Introduction to JavaCard Dynamic Logic

Andreas Roth, Richard Bubel, Christian Engel

November 22, 2006

• Assignments, complex expressions with side effects int i = 0; if ((i=2) >= 2) {i++;} // value of i?

- Assignments, complex expressions with side effects int i = 0; if ((i=2) >= 2) {i++;} // value of i?
- Abrupt termination

- Assignments, complex expressions with side effects int i = 0; if ((i=2) >= 2) {i++;} // value of i?
- Abrupt termination
 - Exceptions (try catch finally)

- Assignments, complex expressions with side effects int i = 0; if ((i=2) >= 2) {i++;} // value of i?
- Abrupt termination
 - Exceptions (try catch finally)
 - Local jumps return, break, continue

- Assignments, complex expressions with side effects int i = 0; if ((i=2) >= 2) {i++;} // value of i?
- Abrupt termination
 - Exceptions (try catch finally)
 - Local jumps return, break, continue
- Aliasing

Different navigation expressions may be same object reference

$$I \models \text{o.age} \doteq 1 \rightarrow \langle \text{u.age} = 2; \rangle \text{o.age} \doteq \text{u.age}$$

Depends on whether $I \models o \doteq u$

- Assignments, complex expressions with side effects int i = 0; if ((i=2) >= 2) {i++;} // value of i?
- Abrupt termination
 - Exceptions (try catch finally)
 - Local jumps return, break, continue
- Aliasing

Different navigation expressions may be same object reference

$$I \models \text{o.age} \doteq 1 \rightarrow \langle \text{u.age} = 2; \rangle \text{o.age} \doteq \text{u.age}$$

Depends on whether $I \models o \doteq u$

Method calls, blocks

- Assignments, complex expressions with side effects int i = 0: if ((i=2) >= 2) {i++:} // value of i?
- Abrupt termination
 - Exceptions (try catch finally)
 - Local jumps return, break, continue
- Aliasing

Different navigation expressions may be same object reference

$$I \models \text{o.age} \doteq 1 \rightarrow \langle \text{u.age} = 2; \rangle \text{o.age} \doteq \text{u.age}$$

Depends on whether $I \models o \doteq u$

• Method calls, blocks

Solution within KeY to be discussed in detail

Addressed in KeY

 Java's rules for localisation of attributes and method implementations (polymorphism, dynamic binding)

Addressed in KeY

- Java's rules for localisation of attributes and method implementations (polymorphism, dynamic binding)
 - Scope (class/instance)
 - Context (static/runtime)
 - Visibility
 - super

Addressed in KeY

- Java's rules for localisation of attributes and method implementations (polymorphism, dynamic binding)
 - Scope (class/instance)
 - Context (static/runtime)
 - Visibility
 - super

Solution: use information from semantic analysis of compiler (branch proof if implementation not uniquely determined)

Addressed in KeY

- Java's rules for localisation of attributes and method implementations (polymorphism, dynamic binding)
 - Scope (class/instance)
 - Context (static/runtime)
 - Visibility
 - super

Solution: use information from semantic analysis of compiler (branch proof if implementation not uniquely determined)

Run time errors (null pointer exceptions)
 Functions that model attributes are partially defined

Addressed in KeY

- Java's rules for localisation of attributes and method implementations (polymorphism, dynamic binding)
 - Scope (class/instance)
 - Context (static/runtime)
 - Visibility
 - super

Solution: use information from semantic analysis of compiler (branch proof if implementation not uniquely determined)

Run time errors (null pointer exceptions)
 Functions that model attributes are partially defined
 Solution: optional rule set enforces proof of !(o = null)
 (whenever object reference o accessed)

 Java Card data types boolean, char, String int, byte, long (cyclic!) Arrays

Solution: optional rule sets N/int, rules for built-ins

- Java Card data types boolean, char, String int, byte, long (cyclic!) Arrays
 - **Solution:** optional rule sets N/int, rules for built-ins
- Java Card transaction mechanism (atomic execution)
 "Roll back" uncompleted transactions ("rip out")
 - **Solution:** new modality $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket \phi$ " ϕ holds throughout execution of α "

- Java Card data types boolean, char, String int, byte, long (cyclic!) Arrays
 - **Solution:** optional rule sets N/int, rules for built-ins
- Java Card **transaction** mechanism (atomic execution)

 "Roll back" uncompleted transactions ("rip out")

 Solutions and modelity [10] | 4 " | holds throughout execution of
 - Solution: new modality $[\![\alpha]\!]\phi$ " ϕ holds throughout execution of α "
- Object creation and initialisation
 Trick to keep same universe *U* in all states:
 all objects exist anytime, use attributes o.created, o.initialized

- Java Card data types boolean, char, String int, byte, long (cyclic!) Arrays
 - **Solution:** optional rule sets N/int, rules for built-ins
- Java Card transaction mechanism (atomic execution)
 "Roll back" uncompleted transactions ("rip out")
 Solution: new modality [α] φ "φ holds throughout execution of α"
- Object creation and initialisation
 Trick to keep same universe *U* in all states:
 all objects exist anytime, use attributes o.created, o.initialized
- Formal specification of Java Card API

Side Effects and Complex Expressions

```
int i = 0; if ((i=2) >= 2) \{i++;\} // value of i?
```

JAVA expressions can assign values (assignment operators) FOL/DL terms have no side effects

Side Effects and Complex Expressions

int
$$i = 0$$
; if $((i=2) >= 2) \{i++;\}$ // value of i?

JAVA expressions can assign values (assignment operators) **FOL/DL terms** have **no** side effects

Decomposition of complex terms following symbolic execution as defined for expressions JAVA language specification

Local program transformations

ITERATED-ASSIGNMENT
$$\frac{\Gamma ==> \langle \pi \ y = t; \ x = y; \ \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta}{\Gamma ==> \langle \pi \ x = y = t; \ \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta} \qquad t \text{ simple}$$

Side Effects and Complex Expressions

int
$$i = 0$$
; if $((i=2) >= 2) \{i++;\}$ // value of i?

JAVA expressions can assign values (assignment operators)

FOL/DL terms have no side effects

 $\label{eq:Decomposition} \textbf{Decomposition} \ \ \text{of complex terms following symbolic execution as defined for expressions} \ \ J_{AVA} \ \ \text{language specification}$

Local program transformations

Temporary program variables '_var<n>' store intermediate results

$$\text{IF-EVAL} \frac{\Gamma ==> \langle \pi \text{ boolean } \mathbf{v_{new}}; \ \mathbf{v_{new}} = \mathbf{b}; \ \text{if } (\mathbf{v_{new}}) \ \{\alpha\}; \ \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta }{\Gamma ==> \langle \pi \text{ if } (b) \ \{\alpha\}; \ \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta }$$
 where b complex

Side Effects and Complex Expressions, Cont'd

Applying rule to statement including guard with side effect is incorrect

Restrict applicability of ${\tt IF-THEN}$ and other rules with guards: Guard expression needs to be **simple** (ie, side effect-free)

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{IF-SPLIT} \ \frac{\Gamma, b \doteq \text{TRUE} \implies \langle \pi \ \alpha; \ \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta \quad \Gamma, b \doteq \text{FALSE} \implies \langle \pi \ \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta}{\Gamma \implies \langle \pi \ \text{if} \ (b) \ \{\alpha\}; \ \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta} \\ \text{where} \ b \ \text{simple} \end{array}$$

Demo

javaDL/complex.key

Abrupt Termination

Redirection of control flow via return, break, continue, exceptions

$$\langle \pi \; {\rm try} \; \{ \xi \alpha \} \; {\rm catch}(e) \; \{ \gamma \} \; {\rm finally} \; \{ \epsilon \}; \; \omega \rangle \phi$$

Abrupt Termination

Redirection of control flow via return, break, continue, exceptions

$$\langle \pi \text{ try } \{ \xi \alpha \} \text{ catch}(e) \{ \gamma \} \text{ finally } \{ \epsilon \}; \ \omega \rangle \phi$$

Solution: rules work on first active statement, **try** part of prefix

Abrupt Termination

Redirection of control flow via return, break, continue, exceptions

$$\langle \pi \text{ try } \{ \xi \alpha \} \text{ catch}(e) \{ \gamma \} \text{ finally } \{ \epsilon \}; \ \omega \rangle \phi$$

Solution: rules work on first active statement, **try** part of prefix

TRY-THROW (exc simple)

$$\Gamma = > \left\langle \begin{array}{c} \pi \text{ if (exc instanceOf Exception) } \{ \\ \text{try } \{ e = \text{exc; } \gamma \} \text{ finally } \{ \epsilon \} \\ \} \text{ else } \{ \epsilon \text{ throw exc} \}; \omega \end{array} \right\rangle \phi, \Delta$$

 $\Gamma =\Rightarrow \overline{\langle \pi \text{ try {throw exc; } } \alpha \} \text{ catch}(e) \{\gamma\} \text{ finally } \{\epsilon\}; \ \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta}$

Aliasing

Naive alias resolution causes **proof split** (on o \doteq u) at each access

$$\Gamma$$
 ==> o.age \doteq 1 -> $\langle u.age = 2; \rangle$ o.age $\doteq u.age, \Delta$

Aliasing

Naive alias resolution causes **proof split** (on o = u) at each access

$$\Gamma$$
 ==> o.age \doteq 1 -> $\langle u.age = 2; \rangle o.age $\doteq u.age, \Delta$$

Unnecessary in many cases!

$$\Gamma ==> o.age \doteq 1 \Rightarrow \langle u.age = 2; \ o.age = 2; \rangle o.age \doteq u.age, \Delta$$

$$\Gamma ==> o.age \doteq 1 \Rightarrow \langle u.age = 2; \rangle u.age \doteq 2, \Delta$$

Aliasing

Naive alias resolution causes **proof split** (on o = u) at each access

$$\Gamma ==> o.age = 1 -> \langle u.age = 2; \rangle o.age = u.age, \Delta$$

Unnecessary in many cases!

$$\Gamma ==> o.age \doteq 1 \Rightarrow \langle u.age = 2; o.age = 2; \rangle o.age \doteq u.age, \Delta$$

$$\Gamma ==> o.age \doteq 1 \Rightarrow \langle u.age = 2; \rangle u.age \doteq 2, \Delta$$

Updates avoid such proof splits:

- Delayed state computation until clear what actually required
- Simplification of updates

Let loc be either one of

o program variable x

Let loc be either one of

- program variable x
- attribute access o.attr (o has object type)

Let loc be either one of

- program variable x
- attribute access o.attr (o has object type)
- array access a[i] (a has array type, not discussed here)

Let loc be either one of

- program variable x
- attribute access o.attr (o has object type)
- array access a[i] (a has array type, not discussed here)

ASSIGN
$$\frac{\Gamma ==> \{loc := val\} \langle \pi \ \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta}{\Gamma ==> \langle \pi \ loc = val; \ \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta}$$

where

- loc and val satisfy above restrictions
- val is a side-effect free term,
- {loc := val} is DL **update** (usage and semantics as in simple DL)

Use conditional terms to delay splitting further

Use conditional terms to delay splitting further

Computing update followed by attribute access

Use conditional terms to delay splitting further

Computing update followed by attribute access

Example

$${o.a := o}o.a.a.b$$

Use conditional terms to delay splitting further

(\if (t1 = t2) \then t \else e)',\beta =
$$\begin{cases} t^{I,\beta} & t_1^{I,\beta} = t_2^{I,\beta} \\ e^{I,\beta} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Computing update followed by attribute access

Example

$${o.a := o}o.a.a.b \sim {o.a := o}o.a.a.b$$

Use conditional terms to delay splitting further

Computing update followed by attribute access

Example

$$\{ \texttt{o.a} := \texttt{o} \} \texttt{o.a.a.b} \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \big(\{ \texttt{o.a} := \texttt{o} \} \texttt{o.a.a} \big) . \texttt{b}$$

Computing Effect of Updates: Attributes

Use conditional terms to delay splitting further

Computing update followed by attribute access

$$\begin{aligned} \{ \mathbf{o.a} &:= t \} \mathbf{o.a} & \sim & t \\ \{ \mathbf{o.a} &:= t \} \mathbf{u.b} & \sim & \big(\{ \mathbf{o.a} &:= t \} \mathbf{u} \big) . \mathbf{b} \\ \{ \mathbf{o.a} &:= t \} \mathbf{u.a} & \sim & \\ & & \big\langle \mathbf{if} \ \big((\{ \mathbf{o.a} &:= t \} \mathbf{u} \big) = \mathbf{o} \big) \ \big\langle \mathbf{then} \ t \ \big\langle \mathbf{e.a} &:= t \} \mathbf{u} \big\rangle . \mathbf{a} \end{aligned}$$

Example

Computing Effect of Updates: Attributes

Use conditional terms to delay splitting further

(\if (t1 = t2) \then t \else e)',\beta =
$$\begin{cases} t^{I,\beta} & t_1^{I,\beta} = t_2^{I,\beta} \\ e^{I,\beta} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Computing update followed by attribute access

$$\begin{aligned} \{ \mathbf{o.a} &:= t \} \mathbf{o.a} & \sim & t \\ \{ \mathbf{o.a} &:= t \} \mathbf{u.b} & \sim & \big(\{ \mathbf{o.a} &:= t \} \mathbf{u} \big) . \mathbf{b} \\ \{ \mathbf{o.a} &:= t \} \mathbf{u.a} & \sim & \\ & & \big\langle \mathbf{if} \ \big((\{ \mathbf{o.a} &:= t \} \mathbf{u} \big) = \mathbf{o} \big) \ \big\langle \mathbf{then} \ t \ \big\langle \mathbf{e.a} &:= t \} \mathbf{u} \big\rangle . \mathbf{a} \end{aligned}$$

Example

$$\label{eq:condition} \{ \text{o.a} := \text{o} \} \text{o.a.a.b} \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{(} \text{ \lambda if (o = o)} \\ \text{ \text{then o}} \\ \text{ \else o.a).b} \end{array}$$

Computing Effect of Updates: Attributes

Use conditional terms to delay splitting further

(\if (t1 = t2) \then t \else e)',\beta =
$$\begin{cases} t^{I,\beta} & t_1^{I,\beta} = t_2^{I,\beta} \\ e^{I,\beta} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Computing update followed by attribute access

Example

$${o.a := o}o.a.a.b \sim o.b$$

Parallel Updates

Computing update followed by update

$$\{l_1 := r_1\}\{l_2 := r_2\} = \{\{l_1 := r_1\}, \{\{l_1 := r_1\} \downarrow l_2 := \{l_1 := r_1\}r_2\}\}$$

Results in parallel update

Parallel Updates

Computing update followed by update

$$\{l_1 := r_1\}\{l_2 := r_2\} = \{\{l_1 := r_1\}, \{\{l_1 := r_1\} \downarrow l_2 := \{l_1 := r_1\}r_2\}\}$$

Results in parallel update

Syntax

$$\{I_1 := v_1, \ldots, I_n := v_n\}$$

Parallel Updates

Computing update followed by update

$$\{l_1 := r_1\}\{l_2 := r_2\} = \{\{l_1 := r_1\}, \{\{l_1 := r_1\} \downarrow l_2 := \{l_1 := r_1\}r_2\}\}$$

Results in parallel update

Syntax

$$\{l_1 := v_1, \ldots, l_n := v_n\}$$

Semantics

- All l_i and v_i computed in old state
- All updates done simultaneously
- If conflict $l_i = l_i$, $v_i \neq v_i$ later update wins

Method call with actual parameters arg_1, \ldots, arg_n

$$\{arg_1 := t_1, \ldots, arg_n := t_n, o := t_o\} \langle o.m(arg_1, \ldots, arg_n); \rangle \phi$$

Where method declaration is: void $m(T_1 p_1, ..., T_n p_n)$

Method call with actual parameters arg_1, \ldots, arg_n

$$\{arg_1 := t_1, \ldots, arg_n := t_n, o := t_o\} \langle o.m(arg_1, \ldots, arg_n); \rangle \phi$$

Where method declaration is: void $m(T_1 p_1, ..., T_n p_n)$

What the rule **method-call** does:

• (type conformance of arg_i to T_i guaranteed by JAVA compiler)

Method call with actual parameters arg_1, \ldots, arg_n

$$\{arg_1 := t_1, \ldots, arg_n := t_n, o := t_o\} \langle o.m(arg_1, \ldots, arg_n); \rangle \phi$$

Where method declaration is: void $m(T_1 p_1, ..., T_n p_n)$

What the rule **method-call** does:

- (type conformance of arg_i to T_i guaranteed by JAVA compiler)
- for each formal parameter p_i of m declare & initialize new local variable ' T_i $p_i = arg_i$;'

Method call with actual parameters arg_1, \ldots, arg_n

$$\{arg_1 := t_1, \ldots, arg_n := t_n, o := t_o\} \langle o.m(arg_1, \ldots, arg_n); \rangle \phi$$

Where method declaration is: void $m(T_1 p_1, ..., T_n p_n)$

What the rule **method-call** does:

- (type conformance of arg_i to T_i guaranteed by JAVA compiler)
- for each formal parameter p_i of m declare & initialize new local variable ' T_i $p_i = arg_i$;'
- look up implementation class C of m split proof, if implementation not determinable

Method call with actual parameters arg_1, \ldots, arg_n

$$\{arg_1 := t_1, \ldots, arg_n := t_n, o := t_o\} \langle o.m(arg_1, \ldots, arg_n); \rangle \phi$$

Where method declaration is: void $m(T_1 p_1, ..., T_n p_n)$

What the rule **method-call** does:

- (type conformance of arg_i to T_i guaranteed by JAVA compiler)
- for each formal parameter p_i of m declare & initialize new local variable ' T_i $p_i = arg_i$;'
- look up implementation class C of m split proof, if implementation not determinable
- make concrete call o. $C::m(p_1,\ldots,p_n)$

After processing code that binds actual to formal parameters (symbolic execution of $T_i p_i = arg_i$;)

METHOD-BODY-EXPAND
$$\frac{\Gamma ==> \langle \pi \text{ method-frame}(C(o)) \{ b \} \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta}{\Gamma ==> \langle \pi \text{ o.} C :: m(p_1, \dots, p_n); \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta}$$

After processing code that binds actual to formal parameters (symbolic execution of $T_i p_i = arg_i$;)

$$\text{METHOD-BODY-EXPAND} \frac{\Gamma \mathrel{\texttt{==>}} \langle \pi \; \text{method-frame}(C(\circ)) \{ \; b \; \} \; \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta}{\Gamma \mathrel{\texttt{==>}} \langle \pi \; \text{o.} C :: m(p_1, \ldots, p_n); \; \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta}$$

Symbolic Execution

After processing code that binds actual to formal parameters (symbolic execution of $T_i p_i = arg_i$;)

$$\text{METHOD-BODY-EXPAND} \frac{\Gamma ==> \langle \pi \text{ method-frame}(C(o)) \{ b \} \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta}{\Gamma ==> \langle \pi \text{ o.} C :: m(p_1, \dots, p_n); \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta}$$

Symbolic Execution
Only static information available, proof splitting

After processing code that binds actual to formal parameters (symbolic execution of $T_i p_i = arg_i$;)

$$\text{METHOD-BODY-EXPAND} \frac{\Gamma ==> \langle \pi \text{ method-frame}(C(o)) \{ b \} \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta}{\Gamma ==> \langle \pi \text{ o.} C :: m(p_1, \dots, p_n); \omega \rangle \phi, \Delta}$$

Symbolic Execution
Only static information available, proof splitting
Runtime infrastructure required in calculus