

Formalism-Driven Development of Decentralized Systems

Yepeng Ding and Hiroyuki Sato

The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan
{youhouitei,schuko}@satolab.itc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract. Decentralized systems have been widely developed and applied to address security and privacy issues in centralized systems since the advancement of distributed ledger technology. Meanwhile, formal methods play a pivotal role in delivering provably correct abstract models and concrete implementations. Most existing development processes use formal methods in the late stage and unable to guide the design and implementation, which seems to “improve” producibility and “speed up” delivery, but in fact brings huge potential risk and cost. In this paper, we formulate an iterative and incremental development process, named formalism-driven development (FDD), for developing provably correct decentralized systems under the guidance of formal methods. Besides, a framework is presented to practicalize FDD with a parallelable branching workflow and scaffolds including a new modeling language and generators to smooth the stage transition. Furthermore, we use a blockchain prototype developed with our framework as an instance to concretize the core concepts of FDD and demonstrate the effectiveness.

Keywords: Development process · Decentralized system · Formal methods.

1 Introduction

Decentralization has become a ubiquitous concept in system design and implementation over the past decades, especially since the advent of blockchain technology, a form of distributed ledger technology (DLT). Based on DLT, numerous decentralized systems have been developed to address security and privacy issues in a wide range of fields including economics, politics, and information technologies. Although these systems are claimed to have many attractive characteristics such as immutability, fault tolerance, non-repudiation, transparency, traceability, and auditability, it is still challenging to correctly design and implement them while preserving these characteristics.

When it comes to system correctness, formal methods have proved to be effective in testing and verification techniques such as model-based testing [23], model checking [10,4,8], and theorem proving [19,11]. Formal specification rigorously describes the system behavior and constrains the implementation, while formal verification and testing prove the correctness and system properties with respect

to specifications. Furthermore, the application of formal methods in developing provably correct decentralized systems ranging from blockchain platforms [9,18] to smart contracts [2,7] has drawn widespread attention both in academia and industry since TheDAO attack [15].

However, most of these formal methods are used in the late stage of the development process, especially after the implementation and even delivery. Either way, formal methods fail to effectively guide the development of rigorous designs and implementations. It is also imperative to ensure the correctness of these systems before delivery at best efforts to save the high repair cost (including time and space) due to the immutability and decentralization of these systems. Besides, it still lacks a standardized development process [5] to develop trustworthy decentralized systems with formal methods.

To address these problems, we propose a novel iterative and incremental development process named formalism-driven development (FDD) for developing provably correct decentralized systems. Driven by the formal methods, FDD produces rigorous designs with fully verified properties and implementations guided and constrained by designs in each incremental iteration. We divide an iteration into four consistent stages including abstraction, verification, implementation, and modularization. Each stage is coherent and tightly connects with both preceding and succeeding stages. Besides, we construct a framework to practicalize FDD that adopts a branching workflow to improve manageability and collaboration. A new modeling language is developed to facilitate designing system models. We also develop scaffolds to smooth stage transitions in FDD. To demonstrate the effectiveness of FDD, we develop a blockchain prototype and use simplified one of its components to concretize core concepts of FDD.

To sum up, our main contributions are (1) formulating the core concepts of FDD, (2) constructing a framework to practicalize FDD, and (3) producing a prototype with our framework.

2 Related Work

Our work is inspired by the work on contributing to three aspects of a development process: transformation between abstract models and concrete implementations, integration of formal methods, blockchain-oriented support.

Model-driven development (MDD) [1,22] focuses on formulating a model as an abstraction of a system and derives source codes from the model. MDD has been widely adopted in many fields such as web development [3], mobile app development [24], IoT application development [21] based on the UML or proposed domain-specific languages. But the classic MDD does not address the correctness of the abstraction and ensure system properties rigorously.

Verification-driven engineering [13,20,17] integrates the formal methods in MDD and particularly promotes formal verification during the development process. In work [16], a verification-driven framework named FIDDLE is presented and evaluated by developing parts of the K9 Mars Rover model. However, the

gap among abstraction, verification, and implementation is not well bridged, which is reflected in the lack of theory support and tools.

Recently, blockchain-oriented development process has been researched based on MDD [6,26] and other methods [14,25]. They focus on providing application-level solutions for the development of decentralized applications and barely introduce formal methods as a critical component in their methodologies.

To the best of our knowledge, no existing work presents an iterative and incremental development process with the integration of formal methods to deliver provably correct model and rigorous implementation for developing decentralized systems based on DLT including both decentralized infrastructures and applications.

3 Formalism-Driven Development

As an iterative and incremental development process, FDD promotes rapid iteration and progressive enhancement. From the overall view, FDD follows the bottom-up approach that starts with constructing small-scale and relatively independent sub-systems and ends with putting all sub-systems together to complete complex systems. For the development of each sub-system, FDD adopts the top-down approach to refine the sub-system by a set of iterations. In each iteration, FDD consists of four stages: abstraction, verification, implementation, and modularization, which is shown in Figure 1.




Fig. 1. The stage graph of formalism-driven development. *A* denotes *abstraction*. *R* denotes *refinement*. *VA* denotes *verified abstraction*. *I* denotes *implementation*.

We use the simplified transaction system in our developed demonstration as an example to illustrate core concepts. The demonstration is a blockchain

prototype that has similar functions as Ethereum, which is fully designed and implemented by FDD.

3.1 Abstraction Stage

In abstraction stage, the goal is to produce a rigorous and incrementally detailed abstraction for a system with a null input (in the case of the first iteration of a new system) or an abstraction from the last iteration. We call the former case as origin stage and the latter case as refinement stage.

Origin Stage Origin stage produces an abstraction, a high-level formal specification of a system that is structured as a labeled transition system (LTS) [12]. The theoretical structure of an LTS is a triple $TS = (Q, A, \rightarrow)$ where Q is a nonempty and countable set of states; A is a countable set of actions; $\rightarrow \subseteq Q \times A \times Q$ is a transition relation.

In FDD, we formulate a practical structure \mathfrak{T} that is a tuple (V, E, \leftrightarrow) where V is a nonempty and countable set of variables; E is a countable set of events that modifies variable values; $\leftrightarrow \subseteq S \times E \times S$ is a transition relation. Here, $S \in \wp(\llbracket V \rrbracket) \setminus \emptyset$ denotes a set of states where $\wp(\llbracket V \rrbracket)$ is the powerset of variable values. Intuitively, the practical structure \mathfrak{T} defines states with a set of variable values and makes transitions by triggering events to change the variable values, which is more straightforward than the theoretical structure to represent an actual system by codes. We use the practical structure by default and abstraction to refer to an LTS with the practical structure.

For instance, we can declare a state variable *status* for \mathfrak{T}_{tx} , the abstraction of our simplified transaction system, to identify five states in the origin stage shown in Figure 2 without the dashed blue branch.




Fig. 2. The transaction system abstraction and refinement.

Refinement Stage Refinement stage accepts an abstraction from the last iteration and produces a more detailed abstraction. A refinement \mathfrak{T}' of \mathfrak{T} is a more detailed system model that has either a strong relation \sim or a weak relation \preceq to \mathfrak{T} . Relation \sim can be regarded as an equivalence relation that identifies \mathfrak{T} and its refinement with the same branching structure by bisimulation. \preceq is a preorder that is reflexive and transitive. $\mathfrak{T}' \preceq \mathfrak{T}$ holds if the refinement \mathfrak{T}' can be simulated by \mathfrak{T} .

In our example, we can refine \mathfrak{T}_{tx} by declaring a new action *Accelerate* that generates a new branch that is marked with the dashed blue line in Figure 2. This refinement mocks a special situation that a user needs to cancel the original transaction and start a new transaction with a higher amount of *Gas* to accelerate the consensus speed of the transaction due to the immutability of the blockchain. Apparently, the refinement \mathfrak{T}'_{tx} cannot be distinguished from \mathfrak{T}_{tx} by *status*. In fact, \mathfrak{T}_{tx} and \mathfrak{T}'_{tx} are bisimulation-equivalent, which can be proved automatically by bisimulation.

3.2 Verification Stage

Verification stage specifies the admissible behaviors of the abstraction produced in the last stage as properties and checks them by formal verification and testing methods.

Specification FDD equips \mathfrak{T} with a set of propositions P to specify interesting system behaviors as a set of properties \mathcal{P} such as invariant, safety, and liveness in terms of linear-time properties. For instance, we can declare $Notified \in P_{tx}$, $Notified \triangleq status = NOTIFIED$ and a property $\diamond Notified$ meaning that the system will eventually reach state *Notified*. By the labeling function $S \mapsto \wp(P)$, the states are labeled with propositions, which builds the connection between the abstraction and verification. In this manner, the satisfiability of \mathcal{P} can be checked.

Furthermore, FDD preserves the properties between two consecutive iterations by using (bi)simulation to ensure the correctness of the refinement and among a set of consecutive iterations by transitivity of simulation. In this way, \mathfrak{T}' will inherit the satisfaction of the properties in \mathfrak{T} . Formally, we may safely conclude $\mathfrak{T}' \models \phi$ from $\mathfrak{T} \models \phi$ where $\phi \in \mathcal{P}$.

Enforcement The enforcement of the verification depends on the mode of FDD.

Checker mode. By structuring the abstraction with LTS, it is trivial to enforce model checking to verify the properties formulated in temporal logics such as linear-time, branching-time, and real-time logic.

Tester mode. A test generator can generate test suites from a specification for an LTS in a systematic and algorithmic way such as the formal, specification based testing process in [23].

Prover mode. Properties of a given LTS can be verified by a theorem prover that mechanizes the logic used to specify these properties.

3.3 Implementation Stage

During the implementation stage, an executable system will be produced based on the verified abstraction. Depending on the programming paradigm for implementation, FDD generates skeletons from the abstraction and provides corresponding constraints to ensure conformity between the abstraction and implementation at best efforts. Due to the page limit, we take objected-oriented programming (OOP) for instance.

In OOP, the practical structure of an LTS is implemented as an abstract class \mathbb{C} with fields persisting variable list, action declaration list, and transition rule list. It is noteworthy that variables identifying states, also called state variables, are different from variables in a specific programming language conceptually. These state variables are implemented as specific data structures and constrained by a transition rule checking method of \mathbb{C} and cannot be explicitly modified in the implementation.

A verified abstraction \mathfrak{T} is transformed to a subclass $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ of \mathbb{C} by inheritance. Meanwhile, all actions of \mathfrak{T} are predefined as methods in an interface \mathbb{I} . $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ implements \mathbb{I} and overrides the predefined methods with functional codes. After $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ is instantiated as an object, it can perform certain tasks during state transitions.

For the parallel system, the implementation depends on the type of parallelisms. For instance, a pure interleaving (asynchronous concurrency) system is mechanized with threads. Consider a system containing a set of transaction systems. Each transaction system is instantiated as an object and assigned in a new thread.

3.4 Modularization Stage

Modularization stage serves the overall bottom-up approach that encapsulates and integrates the current abstraction into a higher-level abstraction. Notably, the modified higher-level abstraction needs at least one more iteration for refinement, verification, and implementation.

In this stage, the current abstraction \mathfrak{T} is encapsulated as a sub-system and integrated into a higher-level abstraction such as a parallel system and channel system. A parallel system $\mathfrak{T}_p = \mathfrak{T} \parallel \dots$ can be pure interleaving or variable sharing. Furthermore, \mathfrak{T} can be integrated into a synchronous or an asynchronous channel system.

In our prototype, \mathfrak{T}_{tx} in Figure 2 is a very high-level abstraction. For instance, branches from state *PENDING* to *NOTIFIED* folds a consensus module that is another high-level abstraction.

4 Framework

To practicalize FDD, we construct a framework that regulates the enforcement of FDD, enhances system modeling, and smooths stage transitions.

Our framework uses a branching workflow that permits parallel development for a set of manageable branches. In each branch, it follows the steps below.

1. Create or refine an abstraction with the EDOT language to obtain an EDOT program \mathcal{E} .
2. Generate a Promela program \mathcal{M} from \mathcal{E} .
3. Specify and verify the properties of the abstraction by the SPIN model checker.
4. If all specified properties pass verification, then move to the next step. Otherwise, go back to step 1).
5. Generate a Java skeleton program \mathcal{J} from the verified \mathcal{E} .
6. Enrich \mathcal{J} under constraints to satisfy functional requirements.
7. If \mathcal{E} represents the highest-level unrefinable abstraction, terminate the workflow. If \mathcal{E} represents a low-level unrefinable abstraction, modularize \mathcal{E} , integrate \mathcal{E} into a higher-level abstraction \mathcal{E}' to obtain \mathcal{E}^* , start a new iteration in \mathcal{E}' branch with \mathcal{E}^* , and go into the next iteration with \mathcal{E} . Otherwise, go into the next iteration with \mathcal{E} .

Besides, we develop an extended DOT language for system modeling in abstraction and modularization stage, a verification generator for the transition between the abstraction and verification stage, and an implementation generator for the transition between the verification and implementation stage.

4.1 Extended DOT Language

To produce a rigorous design that is structured by LTS, we design and develop a new modeling language EDOT by extending a graph description language called the DOT language with novel features and engine support.

EDOT supports defining meta information of an abstraction including system identifier, state variables, and action identifiers. With the declarations of state variables, a state can be identified by passing a set of variable evaluations (name-value pairs) into *label* attribute of its identifier. A transition is represented by applying operator \rightarrow to two state identifiers with an action identifier as the transition label. A checking engine ensures the correctness of the abstraction representation by doing static analysis such as the identifier legacy. For instance, a state or a state variable identifier being used as a transition label can never pass the check.

Each EDOT file models an abstraction with high coherence. An abstraction is relatively independent and can be integrated into other abstractions by *import* in EDOT. To fully support the modularization stage, EDOT provides new operators for modeling higher-level abstraction such as \parallel for a parallel relation between abstractions.

Additionally, an EDOT file can be visualized by a rendering engine. The transaction system in Figure 2 is a rendered graph by defining its abstraction in an EDOT program.

4.2 Verification Generator

The goal of a verification generator is to reproduce the abstraction in the context of a verification modeling language to facilitate the verification.

Our framework provides a verification generator that translates EDOT programs developed in the abstraction stage into Promela programs for the verification stage. State variables in the EDOT program are formed as a set of *mtype*. The action identifiers with corresponding modifications of state variables are implemented as a set of predefined *inline*. The transition flow of the LTS in the EDOT program is formulated by a *do* block in *proctype* named with the system identifier. Notably, the diverging branches from a certain state can be translated by *select* as a non-deterministic situation such as branches derived from state *PENDING* in Figure 2.

4.3 Implementation Generator

The implementation generator connects the modeling language with the general-purpose and Turing-complete programming languages.

We use generative programming techniques to bridge the gap between the modeling and programming languages. In our framework, Java skeleton programs are generated from the EDOT programs by the implementation generator based on the methodology in Section 3.3.

5 Discussion

FDD promotes the application of formal methods as a critical component in the development of decentralized systems. We summarize the main advantages as follows.

- FDD enables a rigorous design process by modeling both static and dynamic system structures.
- System properties are formally specified and verified to ensure correctness.
- The implementation is rigorously constrained by its abstraction to ensure conformity with the design at best efforts.
- As an iterative and incremental process, FDD supports continuous integration and delivery in an evolutionary way.

6 Conclusion

We have proposed FDD, a novel iterative and incremental development process for developing provably correct decentralized systems with formal methods. The

core concepts including stages and mechanisms have been formulated based on LTS theory. Besides, we have presented a framework with the branching workflow and scaffolds to practicalize FDD and gained preliminary results by developing a blockchain prototype under FDD. Our future directions include enriching the framework by providing both theoretical support and practical scaffolds and developing more sophisticated decentralized systems under FDD.

References

1. Atkinson, C., Kuhne, T.: Model-driven development: a metamodeling foundation. *IEEE software* **20**(5), 36–41 (2003), ISBN: 0740-7459 Publisher: IEEE
2. Bhargavan, K., Delignat-Lavaud, A., Fournet, C., Gollamudi, A., Gonthier, G., Kobeissi, N., Kulatova, N., Rastogi, A., Sibut-Pinote, T., Swamy, N.: Formal verification of smart contracts: Short paper. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Workshop on Programming Languages and Analysis for Security*. pp. 91–96 (2016)
3. Ceri, S., Daniel, F., Matera, M., Facca, F.M.: Model-driven development of context-aware Web applications. *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology (TOIT)* **7**(1), 2–es (2007), ISBN: 1533-5399 Publisher: ACM New York, NY, USA
4. Dehnert, C., Junges, S., Katoen, J.P., Volk, M.: A storm is coming: A modern probabilistic model checker. In: *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*. pp. 592–600. Springer (2017)
5. Destefanis, G., Marchesi, M., Ortu, M., Tonelli, R., Bracciali, A., Hierons, R.: Smart contracts vulnerabilities: a call for blockchain software engineering? In: *2018 International Workshop on Blockchain Oriented Software Engineering (IWBOSE)*. pp. 19–25. IEEE (2018)
6. Dittmann, G., Sorniotti, A., Völzer, H.: Model-Driven Engineering for Multi-party Interactions on a Blockchain—An Example. In: *International Conference on Service-Oriented Computing*. pp. 181–194. Springer (2019)
7. Frank, J., Aschermann, C., Holz, T.: ETHBMC: A Bounded Model Checker for Smart Contracts. In: *29th {USENIX} Security Symposium ({USENIX} Security 20)* (2020)
8. Gacek, A., Backes, J., Whalen, M., Wagner, L., Ghassabani, E.: The JK ind model checker. In: *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*. pp. 20–27. Springer (2018)
9. Hildenbrandt, E., Saxena, M., Rodrigues, N., Zhu, X., Daian, P., Guth, D., Moore, B., Park, D., Zhang, Y., Stefanescu, A.: Kevm: A complete formal semantics of the ethereum virtual machine. In: *2018 IEEE 31st Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*. pp. 204–217. IEEE (2018)
10. Holzmann, G.J.: The model checker SPIN. *IEEE Transactions on software engineering* **23**(5), 279–295 (1997), ISBN: 0098-5589 Publisher: IEEE
11. Kaufmann, M., Manolios, P., Moore, J.S.: *Computer-aided reasoning: ACL2 case studies*, vol. 4. Springer Science & Business Media (2013)
12. Keller, R.M.: Formal verification of parallel programs. *Communications of the ACM* **19**(7), 371–384 (1976), ISBN: 0001-0782 Publisher: ACM New York, NY, USA
13. Kordon, F., Hugues, J., Renault, X.: From model driven engineering to verification driven engineering. In: *IFIP International Workshop on Software Technologies for Embedded and Ubiquitous Systems*. pp. 381–393. Springer (2008)

14. Marchesi, M., Marchesi, L., Tonelli, R.: An agile software engineering method to design blockchain applications. In: Proceedings of the 14th Central and Eastern European Software Engineering Conference Russia. pp. 1–8 (2018)
15. Mehar, M.I., Shier, C.L., Giambattista, A., Gong, E., Fletcher, G., Sanayhie, R., Kim, H.M., Laskowski, M.: Understanding a revolutionary and flawed grand experiment in blockchain: the DAO attack. *Journal of Cases on Information Technology (JCIT)* **21**(1), 19–32 (2019), publisher: IGI Global
16. Menghi, C., Spoletini, P., Chechik, M., Ghezzi, C.: A verification-driven framework for iterative design of controllers. *Formal Aspects of Computing* **31**(5), 459–502 (2019), ISBN: 0934-5043 Publisher: Springer
17. Mitsch, S., Passmore, G.O., Platzer, A.: Collaborative verification-driven engineering of hybrid systems. *Mathematics in Computer Science* **8**(1), 71–97 (2014), ISBN: 1661-8270 Publisher: Springer
18. Park, D., Zhang, Y., Saxena, M., Daian, P., Roşu, G.: A formal verification tool for Ethereum VM bytecode. In: Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering. pp. 912–915 (2018)
19. Paulson, L.C.: Isabelle: A generic theorem prover, vol. 828. Springer Science & Business Media (1994)
20. Shaikh, A., Clarisó, R., Wiil, U.K., Memon, N.: Verification-driven slicing of UML/OCL models. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM international conference on Automated software engineering. pp. 185–194 (2010)
21. Sosa-Reyna, C.M., Tello-Leal, E., Lara-Alabazares, D.: Methodology for the model-driven development of service oriented IoT applications. *Journal of Systems Architecture* **90**, 15–22 (2018), ISBN: 1383-7621 Publisher: Elsevier
22. Tolvanen, J.P., Kelly, S.: Model-driven development challenges and solutions: Experiences with domain-specific modelling in industry. In: 2016 4th International Conference on Model-Driven Engineering and Software Development (MODEL-SWARD). pp. 711–719. IEEE (2016)
23. Tretmans, J.: Model based testing with labelled transition systems. In: Formal methods and testing, pp. 1–38. Springer (2008)
24. Vaupel, S., Taentzer, G., Gerlach, R., Guckert, M.: Model-driven development of mobile applications for Android and iOS supporting role-based app variability. *Software & Systems Modeling* **17**(1), 35–63 (2018), ISBN: 1619-1366 Publisher: Springer
25. Wessling, F., Gruhn, V.: Engineering software architectures of blockchain-oriented applications. In: 2018 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture Companion (ICSA-C). pp. 45–46. IEEE (2018)
26. Xu, X., Weber, I., Staples, M.: Model-Driven Engineering for Blockchain Applications. In: *Architecture for Blockchain Applications*, pp. 149–172. Springer (2019)