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Abstract. The Java Modeling Language (JML) can be used to specify the detailed design of Java classes and interfaces by adding annotations to Java source files. The aim of JML is to provide a specification language that is easy to use for Java programmers and that is supported by a wide range of tools for specification type-checking, runtime debugging, static analysis, and verification.

This paper gives an overview of the main ideas behind JML, details about JML’s wide range of tools, and a glimpse into existing applications of JML.

1 Introduction

JML [57, 58], the Java Modeling Language, is useful for specifying detailed designs of Java classes and interfaces. JML is a behavioral interface specification language for Java; that is, it specifies both the behavior and the syntactic interface of Java code. The syntactic interface of a Java class or interface consists of its method signatures, the names and types of its fields, etc. This is what is commonly meant by an application programming interface (API). The behavior of such an API can be precisely documented in JML annotations; these describe the intended way that programmers should use the API.

In terms of behavior, JML can detail, for example, the preconditions and postconditions for methods as well as class invariants, in the Design by Contract style [73].

An important goal for the design of JML is that it should be easily understandable by Java programmers. This is achieved by staying as close as possible to Java syntax and semantics. Another important design goal is that JML not impose any particular design methodology on users; instead, JML should be able to document Java programs designed in any manner.

The next section introduces the JML notation. Sections 3 through 7 then discuss the tools currently available for JML in more detail. Section 8 discusses the applications of JML in the domain of Java Card, the Java dialect for programming smartcards. Section 9 discusses some related languages and tools, and Section 10 concludes.

2 The JML Notation

JML blends Eiffel’s Design by Contract approach [73] with the Larch tradition [41, 20, 56] (both of which share features and ideas with VDM [52]).¹ Because JML supports quantifiers such as $\forall$orall and $\exists$ists, and because JML allows model (i.e., specification-only) fields

¹ JML also has some of the refinement calculus [75], which we do not discuss in this paper.
and methods, specifications can easily be made more precise and complete than is typical for Eiffel software. However, following Eiffel’s use of its expression syntax in assertions, JML uses Java’s expression syntax in assertions; this makes JML’s notation easier for programmers to learn than notations based on a language-independent specification language, such as the Larch Shared Language [58,59] or OCL [91].

Figure 1 gives an example of a JML specification that illustrates its main features. JML assertions are written as special annotation comments in Java code, either after // or between /*@ . . . @*/, so that they are ignored by Java compilers but can be used by tools that support JML. Within annotation comments, JML extends the Java syntax with several keywords—in the example in Figure 1, the JML keywords invariant, requires, assignable, ensures, and signals are used. It also extends Java’s expression syntax with several operators—in the example forall, old, and result are used; these begin with a backslash so they do not clash with existing Java identifiers.

The central ingredients of a JML specification are preconditions (given in requires clauses), postconditions (given in ensures clauses), and invariants. These are all expressed as boolean expressions in JML’s extension to Java’s expression syntax.

In addition to normal postconditions, the language also supports exceptional postconditions, specified using signals clauses. These can be used to specify what must be true when a method throws an exception. For example, the signals clause in Figure 1’s debit method specifies that debit may throw a PurseException and that the balance will not change in that case (as specified by the use of the old keyword).

The assignable clause for the method debit specifies a frame condition, namely that debit will assign only to the balance field. Although not a traditional part of Design by Contract languages like Eiffel, such frame conditions are essential for verification of code when using some of the tools described later.

There are many additional features of JML that are not used in the example in Figure 1. We briefly discuss the most important of these below.

- Model variables, which play the role of abstract values for abstract data types [23], allow specifications that hide implementation details. For example, if instead of a class Purse, we were specifying an interface PurseInterface, we could introduce the balance as such a model variable. A class implementing this interface could then specify how this model field is related to the class’s particular representation of balance.

- JML comes with an extensive library that provides Java types that can be used for describing behavior mathematically. This library includes such concepts as sets, sequences, and relations. It is similar to libraries of mathematical concepts found in VDM, Z, LSL, or OCL, but allows such concepts to be used directly in assertions, since they are embodied as Java objects.

- The semantics of JML forbids side-effects in assertions. This both allows assertion checks to be used safely during debugging and supports mathematical reasoning about assertions. This semantics works conservatively, by allowing a method to be used in assertions only if it is declared as pure, meaning the method does not have any side-effects and does not perform any input or output [58]. For example, if there is a method getBalance() that is declared as pure,

```java
/*@ pure @*/ int getBalance() { ... }
```

then this method can be used in the specification instead of the field balance.

- Finally, JML supports the Java modifiers (private, protected, and public) that control visibility of specifications. For example, an invariant can be declared to be protected if it is not observable by clients but is intended for use by programmers of subclasses. (Technically the invariants and method specifications in the Purse example of Figure 1 have default or package visibility, and thus would only be visible to code in the same package.)
public class Purse {
    final int MAX_BALANCE;
    int balance;
    //@ invariant 0 <= balance && balance <= MAX_BALANCE;
    byte[] pin;
    //@ invariant pin != null && pin.length == 4
    0 && (forall int i; 0 <= i && i < 4;
    0 0 <= pin[i] && pin[i] <= 9);
    @*/
    //@ requires amount >= 0;
    @ assignable balance;
    @ ensures balance == \old(balance) - amount
    @ && \result == balance;
    @ signals (PurseException) balance == \old(balance);
    @*/
    int debit(int amount) throws PurseException {
        if (amount <= balance) { balance -= amount; return balance; }
        else { throw new PurseException("overdrawn by " + amount); }
    }
    //@ requires p != null && p.length >= 4;
    @ assignable \nothing;
    @ ensures result <==> (forall int i; 0 <= i && i < 4;
    0 pin[i] == p[i]);
    @*/
    boolean checkPin(byte[] p) {
        boolean res = true;
        for (int i=0; i < 4; i++) { res = res && pin[i] == p[i]; }
        return res;
    }
    //@ requires 0 < mb && 0 <= b && b <= mb
    @ assignable MAX_BALANCE, balance, pin;
    @ ensures MAX_BALANCE == mb && balance == b
    @ && (forall int i; 0 <= i && i < 4; p[i] == pin[i]);
    @*/
    Purse(int mb, int b, byte[] p) {
        MAX_BALANCE = mb; balance = b; pin = (byte[]) p.clone();
    }
}
4 Runtime Assertion Checking and Testing

The most obvious way to use JML annotations is to test them at runtime and report any detected violations. In this section we discuss two tools, \texttt{jmlc} and \texttt{jmlunit}, that work this way.

4.1 Runtime Assertion Checking

4.1.1 Overview and Goals

The goal of the JML compiler, \texttt{jmlc}, also known as the runtime assertion checker, is to find inconsistencies between specifications and code by executing assertions at runtime. The overall approach is to find such inconsistencies dynamically, by executing JML’s assertions while the program runs and notifying the user of any assertion violations. As with other runtime assertion checkers, one normally hopes to find that the code is incorrect with respect to the specification. However, it may also be that the specification itself is incorrect (with respect to what the user has in mind), but the code is correct. Finding problems in specifications is important for keeping the specifications accurate and up-to-date; this solves a common problem with informal documentation, which cannot be mechanically checked against the program.

An important requirement for the runtime assertion checker is that it be good at isolating problems, in the sense that users of the tool should be able to quickly pinpoint what in either the code or specifications must be changed to correct an inconsistency. For this purpose, \texttt{jmlc} must provide information that is helpful for users. This includes both static information, such as what parts of the specification were violated and where in the program the violation was detected, as well as dynamic information about the values of variables and what method calls led to the violation (a stack backtrace).

It is also helpful, for isolating problems, if the runtime assertion checker can execute as large a subset of the JML language as possible.

The runtime assertion checker must also be trustworthy, in the sense that it must not generate false reports of assertion violations. That is, every assertion violation must be a report of an assertion that is false, according to the JML semantics. In meeting this goal, the runtime assertion checker must also be trustworthy, in the sense that users of the tool should be able to quickly pinpoint what in either the code or specifications must be changed to correct an inconsistency. For this purpose, \texttt{jmlc} must provide information that is helpful for users. This includes both static information, such as what parts of the specification were violated and where in the program the violation was detected, as well as dynamic information about the values of variables and what method calls led to the violation (a stack backtrace).

It is also helpful, for isolating problems, if the runtime assertion checker can execute as large a subset of the JML language as possible.

Finally, in spite of all the tools mentioned above, ultimately human beings must read and understand JML specifications. Since JML specifications are also meant to be read and written by ordinary Java programmers, it is important to support the conventional ways that these programmers create and use documentation. The \texttt{jmldoc} tool (Section 7.1) produces browsable HTML pages containing both the API and the specifications for Java code, in the style of pages generated by \texttt{javadoc} [38].
An important goal of the runtime assertion checker is that its work should be transparent when no assertions are violated. That is, except for time and space measurements, a correct program compiled with \texttt{jmlc} should behave just as if compiled with a normal Java compiler. The transparency of runtime assertion checking is aided by JML's design, as assertions are not allowed to have any side-effects [59].

Although \texttt{jmlc} does not have to be used with any particular methodology, there are some general ideas for using such tools that are helpful for beginners [73]. A basic technique for using the runtime assertion checker is to first specify preconditions for the normal behavior of methods. This is easily done and helps ensure that all methods are called in expected states. For debugging purposes, it is also important to add \texttt{toString} methods to all types involved, so that \texttt{jmlc} can display object values in violation messages. Following this, one could define invariants that describe the legal states of objects of each class (see Section 6.1 for more on this topic). To help debug implementations, one can then advance to describing normal postconditions for methods. If one is describing a library for untrusted clients, it may also be useful to document when various exceptions are thrown by writing exceptional postconditions.

### 4.1.2 Design of the Tool

The JML compiler was developed at Iowa State University as an extension to the MultiJava compiler [24]. It compiles Java programs annotated with JML specifications into Java bytecode [19,21]. The compiled bytecode includes instructions that check JML specifications such as preconditions, normal and exceptional postconditions, invariants, and history constraints.

Because the JML language provides such a rich set of specification facilities, it presents new challenges in runtime assertion checking. One of these challenges that the current tool meets is supporting abstract specifications written in terms of specification-only declarations such as model fields, ghost fields, and model methods. This aspect of the JML compiler represents a significant advance over the state of the art in runtime assertion checking as represented by Design by Contract tools such as Eiffel [73] or by Java tools such as iContract [55] or Jass [9]. Other advances over such tools include (stateful) interface specifications, multiple inheritance of specifications from interfaces, various forms of quantifiers and set comprehension notation, support for strong and weak behavioral subtyping [68,28], and a contextual interpretation of undefinedness [21].

### 4.1.3 Example

The specifications and code in Figure 1 were debugged using the runtime assertion checker in combination with the unit testing tool described in Section 4.2.3. Using \texttt{jmlc} on the example is straightforward; the user simply tells the tool to compile the \texttt{Purse.java} file and then runs a test driver using \texttt{jmlrac} as the virtual machine. The \texttt{jmlrac} command is a version of the \texttt{jvm} command that knows about the necessary runtime libraries for runtime assertion checking. Assertion violations are printed as messages on the console. We discuss details of this kind of testing in Section 4.2.3.

### 4.1.4 Experience

The runtime assertion checker is one of the most widely used JML tools. It has been used on several case studies. One of the most demanding of these case studies is the checking of the built-in model types for JML itself, which have very rich and complete specifications. It has been used in several undergraduate classes, but in those cases it has also been used for simple, Design by Contract style, specifications. It has also been used in several of the other case studies mentioned in the rest of this paper. It seems to be helpful to use the runtime assertion checker before doing serious program verification, to make sure that the easily found bugs are removed before spending the effort to do verification.

In sum, the JML compiler brings programming benefits to formal interface specifications by allowing Java programmers to use JML specifications as practical and effective tools for debugging, testing, and Design by Contract.

### 4.1.5 Future Work

One of the main issues in the future work on \texttt{jmlc} is improving both the speed of compilation and the speed of executing runtime assertion checks. For the latter, there seem to be several simple things that can be done to improve execution speed. For example, caching the values of model fields instead of recomputing them in several places within an assertion would be helpful.

Another direction for future work is being pursued at Virginia Tech by Stephen Edwards and his student Roy Tan. They are building a version of the JML compiler that produces separate bytecode files for the normal code and for a runtime assertion checking wrapper. Separating the runtime assertion checking code into this wrapper has several advantages. In particular, decisions about what classes should be checked can be made while the program executes. It will also enable the addition of runtime checks to code for which the source code is not available.

### 4.1.6 Availability

The runtime assertion checker is part of the main JML toolset available via \url{www.jmlspecs.org}, which is developed as an open source project hosted at SourceForge.net.
4.2 Unit Testing

4.2.1 Overview and Goals

A formal specification can be viewed as a test oracle [84, 3], and JML’s runtime assertion checker can be used as the decision procedure for the test oracle [22]. This idea has been implemented as a unit testing tool for Java, jmlunit, by combining JML with the popular unit testing tool JUnit [10].

The main goal of the jmlunit tool is to significantly automate unit testing of Java code. More specifically, the goal is to free the programmer from writing the code that decides whether unit tests pass or fail.

4.2.2 Design of the Tool

The jmlunit tool, developed at Iowa State University, generates JUnit test classes that rely on the JML runtime assertion checker. The test classes send messages to objects of the Java classes under test. The testing code catches assertion violation errors from such method calls to decide if the test data violate the precondition of the method under test; such assertion violation errors do not constitute test failures. When the method under test satisfies its precondition, but otherwise has an assertion violation, then the implementation failed to meet its specification, and hence the test data detects a failure [22]. In other words, the generated test code serves as a test oracle whose behavior is derived from the specified behavior of the class being tested.

The user is still responsible for generating test data; however, the generated test classes make it easy for the user to supply this data. The tool comes with a framework that includes sample test data for the built-in Java value types. This framework allows one to combine, filter, and compose test data in several different ways to create a variety of tests. In addition, the user can supply handwritten JUnit test methods if desired. Such handwritten tests are useful for exploring combinations of method calls that the automatic testing ignores.

4.2.3 Example

In this subsection we discuss runtime assertion checking and unit testing with jmlunit, based on Figure 1. To do unit testing with jmlunit, one first runs the jmlunit tool on the Purse.java file (technically, one has to use an option to tell the tool to test methods and constructors with package visibility). This produces a file, Purse_JML_TestData.java, into which test data is placed, and another file Purse_JML_Test.java, which contains a driver to run the tests. In the first file we supplied data of the various types used as arguments to the methods being tested; this consists of integers (0, 1, -1, -22, etc.), Purse objects (such as null and new Purse(1,1,p), where p is a 4-element array of bytes), and fresh byte arrays (such as null, new byte[0], null, new byte[] {0,0,0}, and new byte[] {0, 0, 0, 0}). To run the tests, one first compiles the classes being tested with jnle (using a special option to flag unhandled and unspecified exceptions as errors); then the classes produced by jmlunit are compiled with a normal Java compiler; finally one executes the automatically-generated driver class, Purse_JML_Test, using jnptr;

If all the annotations are removed from Figure 1, then the unit testing process described in the previous paragraph does not detect any errors. This is because the unit testing tool is only testing for violations of assertions and, if there are no assertions, then no violations are detected. This illustrates the important observation that the quality of the testing that jmlunit provides is only as good as the specifications.

Consider a version of Figure 1 that only includes the preconditions of the methods and the constructor, but omits the invariants, the frame axioms, and all the normal and exceptional postconditions. Testing of Purse produces 11 failures, all of which are similar to that shown in Figure 2. (Printing of Purse objects is handled by adding the obvious toString method to the code in Figure 1.)

This error is the result of not specifying (i.e., deleting) the exceptional postconditions of the debit method. It shows that the condition in an exceptional postcondition can be alternatively considered as the negation of a precondition for normal behavior; which makes sense, because throwing an exception is not normal behavior. If the precondition of the debit method is changed to the following:

\[
\text{amount} \geq 0 \quad \& \quad \text{amount} \leq \text{balance}
\]

then all of these failures go away. This also happens if the debit method has the exceptional postcondition restored from Figure 1, which tells the runtime assertion checker that such exceptions are expected.

This kind of testing is also effective at finding various omissions in preconditions. For example, if the precondition in the checkPin method or the constructor that specifies that the array must be of an appropriate length is omitted, then the tests will encounter failures.

Checking preconditions will not show places where the code is wrong, unless one method in the code calls another incorrectly. For the most part, errors in code are revealed by adding either invariants or postconditions. If we add the invariants back into the version of Purse, but still leave out the postconditions, then testing can detect omitted initialization of the MAX_BALANCE field in the constructor (although Java itself detects missing initializations of final fields, so for JML, to detect this error, one also has to omit the final attribute from that field). Similarly, with the invariants, the constructor's precondition must have the first line shown in Figure 1, or many violations of the first invariant in the figure occur.
Adding postconditions from Figure 1 allows many other errors in coding to be detected. For example, with all the postconditions restored, omissions of initializations of the balance and pin fields are detected. The postconditions can also detect incorrect coding in the loop of the checkPin method, but doing so requires test data for byte arrays that differ in only the positions not checked by the code; we had to add such data to our initial set of test data, since the original test data did not detect these errors. Figuring out the right test data to add in this case was subtle and could easily have been missed.

4.2.4 Experience

Our experience shows that the tool allows one to perform unit testing with minimal coding effort and detects many kinds of errors. Ironically, about half of our test failures were caused by specification errors, which shows that the approach is also useful for debugging specifications. In addition, the tool can report assertion coverage information, identifying assertions that are always true or always false, and thus indicating deficiencies in the set of test cases. However, the approach requires specifications to be fairly complete descriptions of the desired behavior, as the quality of the generated test oracles depends on the quality of the specifications. Thus, the approach trades the effort one might spend in writing test cases for effort spent in writing formal specifications.

4.2.5 Future Work

JML/JUnit testing is limited in that it only detects problems that are the result of single method or constructor calls. Thus test data has to be carefully crafted so that the method is applied to objects in states that will fully exercise it. This process would be easier if the test drivers would apply several methods in sequence to various pieces of data. One alternative for doing this would be to generate such sequences of method calls automatically. (An experimental version of Daikon can do this.) Another alternative is to augment JML with facilities to write specifications for blocks of example code to be used in testing.

4.2.6 Availability

jmlunit is part of the main JML toolset. This toolset is available via www.jmlspecs.org. It has been developed as an open source project hosted at SourceForge.net.

5 Static Checking and Verification

In this section, we describe several tools for statically checking—or verifying—JML annotations, providing different degrees of rigor and automation.

5.1 Extended Static Checking with ESC/Java

5.1.1 Overview and Goals

The ESC/Java tool [36], originally developed at Compaq Research, performs what is called extended static checking [27,60], compile-time checking that goes well beyond type checking. It can check relatively simple assertions and can check for certain kinds of common errors in Java code, such as dereferencing null, indexing an array outside its bounds, or casting a reference to an impermissible type. ESC/Java supports a subset of JML. For this subset it checks the consistency between the code and the given JML annotations. The user’s interaction with ESC/Java is quite similar to the interaction with a compiler’s type checker: the user includes JML annotations in the code and runs the tool, and the tool responds with a list of possible errors in the program.

5.1.2 Design of the Tool

JML annotations affect ESC/Java in two ways. First, the given JML annotations help ESC/Java suppress spurious warning messages. For example, in Figure 1, the constructor’s precondition p != null lets ESC/Java determine that the dereference of p in the constructor’s body is valid, and thus no null-dereference warning is produced. Second, annotations make ESC/Java do additional checks. For example, when checking a caller of the Purse constructor, the precondition p != null causes ESC/Java to emit a warning if the actual parameter
for \( p \) may be passed in as \texttt{null}. In these two ways, the use of JML annotations enables \texttt{ESC/Java} to produce warnings not at the source locations where errors manifest themselves at runtime, but at the source locations where the errors are committed.

An interesting property of \texttt{ESC/Java} is that it is neither sound nor complete; that is, it neither warns about all errors, nor does it warn only about actual errors. This is a deliberate design choice: the aim is to increase the cost-effectiveness of the tool. In some situations, convincing a mechanical checker of the absence of some particular error may require a large number of JML annotations (consider, for example, a hypothetical program that dereferences \texttt{null} if four of the program’s large-tation (consider, for example, a hypothetical program that dereferences \texttt{null} if four of the program’s large-

5.1.3 Example

We refrain from giving details of an \texttt{ESC/Java} example here. Instead, we describe an example in the context of \texttt{ESC/Java}'s successor, \texttt{ESC/Java2}, in Section 5.2.3.

5.1.4 Experience

The first major experience with \texttt{ESC/Java} was to apply the tool to the sources of its own front end, over 40 KLOC of Java. This source was “fully annotated”, meaning that enough specifications were given for \texttt{ESC/Java} to check the front end for run-time errors (like \texttt{null} dereferences and array-index bounds errors) and specification violations (like precondition violations) without producing any warnings. This and some other early experiences are described in the \texttt{ESC/Java} overview paper [36].

Applications to Java Card are discussed in Section 8. The experience applying \texttt{ESC/Java} to Java Card was one of the motivations for the work on \texttt{ESC/Java2}, as maintaining different versions of the API specification, one using \texttt{ESC/Java}'s dialect of JML and one using the full JML language, was becoming a lot of work.

5.1.5 Availability

The final binary release (version 1.2.4) of \texttt{ESC/Java} is available from Compaq/HP’s web site: \texttt{www.research.compaq.com/downloads.html}. The source code (including that of related tools, e.g. Houdini, Calvin, and Simplify) is available as well. This source code release is obscurely named the “Java Programming Toolkit Source Release.” \texttt{ESC/Java} only runs on x86 machines with Linux and Microsoft Windows, Sun’s SPARC with Solaris, and Alpha processors with Hewlett-Packard’s Tru64 Unix.

5.2 \texttt{ESC/Java2}

5.2.1 Overview and Goals

Development of version 1 of \texttt{ESC/Java} had ceased by the time the Compaq Systems Research Center became part of HP Labs, where it was later dissolved. Consequently, Cok and Kiniry have in progress a version 2 of \texttt{ESC/Java}, built on the source code release provided by Compaq and HP. This version has the following goals:

- to migrate the code base of \texttt{ESC/Java} and the code accepted by \texttt{ESC/Java} to Java 1.4;
- to update \texttt{ESC/Java} to accept annotations consistent with the current version of JML;
- to increase the amount of JML that is checked, while remaining true to the original engineering goals of \texttt{ESC/Java}.

5.2.2 Design of the Tool

\texttt{ESC/Java2} follows the design of \texttt{ESC/Java}. In addition, \texttt{ESC/Java2}, like \texttt{ESC/Java}, recognizes that the state-of-the-art of static checking is such that not all matches between code and specifications are reported by static checking tools; that is, there are aspects which are unsound, typically because some of the Java semantics are not yet fully modeled. Similarly, some generated warnings are not actually errors in the program; that is, there are aspects which are incomplete, typically because current theorem provers are insufficiently powerful. It is a goal of all such tools, including \texttt{ESC/Java2}, to be as sound and complete as is possible within reasonable engineering limits, but since no existing tools fully model or fully prove full multi-threaded Java (indeed, portions of the semantics of the language are still being debated), the authors of both \texttt{ESC/Java} and \texttt{ESC/Java2} believe that it is in the interests of users to be explicit about the known sources of unsoundness and incompleteness.

\texttt{ESC/Java2} does include improvements to \texttt{ESC/Java} in the following areas, while retaining backwards compatibility in all but a few features:
5.2.3 Example

As an example, if the second invariant in Figure 1 is omitted and the current ESC/Java2 tool is applied to the source code, the warnings shown in Figure 3 are produced. The warning messages indicate the likely problem and the source code location that violates the implicit or explicit specification, namely, in this case, the implicit specification that the left-hand operand of the dereference operation must not be a null reference and that the index of an array reference must be less than the array length.

If ESC/Java2 is applied to Purse.java as it stands (using a current version of JML’s specifications for Java system classes), a warning will be produced reflecting the fact that the specifications of the behavior of clone are not yet completed.

A source of unsoundness in ESC/Java2 that is relevant in the Purse example is its handling of loops: by default, it will not attempt verification of the loop in checkPin, but simply unroll it once. This makes it easy for the programmer, who doesn’t have to supply a loop invariant, but it may also miss errors. In contrast, LOOP and JACK (and ESC/Java2 with the -loopSafe switch) handle loops soundly, but then require users to supply loop invariants. For this case, the loop invariant as illustrated in Figure 4 would have to be given.

5.2.4 Experience

The first major partial verification using ESC/Java2 was done in early 2004 when the Dutch Parliament decided in 2003 to construct an Internet-based remote voting system for use by Dutch expatriates. The SoS group at the University of Nijmegen was part of an expert review panel for the system and also performed a black-box network and system security evaluation of this system in late 2003. They also were responsible for designing, implementing, and verifying the vote tally subsystem of this system in early 2004. This implementation used JML and ESC/Java2 extensively.

ESC/Java2 made a very positive impression on the SoS developers. Its increased capabilities as compared to Compaq ESC/Java, particularly with regards to handling the full JML language, the ability to reason with models and specifications with pure methods, are very impressive. And, while the tool is still classified as an “alpha” release, we found it to be quite robust (perhaps unsurprising given its history, the use of JML and ESC/Java2 in and on its own source code, and the fact that it is passed through seven alpha releases thus far). But there are still a number of issues with ESC/Java2 and JML that were highlighted by this verification effort and are discussed in another paper [54].

5.2.5 Future Work

There are a number of major areas of development of ESC/Java2 that will improve overall usability of the tool, besides performance improvements.

- The use of model variables and method calls in annotation expressions. Model variables are an important abstraction mechanism in writing specifications and model methods allow much more readable and compact specifications [23]. This is a current topic of research and experimentation; most of what is needed to support these features is a part of the current alpha release of ESC/Java2 [25].
- Checking of the frame conditions specified by JML’s assignable clause (also known as modifies). It is an acknowledged unsoundness of ESC/Java that these are not checked and faulty assignable clauses can be a subtle source of errors. ESC/Java2 checks most aspects of assignable clauses. However, the default assignable clause in JML specifications is that everything is potentially modified; this interpretation is not currently implemented.
- Arithmetic. JML needs to have available for specifications both mathematical integers and reals as well as the finite-precision approximations that are used.
in computer programs. There is some initial work [18] incorporating these into JML, but as yet no axiomatization that enables reasoning with ESC/Java2.

The most significant aspect of future work, however, is experimentation with specification and static checking of larger, more varied, and real-world bodies of source code. Such experimentation is needed to verify that JML has the facilities that are needed for realistic specifications and that static checking tools such as ESC/Java2 are capable of providing a benefit to working programmers.

5.2.6 Availability

An alpha version of ESC/Java2 is available from http://www.cs.kun.nl/sos/research/escjava. The tool is a Java program that is fairly platform-independent, but it uses the Simplify prover, which is only available on Linux, Windows, Solaris, and MacOSX platforms.

5.3 Program Verification with LOOP

5.3.1 Overview and Goals

The LOOP project at the University of Nijmegen started out as an exploration of the semantics of object-oriented languages in general, and Java in particular. Only later did it evolve to investigate verification of JML-annotated Java. For a detailed overview of the LOOP project we refer to [50].

5.3.2 Design of the Tool

The project began with the formalization of a denotational semantics of sequential Java [51] in the language of the theorem prover PVS [82]. An associated compiler, called the LOOP tool [11], was developed, which translates any given sequential Java class into PVS theories describing its semantics. In order to conveniently use this as a basis for the specification and verification of Java code, the LOOP tool was then extended to also provide a formal semantics of JML, so that the tool now translates JML-annotated Java code into proof obligations for PVS, which one can try to prove interactively, in PVS. These proof obligations are expressed as a special kind of Hoare statements about methods, and they are proved using an associated Hoare logic [49] and weakest-precondition calculus [47] for Java and JML, both of which have been formalized in PVS.

A difference between LOOP and both ESC/Java(2) and JACK (see Section 5.4 for the JACK tool) is that it provides a so-called shallow embedding of Java and JML in PVS, defining a formal denotational semantics of both Java and JML in PVS. This has its advantages. The Hoare logic and wp-calculi that are used have been completely formalized and proven sound with respect to these semantics in PVS, whereas both ESC/Java(2) and JACK directly rely on an axiomatic semantics. Also, our semantics of Java in PVS is still (symbolically) executable to a degree, as it lets PVS evaluate the denotation of a program. This has been very useful in the extensive testing and debugging of our formal semantics, where we compared the results of the normal execution of a Java program, i.e. the result of executing its bytecode on a Java VM, and the symbolic execution of its semantics in PVS.

5.3.3 Example

Using the LOOP tool to verify the example in Figure 1 fails for the constructor, as it did for ESC/Java, because the specifications of the behavior of clone are incomplete. The verification of the methods is fully automatic using LOOP, using its weakest precondition calculus, except that the verification of checkPin needs manual interaction in PVS to supply the loop invariant, as the tool doesn’t handle JML’s loop invariant yet.

5.3.4 Experience

Case studies with the LOOP tool are discussed in [12, 46, 48]. Verification of JML-annotated code with the LOOP tool (especially the required interactive theorem proving with PVS) can be very labor-intensive, but allows verification of more complicated properties than can be handled by fully automated extended static checking using ESC/Java. Because of this labor-intensive nature, one will typically first want to use other, less labor-intensive, approaches, such as runtime assertion checking or extended static checking, to remove some of the errors in the code or specifications before turning to the LOOP tool. Experiences with such a combined approach are described in [13]. The possibility to do this is an impor-
tant—if not crucial—advantage of using a specification language that is supported by a range of tools.

The LOOP tool generates a single proof obligation for each method and constructor, expressed as a Hoare statement. It does not, as commonly done in verification condition generators, split this up into smaller verification conditions. Instead, this splitting up is done inside the theorem prover PVS, using dedicated proof strategies. A disadvantage of this is that the size of proof obligations that can be comfortably handled in PVS has become a bottleneck.

5.3.5 Future Work

Ongoing work on the LOOP tool includes support for the different forms of arithmetic as proposed in [18] and investigations into proving information flow properties. The longer term plans for the LOOP tool are currently not clear.

5.3.6 Availability

The LOOP tool is not publicly available, simply because it is not easy to use without intensive user support and documentation that we cannot provide. Actually, LOOP itself is easy enough to use—it is simply a compiler that outputs PVS—but dealing with the large and numerous PVS theories it outputs requires considerable (PVS) expertise.

5.4 Static Verification with JACK

5.4.1 Overview and Goals

The JACK [15] tool was initially developed at the research lab of Gemplus, a manufacturer of smartcards and smartcard software. Further development is now happening at INRIA. JACK aims to provide an environment for Java and Java Card program verification using JML annotations. It implements a fully automated weakest precondition calculus in order to generate proof obligations from JML-annotated Java sources. Those proof obligations can then be discharged using different theorem provers.

The main design goals are an easily accessible user interface, a high degree of automation, a high correctness assurance, and prover independence.

5.4.2 Design of the Tool

The main goal of JACK is that it should be usable by normal Java developers, allowing them to validate their own code, following, in this way, the JML philosophy. Thus, care has been taken to hide the mathematical formulation of the underlying concepts. To allow developers to work in a familiar environment, JACK is integrated as a plug-in to the Eclipse IDE. This plug-in allows users to generate proof obligations, to run the automatic provers, and to inspect the generated lemmas. To facilitate this last task, JACK provides a dedicated proof obligation viewer. This viewer presents the proof obligations as execution paths within the program, highlighting the source code relevant to the proof obligations. Moreover, goals and hypotheses are displayed in a Java/JML-like notation. The user can then work within its current development tool, add the JML annotations and check partially the correctness of the code in a familiar environment.

JACK’s core is an implementation, in Java, of a weakest precondition calculus. This ensures proof obligation generation without user interaction. Following this step, automatic provers are used to prove the generated lemmas. Users then have to check whether any remaining lemmas are valid or not. To reduce the remaining costly manual task—creating the JML annotation assertions—we have developed and integrated in JACK a prototype that annotates source code with assertions by propagation of pre and post conditions. This is a way to reduce the cost of using JML, since, at the moment, the main issue when using JACK is the time spent annotating classes.

JACK is not based on a formalization of Java as LOOP is; thus one cannot easily prove the formal correctness of the tool, and the implementation of the weakest precondition calculus can contain bugs. Nevertheless, the aim of the tool is to be complete and sound (i.e. to generate all proof obligations that are valid if and only if the application respects its formalization). So, users can choose to check partially the correctness of their application by just reviewing the unproved proof obligations, or they can also prove all the proof obligations using an interactive theorem prover, thereby obtaining a complete assurance on the development correctness.

JACK provides an interface to automatic theorem provers. Currently, the prover of the Atelier B toolkit, Simplify (the prover used in ESC/Java), and PVS are integrated. These provers are integrated as plug-ins in JACK. Since JACK is based on an intermediate lemma formulation language, it is quite easy to integrate new provers by implementing a translator from this intermediate language to the prover input. Interfacing several provers increases the automatic proof ratio. This also allows people to prove any remaining lemmas interactively in their preferred prover.

The actually interfaced automatic provers can usually automatically prove up to 90% of the proof obligations. The remaining ones have to be proved outside of JACK, using the classical B proof tool, PVS, or the Coq proof assistant. However, JACK is meant to be used by Java developers, who cannot be expected to use a proof assistant. Therefore, in addition to the proved and un-
proved states, J\textsc{ack} adds a \textit{checked} state, which allows developers to indicate that they have manually checked the proof obligation. In order to better handle those cases, other different approaches could be investigated, such as integration with test tools such as \textit{jmlunit}, integration of other proof assistants, or perhaps support from a proof-expert team.

5.4.3 Example

The code of the class given in the Figure 1 was proved using J\textsc{ack}. To generate proof obligations automatically, loop invariants have to be given explicitly in the code. Here, the JML annotation of Figure 4 is added in the body of the method \texttt{checkPin} before the \texttt{for} statement. When this annotation is added, one can run J\textsc{ack}, which then calculates proof obligations automatically and proves them using the automated provers. Here, only three proof obligations remain unproved due to, yet again, the lack of complete specification of the \texttt{clone\textasciitilde} method in the constructor.

5.4.4 Experience

Like \textit{ESC/Java}, J\textsc{ack} tries to hide the complications of the underlying theorem prover from the user, by providing a push-button tool that normal Java developers, and not just formal methods experts, can and would like to use. We believe that this may be a way to let non-experts venture into the world of formal verification.

\textit{ESC/Java}, \textit{LOOP}, and J\textsc{ack} all use (or, in the case of \textit{LOOP}, have the option of using) a weakest precondition calculus to generate verification conditions. \textit{ESC/Java} and \textit{LOOP} generate one verification condition per method implementation, whereas J\textsc{ack} generates roughly one verification condition per syntactic code path through the code. So each of J\textsc{ack}'s verification conditions is smaller than those generated by \textit{ESC/Java} and \textit{LOOP}. On the other hand, J\textsc{ack} may generate a very large number of verification conditions. Though it generates just one verification condition per method, \textit{ESC/Java} factors its verification conditions differently than the other two tools (see [37,61]) and therefore is able to keep the one verification condition reasonably small. More important than size, verification conditions generated by \textit{ESC/Java} often let the theorem prover avoid redundant work. J\textsc{ack}'s approach has the advantage that it is easy to pass the different verification conditions to different theorem provers.

5.4.5 Future Work

To increase the automation of this validation phase, we are currently thinking of interfacing J\textsc{ack} with a counterexample detector or runtime test generator. We are also still investigating the annotation generation and propagation techniques since we consider that it can be a way to reduce the cost of using the tool.

5.4.6 Availability

J\textsc{ack} is currently not publicly available.

6 Generating Specifications

Apart from checking that implementations meet specifications, a considerable barrier to entry in the use of any formal specification language is writing specifications in the first place. The JML tools discussed so far assume the existence of a JML specification, and leave the task of writing it to the programmer. This task can be time-consuming, tedious, and error-prone, so tools that can help in this task can be of great benefit.

6.1 Invariant Detection with Daikon

6.1.1 Overview and Goals

The Daikon invariant detector [31,32] is a tool that provides assistance in creating a specification. Daikon outputs observed program properties in JML syntax (as well as other output formats) and automatically inserts them into a target program.

6.1.2 Design of the Tool

The Daikon tool dynamically detects likely program invariants. In other words, given program executions, it reports properties that were true over those executions. The set of reported properties is also known as an operational abstraction. Dynamic invariant detection operates by observing values that a program computes at runtime, generalizing over those values, and reporting the resulting properties. The properties reported by Daikon encompass numbers (\(x \leq y, y = ax + b\)), collections (\texttt{mytree.contains}(x), \texttt{mylist.isSorted}()), pointers (\(n == n\texttt{.next.prev}\)), and implications (\(p \Leftarrow \texttt{null} \Rightarrow p\texttt{.value} > x\)); a complete list appears in the Daikon user manual.

Like any dynamic analysis, the accuracy of the inferred invariants depends in part on the quality and completeness of the test cases, and other executions may falsify some of the reported properties. (Furthermore, the actual behavior of the program is not necessarily the same as its intended behavior.) However, Daikon uses static analysis, statistical tests, and other mechanisms to reduce the number of false positives [33]. Even if a property is not true in general, Daikon's output provides valuable information about the test suite over which the program was run. Combining invariant detection with a static verifier such as \textit{ESC/Java} helps to overcome the problems of both techniques: the unsoundness of the dynamic analysis and the static analysis's need for annotations.
In order to apply Daikon to a program, a user runs an instrumented version of the program to create a data trace file, then runs Daikon over the data trace file to produce likely invariants. The instrumented version of the program contains, at program points such as procedure entries and exits, code that writes the values of all variables in scope to a trace file. In some cases (as for Daikon’s C front end), the instrumentation is performed automatically on a compiled executable by a special runtime system. In other cases (as for Daikon’s Java front end), the user runs a source-to-source translator that instruments the program, then runs the instrumented program in place of the original.

Given a simple test suite that creates 1000 random Purse objects and invokes debit on each one, the Daikon tool automatically generates the annotations of Figure 1, except that the current version of Daikon does not generate JML’s signals clauses. Daikon’s output is correct JML that is parseable by the JML toolset.

6.1.4 Experience

Even with modest test suites, Daikon’s output is remarkably accurate. In one set of experiments [80], over 90% of the properties that it reported were verifiable by ESC/Java (the other properties were true, but were beyond the capabilities of ESC/Java), and it reported over 90% of the properties that ESC/Java needed in order to complete its verification. For example, if Daikon generated 100 properties, users had only to delete less than 10 properties and to add another 10 properties in order to have a verifiable set of properties. In another experiment [81], users who were provided with Daikon output (even from unrealistically bad test suites) performed statistically significantly better on a program verification task than did users who did not have such assistance. In addition to aiding the task of static checking as described above, operational abstractions generated by the Daikon invariant detector have been used to generate and improve test suites [44, 93, 40], automate theorems-proving [78, 79], identify refactoring opportunities [53], aid program analysis [29, 30], choose modalities [67], predict incompatibilities in component upgrades [71, 72], detect anomalies and bugs [89, 43, 87, 14, 70], and isolate errors [92, 39, 66], among other uses.

6.1.5 Future Work

As noted above, Daikon does not generate JML signals clauses for exceptional method exits. Doing so requires enhancements to the language-specific front ends, but no significant changes to Daikon proper. Another instrumentation enhancement that we are pursuing is replacing the current Java instrumenter (which performs a source-to-source translation) by one that is embedded in the Java Virtual machine and works on compiled Java programs. This change will simplify using Daikon by reducing the work required of a user. Finally, making Daikon work online—taking data from a running program rather than from a trace file—will reduce the number of steps to 1, which is the same as currently required to run any Java program (via the java command).

Our main research thrust is not to improve Daikon itself, but to find more uses for the operational abstractions that it produces. Linking it to verification tools from the JML toolset is just one application; some others were noted above in Section 6.1.4.

6.1.6 Availability

Daikon is publicly available, in both source and compiled form, from http://pag.csail.mit.edu/daikon/. Daikon includes front ends for Java, C, Perl, and other languages and input formats.

Several other implementations of dynamic invariant detection exist [43, 87, 45]. However, they do not produce output in JML format, they are not publicly available, and they check and report only a small fraction of the properties that Daikon does [83].

6.2 Inferring annotations with Houdini

6.2.1 Overview and Goals

An obstacle to using program verification tools such as ESC/Java on legacy code is the lack of annotations in such a program. The warnings more likely point out missing annotations than errors in the code. The Houdini tool [35, 34] attempts to alleviate this problem by supplying many of the missing annotations.

6.2.2 Design of the Tool

Houdini works by making up candidate annotations for the given program. Such candidate annotations compare fields and array lengths to -1, 0, 1, constants used in array constructors, null, true, and false (depending on the type of the field), and indicate that arrays and sub-arrays contain no null elements. To find which of the candidate annotations hold for the program, Houdini repeatedly invokes ESC/Java, removing those can-
didate annotations that ESC/Java finds to be inconsistent with the code. When all remaining candidate annotations are consistent with the code, Houdini invokes ESC/Java a final time to produce warnings that are then presented to the user. Houdini thus retains the precision of ESC/Java, trading quick turnaround for a reduced annotation effort.

Note that any user-supplied JML annotations in the program still get used by Houdini, since they become part of each invocation of ESC/Java. Thus, the benefits of using JML annotations are the same for ESC/Java, but Houdini can find program errors from a smaller set of user-supplied JML annotations.

6.2.3 Example

If the class in Figure 1 is given to Houdini without any annotations, then Houdini will produce a number of candidate annotations, including the invariants $0 \leq \text{balance}$ and $1 \leq \text{balance}$ and the Purse-constructor preconditions $0 \leq b$ and $1 \leq b$. If the given program contains a call to the Purse constructor that passes in $0$ for $b$, then the candidate precondition $1 \leq b$ is refuted and removed. Since the constructor assigns $b$ to balance, the candidate invariant $1 \leq \text{balance}$ will then eventually also become refuted.

Houdini will also include $\text{balance} \leq \text{MAX\_BALANCE}$ among many other candidate annotations, but will not include, for example, the universal quantifications shown in Figure 1.

6.2.4 Experience

Houdini has been applied to a number of real application programs, the initial account of which is reported in [35]. For each of the applications, Houdini (in concert with ESC/Java) was able to find errors. The number of warnings produced was generally larger than the number of warnings inspected by a user. For example, in the 36-KLOC program “Cobalt” [35], only 200 of the 540 warnings were inspected by a user, though this inspection revealed 8 errors. In the largest program to which Houdini was applied, a systems administration tool comprising 500 KLOC of Java, the number of warnings produced was too large to be particularly useful, though an inspection of 10 of the warnings still revealed 2 program errors. The experience with Houdini, albeit limited, suggests that it is possible for a user to inspect a program for errors at a rate of upwards of 1000 LOC per hour.

6.2.5 Future Work

Though Houdini has found real errors, some problems make the tool less effective than one would like. We mention three such problems here.

First, Houdini’s simple strategy for producing candidate annotations limits the number of ESC/Java warnings it can suppress. Future work might consider applying more static analysis or dynamic profiling to improve the initial set of candidate annotations.

Second, to reduce the number of warnings produced, it is important for Houdini to infer good class invariants. Even in the cases where Houdini’s candidate set includes the necessary invariants, Houdini may fail to infer them because the first point at which they hold is unknown. For example, ESC/Java generally checks that an object’s invariant has been established before the object’s constructor invokes any method on the object. But the purpose of such a method invocation is sometimes to help establish the object’s invariant in the first place. In an attempt to improve this situation, Houdini uses a special mode of ESC/Java, where ESC/Java infines any method call from a constructor. This mode allows Houdini to infer better invariants, but sometimes produces enormous verification conditions in ESC/Java. Future work might find a better solution to this problem.

Third, to avoid forcing users to write loop invariants, ESC/Java by default analyzes only a fixed number of unrollings of each loop. If the loop is known always to go through more iterations than are unrolled (for example, if a for loop iterates exactly 10 times, where 10 is a constant mentioned in the loop head), then the effect is that ESC/Java’s analysis doesn’t ever reach the other side of the loop. This may be acceptable in a manual application of ESC/Java, since ESC/Java performs modular checking method by method, and therefore the checking of other methods is unaffected. However, for Houdini, whose inference is more like that of a whole-program analysis, this situation can have a paralyzing effect on the entire program analysis. Houdini side steps this situation by using a special mode of ESC/Java, where ESC/Java in effect introduces a jump from its last unrolling of the loop until after the loop. This is much better for Houdini, but it also introduces execution paths that don’t exist in the given program, which leads to other problems. Perhaps there are better solutions.

6.2.6 Availability


7 Documentation

Generating human-readable web pages from JML specifications is accomplished by the jmldoc tool.
7.1 jmldoc

7.1.1 Overview and Goals

The goal of the jmldoc tool is to produce HTML pages like those produced by the javadoc tool, but including information from JML annotations as well. JML allows specifications to be spread across a number of refinement files. This is essential, for example, in the case that the Java source code may not be modified to include specifications directly in the source code. Even within one file, the specifications relevant to the class may be spread throughout the file, making easy spotting of a relevant invariant difficult. Also, JML enforces behavioral inheritance, in which an overriding method must satisfy the specification of the methods it overrides. Accordingly, jmldoc includes in the HTML representation of the specifications of a method the specifications of the methods it overrides. By combining and grouping these specifications appropriately, jmldoc makes them more accessible to the programmer. Particularly for those accustomed to browsing the javadoc documentation of an API, the inclusion of the additional specifications in a formal notation as provided by jmldoc is expected to be a convenience.

7.1.2 Design of the Tool

The jmldoc tool is designed to leverage as much of both the JML tools and the javadoc tool as possible. It uses the classes of the JML checker to parse, typecheck, and provide an AST that includes specifications of each class and method being documented. The javadoc tool provides a docket API that allows some reuse of the javadoc framework. Many of the contributed doctets use the provided classes to parse valid Java source code with javadoc comments and then to do checks or alternative processing on those files, such as producing PDF rather than HTML or checking that all methods do indeed have javadoc comments. The jmldoc tool instead alters (by derivation) the mechanism that generates the HTML pages in order that the output will contain in addition information about the JML annotations in the source files, as provided by the JML-generated AST. In this way, the jmldoc tool remains consistent with the other JML tools in their handling of the JML language, but it also produces HTML pages consistent with other current javadoc documentation and with that produced by the javadoc tool itself. Aside from accepting additional command-line options appropriate to JML, jmldoc is intended to be a drop-in replacement for javadoc.

7.1.3 Example

An example of jmldoc's output is shown in Figure 5; it shows the current output produced for the method HashMap.size as currently specified by JML specifications for Java system classes.

7.1.4 Experience

The main experience we have with jmldoc is in documentation of packages that ship with JML, such as JML's built-in types for modeling and its samples, and with documentation of parts of the Java standard libraries. While these are used by JML users on a daily basis, there have been no formal case studies of the usefulness of jmldoc. Informal reports, however, have been positive.

7.1.5 Future Work

The tool is being maintained as part of the JML toolset, but not being extended further other than to keep pace with changes in the definition of JML itself. Extensive maintenance is also needed to keep pace with changes in the docket API with each new version of Java. As it happens, the portions of the docket API that are extended by jmldoc have been changing significantly even between minor releases of javadoc. If this rate of change continues, the JML project may need to seek an alternative design that is not tied as closely to the current appearance of javadoc documentation in order to lessen the maintenance burden.

7.1.6 Availability

The jmldoc tool was authored by David Cok along the lines of the goals espoused by Raghavan [88]. It is part of the main JML toolset available via www.jmjspes.org, which is developed as an open source project hosted at SourceForge.net.

8 Applications of JML to Java Card

Although JML is able to specify arbitrary sequential Java programs, most of the serious applications of JML and JML tools up to now have targeted Java Card. Java Card™ is a dialect of Java specifically designed for the programming of the latest generation of smartcards. Java Card is adapted to the hardware limitations of smartcards; for instance, it does not support floating point numbers, strings, object cloning3, or threads.

Java Card is a well-suited target for the application of formal methods. It is a relatively simple language with a restricted API. Moreover, Java Card programs, called applets, are small, typically on the order of several KBytes of bytecode. Additionally, correctness of Java Card programs is of crucial importance, since they are used in sensitive applications, e.g. as bank cards, identity cards, and in mobile phones. Furthermore, once such

3 The fact that Java Card does not have cloning means that a version of the Purse example in Figure 1 rewritten to Java Card rather than Java does verify using ESC/Java, LOOP, or JACK. Indeed, the absence of clone in Java Card is a reason why dealing with clone has not been a priority in these tools.
smartcards are issued, it is difficult, if not impossible, to
fix any software errors.

JML, and several tools for JML, have been used for
Java Card, especially in the context of the EU-supported
project VerifiCard (www.verificard.org).

JML has been used to write a formal specification
of almost the entire Java Card API [86]. This experience
has shown that JML is expressive enough to specify
non-trivial existing API classes. The runtime assertion
checker has been used to specify and verify a compo­
nent of a smartcard operating system [85].

ESC/Java has been used with great success to verify
a realistic example of an electronic purse implementation
in Java Card [16]. This case study was instrumental in
convincing industrial users of the usefulness of JML and
feasibility of automated program checking by ESC/Java
for Java Card applets. In fact, this case study provided
the motivation for the development of the JACK tool
discussed earlier, which is specifically designed for Java
Card programs. One of the classes of the electronic purse
has also been verified using the LOOP tool [12]. An
overview of the work on this electronic purse, and the
way in which ESC/Java and LOOP can be used to com­
plement each other, is given in [13].

As witnessed by the development of the JACK tool
by Gemplus, Java Card smartcard programs may be
one of the niche markets where formal methods have a
promising future. Here, the cost that companies are
willing to pay to ensure the absence of certain kinds of
bugs is quite high. It seems that, given the current state
of the art, using static checking techniques to ensure
relatively simple properties (e.g., that no runtime ex­
ception ever reaches the top-level without being caught)
seems to provide an acceptable return-on-investment. It
should be noted that the very simplicity of Java Card is
not without its drawbacks. In particular, the details of
its very primitive communication with smartcards (via
a byte array buffer) is not easily abstracted away from.
It will be interesting to investigate if J2ME (Java 2 Mi­
cro Edition), which targets a wider range of electronic
consumer products, such as mobile phones and PDAs, is
also an interesting application domain for JML.

9 Related Work

9.1 Java

Many runtime assertion checkers for Java exist, for
example Jass, jContract, and Parasoft’s jContract, to name
just a few. Each of these tools has its own specification
language, thus specifications written for one tool do not
work in any other tool. And while some of these tools
support higher-level constructs such as quantifiers, all
are quite primitive when compared to JML. For example,
none include support for purity specification and
checking, model methods, refinements, or unit test inte­
geration. The developers of Jass have expressed interest
in moving to JML as their specification language.

The ChAsE tool [17] is a static checker for JML’s
assignable clauses. It performs a syntactic check on
such clauses, which, in the spirit of ESC/Java, is nei­
ther sound nor complete, but which spots many mis­
takes made in the user’s assignable clauses. ChAsE was
developed to complement the functionality missing in
other tools: not checking assignable clauses was one of
the sources of unsoundness of ESC/Java. Also, assignable
clauses are not checked by the runtime assertion
checker, making errors in assignable clauses hard to de­
tect. The functionality to check assignable clauses is now
incorporated in ESC/Java2. Also, the JML runtime as­
sertion checker has started to incorporate some of this
functionality.

In addition to ESC/Java2, LOOP, and JACK, sev­
eral other tools exist for the verification of Java code,
for instance Krakatao [69], Jive [74], and KeY [1]. The
Krakatao tool also uses JML as specification language; it
produces proof obligations for the theorem prover Coq.
It is planned that Jive will also start supporting JML.
The KeY tool uses OCL instead as its specification language, and is integrated with a commercial CASE tool.

9.2 Other languages

SPARK (www.sparkada.com, [4]) is an initiative similar to JML in many respects, but much more mature, and targeting Ada rather than Java. SPARK (which stands for Spade Ada Kernel) is a language designed for programming high-integrity systems. It is a subset of Ada95 (with no object references and subclasses, for example) enriched with annotations to enable tool support. This includes tools for data- and information-flow analysis, and for code verification, in particular to ensure the absence of runtime exceptions [2]. Spark has been successfully used to construct high-integrity systems that have been certified using the Common Criteria, the ISO standard for the certification of information technology security. SPARK and the associated tools are marketed by Praxis Critical Systems Ltd., demonstrating that this technology is commercially viable.

A more recent initiative that is very similar to JML is Spec# [6]. The Spec# language extends C# with contract specifications, analogously to the way JML extends Java. The Spec# compiler then introduces runtime checks for the declared specifications (akin to jmlc), and the Boogie program verifier tries to prove these specifications statically using an automatic theorem prover (akin the tools described in Section 5). One difference between Spec# and JML is that Spec# builds in a new methodology for object invariants [5,63,7], trading restrictions on the kinds of programs that can be written for a sound modular reasoning technique.

9.3 OCL: UML’s constraint language

Despite the similarity in the acronyms, JML is very different in its aims from UML [90]. The most basic difference is that the UML aims to cover all phases of analysis and design with many notations, and it tries to be independent of programming language, while JML only deals with detailed designs (for APIs) and is tied to Java. The model in JML refers to abstract, specification-only fields that can be used to describe the behavior of various types. By contrast, the model of UML refers to the general modeling process (analysis and design) and is not limited to abstractions of individual types.

JML does have some things in common with the Object Constraint Language (OCL) [91], which is part of the UML standard. Like JML, OCL can be used to specify invariants and pre- and postconditions. An important difference is that JML explicitly targets Java, whereas OCL is not specific to any one programming language. One could say that JML is related to Java in the same way that OCL is related to UML.

JML clearly has the disadvantage that it can not be used for, say, C++ programs, whereas OCL can. But it also has obvious advantages when it comes to syntax, semantics, and expressivity. Because JML sticks to the Java syntax and typing rules, a typical Java programmer will prefer JML notation over OCL notation, and, for instance, prefer to write (in JML):

\[
\text{inv: } \text{pin} \neq \text{null} \& \& \text{pin.length == 5};
\]
rather than the OCL:

\[
\text{inv: } \text{pin} \neq \text{null and pin.size() == 5}
\]

JML supports all the Java modifiers such as static, private, public, etc., and these can be used to record detailed design decisions for different readers. Furthermore, there are legal Java expressions that can be used in JML specifications but that cannot be expressed in OCL.

More significant than these limitations, or differences in syntax, are differences in semantics. JML builds on the (well-defined) semantics of Java. So, for instance, equals has the same meaning in JML and Java, as does ==, and the same rules for overriding, overloading, and hiding apply. One cannot expect this for OCL, although efforts to define a semantics for OCL are underway.

In all, we believe that a language like JML, which is tailored to Java, is better suited for recording the detailed design of Java programs than a generic language like OCL. Even if one uses UML in the development of a Java application, it may be better to use JML rather than OCL for the specification of object constraints, especially in the later stages of the development. There has been work on automatically translating OCL to JML [42].

10 Conclusions

We believe that JML presents a promising opportunity to gently introduce formal specification into industrial practice. It has the following strong points:

1. JML is easy to learn for any Java programmer, since its syntax and semantics are very close to Java. We believe this a crucial advantage, as a big hurdle to introducing formal methods in industry is often that people are not willing, or do not have the time, to learn yet another language.

2. There is no need to invest in the construction of a formal model before one can use JML. Or rather: the source code is the formal model. This brings further advantages:

   - It is easy to introduce the use of JML gradually, simply by adding the odd assertion to some Java code.
   - JML can be used for existing (legacy) code and APIs. Indeed, most applications of JML and its tools to date have involved existing APIs and code.
There is no discrepancy between the actual code and the formal model. In traditional applications of formal methods there is often a gap between the formal model and the actual implementation, which means that some bugs in the implementation cannot be found, because they are not part of the formal model, and, conversely, some problems discovered in the formal model may not be relevant for the implementation.

3. There is a growing availability of a wide range of tool support for JML.

Unlike B, JML does not impose a particular design methodology on its users. Unlike UML, VDM, and Z, JML is tailored to specifying both the syntactic interface of Java code and its behavior. Therefore, JML is better suited than these alternative languages for documenting the detailed design of existing Java programs.

As a common notation shared by many tools, JML offers users multiple tools supporting the same notation. This frees users from having to learn a whole new language before they can start using a new tool. The shared notation also helps the economics both for users and tool builders. Any industrial use of formal methods will have to be economically justified, by comparing the costs (the extra time and effort spent) against the benefits (improvements in quality, number of bugs found). Having a range of tools, offering different levels of assurance at different costs, makes it much easier to start using JML. One can begin with a technique that requires the least time and effort (perhaps runtime assertion checking) and then move to more labor-intensive techniques if and when that seems worthwhile, until one has reached a combination of tools and techniques that is cost-effective for a particular situation.

Using any of the tools for static checking or verification requires formal specifications of the APIs of any system libraries used, and the cost of developing such specifications is very high. Indeed, the largest case study to date in using JML for specification is the ongoing work in developing specifications for substantial parts of the Java system libraries. Being able to reuse these same specifications for different tools is an important advantage.

Future Work

There are still many opportunities for further development of both the JML language and its tools. For instance, we would also like to see support for JML in integrated development environments (such as Eclipse) and integration with other kinds of static checkers.

A major recent extension to JML concerns the support for different forms of arithmetic, providing normal mathematical integers in addition to Java’s n-bit 2’s-complements integers [18].

One important aspect of future work is experimenting with the use JML for specification of real-world code and APIs, and using the associated tools. There has been a lot of work on producing JML specifications of the Java system libraries (these can be downloaded from www.jmle specs.org), but more work is needed.

Using JML to specify real-world code raises many interesting issues. For instance, JML allows pure methods to be used in annotations, where pure methods are defined as those which have no side-effects. But this is a very strict definition, which can be impractical when writing specifications, as many methods (including some in core Java libraries) that programmers intuitively assume to be pure are not pure, due to unobservable and benevolent side-effects [59]. Work continues on a better and more useful definition of purity, e.g. [8].

With more tools supporting JML, and the specification language JML growing in complexity due to the different features that are useful for the different tools, one important challenge is maintaining agreement on the semantics of the language between the different tools. One thing that has become very clear in the course of developing JML is that precisely defining the semantics of a specification language such as JML is very tricky.

More generally, there are several fundamental issues in the specification of object-oriented systems that are still active topics of investigation. The notion of object invariant is tricky in the presence of callbacks [5, 7, 63, 77]. Another largely open issue is how concurrency properties should be specified.

As always in imperative programming, aliasing is a major source of complications, and an important source of bugs. For example, in the example in Figure 1 it is probably important that in the constructor the field 

\text{pin}

is not simply aliased to the argument p, but that a new array is created. However, the current specification does not demand this. JML should offer practical ways to constrain potential aliasing. A first proposal is given in [76].

The subtleties involved in such open problems are evidenced by the slightly different ways in which different tools approach these problems. This reflects the research (as opposed to industrial development) focus of most of those involved in JML and its tools. Nevertheless, JML seems to be successful in providing a common notation and a semantics that is, at least for a growing core subset, shared by many tools, and as a common notation, JML is already proving to be useful to both tool developers and users.
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