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Program of this first lecture

Introduction to the course:

1. a study of some **examples** of **software errors**
   - what are the causes? what kind of properties do we want to verify?

2. a panel of the main **verification methods**
   with a fundamental limitation: **indecidability**
   - many techniques allow to **compute semantic properties**
   - each comes with **advantages** and **drawbacks**

3. an introduction to the **theory of ordered sets**
   (or, most likely, mostly a refresher...)
   - **order relations** are pervasive in **semantics** and **verification**
   - **fixpoints** of operators are also very common
Outline
Ariane 5 – Flight 501

Ariane 5:
- a satellite launcher
- replacement of Ariane 4, a lot more powerful
- first flight, June, 4th, 1996: failure!

Flight story:
- nominal take-off, normal flight for 36 seconds
- \(T + 36.7\) s: angle of attack change, trajectory lost
- \(T + 39\) s: disintegration of the launcher

Consequences:
- loss of satellites: more than $370,000,000...
- launcher unusable for more than a year (delay !)

Full report available online:
http://esamultimedia.esa.int/docs/esa-x-1819eng.pdf
Trajectory control system design overview

**Sensors:** gyroscopes, inertial reference systems...

**Calculators** (hardware + software):
- **"Inertial Reference System" (SRI):** integrates data about the trajectory (read on sensors)
- **"On Board Computer" (OBC):** computes the engine actuations that are required to follow the pre-determined theoretical trajectory

**Actuators:** engines of the launcher follow orders from the OBC

**Redundant systems** (failure tolerant system):
- keep running even in the presence of one or several system failures
- traditional solution in embedded systems: duplication of systems
  - aircraft flight system: 2 or 3 hydraulic circuits
  - launcher like Ariane 5: 2 SRI units (SRI 1 and SRI 2)
- there is also a control monitor
The root cause: an unhandled arithmetic error

Processor registers

Each register has a size of 16, 32, 64 bits:

- **64-bits floating point**: values in range \([-3.6 \cdot 10^{308}, 3.6 \cdot 10^{308}]\)
- **16-bits signed integers**: values in range \([-32768, 32767]\)
- upon copy of data: conversions are performed such as rounding
- when the values are too large:
  - **interruption**: run error handling code if any, otherwise crash
  - or **unexpected behavior**: modulo arithmetic or other

Ariane 5:

- the SRI hardware runs in interruption mode
- it has **no error handling code** for arithmetic interruptions
- an **unhandled arithmetic conversion overflow** crashes the SRI
From the root cause to the failure

A not so trivial sequence of events:

1. a conversion from 64-bits float to 16-bits signed int is performed and causes an overflow
2. an interruption is raised
3. due to the lack of error handling code, the SRI crashes
4. the crash causes an error return (negative integer value) value be sent to the OBC (On-Board Computer)
5. the OBC interprets this illegal value as flight data
6. this causes the computation of an absurd trajectory
7. hence the loss of control of the launcher

Let us discuss a few specific points
A crash due to an unaddressed software case

Several solutions would have prevented this mishappening:

1. **Deactivate interruptions on overflows:**
   - then, an overflow may happen, and produce wrong values in the SRI
   - but, these wrong values will not cause the computation to stop!
     and most likely, the flight will not be impacted too much

2. **Fix the SRI code**, so that no overflow can happen:
   - all conversions must be **guarded against overflows**:
     ```
     double x = /* ... */;
     short i = /* ... */;
     if( -32768. <= x && x <= 32767. )
       i = (short) x;
     else
       i = /* default value */;
     ```
   - this may be costly (many tests), but redundant tests can be removed

3. **Handle** conversion errors (not trivial):
   - the handling code should **identify the problem** and **fix it** at run-time
   - the OBC should **identify illegal input values**
A crash due to a useless task

**Piece of code that generated the error:**
- part of a gyroscope re-calibration process
- very useful to quickly restart the launch process after a short delay
- can only be done *before lift-off...*
- ... *but not after!*

**Re-calibration task shut down:**
- normally planned *50 seconds* after lift-off...
- no chance of a need for such a re-calibration after $T_0 + 3$ seconds
- the crash occurred at *36 seconds*
A crash due to legacy software

**Software history:**
- already used in Ariane 4 (previous launcher, before Ariane 5)
- the software was tested and ran in real conditions many times yet never failed...
- but Ariane 4 was a much less powerful launcher

**Software optimization:**
- many conversions were initially protected by a safety guard
- but these tests were considered expensive
  (a test and a branching take processor cycles, interact with the pipeline...)
- thus, conversions were ultimately removed for the sake of performance

Yet, Ariane 5 violates the assumptions that were valid with Ariane 4
- higher values of horizontal bias were generated
- those were never seen in Ariane 4, hence the failure
Principle of redundant systems: survive the failure of a component by the use of redundant systems

System redundancy in Ariane 5:
- one OBC unit
- two SRI units... yet running the same software

Obviously, physical redundancy does not address software issues

Other implementation of system redundancy (e.g., Airbus FBW):
- two independent set of controls
- three computing units per set of controls
- each computing unit comprises two computers with distinct softwares (design and implementation is also performed in distinct teams)
Ariane 501, a summary of the issues

A long series of design errors, all related to a lack of understanding of what the software does:

1. **Non-guarded** conversion raising an **interruption** due to **overflow**
2. **Removal of pre-existing guards**, too high confidence in the software
3. **Non revised assumptions** on the inputs when moving from Ariane 4 to Ariane 5
4. **Redundant systems** running the same software
5. **Useless task** not shutdown at the right time

**Current status:** such issues can be found by static analysis tools
Outline
High-speed runway overshoot at landing

**Landing** at Warsaw airport, Lufthansa A320:
- **bad weather conditions:** rain, high side wind
- **wet runway**
- **landing** (300 km/h) followed by **aqua-planing**, and **delayed braking**
- **runway overrun** at 132 km/h
- **impact** against a hillside at about 100 km/h

**Consequences:**
- **2 fatalities, 56 injured** (among 70 passengers + crew)
- **aircraft completely destroyed** (impact + fire)

**Full report available online:**
http://www.rvs.uni-bielefeld.de/publications/Incidents/DOCS/ComAndRep/Warsaw/warsaw-report.html
Causes of the accident

1. **Root cause:**
   - **bad weather conditions** not well assessed by the crew
   - side wind **exceeding** aircraft certification specification
   - **wrong action from the crew:**
     a “Go Around” (missed landing, acceleration + climb) should have been done

2. **Contributing factor:** delayed action of the brake system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time (seconds)</th>
<th>distance (meters) from runway threshold</th>
<th>events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$T_0$</td>
<td>770 m</td>
<td>main landing gear landed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_0 + 3$ s</td>
<td>1030 m</td>
<td>nose landing gear landed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>brake command activated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_0 + 12$ s</td>
<td>1680 m</td>
<td>spoilers activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_0 + 14$ s</td>
<td>1800 m</td>
<td>thrust reversers activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_0 + 31$ s</td>
<td>2700 m</td>
<td>end of runway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protection of aircraft brake systems

- **Braking systems inhibition**: Prevent in-flight activation!
  - **spoilers**: increase in aerodynamic load (drag)
  - **thrust reversers**: could destroy the plane if activated in-flight!
    (ex: crash of a B 767-300 ER Lauda Air, 1991, 223 fatalities; thrust reversers in-flight activation, electronic circuit issue)

- **Braking software specification**: DO NOT activate spoilers and thrust reverse **unless the following condition is met**:
  - thrust lever should be set to **minimum** by the flight crew
  - **AND** either of the following conditions:
    - **weight** on the main gear should be at least 12 T
      i.e., 6 T for each side
    - **OR** wheels should be spinning, with a speed of at least 130 km/h
      [Minimum Thrust] **AND** ([Weight] **OR** [Wheels spinning])
Understanding the braking delay

- **Landing configuration:**

  ![Diagram](Diagram from the text)

- **Braking systems: inhibited**
  - thrust command properly set to minimum
  - no weight on the left landing gear due to the wind
  - no speed on wheels due to aquaplaning

  \[ \text{Minimum Thrust} \land (\text{Weight} \lor \text{Wheels spinning}) \]
Flight 2904, a summary of the issues

Main factor is human (landing in weather conditions the airplane is not certified for), but the specification of the software is a contributing factor:

- **Old condition** that failed to be satisfied:
  \[
  (P_{\text{left}} > 6T) \text{ AND } (P_{\text{right}} > 6T)
  \]

- **Fixed condition** (used in the new version of the software):
  \[
  (P_{\text{left}} + P_{\text{right}}) > 12T
  \]

- The fix can be understood **only with knowledge of the environment**
  - conditions which the airplane will be used in
  - behavior of the sensors
Case studies
Patriot missile (anti-missile system), Dahran (1991)

The anti-missile “Patriot” system

- **Purpose**: destroy foe missiles before they reach their target
- **Use in wars**:
  - **first Gulf war** (1991)
    protection of towns and military facilities in Israël and Saudi Arabia (against “Scud” missiles launched by Irak)
  - **success rate**:
    - around 50 % of the “Scud” missiles are successfully destroyed
    - almost all launched Patriot missiles destroy their target
    - failures are due to failure to launch a Patriot missile
- **Constraints on the system**:
  - **hit very quickly moving targets**:
    “Scud” missiles fly at around 1700 m/s; travel about 1000 km in 10 minutes
  - **not to destroy a friendly target** (it happened at least twice!)
  - very high cost: about $1 000 000 per launch
System components

Detection / trajectory identification:

- **Detection** using radar systems
- **Trajectory confirmation** (to make sure a foe missile is tracked):
  - 1. **Trajectory identification** using a sequence of points at various instants
  - 2. **Trajectory confirmation**
    - Computation of a predictive window (from position and speed vector)
    - Confirmation of the predicted trajectory
  - 3. **Identification of the target** (friend / foe)

Guidance system:

- **Interception trajectory** computation
- **Launch** of a Missile, and control until it hits its target
  - High precision required (both missiles travel at more than 1500 m/s)

Very short process: about ten minutes
Dahran failure (1991)

1. Launch of a “Scud” missile

2. Detection by the radars of the Patriot system but failure to confirm the trajectory:
   - imprecision in the computation of the clock of the detection system
   - computation of a wrong confirmation window
   - the “Scud” cannot be found in the predicted window failure to confirm the trajectory
   - the detection computer concludes it is a false alert

3. The “Scud” missile hits its target:
   28 fatalities and around 100 people injured
Fixed precision arithmetic

- **Fixed precision numbers** are of the form $\epsilon N 2^{-p}$ where:
  - $p$ is fixed
  - $\epsilon \in \{-1, 1\}$ is the **sign**
  - $N \in [-2^n, 2^n - 1]_\mathbb{Z}$ is an integer ($n > p$)

- In **32 bits fixed precision**, with one sign bit, $n = 31$; thus we may let $p = 20$

- **A few examples:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>decimal value</th>
<th>sign</th>
<th>truncated value</th>
<th>fractional portion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00000000010</td>
<td>00000000000000000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>000000000101</td>
<td>00000000000000000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>000000000000</td>
<td>10000000000000000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−9.125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00000001001</td>
<td>00100000000000000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Range of values that can be represented:**

$$\pm 2^{12}(1 - 2^{-32})$$
Rounding errors in fixed precision computations

- Not all real numbers in the right range can be represented.
  Rounding is unavoidable.
  May happen both for basic operations and for program constants...

- **Example:** fraction $1/10$
  
  - $1/10$ cannot be represented exactly in fixed precision arithmetic.
  
  - Let us decompose $1/10$ as a sum of terms of the form $\frac{1}{2^i}$:

    \[
    \frac{1}{10} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{5} = \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16} + \frac{1}{16} \cdot \frac{1}{5} = \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16} + \frac{1}{16} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16} + \frac{1}{16} \cdot \frac{1}{5}\right) = \ldots
    \]

    - Infinite binary representation: $0.00011001100110011001100\ldots$
    
    - If $p = 24$:
      
      Representation: “0.000110011001100110011001”
      
      Rounding error is $9.5 \cdot 10^{-8}$

- **Floating precision numbers** (more commonly used today) have the same limitation.
The root cause: a clock drift

**Trajectory confirmation algorithm** (summary):

- **hardware clock** $T_d$ ticks every tenth of a second
- time $T_c$ is computed in seconds: $T_c = \frac{1}{10} \times T_d$
- in **binary**: $T_c = 0.000110011001100110011001b \times b T_d$!
- **relative error is** $10^{-6}$
- after the computer has been running for **100 h**:
  - the absolute error is **0.34 s**
  - as a “Scud” travels at 1700 m/s: the predicted window is about **580 m** from where it should be
    this explains **the trajectory confirmation failure!**

**Remarks:**

- the issue was **discovered** by israeli users, who noticed the clock drift
- their solution: **frequently restart the control computer**... (daily)
- this was not done in Dahran... the system had been running for 4 days
Patriot missile failure, a summary of the issues

**Precision issues** in the fixed precision arithmetic:

- A scalar *constant* used in the code was *invalid*
  i.e., bound to be rounded to an approximate value, incurring a
  significant approximation the designers were unaware of

- There was *no adequate study of the precision* achieved by the
  system, although precision is clearly critical here!

**Current status:** such issues can be found by static analysis tools
Outline
Common issues causing software problems

The examples given so far are not isolated cases
See for instance:

www.cs.tau.ac.il/~nachumd/horror.html

(not up-to-date)

Typical reasons:

- Improper specification or understanding of the environment, conditions of execution...

- Incorrect implementation of a specification
  e.g., the code should be free of runtime errors
  e.g., the software should produce a result that meets some property

- Incorrect understanding of the execution model
  e.g., generation of too imprecise results
New challenges to ensure embedded systems do not fail

**Complex software architecture**: e.g. *parallel softwares*

- single processor *multi-threaded, distributed* (several computers)
- more and more common: multi-core architectures
- **very hard to reason about**
  - other kinds of issues: *dead-locks, races*...
  - very complex execution model: *interleavings, memory models*

**Complex properties to ensure**: e.g., *security*

- the system should resist even in the presence of an *attacker* (agent with malicious intentions)
- attackers may try to *access sensitive data*, to *corrupt* critical data...
- security properties are often even *hard to express*
Techniques to ensure software safety

Software development techniques:

- **software engineering**, with a focus on specification, and software quality (may be more or less formal...)
- **programming rules** for specific areas (e.g., DO 178 c in avionics)
- usually do not guarantee any strong property, but make softwares “cleaner”

Formal methods:

- should have **sound mathematical foundations**
- should allow to **guarantee** softwares meet some complex properties
- should be **trustable** (is a paper proof ok ???)
- **increasingly used in real life applications**, but still a lot of open problems
What is to be verified?

What do the C programs below do?

What do these C programs do?

**P0.c**

```c
int x = 0
int f0( int y ){
    return x * y;
}
int f1( int y ){
    x = y;
    return 0;
}
void main( ){
    int z = f0( 10 ) + f1( 100 );
}
```

**P1.c**

```c
void main( ){
    int i;
    int t[100] = { 0, 1, 2, ...
        ..., 99 }
    while( i < 100 ){
        t[i]++;
        i++;
    }
}
```

**P2.c**

```c
void main( ){
    float f = 0.;
    for( int i = 0;
        i < 1000000;
        i++ )
        f = f + 0.1;
}
```
Semantic subtleties...

```c
int x = 0
int f0( int y ){
    return x * y;
}
int f1( int y ){
    x = y;
    return 0;
}
void main( ){
    int z = f0( 10 ) + f1( 100 );
}
```

Execution order:

- not specified in C
- specified in Java
- if left to right, \( z = 0 \)
- if right to left, \( z = 1000 \)
Semantic subtleties...

Initialization:
- runtime error in Java
- read of a random value in C (the value that was stored before)

Floating point semantics:
- 0.1 is not representable exactly; what is it rounded to by the compiler?
- rounding errors; what is the rounding mode at runtime?
The two main parts of this course

1 Semantics

- allow to describe precisely the behavior of programs
  should account for execution order, initialization, scope...
- allow to express the properties to verify
  several important families of properties: safety, liveness, security...
- also important to transform and compile programs

2 Verification

- aim at proving semantic properties of programs
- a very strong limitation: indecidability
- several approaches, that make various compromises around indecidability
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The termination problem

Termination

Program $P$ terminates on input $X$ if and only if any execution of $P$, with input $X$ eventually reaches a final state

- **Final state:** final point in the program (i.e., not error)
- **We may want to ensure termination:**
  - processing of a task, such as, e.g., printing a document
  - computation of a mathematical function
- **We may want to ensure non-termination:**
  - operating system
  - device drivers

The termination problem

Can we find a program $Pt$ that takes as argument a program $P$ and data $X$ and that returns "TRUE" if $P$ terminates on $X$ and "FALSE" otherwise?
The termination problem is not computable

- **Proof by reductio ad absurdum**, using a *diagonal argument*
  - We assume there exists a program \( P_a \) such that:
    - \( P_a \) always terminates
    - \( P_a(P, X) = 1 \) if \( P \) terminates on input \( X \)
    - \( P_a(P, X) = 0 \) if \( P \) does not terminate on input \( X \)

- We consider the following program:

  ```c
  void P0( P ){  
  if( Pa( P, P ) == 1 ){  
  while ( 1 ){  
  // loop forever  
  }  
  } else {  
  return ; // do nothing  
  }  
  }
  ```

- **What is the return value of** \( P_a(P_0, P_0) \) ?
  - i.e., does \( P_0 \) terminate on input \( P_0 \) ?
The termination problem is not computable

- **What is the return value of \( Pa(P_0, P_0) \)?**
  
  We know \( Pa \) always terminates and returns either 0 or 1 (assumption).
  Therefore, we need to consider only two cases:
  
  ▶ if \( Pa(P_0, P_0) \) returns 1, then \( P_0(P_0) \) loops forever, thus \( Pa(P_0, P_0) \) should return 0, so we have reached a contradiction
  
  ▶ if \( Pa(P_0, P_0) \) returns 0, then \( P_0(P_0) \) terminates, thus \( Pa(P_0, P_0) \) should 1, so we have reached a contradiction

- In both cases, we reach a contradiction
- Therefore we conclude no such a \( Pa \) exists

The termination problem is not decidable

There exists no program \( Pt \) that always terminates and always recognizes whether a program \( P \) terminates on input \( X \)
Absence of runtime errors

- Can we find a program $P_c$ that takes a program $P$ and input $X$ as arguments, always terminates and returns
  - 1 if and only if $P$ runs safely on input $X$, i.e., without a runtime error
  - 0 if $P$ crashes on input $X$
- Answer: **No**, the same diagonal argument applies
  if $P_c(P, X)$ decides whether $P$ will run safely on $X$, consider

```cpp
void P1( P ){
  if( Pc( P, P ) == 1 ){
    0 / 0; // deliberately crash
    (unsafe)
  } else {
    return; // do nothing
  }
}
```

**Non-computability result**

The absence of runtime errors is not computable
Approaches to verification

Indecidability and fundamental limitations

Rice theorem

- **Semantic specification**: set of *correct* program executions
- “Trivial” semantic specifications:
  - empty set
  - set of all possible executions

⇒ intuitively, the non interesting verification problems...

Rice theorem (1953)

**Considering a Turing complete language,**
any non trivial semantic specification is not computable

- **Intuition**: there is no algorithm to decide non trivial specifications, starting with only the program code
- Therefore **all interesting properties are not computable**:
  - termination,
  - absence of runtime errors,
  - absence of arithmetic errors, etc...
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Towards partial solutions

The initial verification problem is not computable

Solution: solve a weaker problem

Several compromises can be made:

- **simulation / testing**: observe only finitely many finite executions
  infinite system, but only finite exploration (no proof beyond that)

- **assisted theorem proving**: we give up on automation
  (no proof inference algorithm in general)

- **model checking**: we consider only finite systems
  (with finitely many states)

- **bug-finding**: search for “patterns” indicating “likely errors”
  (may miss real program errors, and report non existing issues)

- **static analysis with abstraction**: attempt at automatic
  correctness proofs
  (yet, may fail to verify some correct programs)
Safety verification method characteristics

Safety verification problem

- **Semantics** $[P]$ of program $P$: set of behaviors of $P$ (e.g., states)
- **Property to verify** $S$: set of admissible behaviors (e.g., safe states)

**Goal:** establish $[P] \subseteq S$

- **Automation:** existence of an algorithm
- **Scalability:** should allow to handle large softwares
- **Soundness:** identify any wrong program
- **Completeness:** accept all correct programs
- **Apply to program source code,** i.e., not require a **modelling phase**
1. Testing by simulation

**Principle**

Run the program on **finitely many finite inputs**

- maximize **coverage**
- **inspect erroneous traces** to fix bugs

- **Very widely used:**
  - **unit testing**: each function is tested separately
  - **integration testing**: with all surrounding systems, hardware
e.g., **iron bird** in avionics

- **Automated**
- **Complete**: will never raise a false alarm
- **Unsound** unless exhaustive: **may miss program defects**
- **Costly**: needs to be re-done when software gets updated
2. Machine assisted proof

**Principle**

Have a *machine checked* proof, that is partly *human written*

- tactics / solvers may help in the inference
- the *hardest invariants* have to be user-supplied

**Applications**

- software industry (rare): Line 14 in Paris Subway
- hardware: ACL 2
- academia: CompCert compiler, SEL4 verified micro-kernel
- also for math: four colour theorem, Feith-Thomson theorem

*Not fully automated*

often turns out *costly* as complex proof arguments have to be found

*Sound* and quasi-complete (in practice fine...
3. Model-Checking

Principle

Consider **finite systems** only, using algorithms for

- exhaustive exploration,
- symmetry reduction...

**Applications:**

- **hardware** verification
- **driver protocols** verification (Microsoft)

Applies on **a model**: a model extraction phase is needed

- for infinite systems, this is **necessarily approximate**
- not always automated

**Automated, sound, complete with respect to the model**
4. “Bug finding”

**Principle**

Identify **“likely” issues**, i.e., patterns known to often indicate an error

- use **bounded symbolic execution, model exploration**...
- rank "defect" reports using heuristics

- **Intuition**: *model checking made unsound*
- **Example**: Coverity
- **Automated**
- **Not complete**: may report false alarms
- **Not sound**: may accept false programs
  thus **inadequate** for safety-critical systems
5. Static analysis with abstraction (1/4)

Principle

**Use some approximation**, but *always in a conservative manner*

- **Under-approximation** of the property to verify: \( S_{\text{under}} \subseteq S \)
- **Over-approximation** of the semantics: \( [P] \subseteq [P]_{\text{upper}} \)
- We let an automatic static analyzer attempt to prove that:
  \[ [P]_{\text{upper}} \subseteq S_{\text{under}} \]

If it succeeds, \([P] \subseteq S\)

- In practice, the static analyzer **computes** \([P]_{\text{upper}}, S_{\text{under}}\)
5. Static analysis with abstraction (2/4)

**Soundness**

The abstraction will catch any incorrect program

- If $\llbracket P \rrbracket \not\subseteq S$, then $\llbracket P \rrbracket_{\text{upper}} \not\subseteq S_{\text{under}}$

Since

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{since} & \quad S_{\text{under}} \subseteq S \\
& \quad \llbracket P \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket P \rrbracket_{\text{upper}}
\end{aligned}
\]
5. Static analysis with abstraction (3/4)

Incompleteness

The abstraction may fail to certify **some correct programs**

Case of a false alarm:
- program $P$ is **correct**
- but the static analysis **fails**
5. Static analysis with abstraction (4/4)

Incompleteness

The abstraction may fail to certify *some correct programs*

- In the following case, the analysis cannot conclude anything

![Diagram]

- One goal of the static analyzer designer is to avoid such cases

Static analysis using abstraction

- **Automatic**: $[P]_{\text{upper}}, S_{\text{under}}$ computed automatically
- **Sound**: reports any incorrect program
- **Incomplete**: may reject correct programs
## A summary of common verification techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Automatic</th>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Source level</th>
<th>Scalable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No $^1$</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>sometimes $^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted proving</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>sometimes $^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model-checking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially $^4$</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bug-finding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Obviously, no approach checks all characteristics
- Scalability is a challenge for all

---

1. unless full testing is doable
2. full testing usually not possible except for small programs with finite state space
3. quickly requires huge manpower
4. only with respect to the finite models... but not with respect to infinite semantics
Order relations

Very useful in semantics and verification:

- **logical ordering**, expresses **implication** of logical facts
- **computational ordering**, useful to establish well-foundedness of fixpoint definitions, and for termination

**Definition: partially ordered set (poset)**

Let a set $S$ and a binary relation $\sqsubseteq \subseteq S \times S$ over $S$. Then, $\sqsubseteq$ is an **order relation** (and $(S, \sqsubseteq)$ is called a **poset**) if and only if it is

- **reflexive**: $\forall x \in S, \ x \sqsubseteq x$
- **transitive**: $\forall x, y, z \in S, \ x \sqsubseteq y \land y \sqsubseteq z \implies x \sqsubseteq z$
- **antisymmetric**: $\forall x, y \in S, \ x \sqsubseteq y \land y \sqsubseteq x \implies x = y$

- **notation**: $x \sqsubseteq y ::= (x \sqsubseteq y \land x \neq y)$
Graphical representation

We often use **Hasse diagrams** to represent posets:

**Extensive definition:**

- \( S = \{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\} \)
- \( \sqsubseteq \) defined by:
  
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  x_0 & \sqsubseteq x_1 \\
  x_1 & \sqsubseteq x_2 \\
  x_1 & \sqsubseteq x_3 \\
  x_2 & \sqsubseteq x_4 \\
  x_3 & \sqsubseteq x_4
  \end{align*}
  \]

- By reflexivity, we have, e.g., \( x_1 \sqsubseteq x_1 \)
- By transitivity, we have, e.g., \( x_1 \sqsubseteq x_4 \)

Order relations are very useful in semantics...
Example: semantics of automata

In the following, we illustrate order relations and their usefulness in semantics using word automata.

We consider the classical notion of finite word automata and let

- \( L \) be a finite set of letters
- \( Q \) be a finite set of states
- \( q_i, q_f \in Q \) denote the initial state and final state
- \( \rightarrow \subseteq Q \times L \times Q \) be a transition relation

**Semantics of an automaton**

The set of words recognized by \( A = (Q, q_i, q_f, \rightarrow) \) is defined by:

\[
\mathcal{L}[A] = \{ a_0a_1\ldots a_n \mid \exists q_0\ldots q_{n-1} \in Q, \ q_i \xrightarrow{a_0} q_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} q_1 \ldots q_{n-1} \xrightarrow{a_n} q_f \}
\]
Example: automata and semantic properties

A simple automaton:

\[ L = \{ a, b \} \quad Q = \{ q_0, q_1, q_2 \} \]

\[ q_i = q_0 \quad q_f = q_2 \]

\[ q_0 \xrightarrow{a} q_1 \quad q_1 \xrightarrow{b} q_2 \quad q_2 \xrightarrow{a} q_1 \]

A few semantic properties:

- \( P_0 \): no recognized word contains two consecutive \( b \)

\[ \mathcal{L}[\mathcal{A}] \subseteq L^* \setminus L^* b b L^* \]

- \( P_1 \): all recognized words contain at least one occurrence of \( a \)

\[ \mathcal{L}[\mathcal{A}] \subseteq L^* a L^* \]

- we could also consider under-approximation properties (of the form \( \mathcal{P}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{L}[\mathcal{A}] \)), but do not in this lecture
Total ordering

**Definition: total order relation**

Order relation \( \sqsubseteq \) over \( S \) is a **total** order if and only if

\[
\forall x, y \in S, \ x \sqsubseteq y \lor y \sqsubseteq x
\]

**Examples:**

- **real numbers:**
  \( (\mathbb{R}, \leq) \) is a total ordering

- **powerset:**
  if set \( S \) has at least two distinct elements \( x, y \) then its powerset \( (\mathcal{P}(S), \subseteq) \) is **not** a total order
  indeed \( \{x\}, \{y\} \) cannot be compared

Most of the order relations we will use are **not** be total
indeed: very often, powerset or similar
Minimum and maximum elements

Definition: extremal elements
Let \((S, \sqsubseteq)\) be a poset and \(S' \subseteq S\). Then \(x\) is

- **minimum element** of \(S'\) if and only if \(x \in S' \land \forall y \in S', x \sqsubseteq y\)
- **maximum element** of \(S'\) if and only if \(x \in S' \land \forall y \in S', y \sqsubseteq x\)

- maximum and minimum elements **may not exist**
  example: \(\{\{x\}, \{y\}\}\) in the powerset, where \(x \neq y\)
- **infimum** \(\bot\) ("bottom"): minimum element of \(S\)
- **supremum** \(\top\) ("top"): maximum element of \(S\)

Exercise:
what are the logical interpretations of infimum / supremum elements?
Upper bounds and least upper bound

Definition: bounds

Given poset \((S, \sqsubseteq)\) and \(S' \subseteq S\), then \(x \in S\) is

- an upper bound of \(S'\) if
  \[ \forall y \in S', \; y \sqsubseteq x \]

- the least upper bound (lub) of \(S'\) (noted \(\sqcup S'\)) if
  \[ \forall y \in S', \; y \sqsubseteq x \land \forall z \in S, (\forall y \in S', \; y \sqsubseteq z) \implies x \sqsubseteq z \]

- if it exists, the least upper bound is unique: if \(x, y\) are least upper bounds of \(S\), then \(x \sqsubseteq y\) and \(y \sqsubseteq x\), thus \(x = y\) by antisymmetry

- notation: \(x \sqcup y := \sqcup \{x, y\}\)

- upper bounds and least upper bounds may not exist

- dual notions: lower bound, greatest lower bound (glb, noted \(\sqcap S'\))

Exercise: logical interpretations?
Duality principle

So far all definitions admit a symmetric counterpart

- **dual relation**: given an order relation $\sqsubseteq$, $\mathcal{R}$ defined by

$$x \mathcal{R} y \iff y \sqsubseteq x$$

is also an order relation

- thus all properties that can be proved about $\sqsubseteq$ also have a symmetric property that also holds

This is the **duality principle**:

- minimum element
- infimum
- lower bound
- greatest lower bound
- maximum element
- supremum
- upper bound
- least upper bound

... more to follow
Complete lattice

Definition: complete lattice

A **complete lattice** is a tuple \((S, \sqsubseteq, \bot, \top, \sqcup, \sqcap)\) where:

- \((S, \sqsubseteq)\) is a poset
- \(\bot\) is the infimum of \(S\)
- \(\top\) is the supremum of \(S\)
- any subset \(S'\) of \(S\) has a lub \(\sqcup S'\) and a glb \(\sqcap S'\)

Properties:

- \(\bot = \sqcup \emptyset = \sqcap S\)
- \(\top = \sqcap \emptyset = \sqcup S\)

Example:

the powerset \((\mathcal{P}(S), \subseteq, \emptyset, S, \cup, \cap)\) of set \(S\) is a complete lattice
Lattice

The existence of lubs and glbs for all subsets is often a very strong property, that may not be met:

**Definition: lattice**

A **lattice** is a tuple \((S, \sqsubseteq, \bot, \top, \sqcup, \sqcap)\) where:

- \((S, \sqsubseteq)\) is a poset
- \(\bot\) is the infimum of \(S\)
- \(\top\) is the supremum of \(S\)
- any pair \(\{x, y\}\) of \(S\) has a lub \(x \sqcup y\) and a glb \(x \sqcap y\)

- let \(Q = \{q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid 0 \leq q \leq 1\}\);
  then \((Q, \leq)\) is a lattice but **not a complete lattice**
  indeed, \(\{q \in Q \mid q \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\}\) has no lub in \(Q\)
- property: a **finite** lattice is also a complete lattice
Chains

**Definition: increasing chain**

Let \((S, \sqsubseteq)\) be a poset and \(C \subseteq S\).

It is an **increasing chain** if and only if

- it has an infimum (thus it is not empty)
- poset \((C, \sqsubseteq)\) is total (i.e., any two elements can be compared)

**Example**, in the powerset \((\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}), \subseteq)\):

\[ C = \{c_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\} \quad \text{where} \quad c_i = \{2^0, 2^2, \ldots, 2^i\} \]

**Definition: increasing chain condition**

The poset \((S, \sqsubseteq)\) **satisfies the increasing chain condition** if and only if any increasing chain \(C \subseteq S\) is finite.
Complete partial orders

**Definition: complete partial order**

A **complete partial order** (cpo) is a poset \((S, \sqsubseteq)\) such that any increasing chain \(C\) of \(S\) has a least upper bound. A **pointed cpo** is a cpo with an infimum \(\perp\).

- clearly, any complete lattice is a cpo
- the opposite is not true:
Towards a constructive definition of the automata semantics

We now look for a **constructive version of the automaton semantics** as hinted by the following observations

**Observation 1:** \( \mathcal{L}[\mathcal{A}] = [\mathcal{A}](q_f) \) where

\[
\begin{align*}
[\mathcal{A}] : & \quad Q \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(L^*) \\
q & \mapsto \{w \in L^* \mid \exists n, w = a_0a_1 \ldots a_n \\
& \quad \exists q_0 \ldots q_{n-1} \in Q, q_i \xrightarrow{a_0} q_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} \ldots q_{n-1} \xrightarrow{a_n} q\}
\end{align*}
\]

**Observation 2:** \( [\mathcal{A}] = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [\mathcal{A}]_n \) where

\[
[\mathcal{A}]_n : \quad Q \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(L^*) \\
q & \mapsto \{a_0a_1 \ldots a_{n-1} \mid \\
& \quad \exists q_0 \ldots q_{n-2} \in Q, q_i \xrightarrow{a_0} q_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} \ldots q_{n-1} \xrightarrow{a_{n-1}} q\}
\]

**Observation 3:** \( [\mathcal{A}]_{n+1} \) can be computed directly from \( [\mathcal{A}]_n \)

\[
[\mathcal{A}]_{n+1}(q) = \bigcup_{q' \in Q} \{wa \mid w \in [\mathcal{A}]_n(q') \wedge q' \xrightarrow{a} q\}
\]
Towards a constructive definition of the automata semantics

Alternate approach:

1. Let \([\mathcal{A}]_n\) denote recognized words of length at most \(n\):

   \[ [\mathcal{A}]_n(q) = \{ w \in [\mathcal{A}](q) \mid \text{length}(w) \leq n \} \]

2. Compute \([\mathcal{A}]_{n+1}\) from \([\mathcal{A}])_n\)

3. Define the semantics of the automaton as the union of the iterates of this sequence:

   \[ [\mathcal{A}] = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [\mathcal{A}]_n \]

In the following, we study such a way of defining semantics, based on general mathematical tools, that we will use throughout the course.
Operators over a poset

Definition: operators and orderings

Let \((S, \sqsubseteq)\) be a poset and \(\phi : S \to S\) be an operator over \(S\). Then, \(\phi\) is:

- **monotone** if and only if \(\forall x, y \in S, x \sqsubseteq y \implies \phi(x) \sqsubseteq \phi(y)\)

- **continuous** if and only if, for any chain \(S' \subseteq S\) then:
  \[
  \begin{cases} 
  \text{if } \sqcup S' \text{ exists, so does } \sqcup \{\phi(x) \mid x \in S'\} \\
  \text{and } \phi(\sqcup S') = \sqcup \{\phi(x) \mid x \in S'\}
  \end{cases}
  \]

- **\(\sqcup\)-preserving** if and only if:
  \[
  \forall S' \subseteq S, \begin{cases} 
  \text{if } \sqcup S' \text{ exists, then } \sqcup \{\phi(x) \mid x \in S'\} \text{ exists} \\
  \text{and } \phi(\sqcup S') = \sqcup \{\phi(x) \mid x \in S'\}
  \end{cases}
  \]

Notes:

- “monotone” in English means “*croissante*” in French; “*décroissante*” translates into “anti-monotone” and “monotone” into “*isotone*”
- the dual of “monotone” is “monotone”
Operators over a poset

A few interesting properties:

Continuity implies monotonicity

If $\phi$ is continuous, then it is also monotone

We assume $\phi$ is continuous, and $x, y \in S$ are such that $x \sqsubseteq y$:
Then $\{x, y\}$ is a chain with lub $y$, thus $\phi(x) \sqcup \phi(y)$ exists and is equal to
$\phi(\sqcup \{x, y\}) = \phi(y)$. Therefore $\phi(x) \sqsubseteq \phi(y)$.

$\sqcup$-preserving implies monotonicity

If $\phi$ preserves $\sqcup$, then it is also monotone

Same argument.
Fixpoints

Definition: fixpoints

Let \((S, \sqsubseteq)\) be a poset and \(\phi : S \to S\) be an operator over \(S\).

- a fixpoint of \(\phi\) is an element \(x\) such that \(\phi(x) = x\)
- a pre-fixpoint of \(\phi\) is an element \(x\) such that \(x \sqsubseteq \phi(x)\)
- a post-fixpoint of \(\phi\) is an element \(x\) such that \(\phi(x) \sqsubseteq x\)
- the least fixpoint \(\text{lfp} \phi\) of \(\phi\) (if it exists, it is unique) is the smallest fixpoint of \(\phi\)
- the greatest fixpoint \(\text{gfp} \phi\) of \(\phi\) (if it exists, it is unique) is the greatest fixpoint of \(\phi\)

Note: the existence of a least fixpoint, a greatest fixpoint or even a fixpoint is *not guaranteed*; we will see several theorems that establish their existence under specific assumptions...
Tarski’s Theorem

**Theorem**

Let \((S, \sqsubseteq, \bot, T, \sqcup, \sqcap)\) be a complete lattice and \(\phi : S \rightarrow S\) be a monotone operator over \(S\). Then:

1. \(\phi\) has a least fixpoint \(\text{lfp } \phi\) and \(\text{lfp } \phi = \sqcap \{x \in S \mid \phi(x) \sqsubseteq x\}\).
2. \(\phi\) has a greatest fixpoint \(\text{gfp } \phi\) and \(\text{gfp } \phi = \sqcup \{x \in S \mid x \sqsubseteq \phi(x)\}\).
3. the set of fixpoints of \(\phi\) is a complete lattice.

**Proof of point 1:**

We let \(X = \{x \in S \mid \phi(x) \sqsubseteq x\}\) and \(x_0 = \sqcap X\).

Let \(y \in X\):

- \(x_0 \sqsubseteq y\) by definition of the glb;
- thus, since \(\phi\) is monotone, \(\phi(x_0) \sqsubseteq \phi(y)\);
- thus, \(\phi(x_0) \sqsubseteq y\) since \(\phi(y) \sqsubseteq y\), by definition of \(X\).

Therefore \(\phi(x_0) \sqsubseteq x_0\), since \(x_0 = \sqcap X\) and \(\phi(x_0)\) is a lower bound.
Tarski’s Theorem

We proved that $\phi(x_0) \subseteq x_0$. We derive from this that:

- $\phi(\phi(x_0)) \subseteq \phi(x_0)$ since $\phi$ is monotone;
- $\phi(x_0)$ is a post-fixpoint of $\phi$, thus $\phi(x_0) \in X$;
- $x_0 \sqsubseteq \phi(x_0)$ by definition of the greatest lower bound.

We have established both inclusions so $\phi(x_0) = x_0$.

If $x_1$ is another fixpoint, then $x_1 \in X$, so $x_0 \subseteq x_1$.

Proof of point 2: similar, by duality.

Proof of point 3:

- if $X$ is a set of fixpoints of $\phi$, we need to consider $\phi$ over
  \[ \{y \in S \mid y \subseteq S \cap X\} \]
  to establish the existence of a glb of $X$ in the poset of fixpoints.
- the existence of least upper bounds in the poset of fixpoints follows by duality.
A function over the powerset:

We consider a set $\mathcal{E}$, and a subset $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$
We let:

$$f : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$$

$$X \longmapsto X \cup A$$

Exercise:

- apply Tarski’s theorem, characterize the least and greatest fixpoints
Tarski’s theorem: example (2)

**Function:**

\[ f : [1, 4\pi - 1] \rightarrow [1, 4\pi - 1] \]

\[ x \mapsto x + \sin x \]

**Exercise:**

- apply Tarski’s theorem, and derive the fixpoints of the function
Automata example, fixpoint definition

Lattice:
- \( S = Q \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(L^*) \)
- the ordering is the pointwise extension \( \subseteq \) of \( \trianglerighteq \)

Operator:
- we let \( \phi_0 : S \rightarrow S \) be defined by
  \[
  \phi_0(f) = \lambda(q \in Q) \cdot \bigcup_{q' \in Q} \{ wa \mid w \in f(q') \land q' \xrightarrow{a} q \}
  \]
- we let \( \phi : S \rightarrow S \) by defined by
  \[
  \phi(f) = \lambda(q \in Q) \cdot \begin{cases} 
  f(q) \cup \phi_0(f)(q_i) \cup \{ \epsilon \} & \text{if } q = q_i \\
  f(q) \cup \phi_0(f)(q) & \text{otherwise}
  \end{cases}
  \]

Proof steps to complete:
- the existence of \( \text{lfp} \phi \) follows from Tarski’s theorem
- the equality \( \text{lfp} \phi = [A] \) can be established by induction and double inclusion... but there is a simpler way
Kleene’s Theorem

Tarski’s theorem guarantees existence of an lfp, but is not constructive.

**Theorem**

Let $(S, \sqsubseteq, \bot)$ be a pointed cpo and $\phi : S \rightarrow S$ be a continuous operator over $S$. Then $\phi$ has a least fixpoint, and

$$\text{lfp } \phi = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \phi^n(\bot)$$

First, we prove the existence of the lub:

Since $\phi$ is continuous, it is also monotone. We can prove by induction over $n$ that $\{\phi^n(\bot) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a chain:

- $\phi^0(\bot) = \bot \sqsubseteq \phi(\bot)$ by definition of the infimum;
- if $\phi^n(\bot) \sqsubseteq \phi^{n+1}(\bot)$, then
  $$\phi^{n+1}(\bot) = \phi(\phi^n(\bot)) \sqsubseteq \phi(\phi^{n+1}(\bot)) = \phi^{n+2}(\bot)$$

By definition of the cpo structure, the lub exists. We let $x_0$ denote it.
Kleene’s Theorem

Secondly, we prove that it is a fixpoint of $\phi$:

Since $\phi$ is continuous, $\{\phi^{n+1}(\bot) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has a lub, and

$$
\phi(x_0) = \phi(\bigsqcup\{\phi^n(\bot) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}) \\
= \bigsqcup\{\phi^{n+1}(\bot) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \\
= \bot \bigsqcup (\bigsqcup\{\phi^{n+1}(\bot) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}) \\
= x_0
$$

by continuity of $\phi$

by definition of $\bot$

by simple rewrite

Last, we show that it is the least fixpoint:

Let $x_1$ denote another fixpoint of $\phi$. We show by induction over $n$ that $\phi^n(\bot) \sqsubseteq x_1$:

- $\phi^0(\bot) = \bot \sqsubseteq x_1$ by definition of $\bot$;
- if $\phi^n(\bot) \sqsubseteq x_1$, then $\phi^{n+1}(\bot) \sqsubseteq \phi(x_1) = x_1$ by monotony, and since $x_1$ is a fixpoint.

By definition of the lub, $x_0 \sqsubseteq x_1$
Kleene’s theorem: example

**Function:**

\[ f : [1, 4\pi - 1] \rightarrow [1, 4\pi - 1] \]
\[ x \mapsto x + \sin x \]

**Exercise:**

- apply Kleene’s theorem and sketch the iterations
Automata: constructive semantics

We can now state a **constructive definition** of the automaton semantics. Operator $\phi$ is defined by

$$
\phi(f) = \lambda(q \in Q) \cdot \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
    f(q) \cup \phi_0(f)(q_i) \cup \{\varepsilon\} & \text{if } q = q_i \\
    f(q) \cup \phi_0(f)(q) & \text{otherwise}
  \end{array} \right.
$$

**Proof steps:**

- $\phi$ is continuous
- thus, Kleene’s theorem applies so $\text{lfp } \phi$ exists and $\text{lfp } \phi = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \phi^n(\bot) \ldots$
  
  ... this actually saves the double inclusion proof to establish that $\llbracket A \rrbracket = \text{lfp } \phi$

Furthermore, $\llbracket A \rrbracket = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \phi^n(\bot)$.

This fixpoint definition will be very useful to infer or verify semantic properties.
Automata: constructive semantics iterates

A simple automaton:

\[ L = \{a, b\} \quad Q = \{q_0, q_1, q_2\} \]
\[ q_i = q_0 \quad q_f = q_2 \]
\[ q_0 \xrightarrow{a} q_1 \quad q_1 \xrightarrow{b} q_2 \quad q_2 \xrightarrow{a} q_1 \]

Iterates of function \( \phi \) from \( \bot \):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iterate</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( q_0 )</td>
<td>( \emptyset )</td>
<td>( {\epsilon} )</td>
<td>( {\epsilon} )</td>
<td>( {\epsilon} )</td>
<td>( {\epsilon} )</td>
<td>( {\epsilon} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( q_1 )</td>
<td>( \emptyset )</td>
<td>( \emptyset )</td>
<td>( {a} )</td>
<td>( {a} )</td>
<td>( {a, aba} )</td>
<td>( {a, aba} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( q_2 )</td>
<td>( \emptyset )</td>
<td>( \emptyset )</td>
<td>( \emptyset )</td>
<td>( {ab} )</td>
<td>( {ab} )</td>
<td>( {ab, abab} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Duality principle

We can **extend the duality notion to fixpoints:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monotone</th>
<th>Monotone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-monotone</td>
<td>Anti-monotone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-fixpoint</td>
<td>Pre-fixpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least fixpoint</td>
<td>Greatest fixpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing chain</td>
<td>Decreasing chain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore both Tarski’s theorem and Kleene’s theorem have a dual version (Tarski’s theorem is its own dual).
On the topic of inductive reasoning...

**Formalizing inductive definitions:**

Definition based on inference rules:

\[
\begin{align*}
x_0 & \in X \\
x & \in X \\
f(x) & \in X 
\end{align*}
\]

Same property based on a least-fixpoint:

\[
\text{lfp}(Y \mapsto \{x_0\} \cup Y \cup \{f(x) | x \in Y\})
\]

Proving the inclusion of a fixpoint in a given set:

- Let \( \phi : S \rightarrow S \) be a continuous operator
- Let \( \mathcal{I} \in S \) such that:

\[
\forall x \in S, \ x \sqsubseteq \mathcal{I} \implies \phi(x) \sqsubseteq \mathcal{I}
\]

- We obviously have \( \bot \sqsubseteq \mathcal{I} \)
- We can prove that \( \text{lfp} \phi \sqsubseteq \mathcal{I} \)
Exercise: language of a grammar

Language of a grammar as a least-fixpoint

Assumptions:
- Alphabet $A$, finite set of nodes $N$
- Finite set of rules $R \subseteq N \times (A \cup N)^*$
- Starting node $S \in N$

Questions:
- Define the set of words recognized by the grammar with inductive rules
- Do the same using a least-fixpoint

Hints:
- start with a function that maps each node into the set of words recognized by this node
- compute such a function by induction
Main points to remember

Foundations:
- **program semantics**: express program behaviors
- **target semantic property**: express proof goal
- **conservative approximation** usually required due to undecidability

Order relations:
- **counterpart for logical implication** (among other)
- will be pervasive in this course

Fixpoints and induction:
- **encode general iteration**
- will also be pervasive in this course
In the next lectures...

- Families of **semantics**, for a general model of programs
- Families of **semantic properties of programs**
- **Verification techniques:**
  - abstract interpretation based static analysis
  - machine assisted theorem proving
  - model checking

**Next week: transition systems and operational semantics**
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- **Jérôme Feret** (DIENS, Semantics, Abstract interpretation)
- **Xavier Rival** (DIENS, Semantics, Abstract interpretation, Coq)

**Practical organization:**

- 1h30 Cours + 2h00 TD or TP depending on week

**Evaluation:**

\[ n = \frac{p + e}{2} \]

- **project** \( p \): several projects will be proposed in a few weeks
- **exam** \( e \): 31st of May, 2019