

Verification Strategies for Feature-Oriented Software Product Lines

<u>Elias Kuiter</u>, Alexander Knüppel, Tabea Bordis, Tobias Runge, Ina Schaefer Otto-von-Guericke-University Magdeburg, Technische Universität Braunschweig

VaMoS 2022 February 24–25 | Florence, Italy



Motivation





- Safety + security of configurable software matters
 - \implies automotive, aircraft, ...



- Safety + security of configurable software matters \implies automotive, aircraft, ...
- Modular design aids with separation of concerns
 - \implies e.g., with FOP
 - \implies cannot prevent bugs



- Safety + security of configurable software matters \implies automotive, aircraft, ...
- Modular design aids with separation of concerns
 - \implies e.g., with FOP
 - \implies cannot prevent bugs
- Deductive verification creates formal proofs of correctness
 - \implies e.g., with KeY
 - \implies can show the presence of bugs



- Safety + security of configurable software matters \implies automotive, aircraft, ...
- Modular design aids with separation of concerns
 - \implies e.g., with FOP
 - \implies cannot prevent bugs
- Deductive verification creates formal proofs of correctness
 - \implies e.g., with KeY
 - \implies can show the presence of bugs
- Verification of feature-oriented SPLs







Product-Based

























Solution 1





Solution 1



Family-Based



Solution 2





Solution 2



Feature-Family-Based





- Formalize proof graphs and plans
 - \implies A novel technique for verification of FOP-based SPLs



- Formalize proof graphs and plans
 - \implies A novel technique for verification of FOP-based SPLs
- Express existing verification strategies as proof plans
 - \implies (Feature-)(Family-)(Product-)Based



- Formalize proof graphs and plans
 - \implies A novel technique for verification of FOP-based SPLs
- Express existing $\ensuremath{\textit{verification strategies}}$ as proof plans
 - \implies (Feature-)(Family-)(Product-)Based
- Propose possible applications
 - \implies Post-Hoc Verification, Evolution Scenarios, Lazy Exploration



- Formalize proof graphs and plans
 - \implies A novel technique for verification of FOP-based SPLs
- Express existing $\ensuremath{\textit{verification strategies}}$ as proof plans
 - \implies (Feature-)(Family-)(Product-)Based
- Propose possible applications
 - \implies Post-Hoc Verification, Evolution Scenarios, Lazy Exploration
- Implement proof plans in KeY



- Formalize proof graphs and plans
 - \implies A novel technique for verification of FOP-based SPLs
- Express existing verification strategies as proof plans
 - \implies (Feature-)(Family-)(Product-)Based
- Propose possible applications
 - \implies Post-Hoc Verification, Evolution Scenarios, Lazy Exploration
- Implement proof plans in KeY
- Evaluate proof plans on a case study



- Formalize proof graphs and plans
 - \implies A novel technique for verification of FOP-based SPLs
- Express existing verification strategies as proof plans
 - \implies (Feature-)(Family-)(Product-)Based
- Propose possible applications
 - \implies Post-Hoc Verification, Evolution Scenarios, Lazy Exploration
- Implement proof plans in KeY
- Evaluate proof plans on a case study
- Goals:
 - \implies Align proof reuse with software reuse by small, modular proofs
 - \implies Position proof plans as manipulatable, first-class objects





$$\begin{split} \texttt{ins}(A, x): & \{A \texttt{ is sorted} \} \\ & \texttt{original}(A, x)\texttt{; sort}(A) \\ & \{A \texttt{ is sorted} \land x \in A \} \end{split}$$



 $\begin{aligned} & \text{ins}(A, x): \ \{A \text{ is sorted}\} \\ & \text{original}(A, x); \text{ sort}(A) \\ & \{A \text{ is sorted} \land x \in A\} \end{aligned}$































Proof Plan with Reuse





























Proof Graph





Proof Graph



Product-Based





Proof Graph





Product-Based

Feature-Based





Proof Graph



Product-Based



Feature-Based







Proof Graph





Product-Based

Feature-Based



Feature-Family-Based*







Applications



* How to choose well?





Feature-Family-Based*



Applications

Post-Hoc Verification



* How to choose well?





Product-Based

Feature-Based



Feature-Family-Based*



Applications

- Post-Hoc Verification
- Evolution Scenarios



* How to choose well?





Product-Based

Feature-Based



Feature-Family-Based*



Applications

- Post-Hoc Verification
- Evolution Scenarios
- Lazy Exploration*



* How to choose well?





Product-Based

Feature-Based

Feature-Family-Based*





Elias Kuiter et al.

Verification Strategies for Feature-Oriented Software Product Lines





- Subject: List case study¹
 - \implies Java + JML + FeatureHouse, 5 features, 13 methods

Elias Kuiter et al.



- Subject: List case study¹
 - \implies Java + JML + FeatureHouse, 5 features, 13 methods
- Application: Post-hoc verification



- **Subject**: *List* case study¹
 - \implies Java + JML + FeatureHouse, 5 features, 13 methods
- Application: Post-hoc verification
- Verification system: KeY 2.8.0 + KeYPI prototype¹



Evaluation

- Subject: List case study¹
 - \implies Java + JML + FeatureHouse, 5 features, 13 methods
- Application: Post-hoc verification
- Verification system: KeY 2.8.0 + KeYPl prototype¹
- Partial proof mechanism: Abstract @model methods



- Subject: List case study¹
 ⇒ Java + JML + FeatureHouse, 5 features, 13 methods
- Application: Post-hoc verification
- Verification system: KeY 2.8.0 + KeYPI prototype¹
- Partial proof mechanism: Abstract @model methods

Verification strategy	Time [s]
Family-Based	20.0
Product-Based (dup)	23.7
Feature-Family-Based	26.2
Feature-Product-Based	28.8
Product-Based (dup)	157.7

¹https://github.com/ekuiter/KeYPl





- Subject: List case study¹
 - \implies Java + JML + FeatureHouse, 5 features, 13 methods
- Application: Post-hoc verification
- Verification system: KeY 2.8.0 + KeYPI prototype¹
- Partial proof mechanism: Abstract @model methods

Verification strategy	Time [s]
Family-Based	20.0
Product-Based (dup)	23.7
Feature-Family-Based	26.2
Feature-Product-Based	28.8
Product-Based (dup)	157.7











¹https://github.com/ekuiter/KeYPl





- **Subject**: *List* case study¹
 - \implies Java + JML + FeatureHouse, 5 features, 13 methods
- Application: Post-hoc verification
- Verification system: KeY 2.8.0 + KeYPI prototype¹
- Partial proof mechanism: Abstract @model methods

Verification strategy	Time [s]
Family-Based	20.0
Product-Based (dup)	23.7
Feature-Family-Based	26.2
Feature-Product-Based	28.8
Product-Based (dup)	157.7











Family-Based > Product-Based > Feature-Family-Based > Feature-Product-Based >> Product-Based (dup)
(dup)
(dup)
(dup)



Conclusion



 $\label{eq:Family-Based} \mbox{Family-Based} > \mbox{Feature-Family-Based} > \mbox{Feature-Product-Based} \gg \mbox{Product-Based} \mbox{(dup)} \mbox{(dup)}$



 $\begin{aligned} & \texttt{ins}(A, x): \ \{A \text{ is sorted}\} \\ & \texttt{original}(A, x); \ \texttt{sort}(A) \\ & \{A \text{ is sorted} \land x \in A\} \end{aligned}$

```
/*@ requires sorted(A);
@ ensures sorted(A) && contains(A, x); */
void main(int[] A, int x) {
    original(A, x);
    sort(A);
}
/*@ model boolean original_ensures(int[] A, int x);
@ model boolean original_ensures(int[] A, int x); */
void original(int[] A, int x);
/*@ model boolean sort_requires(int[] A);
@ model boolean sort_ensures(int[] A); */
void sort(int[] A);
```





