A Graduate Seminar in Tools and Techniques

Patrick J. Graydon M. Anthony Aiello Elisabeth A. Strunk John C. Knight

University of Virginia

A Seminar...

For SE grad students Particularly in dependable systems To introduce, not build proficiency Introduce tools and concepts Students critique the tools and concepts On model checking and model-based development They're both important Because we can

Tools and Techniques

Each student picked a tool: SLAM - driver model checker from Microsoft BLAST - model checker from UC Berkeley Kronos - model checker from Verimag Spin - Model checker developed at Bell Labs SCRtool - Specification tool from NRL PerfectDeveloper - design-by-contract development tool from Escher Technologies SCADE - MDB tool from Esterel Technologies Simulink - MDB tool from The MathWorks

Course Organization



Presentation phase: each student gives a presentation on his or her tool

Laboratory phase: each student prepares and directs a laboratory exercise

Comparison phase: students compare their tools

 Presentations, lab exercise, and comparison discussions each lasted 75 minutes (one of two course periods per week)

26 Aug. 2006 A Graduate Seminar in Tools and Techniques at the University of Virginia

Deliverables and Grading

Grades were based on:

Project report, final (35%)

Project report, draft (10%)

Lab materials, final (30%)

Participation (5%)

Presentation (10%)

Lab materials, draft (10%)

26 Aug. 2006 A Graduate Seminar in Tools and Techniques at the University of Virginia

5

Project reports

Reports described: The tool's developers The problem it addresses It's capabilities, strengths, and weaknesses How the tool compares to others we studied Course staff worked closely with selected students to help them improve reports Final reports were of high quality Reports collected into a tech. report: http://www.cs.virginia.edu/~pjg2e/documents/survey_mc_mbd.pdf

SCRtool Presentation

Students read:

- C. Heitmeyer, "Managing Complexity in Software Development with Formally Based Tools"
- K. Heninger, "Specifying Software Requirements for Complex Systems: New Techniques and Their Applications"

SCR team's vision for tools
 Tabular notation and concepts
 Collected questions
 Audience questions

focused later investigation and shaped the lab exercise

7

SCRtool Laboratory

Students <u>completed</u> a specification for a computer-controlled bath tub



Bath is filling



 Mode transition tables control modes for filling, heating, draining, etc.

Condition tables and event tables define the values of controlled variables

@T (PowerButton = Depressed)

SCRtool Laboratory (Cont'd)

Students checked spec for type, coverage, and disjointness errors We didn't plant errors Students attempted to prove a safety property We simulated the specified system

🕶 hap py_yu.ssi 📃 🗵 🔀	
File Edit Errors T	ools Settings
∇-Dictionaries	
🗅 🗁 Types	
▷ Mode Classes	
- Constants	
🗁 Variables	
- Assertions	
- Assumptions	
Modules	
✓ Functions	
Condition	
▷ Event	
✓ Mode Transition	
🗸 🖽 fo 🔀 HappyYuMode	
Blank cell is illegal	
- Blank cell is illegal	
- Blank cell is illegal	
- Blank cell is illegal	
Blank cell is illegal	
completed type ch	100%

Discussion

- Model checkers and MBD tools compared and contrasted separately MBD discussion covered: The kind of software the tool is intended for The kind of developer the tool is aimed at The tool's limitations The guarantees made by the tool (n)The V&V activities supported by the tool The tool's code generation capabilities
 - The tool's usability and scalability

Looking Back

Students showed interest in teaching
Lab development offered as an alternative to a longer paper
Comments from students positive
Reports were overall high quality
Tool comparisons impressive

Acknowledgement

We thank:

- Ralph Jeffords of the Naval Research Laboratory for his assistance in obtaining and using SCRtool
- Escher Technologies, Esterel Technologies, iLogix, and The MathWorks for letting us use their tools
- The students in the course, for their efforts and for trying this approach to introducing formal methods
- Kendra Schmid, Michael Spiegel, and Benjamin Taitelbaum for their comments on SCADE, Perfect Developer, and Simulink, respectively