = 4; }</pre>

//@ requires cost < (maxCredit - balance);
//@ ensures \result == \old(balance + cost);
public double purchase(double cost)
 { return balance + cost; }</pre>

//@ ensures (accountType == GOLD ? 1 : 0);
public /*@ pure @*/ boolean isGoldCard()
 { return accountType | GOLD; }









































School of Computer Science and Informatics **University College Dublin**





 $\Gamma, K \to L, L$ increase user awareness of tool limitations ٠ * no more "creeping toward functional verification" increase in user confidence * possible excess of user feedback Ieads to user confusion and frustration * text-based warnings need refinement * prioritization, graphical feedback, etc. Systems Research Group obius School of Computer Science and Informatics

University College Dublin

$A \xrightarrow{p} B \times G \xrightarrow{m} D$ Future Work $F, K \to L, L \to M, K \to M \vdash \Delta, (K \to M) \equiv (L \to M, K \to L)$ E

finish implementation

* only for default code paths

* strongest postcondition calculus, loop unrolling and safe loops, simplify

* integration with the ESC/Java2 Eclipse plugin and Mobius Tool

* use theorem proving during analysis

automatic visitor generation





Questions and Comments?





Extra Slides for Questions





three options for warnings
 standard warning mode
 verbose warning mode
 no warnings mode









