

# SOCLe: Integrated Design of Software Applications and Security\*

Frédéric Painchaud

Defence Research and Development Canada – Valcartier  
2459 Pie-XI Blvd North  
Val-Bélair (Québec)  
Canada, G3J 1X5  
Frederic.Painchaud@drdc-rddc.gc.ca

Damien Azambre

Mathieu Bergeron

John Mullins

Raveca Maria Oarga

Department of Computer Engineering  
École Polytechnique de Montréal  
P.O. Box 6079, Centre-ville Station  
Montréal (Québec)  
Canada, H3C 3A7  
{damien.azambre, mathieu-2.bergeron,  
john.mullins, raveca-maria.oarga}@polymtl.ca

## Abstract

*Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) – Valcartier, with the support of the CRAC Laboratory at École Polytechnique de Montréal, carried out an ambitious R&D project aiming at developing a tool called SOCLe which integrates the design of software applications with their security. Integrating the design of software applications and security into a unique tool is not only particularly innovative but also crucial to ensure the quality and security of critical command and control information systems. Moreover, as it is 50 to 100 times more expensive to correct a software error once the design phase is finished, detecting and correcting errors at design-time saves time and money. This paper presents the SOCLe project's major achievements along with a simplified case study on Caveats, as an illustrative example of a possible military application for this new technology.*

## 1. Introduction

It is now generally recognized that the design phase is crucial to the development of high-quality software. Nowadays, software is omnipresent and its faults can involve enormous social and economic repercussions. Sad examples abound: the Therac-25 radiotherapy machine (3 dead and 3 severely wounded persons), the ARIANE 5 rocket

(approximately 500 million US dollars loss), the breakdown of AT&T network (approximately 60 million US dollars loss), etc.<sup>1</sup> However, programs' behavior is generally only validated after their partial or complete implementation, using various testing techniques. Moreover, it is estimated that correcting a software error after its implementation is 50 to 100 times more expensive than at design-time [2]. Thus, there is a real need for design-time validation techniques.

With this objective in mind, Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) – Valcartier initiated a project to develop a tool that allows the integration of security within the design of software applications. The idea is an innovative exploitation of constraints in Unified Modeling Language (UML) diagrams. These security constraints are expressed in the Object Constraint Language (OCL), hence the name Secure OCL expressions (SOCLe). The UML notation is currently the *de facto* industrial standard for the design of object-oriented, modern software. Indeed, it is used to support software engineering best practices. With UML, it is possible to specify the structural and behavioral aspects of software using standardized diagrams. OCL is integrated into the UML standard and expresses class invariants and pre/post-conditions on operations. These constraints specify and clarify the meaning of UML diagrams by precisely describing the correct model behavior.

The SOCLe project is carried out by a team of student members of the *Conception et Réalisation des Applications Complexes* (CRAC) Laboratory at *École Polytechnique de Montréal*, and is directed by professor John Mullins. It tackles the important problem of design-time validation. In

---

\*The Secure OCL expressions (SOCLe) project was sponsored by Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) (Government of Canada).

---

<sup>1</sup>According to wikipedia.org and cnn.com.

# Report Documentation Page

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE <b>JUN 2005</b>		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED <b>00-00-2005 to 00-00-2005</b>	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>SOCLe: Integrated Design of Software Applications and Security</b>				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>Defence Research and Development Canada - Valcartier, 2459 Pie-XI Blvd North, Val-Belair (Quebec) Canada G3J 1X5, ,</b>				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES <b>The original document contains color images.</b>					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>40</b>	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>			

the first research phase, the SOCLE team compiled an exhaustive state-of-the-art study in order to judiciously choose technologies to be used throughout the project. UML was essentially selected because of its popularity in the industry. OCL is interesting for several reasons: it is integrated into the UML standard, it is easy to use, and, especially, it is possible to give it a precise and unambiguous meaning and to integrate it into rigorous verification techniques. Research efforts continued thereafter with the formal design necessary for the implementation of the SOCLE tool. This implementation phase initially targeted the development of an automatic verification engine, and then the design of a graphical user interface for this engine. Considerable efforts were also invested in order to improve the engine's performance, which is now adequate.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 discusses similar tools found in the literature. Section 3 presents the general architecture of the SOCLE tool. Section 4 details the simplified case study used throughout this paper: a caveat-separation system. Sections 5, 6, and 7 sketch the utilization of the tool using this case study. Finally, Section 8 presents ongoing improvements to the tool and conclusions. Note that some familiarity with UML and OCL is assumed. The reader is referred to [10] for an introduction to UML. Details about OCL can be found in [9].

## 2. Related Work

Few research tools are currently available for static and/or dynamic validation of UML diagrams. Lilius and Paltor [8] propose  $\forall$ UML, a tool that translates UML statechart diagrams into Promela, the modeling language of the SPIN model-checker. Constraints are expressed through Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) and are transmitted to SPIN. Similarly, Latella et al. [7] give a provably-correct translation from a subset of UML statechart diagrams into Promela. None of these approaches, however, have taken OCL into account.

The toolset proposed by Shen et al. [11] offers static and dynamic validation. Static checks include: syntactic correctness according to well-formedness constraints of the UML meta-model, coherence of an object diagram with respect to a class diagram, and validation of OCL constraints on an object diagram. The dynamic checks consist of the verification of statechart diagrams using the SMV model-checker. However, OCL constraints are not considered by this model-checker either. Therefore, they are not supported as a dynamic constraint specification language.

Extensions for OCL constraints are suggested by Distefano et al. [5], using Computational Tree Logic (CTL), and Bradfield et al. [3], using propositional  $\mu$ -calculus. The general idea is to replace the atomic properties of these temporal logics by standard OCL constraints. Note, however,

that neither of these frameworks support UML as a design notation.

## 3. SOCLE Architecture

SOCLE is divided into three main modules:

1. a UML compiler,
2. a specialized Abstract State Machine (ASM) interpreter [1], and
3. a model-checker (Figure 1).<sup>2</sup>

The tool works with UML diagrams expressed in the XML Metadata Interchange (XMI) format, which is supported by most UML CASE tools.

The verification process has three phases:

1. translate the UML diagrams into an ASM executable specification,
2. simulate the execution of the generated specification, and
3. verify OCL constraints against the resulting execution graph.

The UML compiler translates UML diagrams to an ASM according to a formally-defined semantics. Basic diagram elements, such as classes and method names, are mapped to sorts (data domains). More complex elements, such as method declarations and statechart transitions, are translated into enumerated functions. The object diagram is mapped to a specific subset of these functions and represents the initial configuration of the UML diagrams.


The ASM interpreter simulates the execution of the ASM specification. From an initial configuration, successor configurations are computed by evaluating an ASM program capturing the dynamic behavior of the UML diagrams.

The model-checker verifies the OCL constraints by translating them into a set of properties and applying a verification algorithm [4]. The result is transmitted back to the graphical user interface through a set of diagnostic files.

SOCLE includes a graphical user interface embedded into argoUML, a customizable open-source UML CASE tool<sup>3</sup>. It allows the designer to visualize verification results and to inspect the diagrams' execution graph.

<sup>2</sup>For the sake of brevity and to respect the scope of this paper, no technical details are given about the ASM formalism and model-checking techniques.

<sup>3</sup><http://argouml.tigris.org>.



**Figure 1. SOCLE Architecture**

#### 4. Caveat-Separation System: Simplified Case Study Specifications

The main objective of the case study is relatively simple: design and verify a simplified caveat-separation system based on the following specifications.

##### 4.1. Users

Of course, a caveat-separation system implies the management of users. In this system, users have the following attributes:

- A security clearance: “Enhanced”, “Confidential”, “Secret”, or “Top Secret”.
- A country of origin. For example: “Canada”, “US”, “UK”, “Germany”, or “Egypt”.
- A military rank: “General”, “Officer”, or “Civilian”.

Except for the country of origin, these attributes can be modified in time. For instance, one particular user can be upgraded from “civilian” to “officer” or from “secret” to “top secret”. It is infrequent for a military rank to be downgraded but the system should handle this situation for the sake of completeness. For example, a retired military officer working as a contractor could be classified civilian for caveat-evaluation purposes.

##### 4.2. Documents

In this caveat-separation system, users want to access documents. Documents have the following attributes:

- A classification level: “Unclassified”, “Confidential”, “Secret”, or “Top Secret”.
- A caveat. For example: “CEO”, “CANUS”, “CANUSUK”, “NATO”, “UN Coalition”, or “USUK”.
- An affiliation with a project. For example: “Project A”, “Project B”, or “Project C”.

Here, all attributes can be modified during the lifespan of a document, even though certain modifications are unlikely to happen.

##### 4.3. Access Control Tables

There are three access control tables that dictate who can access which documents: the classification table (Table 1), the caveat table (Table 2), and the need-to-know table (Table 3). They are all presented in the following subsections.

###### 4.3.1 Classification Table

Table 1 presents the access relation between the security clearance of users and the classification level of documents. Of course, the higher the classification level of a document, the higher the security clearance required to access it. This

Classification level / Security clearance	Enhanced	Confidential	Secret	Top Secret
Unclassified	Granted	Granted	Granted	Granted
Confidential	Denied	Granted	Granted	Granted
Secret	Denied	Denied	Granted	Granted
Top Secret	Denied	Denied	Denied	Granted

**Table 1. Classification Table**

table is not simply an example. It is fixed once and for all in the caveat-separation system.

#### 4.3.2 Caveat Table

In Table 2, the caveat of the document dictates acceptable countries of origin for the user who wants to access it. This table is simply an example. Of course, many other caveats and countries exist. However, for the purpose of the current caveat-separation system, it can be considered to be fixed.

#### 4.3.3 Need-to-Know Table

Table 3 determines who, in terms of countries of origin and military ranks, has the “need-to-know” in order to access the documents of a particular project. A user must not only have the proper security clearance and country of origin to be able to access a document but must also have what is called the “need-to-know”. In this caveat-separation system, it is assumed that this “need-to-know” is attributed on a per-project basis and is related to a user’s country of origin and military rank. This table is simply an example and should not be considered fixed once and for all in the caveat-separation system. Indeed, new projects could be created, old projects could be terminated, and entries could be modified or deleted in time.

#### 4.4. Property to Verify

Finally, the following property must be verified to be valid in the design of the current caveat-separation system:

At all times, a user can access a document if and only if the access is granted with respect to the classification, caveat, and need-to-know tables.

This is particularly essential if the attributes and/or the need-to-know table are dynamically modified.

### 5. Caveat-Separation System: UML Design

For any given design in SOCLE, the designer must include exactly one class diagram, one statechart diagram for

each class defined in the class diagram, and one object diagram. In this section, these diagrams are illustrated through the modeling of the case study.

#### 5.1. Class Diagram

Figure 2 presents the class diagram of the simplified caveat-separation system used as a case study. Class *Document* models a document in the system with its associated security level, caveat, and project. Class *User* models a user who has access to the system with its associated security clearance, country of origin, and military rank (or civilian). Two roles are represented for users: senders (class *Sender*) and receivers (class *Receiver*) of documents. The class *Controller* manages accesses to documents by users. This class accesses the three tables that dictate which user can access which document. The classes *TableSecret*, *TableCaveat*, and *TableProject* model the classification table (Table 1), the caveat table (Table 2), and the need-to-know table (Table 3), respectively.

In order to be properly handled by the SOCLE tool, the information contained in these three tables is encoded as per tables 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Unclassified	0
Confidential	1
Secret	2
Top Secret	3

**Table 4. Classification Level Encoding**

Enhanced	0
Confidential	1
Secret	2
Top Secret	3

**Table 5. Security Clearance Encoding**

Caveat / Country of origin	Canada	United States	United Kingdom	Germany	Egypt
CEO	Granted	Denied	Denied	Denied	Denied
CANUS	Granted	Granted	Denied	Denied	Denied
CANUSUK	Granted	Granted	Granted	Denied	Denied
NATO	Granted	Granted	Granted	Granted	Denied
UN Coalition	Granted	Granted	Granted	Granted	Granted
USUK	Denied	Granted	Granted	Denied	Denied

**Table 2. Caveat Table**

Project / Country of origin	Canada	United States	United Kingdom	Germany	Egypt
A				G - O	G - O - C
B	G - O - C	G - O - C			
C	G	G - O	G - O - C	G - O - C	
D	G - O	G - O - C	G - O - C		
E	G - O - C	G - O - C	G		
F			G - O - C		G - O

Legend
G: General
O: Officer
C: Civilian

**Table 3. Need-to-Know Table**

CEO	10
CANUS	11
CANUSUK	12
NATO	13
UN Coalition	14
USUK	15

Canada	100
United States	200
United Kingdom	300
Germany	400
Egypt	500

**Table 6. Caveat Encoding**

**Table 7. Country of Origin Encoding**

## 5.2. Statechart Diagrams

Statechart diagrams are used to define the dynamic behavior of each object in the system. Figures 3 and 4 show the statechart diagrams of the *Sender* and *Controller* classes, respectively. Every class must have its statechart in order for SOCLE to be able to predict its dynamic behavior. For the sake of brevity, however, all the statecharts are not presented in this paper.


Notice that the control flow of a statechart is specified by states and transitions. The basic condition for a transition to be fired is that its source state is active. Accordingly, the basic response to firing a transition is the activation of its target state. In the case of composite states, the initial states they encompass are also activated. This basic statechart se-

mantics is adapted from Harel's statecharts [6].

In addition, transitions are labeled with a trigger, a guard, and a list of actions. Triggers refer to signals (atomic events), method calls, or method returns. For example, the list of actions of a transition labeled with trigger *inc* (for incrementation) will execute that method's instructions. Guards are boolean OCL constraints. OCL constraints are presented in Section 6. SOCLE supports the following actions: method call/return, field assignment, object creation/deletion, and signal emission.

## 5.3. Object Diagram

The object diagram is used to define the initial state of all objects in the system. In other words, it gives the initial configuration of the system. Figure 5 shows a possible



**Figure 2. UML Class Diagram of the Caveat-Separation System**

<b>A</b>	1
<b>B</b>	2
<b>C</b>	3
<b>D</b>	4
<b>E</b>	5
<b>F</b>	6

**Table 8. Project Encoding**

<b>General</b>	99
<b>Officer</b>	88
<b>Civilian</b>	77

**Table 9. Rank Encoding**

object diagram for the caveat-separation system.

This diagram models a system composed of a user who can send a document to another user via a controller. Using Tables 1, 2, and 3, the latter determines if the receiver can have access to the document.

## 6. OCL Constraints


The syntax of an OCL constraint  $c$  is defined as follows:

$$c ::= v|x|\Delta c|c_1\Delta c_2|c.f|c_1.\text{iterate}(x_1;x_2 = c_2|c_3)$$

It includes a significant fragment of OCL constraints as defined in [9]. Symbols  $v$  and  $x$  denote values and variables, respectively. Values include booleans, integers, object names, and lists. Construct  $\Delta c (c_1\Delta c_2)$  stands for the application of any of the usual unary (binary) operators on booleans, integers, and lists. Construct  $c.f$  returns the value that field  $f$  takes in the object  $c$ . The semantics of these constructs is formally defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket v \rrbracket_\rho &= v \\ \llbracket x \rrbracket_\rho &= \rho(x) \\ \llbracket \Delta c \rrbracket_\rho &= \Delta \llbracket c \rrbracket_\rho \\ \llbracket c_1\Delta c_2 \rrbracket_\rho &= \llbracket c_1 \rrbracket_\rho \Delta \llbracket c_2 \rrbracket_\rho \\ \llbracket c_1.f \rrbracket_\rho &= \text{heap}(\llbracket c_1 \rrbracket_\rho, f) \end{aligned}$$

The application  $\rho(x)$  retrieves the value of variable  $x$  in the variable environment  $\rho$ . The application  $\text{heap}(\llbracket c_1 \rrbracket_\rho, f)$



**Figure 3.** UML Statechart Diagram of the *Sender Class*


fetches the value of field  $f$  according to the ASM function *heap*, defined by the UML compiler.

The *iterate* construct is OCL's main collection operator. Informally, it iterates variable  $x_1$  through the values of the collection denoted by  $c_1$ , stores the successive values of  $c_3$  in variable  $x_2$  (which first evaluates to  $c_2$ ), and returns the final value of  $x_2$ . The formal semantics of this construct is simply too complex for the scope of this paper. It is, however, quite expressive and this is why it is used to encode additional collection operators, that are supported by SOCLE. Figure 6 illustrates some of them.

## 7. Caveat-Separation System: An OCL Constraint

It is possible to give OCL constraints for each statechart of the system in order to validate each module separately but it is even more interesting to define global OCL constraints that validate the entire system as a whole. The OCL constraint defined in Figure 7 is a good example of such constraint. It ensures that the behavior of the controller is correct. Since the security of the whole system depends on the controller, its behavior must be validated. The constraint verifies the three conditions that must be valid prior to the execution of the operation  $access(u : User, d : Document)$ :

1. the security clearance of the user is higher or equal to the classification level of the document (1),
2. the nationality of the user is compatible with the caveat of the document (2), and



**Figure 4.** UML Statechart Diagram of the *Controller Class*

- |                             |   |   |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| <b>size</b>                 | : | <b>iterate</b> ( $v_1; v_2 = 0   v_2 + 1$ )               |
| <b>forall</b> ( $v_1   c$ ) | : | <b>iterate</b> ( $v_1; v_2 = \mathbf{true}   v_2 \& c$ )  |
| <b>exists</b> ( $v_1   c$ ) | : | <b>iterate</b> ( $v_1; v_2 = \mathbf{false}   v_2   c$ )  |
| <b>unique</b> ( $v_1   c$ ) | : | <b>iterate</b> ( $v_1; v_2 = \mathbf{false}   v_2    c$ ) |

**Figure 6.** Additional Collection Operators

3. the military rank of the user is compatible with the document project (3) (modeling the need-to-know).

As shown in Figures 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, SOCLE can automatically verify this constraint for the entire system. This ensures the security of its design.

## 8. Conclusion and Future Work


This paper has presented a tool that integrates the design of software applications and their security by using OCL constraints on UML diagrams combined with innovative automatic verification techniques. Such a tool is of paramount importance for the design of critical military command and control information systems because these systems have to be not only robust but also secure. Moreover, the detection and correction of errors earlier in the development cycle saves time and money. Finally, a case study on a caveat-separation system has been presented in order to illustrate

the capabilities of the SOCLe tool.

A few improvements are currently underway. They essentially consist in translating the UML diagrams into an intermediate control flow language before analyzing their behavior and using a local model-checking algorithm to drive the computation of a system's execution graph. Such improvements will facilitate the implementation of various static analysis techniques such as slicing and code generation. They will also reduce memory requirements as some constraints could be falsified/verified even though the execution graph is only partially computed.

## References


- [1] D. Azambre. Réalisation d'un interpréteur d'Abstract State Machines adapté à la validation de modèles UML-OCL. Master's thesis, INSA Lyon, France, 2003.
- [2] B. W. Boehm and P. Papaccio. Understanding and controlling software costs. In *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, volume 14, pages 1462–1477, October 1988.
- [3] J. C. Bradfield, J. K. Filipe, and P. Stevens. Enriching OCL using observational mu-calculus. In *Proceedings of FASE2002*. Springer Verlag, 2002.
- [4] R. Cleaveland. Tableaux-Based Model Checking in the Propositional  $\mu$ -calculus. *Acta Informatica*, 27:725–747, 1990.
- [5] D. Distefano, J.-P. Katoen, and R. Rensink. On a temporal logic for object-based systems. In S. F. Smith and C. L. Talcott, editors, *Formal Methods for Open Object-Based Distributed Systems IV - Proc. FMOODS'2000, September, 2000, Stanford, California, USA*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.
- [6] D. Harel and A. Naamad. The STATEMATE Semantics of Statecharts. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 5(4):293–333, 1996.
- [7] D. Latella, I. Majzik, and M. Massink. Automatic verification of a behavioural subset of UML statechart diagrams using the SPIN model-checker. *The International Journal of Formal Methods*, 11(6):637–664, 1999.
- [8] J. Lilius and I. P. Paltor. vUML: a tool for verifying UML models. In *IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 255–258. IEEE Computer Society, 1999.
- [9] OMG. Response to the UML 2.0 OCL RfP (ad/2000-09-03). Technical Report ad/2002-05-09, 2002.
- [10] J. Rumbaugh, I. Jacobson, and G. Booch. *Unified Modeling Language Reference Manual*. Addison-Wesley, 1998.
- [11] W. Shen, K. Compton, and J. K. Huggins. A toolset for supporting UML static and dynamic model checking. In *26th IEEE International Computer Software and Applications Conference (COMPSAC)*, pages 147–152, Oxford, England, August 2002. IEEE Computer Society.




**Figure 5. Possible UML Object Diagram for the Caveat-Separation System**

**context** : *Controller* :: *access*(*u* : *User*, *d* : *Document*)  
**pre** :  $u.\text{clearance} \geq d.\text{level}$  (1)  
 $\wedge (\text{self}.\text{tabC}).\text{co} \rightarrow \text{filter}\{x|x.\text{codeP} = u.\text{country}\}.\text{cav} \rightarrow$   
 $\text{exists}\{y|y.\text{codeC} = d.\text{caveat}\}$  (2)  
 $\wedge (\text{self}.\text{tabP}).\text{cell} \rightarrow \text{filter}\{x|x.\text{country}.\text{codeCt} = u.\text{country}\} \rightarrow$   
 $\text{filter}\{y|y.\text{proj}.\text{codePj} = d.\text{project}\}.\text{ra}.\text{codeR} \leq u.\text{rank}$  (3)  
**post** : **true**

**Figure 7. OCL Constraint for Operation *access*(*u* : *User*, *d* : *Document*) of the *Controller* Class**



**Figure 8. SOCLE Screenshot: Class Diagram**



**Figure 9. SOCLE Screenshot: Statechart Diagram of the *Controller* Class**




Figure 10. SOCLE Screenshot: Object Diagram




Figure 11. SOCLE Screenshot: Verifying OCL Constraint




Figure 12. SOCLE Screenshot: Selecting a Node in the Statechart Diagram to Obtain the Corresponding Execution Path




Figure 13. SOCLE Screenshot: Browsing the Execution Path in the Diagnosis

DEFENCE



DÉFENSE

**SOCLe:**

*Integrated Design of Software Applications and Security*

Frédéric Painchaud

Defence Scientist

Trusted C2IS Group



R et D pour la défense  
Canada

Defence R&D  
Canada

Canada



# High-Assurance Software: A Question of Correct Design

- Software abounds in mission-critical systems
  - Banks, hospitals, emergency services, public utilities, governments, military organizations, etc.
- High reliability and security requirements
  - But very complex and fragile
- Three main issues:
  - Design problems (system architecture)
  - Implementation problems (programming languages and platforms used)
  - Malicious code (viruses, trojans, worms, backdoors, etc.)
- Correcting errors during or after implementation is costly
  - 50 to 100 times more expensive than at design-time

Source: B. W. Boehm and P. Papaccio.  
Understanding and controlling software costs. In  
*IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*,  
volume 14, pages 1462-1477, October 1988.



# Validating Design: Our Key Approach

- Integrate design and system specification
- Use an innovative mix of UML and OCL



## UML and OCL

- UML is the *de facto* standard software design notation
  - Used in the industry and in C2IS and other governmental critical systems
- OCL is a complementary constraint language
  - Eliminates ambiguities in software design
  - Formulates pre-/post-conditions and invariants
  - Part of UML

UML: Unified Modeling Language

OCL: Object Constraint Language




# Plan of the Presentation

- 1. SOCLe Architecture**
2. Caveat-Separation System: A Simplified Case Study
3. SOCLe Prototype
4. Conclusion



# SOCLe Architecture





# Plan of the Presentation

1. SOCLe Architecture
2. **Caveat-Separation System: A Simplified Case Study**
3. SOCLe Prototype
4. Conclusion



# Caveat-Separation System: A Simplified Case Study

- Users
  - **Security clearance:** Enhanced, Confidential, Secret, or Top Secret
  - **Country of origin:** Canada, United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Egypt, etc.
  - **Military rank:** General, Officer, or Civilian
- Documents
  - **Classification level:** Unclassified, Confidential, Secret, or Top Secret
  - **Caveat:** CEO, CANUS, CANUSUK, NATO, UN Coalition, USUK, etc.
  - **Affiliation with a project:** A, B, C, etc.



# Caveat-Separation System: A Simplified Case Study

- Access Control Tables
  - **Classification table:** access relation between the security clearance of users and the classification level of documents
  - **Caveat table:** caveats dictate acceptable countries of origin for users who want to access documents
  - **Need-to-Know table:** determines the need-to-know, in terms of countries of origin and military ranks, that is necessary to access the documents of a particular project
- System property
  - At all times, a user can access a document if and only if the access is granted with respect to the three access control tables.



# Classification Table

Classification level / Security clearance	Enhanced	Confidential	Secret	Top Secret
Unclassified	Granted	Granted	Granted	Granted
Confidential	Denied	Granted	Granted	Granted
Secret	Denied	Denied	Granted	Granted
Top Secret	Denied	Denied	Denied	Granted



## Caveat Table

Caveat / Country of origin	Canada	United States	United Kingdom	...
CEO	Granted	Denied	Denied	...
CANUS	Granted	Granted	Denied	...
CANUSUK	Granted	Granted	Granted	...
...	...	...	...	...



# Need-to-Know Table

Project / Country of origin	Canada	United States	United Kingdom	...
A	G – O – C	G – O – C		...
B	G	G – O	G – O – C	...
C	G – O	G		...
...	...	...	...	...

G: General  
O: Officer  
C: Civilian




# Plan of the Presentation


1. SOCLe Architecture
2. Caveat-Separation System: A Simplified Case Study
- 3. SOCLe Prototype**
4. Conclusion



## SOCLe Prototype

- Design the system in the usual way
  - Class diagrams, object diagrams, collaboration diagrams, statecharts, etc.
  - Add OCL constraints
- SOCLe constructs an underlying model
  - Formally verified by under-the-hood model-checking
  - Transparent to the designer











**context** : *Controller :: access(u : User, d : Document)*  
**pre** : *u.clearance ≥ d.level*  
 $\wedge$  *(self.tabC).co → filter{x|x.codeP = u.country}.cav →*  
*exists{y|y.codeC = d.caveat}*  
 $\wedge$  *(self.tabP).cell → filter{x|x.country.codeCt = u.country} →*  
*filter{y|y.proj.codePj = d.project}.ra.codeR ≤ u.rank*  
**post** : **true**





ToDo Item Properties Documentation Style Source Constraints Tagged Values Checklist

Exec Node: 10

Feat State: Controller c Granted, AskAccessUser2, InitAS, InitCT

In Trans: Controller c:c4

Out Trans: Controller c:c10

OCL Constraints

c\_1\_uR\_1

Active States


```

d= {}
ger= (initC)
nato= (initCa)
tBool= (initTC)
tabP= (initTP)
tabS= (initSec)
uR= (initRec)
uS= (AskAccessSend, initSend1)
uk= (initC)
us= (initC)
usuk= (initCa)
  
```

Heap

```

uS.clearance=1
uS.con=[c]
uS.country=100
uS.doc=[d]
uS.rank=88
uS.sd=[uR]
uk.cav=[usuk,canusuk,nato]
uk.codeP=300
us.cav=[canus,usuk,canusuk,nato]
us.codeP=200
usuk.codeC=15
  
```





# Plan of the Presentation

1. SOCLe Architecture
2. Caveat-Separation System: A Simplified Case Study
3. SOCLe Prototype
4. **Conclusion**



## Conclusion

- Critical software design should be and can be formally verified to some extent
- Reduces the risk of design problems and defects in the implementation
- Error detected
  - Falsified property when the access rules for documents can be updated while the point-to-point transfer is still in progress.
- Reasonably scalable
  - But state explosion on large systems
- Work in progress
  - State reduction techniques
  - On-the-fly validation



## Conclusion

- Technical reports
  - Caveat Case Study
  - An ASM Semantics of UML and OCL
  - Java Source Code Generation from UML
  - etc.
- Quebec Provincial FIQ OCTAS 2005 Winner
  - Finalist in the Canadian CIPA Awards
- IBM Canada at Ottawa is particularly interested in SOCLe technology transfer
  - Inline with their current vision
  - PolyMTL is currently preparing a proposition for IBM on how to integrate this technology into their tools

Frederic.Painchaud@drdc-rddc.gc.ca

<http://www.polymtl.ca/crac/socle>

