

Program Verification

Exercise Sheet 8: The Boogie Intermediate Verification Language

Assignment 1 (Modularity)

Give an example of a Boogie program, including a (non-recursive) procedure p such that:

1. The program includes at least one call to procedure p .
2. Each call to p in the program is made in a state in which the precondition of p is provably true.
3. If each call to p were inlined, the states at the end of each inlined copy are each guaranteed to satisfy the postcondition of p .
4. Procedure-modular verification of p will not succeed.

Write a variant of your program which includes an `assert` statement immediately after a call to p , such that the `assert` statement will result in a verification error for procedure-modular verification, but not if the definition of p is inlined for the call.

Assignment 2 (Verification)

Consider the `n_reverse_m` procedure declaration from slide 192. Provide an implementation of this procedure. You should check that it verifies (e.g. you could test your implementation via the web interface at <http://rise4fun.com/boogie>).

Assignment 3 (Well-Definedness Conditions)

Consider the operation $\text{def}(e)$ discussed (and partially defined) on slide 194. Suppose that we are modelling integer arrays using the definitions on slide 197, and want to *enforce that array-index expressions index the array within its bounds*, as a well-definedness condition.

Write down appropriate cases of the $\text{def}(e)$ construct for:

1. an array-index expression $e[e']$

2. an equality expression $e_1 == e_2$
3. a negation expression $!e$
4. a disjunction expression $e_1 || e_2$

Assignment 4 (Boogie Maps and Java Arrays)

Consider the following fragment of Java code where a and b are arrays:

```
int [] b = a;  
b[3] = 4;  
assert(a[3] == 4);
```

Try encoding this example by using the encoding of arrays discussed in the lecture on slide 197. Suppose you encode an analogous program that uses Boogie maps instead of arrays. What difference do you see and why?