

Automated Test-Trace Inspection for Microcontroller Binary Code

<u>Thomas Reinbacher</u>¹, Jörg Brauer², Daniel Schachinger¹, Andreas Steininger¹, and Stefan Kowalewski²

> ¹ Institute of Computer Engineering Vienna University of Technology, Austria

² Embedded Software Laboratory RWTH Aachen University, Germany





Setting the Scene

Binary Code Verification



- 1 Embedded software mostly not in plain ANSI C
 - side effects, embedded assembler, direct hardware register access
- Who verified your compiler?
 - GCC 4.3.5 has 8M loc (2.5M C, 1.5M C++, 1.5M Java, 60k ASM ...)
 - Good SW has about 1 error in 250 loc $\rightarrow \frac{8M}{250} = 33k$ flaws
 - Proving correctness of the compiler is typically infeasible
 - Even translation validation is hard (and not really widespread in industry)
- 3 No source code required (closed source libraries)
- **4** Binary code is as close as possible to the actual execution

Setting the Scene II

Runtime Verification (RV)



Testing is based on a guess & check paradigm

- Guess a configuration of the program's input
- Check the result of an individual test run

 RV bridges the gap between rigorous software verification and dynamic testing

Intuition for our approach

- Use formal methods to derive a set of test cases (guess)
- Use RV to check validity of test cases during execution (check)

CevTes Approach



- 1 Use AI to derive an over-approximation of the reachable states
- 2 Find program locations where the specification is violated
- 3 Backward analysis derives counterexamples (test cases)
- Interface a hardware unit attached to the SUT to replay a CE and automatically identify spurious warnings



CevTes Approach & RV

So far



Pure hardware approach [FMICS'11] for a static setting \checkmark

- 1 Non instrumenting approach
- Specification in ptLTL, auto-generate observers [Havelund&Rosu; TACAS'02]
- 3 Observers are generated as VHDL entities
- 4 Logic synthesis tool translates VHDL entities into a netlist
- **5** Observer runs in parallel to microcontroller (both on FPGA)

However

- In a *dynamic* setting, specifications may change frequently
- A single run of the synthesis tool may take several minutes $\ensuremath{\textcircled{\sc several}}$

Specification

ptLTL Observer



Past time LTL

Monitoring operators

$$\psi$$
 ::= $\uparrow \psi \mid \downarrow \psi \mid [\psi, \psi)_s \mid [\psi, \psi)_w$

Approach



Synthesize

- **1** A binary program Π for the μ Monitor
- **2** A configuration C for the atChecker
- \rightsquigarrow evaluates ptLTL \rightsquigarrow evaluates AP

Evaluate Atomic Propositions

TVPI constraints



AP are a form of two-variable-per-inequality constraints

$$\alpha \cdot m_1 + \beta \cdot m_2 \bowtie C$$

where:

• $\alpha, \beta \in \{0, \pm 2^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ m_1, m_2 are locations within RAM • $\bowtie \in \{<, >, \le, \ge, =, \neq\}$ $C \in \mathbb{Z}$ is a constant



Evaluate Atomic Propositions

Invariant Checker



Evaluation of TVPI constraints results in fairly efficient HW units

- Ripple carry adder: $\mathbf{Add}(\langle a \rangle, \langle b \rangle, c)$
- Subtraction of $\langle a \rangle \langle b \rangle$ is equivalent to $\mathsf{Add}(\langle a \rangle, \langle \overline{b} \rangle, 1)$
- Relational operators are similar
- Sensing the memory interface of the SUT (target microcontroller)







runs SUT natively



evaluates AP (TVPI constraints)



Implementation Details



FPGA: Altera Cyclone III EP3C16

Unit	LC	f _{max}
μ Monitor	367	145 MHz
atChecker	290	80 MHz
8051 IP-Core	4000	16 MHz



μ Monitor

- Instruction set features 16 opcodes to handle full ptLTL
- Each opcode is 3 bytes long

8051 IP-Core

 Unmodified, industrial 8051 IP-Core [www.oreganosystems.at]

Example



Digital controller implementation

- Temperature control of two DC motors M_1 and M_2
- Motors have max operating temperature, i.e., Θ_1 and Θ_2
- Sanity check $|\vartheta_1 \vartheta_2| \leq \delta_{max}$
- SUT
 - continuously reads operating temperatures, i.e., ϑ_1 and ϑ_2
 - invokes cooling system when $artheta_1 > \mathcal{T}_{\textit{on}_1}$ or $artheta_2 > \mathcal{T}_{\textit{on}_2}$



Example

 p_1

Industrial Automation





 $\begin{array}{ll} \psi: & \mathsf{Inv}(|\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_2| \leq \Delta_{max}) & \land \\ \uparrow (\mathsf{fanOn} = \#\mathsf{F_ON}) \Rightarrow [\vartheta_1 > \mathcal{T}_{\mathit{on}_1} \lor \vartheta_2 > \mathcal{T}_{\mathit{on}_2}; \ \vartheta_1 \geq \Theta_1 \lor \vartheta_2 \geq \Theta_2)_s \end{array}$

- atChecker will trace state changes of fanOn, temp1, temp2
- μ Monitor will check the validity of ψ

 $\stackrel{(p_2)}{\textcircled{p_2}} \rightsquigarrow \stackrel{(q_2)}{\checkmark} \checkmark \text{ is a valid wrt. to } \psi$ $\stackrel{(q_1)}{\longleftarrow} \stackrel{(p_2)}{\times} \text{ is invalid wrt. to } \psi, \text{ hence, detected by } \mu \text{Monitor}$

Conclusion & Future Work

Receivations with the second s

Non-intrusive monitoring framework for ptLTL

- Atomic propositions evaluated in hardware
- Validity of ptLTL specifications determined by a µCPU (µMonitor)
- μ Monitor runs in parallel to SUT
- ptLTL specifications are synthesized into μ Monitor programs
- SUT is an unmodified off-the-shelf IP core running the binary code under investigation

More recent and future work

- CFG recovery a priori instead of on-the-fly (see EMSOFT'11)
- Checking real-time properties (in progress)
- Orthogonal but related future work: automatic test-case / trace generation

CEVTES ⇔ Framework for Testing / RV of Embedded Software [http://ti.tuwien.ac.at/ecs/research/projects/cevtes]