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ABSTRACT
Software model checking is a verification technique which is widely used for checking temporal properties of software systems. Even though it is a property verification technique, its common usage in practice is in “bug finding”, that is, finding violations of temporal properties. Motivated by this observation and leveraging the recent progress in fuzzing, we build a greybox fuzzing framework to find violations of Linear-time Temporal Logic (LTL) properties.

Our framework takes as input a sequential program written in C/C++, and an LTL property. It finds violations, or counterexample traces, of the LTL property in stateful software systems; however, it does not achieve verification. Our work substantially extends directed greybox fuzzing to witness arbitrarily complex event orderings. We note that existing directed greybox fuzzing approaches are limited to witnessing reaching a location or witnessing simple event orderings like use-after-free. At the same time, compared to model checkers, our approach finds the counterexamples faster, thereby finding more counterexamples within a given time budget.

Our LTL-Fuzzer tool, built on top of the AFL fuzzer, is shown to be effective in detecting bugs in well-known protocol implementations, such as OpenSSL and Telnet. We use LTL-Fuzzer to reproduce known vulnerabilities (CVEs), to find 15 zero-day bugs by checking properties extracted from RFCs (for which 10 CVEs have been assigned), and to find violations of both safety as well as liveness properties in real-world protocol implementations. Our work represents a practical advance over software model checkers — while simultaneously representing a conceptual advance over ex-work represents a practical advance over software model checkers.

Motivated by this observation and leveraging the recent progress in fuzzing, we build a greybox fuzzing framework to find violations of Linear-time Temporal Logic (LTL) properties. Parallel to the works in software model-checking, greybox fuzzing methods [1, 3] have seen substantial recent advances. These methods conduct a biased random search over the domain of program inputs, to find bugs or vulnerabilities. The main advantage of greybox fuzzing lies in its scalability to large software systems. However, greybox fuzzing is only a testing (not verification) method and it is mostly useful for finding witnesses to simple oracles such as crashes or overflows. Recently there have been some extension of greybox fuzzing methods towards generating witnesses of more complex oracles, such as tests reaching a location [16]. However, generating inputs and traces satisfying a complex temporal property remains beyond the reach of current greybox fuzzing tools. Thus, today’s greybox fuzzing technology cannot replace the bug-finding abilities of software model checking.

In this paper, we take a step forward in understanding the synergies between software model checking and greybox fuzzing. Given a sequential program and a Linear-time Temporal Logic (LTL) property \( \phi \), we construct the Büchi automata \( A_{\neg \phi} \) accepting \( \neg \phi \), and use this automata to guide the fuzz campaign. Thus, given a random input exercising an execution trace \( \pi \), we can check the “progress” of \( \pi \) in reaching the accepting states of \( A_{\neg \phi} \), and derive from \( A_{\neg \phi} \), the events that are needed to make further progress in the automata. Furthermore, in general, traces accepted by \( A_{\neg \phi} \) are infinite in length and visit an accepting state infinitely often. To accomplish
the generation of such infinite-length traces in the course of a fuzz campaign, we can take application state snapshots (at selected program locations) and detect whether an accepting state of \( \mathcal{A}_{\phi} \) is being visited with the same program state. The application state snapshot can also involve a state abstraction if needed, in which case the counterexample trace can be subsequently validated via concrete execution.

We present a fuzzing-based technique that directs fuzzing to find violations of arbitrary LTL properties. To the best of our knowledge, no existing fuzzing technique is capable of finding violations of complex constraints on event orderings such as LTL properties. Existing works on greybox fuzzing are limited to finding witnesses of simple properties such as crashes or use-after-free. This is the main contribution of our work: algorithms and an implementation of our ideas in a tool that is able to validate any LTL property, thereby covering a much more expressive class of properties than crashes or use-after-free. Our work adapts directed greybox fuzzing (which directs the search towards specific program locations) to find violations of temporal logic formulae. We realize our approach for detecting violations of LTL properties in a new greybox fuzzer tool called LTL-Fuzzer. LTL-Fuzzer is built on top of the AFL fuzzer \([1]\) and involves additional program instrumentation to check if a particular execution trace is accepted by the Büchi automaton representing the negation of the given LTL property.

We evaluated LTL-Fuzzer on well-known and large-scale protocol implementations such as OpenSSL, OpenSSH, and Telnet. We show that it efficiently finds bugs that are violations of both safety and liveness properties. We use LTL-Fuzzer to reproduce known bugs/violations in the protocol implementations. More importantly, for 50 LTL properties that we manually extracted from Request-for-Comments (RFCs), LTL-Fuzzer found 15 new bugs (representing the violation of these properties), out of which 10 CVEs have been assigned. These are zero-day bugs which have previously not been found. We make the data-set of bugs found by LTL-Fuzzer available with this paper. We expect that in future, other researchers will take forward the direction in this paper to detect temporal property violations traditionally found by model checkers, via greybox fuzzing. The data-set of bugs found by LTL-Fuzzer can thus form a baseline standard for future research efforts.

## 2 APPROACH OVERVIEW

At a high level, our approach takes a sequential program \( P \) and a Linear-time Temporal Logic (LTL) property \( \phi \) as inputs. The atomic propositions in \( \phi \) refer to predicates over the program variables that can be evaluated to true or false. An example is a predicate \( x > y \) in which \( x \) and \( y \) are program variables. Our approach identifies program locations at which the atomic propositions in the LTL property may be affected. For this, we find program locations at which the values of variables in the atomic proposition and their aliases may change.\(^1\) Our technique outputs a counterexample, i.e., a concrete program input that leads to a violation of the specification. Counterexample generation proceeds in two phases. In the first phase, the program \( P \) is transformed into \( P' \). For this, we use code instrumentation to monitor program behaviors and state transitions during program execution. We check these against the provided LTL property. In the second phase, a fuzz campaign is launched for the program \( P' \) to find a counterexample through directed fuzzing.

We illustrate our technique with an FTP implementation called Pure-FTPd\(^2\). Pure-FTPd is a widely-used open source FTP server which complies with the FTP RFC\(^3\). Here is a property described in the RFC that an FTP implementation must satisfy. The FTP server must stop receiving data from a client and reply with code 552 when user quota is exceeded while receiving data. Code 552 indicates the allocated storage is exceeded. Throughout this paper, we will use this FTP property – as represented by \( \phi \) – to illustrate how our technique finds property violations in Pure-FTPd.

### 2.1 LTL Property Construction

Listing 1: Enabling the user quota option:<ftpd.c, 6072>.

```
6063 #ifdef QUOTAS
6064 case 'n':
...
6072  user_quota_size = (1024ULL * 1024ULL);
6073  /* if(liveness) record_state();
6074  generate_event("s");
6075  if(liveness) record_state();
6076 */
```

Listing 2: Writing to user directories:<safe_rw.c, 12>.

```
12  safe_write(const int fd, const void * const buf_,
13    size_t count, const int timeout)
14 {
15    if(user_dir_size > user_quota){
16      /* generate_event("o");
17      if(liveness) record_state();
18    */
```

Listing 3: Replying msg_quota_exceeded:<ftpd.c, 4444>.

```
4442 afterquota:
4443  if (overflow > 0) {
4444    addreply(552, MSG_QUOTA_EXCEEDED, name);
4445    /* if(liveness) record_state();
4446    generate_event("n");
4447    if(liveness) record_state();
4448 */
```

Listing 4: Entry of a loop statement:<ftpd.c, 4067>.

```
4866  for (;;) {
4867    /* if(liveness) record_state();
4868    generate_event("l");
4869    if(liveness) record_state();
4870 */
```

We start by manually translating the informal property in the RFC into a LTL property \( \phi \). For this, we search the Pure-FTPd source code using keywords APPE and 552. Source code analysis reveals that (1) Pure-FTPd implements a quota-based mechanism to manage user storage space and it works only when activated, and (2) the command APPE is handled by the function dostor(), in which user_quota_size is checked when receiving data. When the quota is exceeded, the server replies with code 552.

\(^1\)In general, our approach requires an alias analysis to map the atomic propositions to program locations.

\(^2\)https://www.pureftpd.org/project/pure-ftpd/

\(^3\)https://www.w3.org/Protocols/rfc959/
Table 1: Mapping between atomic propositions and program locations ("..." indicates omitted loop entries).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicate</th>
<th>Atomic Prop</th>
<th>Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quota_actiuated = true</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>(ftp.d.c, 6072)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>user_dir_size &gt; user_quota</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>(safe_r.w.c, 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(safe_r.w.c, 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>msg_quota_exceeded = true</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>(ftp.d.c, 4444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ftp.d.c, 3481)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loop_entry = true</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>(ftp.d.c, 4057)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(MSG_QUOTA_EXCEEDED) via the function addr_reply(). We therefore construct the property $\phi$ as

$$\neg F(a \land F(o \land G\neg n))$$

(1)

The negation of $\phi$ is thus

$$F(a \land F(o \land G\neg n))$$

where definition of atomic propositions $a, o, n$ appear in Table 1.

Next, we identify program locations where the values of variables in atomic propositions in $\phi$ may change at runtime. A simple example is the proposition $\text{quota\_actiuated = true}$, which corresponds to the program location where quota checking is enabled in Pure-FTPd. At another statement, $\text{user\_dir\_size > user\_quota}$, we consider the first statement of functions that are used to store data in user directories. As a result, whenever data is written to user directories, those functions will be invoked and this proposition will be evaluated, i.e., all cases where user quota is exceeded will be captured in an execution. For $\text{msg\_quota\_exceeded = true}$, we identify function invocations of addr_reply(552, MSG_QUOTA_EXCEEDED...) which are a reply to clients when the quota is exceeded. Specific program locations for each atomic proposition are listed in Table 1. Their corresponding code snippets are shown in Listings 1, 2, 3, and 4. Here, we show one code snippet per atomic proposition. For convenience, we use a tuple $(l, p, cp)$ in which $l$ denotes a program location, $p$ is an atomic proposition, and $cp$ represents the predicate for the atomic proposition $p$. At the end of our manual LTL property generation process, we output a list $L$ comprising such tuples. For the example property, the manual process of writing down the predicates and the accompanying tuples was completed by one of the authors in 20 minutes.

2.2 Program Transformation

After deriving the property $\phi$ and the list of tuples $L$, we transform program $P$ into $P'$, which can report a failure at runtime whenever $\phi$ is violated. We perform this program transformation using two instrumentation modules: (1) Event generator, which generates an event when a proposition in $\phi$ is evaluated to true at runtime; (2) Monitor, which collects the generated events into an execution trace and evaluates if the trace violates $\phi$. If a violation is found, the monitor reports a failure.

Event Generator. To detect changes in $\phi$’s proposition values during program execution, the event generator injects event generation statements at specific program locations. To do so, the generator takes the list $L$ produced in the previous step as input. For each tuple $(l, p, cp) \in L$, the generator injects a statement $\text{if} (cp) \text{ generate\_event(}“p”\text{);}$ at the program location $l$, such that an event associated with $p$ can be generated when condition $cp$ is satisfied. For instance, the program location $(ftp.d.c, 6072)$ corresponds to the proposition variable $a$ (quota\_actiuated = true) and the enabling condition is true. The generator then inserts a statement $\text{if (1) generate\_event(}“a”\text{);}$ at line 6072 in ftp.d.c (see Listing 1). Consequently, whenever $(ftp.d.c, 6072)$ is reached, an event associated with $a$ is generated and recorded at runtime. Instrumentation for the other tuples appear in Listings 2, 3, and 4.

Monitor. The monitor module inserts a monitor into program $P$ to verify if the program behavior conforms to property $\phi$ at runtime. Specifically, the monitor produces a trace $\tau$ by collecting events that are generated during execution (by the instrumented code). It then converts the negation of $\phi$ to a Büchi automata $A_{\neg \phi}$, and checks whether $A_{\neg \phi}$ accepts $\tau$. If the trace is accepted, the monitor reports a failure, i.e., $\phi$ does not hold in $P$. In our Pure-FTPd example, the negation of $\phi$ is $F(a \land F(o \land G\neg n))$, and the converted Büchi automata $A_{\neg \phi}$ is illustrated in Figure 1.

Checking Safety Properties. A Büchi automata accepts a trace $\tau$ if and only if $\tau$ visits an accepting state of the automata “infinitely often” (e.g., state 2 in Figure 1). For the negation of a safety property ($\neg \phi$), the Büchi automata $A_{\neg \phi}$ accepts all traces which reach an accepting state, since all traces reaching an accepting state will loop there infinitely often. Since only a finite prefix of the trace is relevant for obtaining the counter-example of a safety property, the monitor thus outputs a counterexample if it witnesses a trace that leads to an accepting state in the Büchi automata $A_{\neg \phi}$.

Checking Liveness Properties. The Büchi automata of the negation of $\phi$ accepts a trace $\tau$ if and only if $\tau$ visits an accepting state of $A_{\neg \phi}$ “infinitely often” (e.g., state 2 in Figure 1). For instance, an infinite trace $a, o, (v)\omega$ in which $v \neq n$ will be accepted by $A_{\neg \phi}$. Formally, such a trace has the form $\tau = t_1(t_2)^\omega (\{t_2\} \neq 0)$, where $t_1$ starts in an initial state of the Büchi automata $A_{\neg \phi}$ and runs until an accepting state $s$ of $A_{\neg \phi}$, and $t_2$ runs from the accepting state $s$ back to itself. Witnessing a trace $\tau = t_1(t_2)^\omega$ in which $t_2$ occurs “infinitely many times” is difficult in practice, since a fuzz campaign visits program executions which are necessarily of finite length. A straightforward approach to tackle this difficulty is to detect a loop in the trace and terminate execution when witnessing the loop occurs $m$ times, e.g., $\tau = t_1(t_2)^m \ldots$. This approach is insufficient because witnessing $t_2$ for $m$ times does not guarantee $t_2$ occurs infinitely often, for instance for $i=0; i<m+2; i++\{\ldots t_2\ldots \}$ may generate $t_2$ for $m$ times but stops generating $t_2$ after $i=m+1$.

In this paper, we record program states when events associated with atomic propositions occur in the execution and detect a state loop in the witnessed trace. If the execution of the state loop produces $t_2$, that means, trace $t_2$ can be generated infinitely many times by repeatedly going through the state loop. As a result, we...
assume that the witnessed trace can be extended to an infinite \( \tau_1(\tau_2)\omega \) shaped trace. Consider following two sequences witnessed in the execution

\[
\tau_e = e_0 \circ e_1 \cdots \circ e_i \circ e_{i+1} \cdots \circ e_{i+h} \circ e_{i+1} \cdots \circ e_{i+h} \\
\text{loop body} \\
\tau_s = s_0 \circ s_1 \circ \cdots \circ s_{i+h} \circ s_{i+h+1} \circ \cdots \circ s_{i+2h}
\]

where \( \tau_e \) is a sequence of events associated with atomic propositions that occur in the execution and \( \tau_s \) is a sequence of program states that are recorded when events occur, for instance \( s_i \) indicates the program state that is recorded when the event \( e_i \) occurs. Suppose \( s_i \) is identical to \( s_{i+h+1} \), then \( s_i \cdots s_{i+h} \) is a state loop and its loop body is \( s_i \cdots s_{i+h} \). Whenever \( s_i \) takes input \( l_{s_i} \cdots s_{i+h} \) that leads to \( s_i \) from \( s_{i+h+1} \), \( s_i \) will transition to \( s_i \) itself. We assume that the system under test is a reactive system taking a sequence of inputs and is deterministic, that is, the same input always leads to the same program behavior in the execution. Thus, \( e_i e_{i+1} \cdots e_{i+h} \) can be generated infinitely many times by repeatedly executing \( l_{s_i} \cdots s_{i+h} \) on state \( s_i \). Trace \( \tau_e = e_0 \circ \cdots \circ e_{i-1} \circ e_i \circ e_{i+h} \circ e_{i+1} \circ \cdots \circ e_{i+h} \) can be generated by running input \( l_{s_i} \cdots s_{i+h} \) \( \omega \) times, where \( l_{s_i} \cdots s_{i+h} \) is an input that leads to state \( s_i \) from \( s_0 \) and \( l_{s_i} \cdots s_{i+h} \) is an input that leads to \( s_i \) from \( s_{i+h+1} \).

As explained, occurrence of a state loop in the execution is evidence that the witnessed trace can be extended to an infinite \( \tau_1(\tau_2)\omega \) shaped trace. We leverage this idea to find a violation of a liveness property. When witnessing a trace in the execution that can be extended to a \( \tau_1(\tau_2)\omega \) shaped trace that is accepted by Büchi automata \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \), we consider a violation of the liveness property has been found. Hence, for liveness property guided fuzzing, we enrich the program transformation of \( P \) to \( P' \) as follows: (1) instrumenting a function call that records the current program state when an event appearing in a transition label of \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) occurs in the execution (shown in Listing 1-4) — specifically, function call record_state() takes the current program state and generates a hash code for the state at runtime; (2) instrumenting event-generating and state-recording statements at the entries of for and while loop statements in the program to observe possible loops in fuzzing. Listing 4 shows the instrumentation of a for loop statement in Pure-FTPd. More detailed and specific optimizations about state saving for checking liveness properties, appear in Section 5.

### 2.3 Witnessing Event Sequences

Since program \( P' \), generated in the previous step, reports a failure when \( \phi \) is violated, we can find a counterexample for \( \phi \) by fuzzing \( P' \). An input that leads to such a failure is a counterexample. However, finding an input of this kind is challenging because it has to generate an execution in which certain events occur in a specific order. In our running example of Pure-FTPd, the quota mechanism must be activated first in the execution, then user_quota must be exceeded, and finally the execution must enter a loop in which no msg_quota_exceeded is sent back to the client. Existing directed fuzzing approaches like AFLGo [16] aim to direct fuzzing towards a particular program location and cannot drive execution through multiple program locations in a specific order. We now discuss our Büchi automata guided fuzzing in the next section.

### 3 BüCHI AUTOMATA GUIDED FUZZING

Given an LTL property \( \phi \) to be checked, automata-theoretic model checking of LTL properties [54] constructs the Büchi automata \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) accepting all traces satisfying \( \neg \phi \). In this section we will discuss how \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) can be used to guide fuzzing. First we design a mechanism to generate an input whose execution passes through multiple program locations in a specific order. We design this mechanism by augmenting a greybox fuzzer in two ways.

- Power scheduling. During fuzzing, the power scheduling component tends to select seeds closer to the target on the pre-built inter-procedural control flow graph. Thus, the target can be reached efficiently. To achieve this, we use the fuzzing algorithm of AFLGo [16].
- Input prefix saving. This component observes execution and records input elements that have been consumed when reaching a target.

As mentioned, we focus on fuzzing reactive systems that take a sequence of inputs. The mechanism we follow involves directing fuzzing towards multiple program locations in a specific order. Consider a sequence of program locations \( l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_n \). Our approach works as follows: first, it takes \( l_i \) as the first target and focuses on generating an input that leads to \( l_i \). Meanwhile, it observes execution and records the prefix \( l_i \) that leads to \( l_i \). Next, it takes \( l_i \) as the target, and focuses on exploring the space of inputs starting with prefix \( l_i \), i.e., keeping generating inputs starting with \( l_i \). As a result, an input that reaches \( l_i \) via \( l_i \) can be generated.

Based on the above mechanism of visiting a sequence of program locations, we develop an automata-guided fuzzing approach. The approach uses the Büchi automata \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) instrumented in program \( P' \) and observes the progress that each trace makes on \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) at runtime, e.g., how many state transitions are made towards the accepting state. To guide fuzzing, the approach saves the progress each input achieves on \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) and uses it to generate inputs that make further progress. Specifically, it saves the progress for each input by recording state transitions that are executed on \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) and the input prefix that leads to those transitions. Consider input \( i_0 \) and its trace \( t_0 \) goes from initial state \( s_0 \) to state \( s_m \) on automata \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \). The achieved progress is represented as a tuple \( (x_0, x_1, x_2) \), where \( x_0 \) is the shortest prefix of \( i_0 \) whose execution trace goes from \( s_0 \) to \( s_m \) and \( x_1, x_2 \) is the state transition sequence \( s_0 \cdots s_m \) visited. Such progress tuples are stored into a set \( X \) and are used to guide fuzzing.

For input generation, the approach takes a tuple from \( X \) and uses it to generate inputs that makes further progress. Consider a tuple \( (x', x^2) \): \( x^2 \) records state transitions on automata \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) which input prefix \( x' \) has led to. Thus, we can query \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) with \( x^2 \) to find a transition that makes further progress, i.e., a state transition that gets closer to an accepting state of \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \). In the example, assuming \( x^2 \) is state 0 in Figure 1, then the transition from state 0 to state 1 will be identified since state 1 is closer to the accepting state 2. Suppose \( t \) is the next progressive state transition of \( x^2 \), then we can further query \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) to obtain atomic propositions that trigger transition \( t \). Then, by querying the map between atomic propositions and program locations, we can identify program locations for those atomic propositions. In the example, atomic proposition \( a \) triggers transition from state 0 to state 1 and its corresponding program location is \( \{ftp.d.c, 6072\} \), as shown in Table 1.
Algorithm 1: Counterexample-Guided Fuzzing

| Input: P: The transformation of program under test |
| Input: A_\phi: Automata of negation of property under test |
| Input: map: Map between propositions and program locations |
| Input: flag: True for liveness properties |
| Input: total_time: Time budget for fuzzing |
| Input: target_time: Time budget for reaching a program location |

1. Procedure Fuzz(P, A_\phi, map, flag, total_time, target_time)
2. \( s_0 \leftarrow \text{getInitState}(A_\phi) \)
3. \( X \leftarrow \{(0, s_0)\}; //\text{Starting with init state of } A_\phi \)
4. for time < total_time do
5. \( (x_i^0, x_i^1) \leftarrow \text{selectPrefix}(X) \);
6. \( p \leftarrow \text{selectTargetAtomicProposition}(A_\phi, x_i^0) \);
7. \( t \leftarrow \text{selectProgramLocationTarget}(\text{map}, p) \);
8. for time’ < target_time do
9. \( I \leftarrow \text{generateInput}(D, S_{\text{power}}) \)
10. \( I’ \leftarrow \text{replacePrefix}(I, x_i^1) \)
11. \( d, (x_i^2, x_i^3) \leftarrow \text{evaluate}(P, I’, \text{flag}) \)
12. \( D \leftarrow D \cup \{d\} \)
13. \( X \leftarrow X \cup \{(x_i^2, x_i^3)\} \)
14. end
15. end

From the above we can define criteria for an input to make further progress: (1) its execution has to follow the path that an input prefix \( x^i \) has gone through such that the generated trace can go through state transitions \( x^i \); and, (2) subsequently the execution reaches one of program locations that are identified above to ensure the generated trace takes a step further in \( A_\phi \).

To generate inputs of this kind, our mechanism for generating inputs that traverse a sequence of program locations in a specific order comes into play. Assume \( l_i \) is one of program locations identified above, for making further “progress” in \( A_\phi \). The mechanism takes \( l_i \) as the target and keeps generating inputs that start with prefix \( x^i \) until generating an input that starts with prefix \( x^i \) and subsequently visits location \( l_i \). This is how our approach uses tuples in \( A_\phi \) to generate inputs that make further “progress” towards an accepting state in the Büchi automata \( A_\phi \). The detailed fuzzing algorithm is now presented.

4 FUZZING ALGORITHM

Algorithm 1 shows the workflow of our counterexample guided fuzzing. To find a counterexample, the algorithm guides fuzzing in two dimensions. First, it prioritizes the exploration of inputs whose execution traces are more likely to be accepted by \( A_\phi \). Specifically, if the trace of the prefix of an input reaches a state that is closer to an accepting state on \( A_\phi \), then its trace is more likely to be accepted. The algorithm selects input prefixes whose traces have been witnessed to get close to an accepting state and keeps generating inputs starting with them (shown in line 5 and line 10). Secondly, the algorithm focuses on generating inputs whose execution makes further progress on \( A_\phi \). Given an input prefix, the algorithm finds a state transition \( t \) that helps us get closer to an accepting state in \( A_\phi \), and finds the atomic propositions which enable \( t \) to be taken (line 6). For the atomic propositions enabling transition \( t \), we identify the corresponding program locations (line 7). Then we attempt to generate inputs that reach the program location in the execution and trigger the program behavior associated with the atomic proposition. As a result, the generated trace can make further progress in \( A_\phi \). To generate inputs that reach a particular program location, we leverage the algorithm proposed in AFLGo (line 8-14). Its idea is to assign more power to seeds that are closer to the target on a pre-built control flow graph such that the generated inputs are more likely to reach the target. The time budget for reaching a target is configurable, via parameter target_time.

For prefix selection (line 5), the algorithm defines a fitness function to compute a fitness value for each prefix tuple. Given a tuple \( (x_i^0, x_i^1) \), its fitness value is

\[
\phi_t = \frac{l_x}{l_x + l_a} + \frac{1}{l_i}
\]

where \( l_x \) is the length of \( x_i^0 \) and \( l_a \) is the length of the shortest path from the last state of \( x_i^0 \) to an accepting state on \( A_\phi \) and \( l_i \) is the length of input prefix \( x_i^1 \). As shown in the formula, a prefix tuple has a higher fitness value if the last state of \( x_i^0 \) is closer to an accepting state on \( A_\phi \) and the input prefix is shorter. Heuristically, by extending such a prefix, our fuzzing algorithm is more likely to generate an input whose execution trace is accepted by \( A_\phi \). Prefix tuples with higher fitness values are prioritized for selection.

For atomic proposition selection (line 6), we adopt a random selection strategy. Consider tuple \( (x_i^0, x_i^1) \) and the last state of \( x_i^0 \) is \( s_t \), the algorithm identifies atomic propositions that make a progressive transition from \( s_t \) on \( A_\phi \) as follows: if state \( s_t \) is not an accepting state of \( A_\phi \), any atomic proposition that triggers a transition from \( s_t \) towards an accepting state is selected. If state \( s_t \) is an accepting state, any atomic proposition that triggers a transition from \( s_t \) back to itself is selected. For simplicity, the algorithm randomly selects one from the identified atomic propositions. When the selected proposition \( p \) has multiple associated program locations, we randomly select one of them as a target. The main consideration for adopting a random strategy is to keep our technique as simple as possible. Moreover, these strategies can be configured in our tool.

5 STATE SAVING

In liveness property verification, LTL-Fuzzer detects a state loop in the witnessed trace. If a state loop is detected, LTL-Fuzzer assumes the current trace can be extended to a lasso-shaped trace \( \tau_1(\tau_2) \). This works with a concrete representation of program states, however in reality state representation of software implementations are always abstracted. State representations that are too abstract may miss capturing variable states that are relevant to the loop, which leads to false positives. State representations that are too concrete may contain variable states that are irrelevant to the loop such as a variable for system-clock, which leads to false negatives. To be practical, LTL-Fuzzer takes a snapshot of application’s registers and addressable memory and hashes it into a 32-bit integer, which is recorded as a state. Addressable memory indicates two kinds of objects: (1) global variables (2) objects that are explicitly allocated with functions malloc() and alloca(). Such a convention was also adopted in previous works on infinite loop detection [19, 51].
Furthermore, LTL-Fuzzer only records a program state for selected program locations, not for all program locations. Specifically, we only save states for the program locations associated with the transition labels of the automata $A_{\phi}$ where $\phi$ is the liveness property being checked. Note that a transition label in $A_{\phi}$ is a subset of atomic propositions [54, 55]. The full set of atomic propositions is constructed by taking the atomic propositions appearing in $\phi$ and embellishing this set with atomic propositions that we introduce for occurrence of each program loop header (such as $l$ in Table 1). If the transition label involves a set $L$ of atomic propositions, we track states for only those atomic propositions in $L$ which correspond to loop header occurrences. The goal here is to quickly find possible infinite loops by looking for a loop header being visited with the same program state. Hence, for the transition label $l$ in our running example, we only store states for the program locations corresponding atomic proposition $l$ in Table 1.

### Listing 5: Quota checking:<ftpd.c. 4315>.

```
4315  if (...(max_filesize >= (off_t) 0 &&
        (max_filesize=user_quota_size - quota.size)
        < (off_t) 0))
  ...
4322      goto afterquota;
4323  }
```

In the example shown in Section 2, LTL-Fuzzer witnesses a state generated at program location `<ftpd.c. 4067>` (shown in Listing 4) that has been observed before and at the same time the witnessed trace is accepted by $A_{\phi}$. In this case, LTL-Fuzzer reports a violation of the LTL property $\phi$ shown in Page 3. To validate if the violation is spurious, we check if the observed state loop can be repeated in the execution. Our analysis shows a chunk of data was read during the execution of the state loop and the chunk of data was from a file uploaded by the client. We duplicated the chunk of data in the uploaded file and reran the experiment and found the state loop was repeated. That means the witnessed trace can be extended to a $\tau_1\tau_2\ldots\tau_n$ shaped trace, which visits the accepting state of the automata accepting $\neg\phi$ (shown in Figure 1) infinitely many times. Thus, the reported violation is not spurious.

We further analyzed the root cause of the violation. It shows there was a logical bug in the quota checking module. As shown in Listing 5, the assignment of `max_filesize` occurs in a conditional statement and is never executed due to that `max_filesize`’s initial value is -1. To fix the bug, we created a patch and submitted a pull request on the Github repo of Pure-FTPD, which has been confirmed and verified.

6 LTL-FUZZER IMPLEMENTATION

We implement LTL-Fuzzer as an open source tool built on top of AFL, which comprises two main components: instrumentor and fuzzing engine. In the following, we explain these components.

6.1 Instrumentation Module

AFL comes with a special compiler pass for c1ang that instruments every branch instruction to enable coverage feedback. By extending this compiler, we instrument a program under test at three levels: specific locations, basic blocks, and the application.
7 EVALUATION

In our experiments, we seek to answer the following questions:

**RQ1 Effectiveness**: How effective is LTL-Fuzzer at finding LTL property violations?

**RQ2 Comparison**: How does LTL-Fuzzer compare to the state-of-the-art validation tools in terms of finding LTL property violations?

**RQ3 Usefulness**: How useful is LTL-Fuzzer in revealing LTL property violations in real-world systems?

7.1 Subject Programs

Table 2 lists the subject programs used in our evaluation. This includes 7 open source software projects that implement 6 widely-used network protocols. We selected these projects because they (1) are reactive software systems that LTL-Fuzzer is designed for, (2) include appropriate specification documents from which LTL properties can be generated, and (3) are widely-used and have been studied. Finding bugs in such real-world systems is thus valuable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Protocol</th>
<th>#SLOC</th>
<th>InPreviousWork</th>
<th>GithubStars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live555 [4]</td>
<td>RTSP</td>
<td>52.5k</td>
<td>[46] [45]</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenSSH [5]</td>
<td>SSH</td>
<td>98.3k</td>
<td>[28] [45]</td>
<td>1.5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TinyDTLS [11]</td>
<td>DTLS</td>
<td>63.2k</td>
<td>[27] [45]</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 Experiment Setup

To answer the research questions, we conducted three empirical studies on the subject programs.

7.2.1 Effectiveness of LTL-Fuzzer. We evaluate LTL-Fuzzer’s effectiveness by running it on a set of LTL properties in subject programs where violations are already known; we check the number of LTL properties for which LTL-Fuzzer can find violations. To create such a data set, we collect event ordering related CVEs (so that they can be captured as a temporal property) that these subject programs follow to extract temporal properties. Based on the aforementioned criteria, we collected 14 CVEs in 7 subjects as shown in Table 3; these LTL properties can be found in the appendix provided with this paper. Our goal is to check experimentally if LTL-Fuzzer can find violations of these LTL properties.

7.2.2 Comparison with other tools. We evaluate LTL-Fuzzer and state-of-the-art techniques on the LTL property data set above and compare them in terms of the number of LTL properties for which each technique finds the violations and the time that is used to find a violation. For state-of-the-art techniques, we reviewed recent and well-known techniques in both model checking and directed fuzzing domains. We chose the following techniques for comparison with LTL-Fuzzer.

- **AFLGo [16]**. It is a well known directed greybox fuzzier which drives execution to a target with a simulated annealing-based power schedule that assigns more energy to inputs that hold the trace closer to the target. We take it as a baseline tool.
- **AFL-LTL**. It is an implementation which enables AFLGo to detect an LTL property violation. Specifically, AFL-LTL powers AFLGo with only the LTL test oracle such that it can report an error when the given LTL property is violated in the execution. By comparing with AFL-LTL, we evaluate how effective is our automata-guided fuzzing strategy in finding LTL property violations. Note that AFL-LTL is also a tool built by us, but it lacks the automata guided fuzzing of LTL-Fuzzer.
- **L+NuSMV**. It combines model learning and model checking to verify properties in a software system. Specifically, it leverages a learning library called LearnLib [37] to build a model for the software system and then verifies given properties on the learned model with the well-known model checker NuSMV [21]. In the paper, we indicate it with L+NuSMV. This technique was published at CAV 2016 [26] and has been subsequently adopted in recent works such as [59] and [27].

We briefly summarize why we did not include certain other model-checkers or fuzzers for comparison. Model checking tools CBMC [22], CPAchecker [15], Seahorn [32], SMACK [48], UAutomizer [34], DIVINE [14] cannot support LTL property verification. Schemel’s work [51] published at CAV 2018 partially supports LTL property verification. SPIN [35] supports LTL property verification but only works with a modeling language Promela [8] and the tool provided in SPIN for extracting models from C programs failed to work on our subject programs. Some model checking tools [36, 52], and directed fuzzing tools (like UAFL [58], Hawkeye [20] and TOFU [60]) we reviewed, are not publicly available.

7.2.3 Real-world utility. In this study, we read RFC specifications that these subject programs follow to extract temporal properties and describe them in LTL. Then we use LTL-Fuzzer to check these properties on the subject programs.

**Configuration Parameters.** Following fuzzing evaluation suggestions from the community [41], we run each technique for 24 hours and repeat each experiment 10 times to achieve statistically significant results. For the initial seeds, we use seed inputs provided in ProFuzzBench [45] for all subjects. ProFuzzBench is a benchmark for stateful fuzzing of network protocols, which contains a suite of representative open-source network protocol implementations. For

---

For some tools, the LTL checker module is not available for usage / experimentation, as our email enquiry with CPAchecker team revealed.
### 7.3 Experimental Results

#### 7.3.1 [RQ1] Effectiveness. Table 3 shows property violations found by LTL-Fuzzer for the 14 LTL properties derived from known CVEs. The first column shows identifiers of the properties being checked. The corresponding LTL properties and their descriptions can be found in the appendix. Columns 2 - 5 represent CVE-IDs, types of vulnerabilities that CVEs represent, subject names, and subject versions, respectively. Column “LTL-Fuzzer” shows the time that is used to find a violation on the 14 LTL properties in the experiment. Note that “T/O” indicates a technique failed to find the violation within the given time budget (i.e., 24 hours). To mitigate randomness in fuzzing, we adopted the Vargha-Delaney statistic $\hat{A}_{12}$ [56] to evaluate whether one tool significantly outperforms another in terms of the time that is used to find a violation. The $\hat{A}_{12}$ is a non-parametric measure of effect size and gives the probability that a randomly chosen value from data group 1 is higher or lower than one from data group 2. It is commonly used to evaluate whether the difference between two groups of data is significant. Moreover, we also use Mann-Whitney U test to measure the statistical significance of performance gain. When it is significant (taking 0.05 as a significance level), we mark the $\hat{A}_{12}$ values in bold.

Table 3: Statistics of found violations and the performance of four tools in finding the violations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop</th>
<th>CVE-ID</th>
<th>Type of Vulnerability</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>LTL-Fuzzer</th>
<th>AFL_4_LTL</th>
<th>AFL_Go</th>
<th>L_Nu_SMV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time(h)</td>
<td>Time(h)</td>
<td>Time(h)</td>
<td>Time(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$PV_1$</td>
<td>CVE-2019-18217</td>
<td>Infinite Loop</td>
<td>ProFTPD</td>
<td>1.3.6</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$PV_2$</td>
<td>CVE-2019-12815</td>
<td>Illegal File Copy</td>
<td>ProFTPD</td>
<td>1.3.5</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.01 0.84</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$PV_3$</td>
<td>CVE-2015-3306</td>
<td>Improper Access Control</td>
<td>ProFTPD</td>
<td>1.3.5</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.89 0.76</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$PV_4$</td>
<td>CVE-2010-3867</td>
<td>Illegal Path Traversal</td>
<td>ProFTPD</td>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>5.17 0.85</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_1$</td>
<td>CVE-2019-6256</td>
<td>Improper Condition Handle</td>
<td>Live555</td>
<td>2018.10.17</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>11.13 1.00</td>
<td>11.47 1.00</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_2$</td>
<td>CVE-2019-15232</td>
<td>Use after Free</td>
<td>Live555</td>
<td>2019.02.03</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.42 0.91</td>
<td>1.46 0.92</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_3$</td>
<td>CVE-2019-7314</td>
<td>Use after Free</td>
<td>Live555</td>
<td>2018.08.26</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>4.18 0.98</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_4$</td>
<td>CVE-2013-6934</td>
<td>Numeric Errors</td>
<td>Live555</td>
<td>2013.11.26</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.58 0.40</td>
<td>2.21 0.39</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_5$</td>
<td>CVE-2013-6933</td>
<td>Improper Operation Limit</td>
<td>Live555</td>
<td>2011.12.23</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.99 0.63</td>
<td>1.45 0.33</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SH_1$</td>
<td>CVE-2018-15473</td>
<td>User Enumeration</td>
<td>OpenSSH</td>
<td>7.7p1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17 0.44</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
<td>24.00 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SH_2$</td>
<td>CVE-2016-6210</td>
<td>User Information Exposure</td>
<td>OpenSSH</td>
<td>7.2p2</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19 0.50</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
<td>24.00 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SL_1$</td>
<td>CVE-2016-6309</td>
<td>Use after Free</td>
<td>OpenSSL</td>
<td>1.1.0a</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>6.00 0.74</td>
<td>6.58 0.82</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SL_2$</td>
<td>CVE-2016-6305</td>
<td>Infinite Loop</td>
<td>OpenSSL</td>
<td>1.1.0</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SL_3$</td>
<td>CVE-2014-0160</td>
<td>Illegal Memory Access</td>
<td>OpenSSL</td>
<td>1.0.1f</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>7.31 1.00</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
<td>T/O 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Found violations in total: 14
- Average time usage (hours): 1.91
- Comparison with LTL-Fuzzer on time usage: -
- Comparison with AFL\_Go on time usage: -

1 T/O represents tools cannot find vulnerabilities within 24 hours for 10 experimental runs. We replace T/O with 24 hours when calculating average usage time.

2 Statistically significant values of $\hat{A}_{12}$ are shown in bold.

7.3.2 [RQ2] Comparison. As shown in Table 3, the last three main columns show the time that is used for comparison techniques to find a violation on the 14 LTL properties in the experiment. Note that “T/O” indicates a technique failed to find the violation for an LTL property in the given time budget (i.e., 24 hours). To mitigate randomness in fuzzing, we adopted the Vargha-Delaney statistic $\hat{A}_{12}$ [56] to evaluate whether one tool significantly outperforms another in terms of the time that is used to find a violation. The $\hat{A}_{12}$ is a non-parametric measure of effect size and gives the probability that a randomly chosen value from data group 1 is higher or lower than one from data group 2. It is commonly used to evaluate whether the difference between two groups of data is significant. Moreover, we also use Mann-Whitney U test to measure the statistical significance of performance gain. When it is significant (taking 0.05 as a significance level), we mark the $\hat{A}_{12}$ values in bold.

LTL-Fuzzer is found to be effective in finding LTL property violations, detecting violations for all 14 properties derived from known CVEs. Contiki-Telnet, which is not contained in ProFuzzBench, we generate random inputs as its initial seeds. For LTL-Fuzzer, we need to specify the time budget for reaching a single program location and we configure it with 45 minutes for each target. For AFL\_Go and AFL\_4\_LTL, we need to provide a target for an LTL property being checked. We specify the target by randomly selecting from program locations that are associated with atomic propositions that trigger the transition to an accepting state on the automata of the negation of the property. In the example in Section 2, we chose one of loop entries as the target since proposition $o$ triggers the transition to the accepting state shown in Figure 1 and it corresponds with loop entries. For execution environments, we conducted experiments on a physical machine with 64 GB RAM and a 56 cores Intel(R) Xeon(R) E5-2660 v4 CPU, running a 64-bit Ubuntu TLS 18.04 as the operating system.
LTL-Fuzzer for CVE-2018-15473 and CVE-2016-6210. We investigated these 4 CVEs and found that triggering those vulnerabilities is relatively straightforward. They can be triggered without sophisticated directing strategies. As a result, other techniques achieve a slightly better performance than LTL-Fuzzer for these four CVEs. In terms of the $\hat{A}_{12}$ statistic, LTL-Fuzzer performs significantly better than other techniques in most cases.

LTL-Fuzzer found violations of all the 14 LTL properties in the experiment. AFL$_{\text{LTL}}$, AFLGo and L+NuSMV found 12, 5, 2 property violations, respectively. LTL-Fuzzer is 3.44x, 8.93x, 12.55x faster than AFL$_{\text{LTL}}$, AFLGo, and L+NuSMV.

7.3.3 [RQ3] Real-world utility. In this study, we evaluate utility of LTL-Fuzzer by checking whether it can find zero-day bugs in real-world protocol implementations. We extract 50 properties from RFCs that our subject programs follow (aided by comments in the source code of the programs) and write them in linear-time temporal logic. The details of the 50 LTL properties can be found in the appendix. In the experiment, LTL-Fuzzer achieved a promising result. Out of these 50 LTL properties, LTL-Fuzzer discovered new violations for 15 properties, which are shown in Table 4. We reported these 15 zero-day bugs to developers and all of them got confirmed by developers. We reported them on the common vulnerabilities and exposures (CVE) system (https://cve.mitre.org/) and 10 of them were assigned CVE IDs. Out of the 10 assigned CVEs, 5 are not allowed to be disclosed for responsible disclosure (three months are requested for fixing). Thus, we indicate them with “CVE-xxxx-xxxx”. Out of 15 reported violations, 3 have been fixed at the time of the submission of our paper. Notably, LTL-Fuzzer shows effectiveness in finding violations for liveness properties. In the experiment, LTL-Fuzzer successfully found violations for 4 liveness properties which are $PrF_1$, $Sl_2$, $TD_1$ and $PuF_3$. All the 4 violations were confirmed by developers, i.e., they are not spurious results. Moreover, to discover violations for these 4 liveness properties, LTL-Fuzzer only recorded 6, 11, 4 and 9 states, respectively. Since every state is recorded as a 32-bit integer, the memory consumption for recording states is thus found to be negligible in our experiments.

Among 50 LTL properties extracted from protocol RFCs, LTL-Fuzzer found 15 previously unknown violations in protocol implementations and 10 of these have been assigned CVEs.

7.4 Threats to validity

There are potential threats to validity of our experimental results. One concern is external validity, i.e., the degree to which our results can be generalized to and across other subjects. To mitigate this concern, we selected protocol implementations that are widely used and have been frequently evaluated in previous research (as shown in Table 2). Besides, we may have made mistakes in converting informal requirements into LTL properties. To reduce this kind of bias, we let two authors check generated properties and remove those on which they do not agree, or do not think are important properties. Another concern is internal validity, i.e., the degree to which our results minimize systematic error. First, to mitigate spurious observations due to the randomness in the fuzzers and to gain statistical significance, we repeated each experiment 10 times and reported the Vargha-Delaney statistic $\hat{A}_{12}$. Secondly, our LTL-Fuzzer implementation may contain errors. To facilitate scrutiny, we make LTL-Fuzzer code available via Zenodo artifact repository.

8 RELATED WORK

Model Checkers. Model checking is a well-known property verification technique dating back to 1980s [23, 47]; it is used to prove a temporal property in a finite state system, or to find property violation bugs. The early works check a temporal logic property against a finite state transition system. There exist well-known model checkers such as [21, 35, 38] which can be used to check temporal properties on a constructed model (via state space exploration). To construct models, one method is manual construction via a modeling language. This requires substantial effort and can be error-prone [31, 43]. LTL-Fuzzer directly checks software implementations; it does not separately extract models from software.

Early works on model checking have been extended to automatically find bugs in software systems, which are typically infinite-state systems. Model checking of software systems usually involves either some extraction of finite state models, or directly analyzing the infinite state software system via techniques such as symbolic analysis. Automatic model extraction approaches [12, 24, 33, 50] include the works on predicate abstraction and abstraction refinement [12, 13] which build up a hierarchy of finite-state abstract models for a software system for proving a property. These approaches extract models which are conservative approximations and capture a superset of the program behavior. There are a number of stateful software model checkers, such as CMC [43], Java Pathfinder [57], MaceMC [39], CBMC [22], CPAchecker [15], which find assertion violations in software implementations. Many of these checkers do not check arbitrary LTL properties for software implementations. These model checkers either suffer from state space explosion, or suffer from other kinds of explosion such as the explosion in the size/solving-time for the logical formula in bounded model checking. In contrast, LTL-Fuzzer does not save any states for safety property checking and saves only certain property-relevant program states in liveness property checking. At the same time, LTL-Fuzzer does not give verification guarantees and does not perform complete exploration of the state space. We now proceed to discuss incomplete validation approaches.

Incomplete Checkers. Instead of exploring the complete set of behaviors, or a super-set of behaviors, one can also explore a subset of behaviors. Incomplete model learning approaches [53] can be mentioned in this regard. The active model learning technique, such as LearnLib [37], is widely used to learn models of real-world protocol implementations [25–28]. It does not need user involvement. But it is time-consuming and hard to determine whether the learned model represents the complete behavior of the software system [53, 61]. Compared with the active learning, LTL-Fuzzer can more rapidly check properties, as shown in our experimental comparison with LearnLib+NuSMV. To alleviate the state-explosion problem, stateless checkers such as VeriSoft [29] and Chess [44] have been proposed; these checkers do not store program states. These works typically involve specific search strategies to check
specific classes of properties such as deadlocks, assertions and so on. In contrast, LTL-Fuzzer represents a general approach to find violations of any LTL property.

Greybox Fuzzing. There are three broad variants of fuzzing: black-box fuzzing [42], whitebox fuzzing or symbolic execution [18, 36, 51], and greybox fuzzing [1, 16, 17, 20, 49, 58]. We first discuss greybox fuzzing since they are the most widely used in industry today. In contrast to software model checking, blackbox/greybox fuzzing techniques represent a random/biased-random search over the domain of inputs for finding bugs or vulnerabilities in programs. Most greybox fuzzing techniques are used to detect memory issues (e.g., buffer overflow and use after free) that can produce observable behaviors (e.g., crashes). However, LTL-Fuzzer can not only witness simple properties like memory corruption, but also detect LTL property violations, for any given LTL property, however complex. Recent advances in greybox fuzzing use innovative objective functions for achieving different goals, such as [16] directs the search to specific program locations. The capabilities of LTL-Fuzzer go beyond visiting specific locations, and LTL-Fuzzer is used to witness specific event ordering constraints embodied by the negation of an arbitrary LTL property. PGFuzz [40] is a greybox-fuzzing framework to find safety violations for robotic vehicles, but it is customized to be used on implementations of robotic vehicles. LTL-Fuzzer can be used to find violation of any LTL property for software from any application domain.

Symbolic Execution based Validation. Symbolic execution or whitebox fuzzing approaches are typically used to find violations of simple properties such as assertions [18, 30]. Recent whitebox fuzzing techniques do find violations of certain classes of properties. Schemmel’s work [51] checks liveness properties while CHIRON [36] checks safety properties. [62, 63] proposed regular-property guided dynamic symbolic execution to find the program paths satisfying a property. However, all of these approaches require a long time budget for heavy-weight program analysis and back-end constraint solving. As a result, these techniques face challenges in scalability. In contrast, LTL-Fuzzer is built on top of greybox fuzzing; it can validate arbitrarily large and complex software implementations.

9 PERSPECTIVE

We present LTL-Fuzzer, a linear-time temporal logic guided greybox fuzzing technique, which takes Linear-time Temporal Logic (LTL) properties extracted from informal requirements such as RFCs and finds violations of these properties in C/C++ software implementations. Our evaluation shows that LTL-Fuzzer is effective in finding property violations. It detected 15 LTL property violations in real world protocol implementations that were previously unknown; 10 of these zero day bugs have been assigned CVEs. We make the data-set of LTL properties, and our tool available for scrutiny.
Our work shows the promise of synergising concepts from temporal property checking with recent advances in greybox fuzzing (these advances have made greybox fuzzing more systematic and effective). Specifically, in this paper we have taken concepts from automata-theoretic model checking of LTL properties [54], while at the same time adapting/ augmenting directed greybox fuzzing [16]. The main advancement of greybox fuzzing in our work, is the ability to find violations of arbitrary LTL properties, which is achieved by borrowing the Büchi automata construction from [54]. We note that the real-life practical value addition of software model checking is often from automated bug-finding in software implementations rather than from formal verification. Our work essentially shows the promise of enjoying the practical benefits of software model checking more efficiently and effectively via augmentation of (directed) greybox fuzzing. This is partially shown by the experiments in this paper where we have compared our work with both model checkers and fuzzers. Arguably we could compare LTL-FUZZER with more model checkers and fuzzers, experimentally. At the same time, we have noted that many model checkers were found to be not applicable for checking arbitrary LTL properties of arbitrary software implementations. Moreover, the problem addressed by LTL-FUZZER is certainly beyond the reach of fuzzers since fuzzers cannot detect temporal property violations. Overall, we believe our work represents a practical advance over model checkers and a conceptual advance over greybox fuzzers. We expect that the research community will take the work in our paper forward, to further understand the synergies between software model checking and greybox fuzzing.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Our replication package with the tool and data-set are available upon request, by emailing all the authors.
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APPENDIX

A PROPERTIES EXTRACTED FROM EXISTING CVES

Table 5: Properties extracted from existing CVEs in the implementations of Pro-FTPD (PrF) for the FTP protocol, Live555 (Lv) for the RTSP protocol, OpenSSH (Sh) for the SSH protocol, OpenSSL (Sl) for the TLS protocol, TinyDTLS (Td) for the DTLS protocol, Contiki-Telnet (Ct) for the TELNET protocol, and Pure-FTpd (PuF) for the FTP protocol.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Vulnerability</th>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>LTL Notation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PrF1</td>
<td>CVE-2019-18217</td>
<td>After one client succeeds to connect with a sever, the server should finally give responses for requests from the connected client.</td>
<td>G((LogIN) → (Xi((G((Requests) → (X(F(Responses)))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrF2</td>
<td>CVE-2019-12815</td>
<td>If a client doesn’t log in successfully, the server must not allow this client to copy files.</td>
<td>G(~(LogIN)) → (Xi(G((Requests) → (X(F(Responses)))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrF3</td>
<td>CVE-2015-3306</td>
<td>If the server receives CPFR and CPTO requests when the client doesn’t succeed to log in, must not allow CPTO successfully.</td>
<td>G(~(LogIN)) → (Xi(G((request = CPFR) ∧ (request = CPTO)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrF4</td>
<td>CVE-2010-3867</td>
<td>If the client logs in and is only assigned one writable directory, the server must not allow it to write out of scope of the assigned directory.</td>
<td>G((state = LogIN) ∧ (request = OverWrite)) → (X(G(response = PermissionDenied))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv1</td>
<td>CVE-2019-6256</td>
<td>After the connection channel is DESTROYED between the server and the client, the channel must not be USED unless one new connection is ESTABLISHED.</td>
<td>G((channel = DESTROYED) → (Xi(((channel = ESTABLISHED) R (~((channel = USED))))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv2</td>
<td>CVE-2019-15252</td>
<td>The server must not create two client sessions with the same ID.</td>
<td>G((SessionID = RID) → (Xi(~((SessionID = RID))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv3</td>
<td>CVE-2019-7314</td>
<td>If the server receives the PLAY request in the INIT state, must not begin StartPlay</td>
<td>G((state = INIT) → (Xi((request = PLAY) → (X(G(~(response = StartPlay)))))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv4</td>
<td>CVE-2013-6934</td>
<td>If receiving a invalid request, must always refuse it with Method_not_Allowed.</td>
<td>G((request = InvalidRequest) → X(G(response = Method_not_Allowed))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv5</td>
<td>CVE-2013-6933</td>
<td>If receiving a invalid request, must always refuse it with Method_not_Allowed.</td>
<td>G((request = InvalidRequest) → X(G(response = Method_not_Allowed))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh1</td>
<td>CVE-2018-15473</td>
<td>Whenever the server receives invalid username or valid username with wrong password, must give the same response.</td>
<td>G(((request = InvalidUsername) ∨ (request = ValidUsername)) → (X(G((SameResponse))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh2</td>
<td>CVE-2016-6210</td>
<td>Whenever the server receives invalid username or valid username with wrong password, must give responses within the same time period.</td>
<td>G(((request = InvalidUsername) ∨ (request = ValidUsername)) → (X(G((SameTimeToResponse))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl1</td>
<td>CVE-2016-6309</td>
<td>If the server receives the ChangeCipherSpec request after sending the ServerHello response, should give a ChangeCipherSpec response or an Alert.</td>
<td>G((response = ServerHello) → (X((request = ChangeChangeCipherSpec) ∧ X(G((response = ChangeCipherSpec) ∨ (response = Alert))))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl2</td>
<td>CVE-2016-6305</td>
<td>If the server receives an ApplicationData after the Handshake is successful, must finally give an Alert or response the ApplicationData.</td>
<td>G((state = HandshakeDone) ∧ (request = ApplicationData) → (X(F(response = ApplicationData) ∨ (response = Alert))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl3</td>
<td>CVE-2014-0160</td>
<td>After the server receives a ClientHello request with the heartbeat extension in the peer_allowed_to_send mode, and gives a ServerHello response with the same options, the server receives a malformed Heartbeat request with the payload length field number larger than the real payload length, must always not send Heartbeat responses.</td>
<td>G(((request = ClientHello) ∧ (Heartbeat_extension = true) ∧ (peer_allowed_to_send = 1)) ∧ (X(G((request = ServerHello) ∧ (Heartbeat_extension = true) ∧ (peer_allowed_to_send = 1))) → F(G(<del>(response = Heartbeat_Request) ∧ (PayloadLength &gt; 3+realPayloadLength)) → F(G(</del>(response = Heartbeat_Response))))))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B LTL PROPERTIES EXTRACTED FROM RFC AND COMMENTS

Please see the following pages for the Linear-time Temporal Logic properties extracted from sources such as RFCs.
Table 6: Properties extracted from relevant RFCs of network protocols and comments in the implementations of Pro-FTPd (PrF) for the FTP protocol, Live555 (LV) for the RTSP protocol, OpenSSL (SH) for the SSH protocol, OpenSSL (SL) for the TLS protocol, TinyDTLS (TD) for the DTLS protocol, Contiki-Telnet (CT) for the TELNET protocol, and Pure-FTPd (PuF) for the FTP protocol.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>PID</th>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>LTL Notation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PrF3</td>
<td>If receiving invalid username or invalid password, the server must always show the same message to the user.</td>
<td>G(((request = InvalidUsername) ∨ (request = InvalidPassword)) → X(G(sameResponse)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PrF6</td>
<td>If receiving the CWD request without login, the server must not give the CommandOkay response.</td>
<td>G(¬((state = LogIn)∧ (request = CWD)) → X(G((response = CommandOkay))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PrF7</td>
<td>After a connection is constructed successfully, there should be a successful login and after that without failed login.</td>
<td>G(((request = ValidUserName) ∧ (request = ValidPassword)) → (response = LoginSuccess)) → X(G(¬(response = LoginFailed)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PrF8</td>
<td>If the connection is lost after a long time, responses should be always timeout.</td>
<td>G(LostConnection → X(G(response = Timeout)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LV3</td>
<td>If the server is in the Play state and receives a Pause request, should go into the Ready state.</td>
<td>G(((state = Play) ∧ (request = Pause)) → X(G(state = Ready)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LV7</td>
<td>If the server is in the Play state and receives a TEARDOWN request, should go into the Init state.</td>
<td>G(((state = Play) ∧ (request = TEARDOWN)) → X(G(state = Init)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LV9</td>
<td>If the server is in the Ready state and receives a Play request with one old URI, should response ChangeTransportParam.</td>
<td>G(((state = Ready) ∧ (request = Play) ∧ (OldURI = true)) → X(G(response = ChangeTransportParam)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LV9</td>
<td>If the server is connected with a client and then receives a TEARDOWN request, should finally give a TeardownSuccess or Timeout response.</td>
<td>G(((request = Setup) ∧ (response = SetupSuccess) ∧ (request = TEARDOWN)) → X(F((response = TeardownSuccess) ∨ (response = Timeout))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LV10</td>
<td>The TEARDOWN request will not be acknowledged until the the SETUP request is be acknowledged.</td>
<td>G(¬((request = Teardown) ∧ (response = TeardownSuccess)) U (request = SETUP) ∧ (response = SetupSuccess))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SH3</td>
<td>If the server receives the SSH_MSG_CHANNEL_OPEN request and gives a SSH_MSG_CHANNEL_OPEN_CONFIRMATION response, and then receives a LogIn request and gives a SSH_MSG_USERAUTH_SUCCESS, there will not have a failure in user authentication.</td>
<td>G(((request = SSH_MSG_CHANNEL_OPEN) ∧ (response = SSH_MSG_CHANNEL_OPEN_CONFIRMATION) ∧ (request = LogIn) ∧ (response = SSH_MSG_USERAUTH_SUCCESS)) → X(G(¬(response = SSH_MSG))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SH4</td>
<td>After the server gives a KEXINIT request, will not give the KEXINIT or AcceptConnection response until receiving the NewKeys request.</td>
<td>G(response = KEXINIT) → X((response = KEXINIT) ∧ (response = AcceptConnection)) U (request = NewKeys))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SH5</td>
<td>All authentication messages after a ConnectionSuccess response should give no response until the end condition is true.</td>
<td>G((request = ConnectionSuccess) → X((NoResponse) U (EndCondition = true)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SL4</td>
<td>If SECURE_RENEGOTIATION is disabled and the server receives a ClientHello request with renegotiation option and an empty &quot;RENEGOTIATED_CONNECTION&quot; field, must send a ServerHello response without the renegotiation option.</td>
<td>G((SECURE_RENEGOTIATION = disabled) ∧ (request = ClientHello) ∧ (RenegotiationExtension = enabled) ∧ (RENEGOTIATED_CONNECTION = empty)) → X(G(response = ServerHello) ∧ (RenegotiationExtension = disabled)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SL5</td>
<td>If SECURE_RENEGOTIATION is disabled the server receives a ClientHello with renegotiation extension and not an empty &quot;RENEGOTIATED_CONNECTION&quot; field, must make a HandshakeFailure response.</td>
<td>G((SECURE_RENEGOTIATION = disabled) ∧ (request = ClientHello) ∧ (RenegotiationExtension = enabled) ∧ (¬RENEGOTIATED_CONNECTION = empty))) → X(G(response = HandshakeFailure)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SL6</td>
<td>If SECURE_RENEGOTIATION is enabled and the server receive ClientHello with SCSV (TLS_EMPTY_RENEGOTIATION_INFO_SCSV), must give a HandshakeFailure response.</td>
<td>G((SECURE_RENEGOTIATION = enabled) ∧ (request = ClientHello) ∧ (SCSV = enabled)) → X(G(response = HandshakeFailure)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SL7</td>
<td>If SECURE_RENEGOTIATION is enabled and the server receives a ClientHello request without renegotiation extension, must then abort the handshake with a HandshakeFailure response.</td>
<td>G((SECURE_RENEGOTIATION = enabled) ∧ (request = ClientHello) ∧ (RenegotiationExtension = false)) → X(G(response = HandshakeFailure)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SL8</td>
<td>If SECURE_RENEGOTIATION is enabled and the server receives a ClientHello request but &quot;RENEGOTIATED_CONNECTION&quot; field is not the same as the saved CLIENT_VERIFY_DATA value, must give a HandshakeFailure response.</td>
<td>G((SECURE_RENEGOTIATION = enabled) ∧ (request = ClientHello) ∧ (¬RENEGOTIATED_CONNECTION = CLIENT_VERIFY_DATA)) → X(G(response = HandshakeFailure)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SL9</td>
<td>After the server receives a ClientHello request without renegotiation extension and gives a ServerHello response, then receives a ClientHello again, must refuse the renegotiation with an Alert.</td>
<td>G(((request = ClientHello) ∧ (RenegotiationExtension = disabled) ∧ (X(response = ServerHello))) ∧ (X(request = ClientHello))) → X(G(response = Alert)))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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19. **TD**₁
   If the server is in the WAIT_CLIENTHELLO state and receives a ClientHello request with valid cookie and the epoch value 0, must finally give ServerHello responses.

   \[ G(\text{state} = \text{WAIT_CLIENTHELLO}) \rightarrow X((\text{request} = \text{ClientHello}) \land (\text{ValidCookie} = \text{true}) \land (\text{EpochValue} = 0)) \rightarrow X(G(\text{response} = \text{ServerHello}))) \]

20. **TD**₂
   If the server is in the WAIT_CLIENTHELLO state and receives a ClientHello request with valid cookie but not 0 epoch value, must not give ServerHello responses before receiving ClientHello with 0 epoch value.

   \[ G(\text{state} = \text{WAIT_CLIENTHELLO}) \rightarrow X((\text{request} = \text{ClientHello}) \land (\text{ValidCookie} = \text{true}) \land (\neg (\text{EpochValue} = 0)) \land (X(\neg(\text{request} = \text{ClientHello}) \land (\text{ValidCookie} = \text{true}) \land (\text{EpochValue} = 0)))) \rightarrow X(G(\neg(\text{response} = \text{ServerHello}))) \]

21. **TD**₃
   If the server is in the WAIT_CLIENTHELLO state and receives a ClientHello request with an invalid cookie, must reply HelloVerifyRequest.

   \[ G(\text{state} = \text{WAIT_CLIENTHELLO}) \rightarrow X((\text{request} = \text{ClientHello}) \land (\text{ValidCookie} = \text{false})) \rightarrow X(G(\text{response} = \text{HelloVerifyRequest}))) \]

22. **TD**₄
   If the server is in the WAIT_CLIENTHELLO state but receives a ChangeCipher request, must refuse it with an Alert.

   \[ G(\text{state} = \text{WAIT_CLIENTHELLO}) \rightarrow X((\text{request} = \text{ChangeCipher}) \rightarrow X(G(\text{response} = \text{Alert}))) \]

23. **TD**₅
   If the server is in the DTLS_HT_CERTIFICATE_REQUEST state and receives a Certificate request, must give a DTLS_ALERT_HANDSHAKE_FAILURE response or DTLS_ALERT_DECODE_ERROR, or set Client_Auth to be verified.

   \[ G(\text{state} = \text{DTLS_HT_CERTIFICATE_REQUEST}) \rightarrow X((\text{request} = \text{Certificate}) \rightarrow X(G(\text{response} = \text{DTLS_ALERT_DECODE_ERROR} \lor \text{response} = \text{DTLS_ALERT_HANDSHAKE_FAILURE} \lor (\text{Client_Auth} = \text{true})))) \]

24. **TD**₆
   If SECURE_RENEGOTIATION is disabled and the server receives a ClientHello request with renegotiation option and an empty "RENEGOTIATED_CONNECTION" field, must send a ServerHello response without the renegotiation option.

   \[ G(\text{SECURE_RENEGOTIATION} = \text{disabled}) \land (\text{request} = \text{ClientHello}) \land (\text{RenegotiationExtension} = \text{enabled}) \land (\neg(\text{RENEGOTIATED_CONNECTION} = \text{empty})) \rightarrow X(G(\text{response} = \text{ServerHello}) \land (\text{RenegotiationExtension} = \text{disabled})) \]

25. **TD**₇
   If SECURE_RENEGOTIATION is disabled and the server receives a ClientHello with renegotiation extension and not an empty "RENEGOTIATED_CONNECTION" field, must send a ServerHello response without the renegotiation option.

   \[ G(\text{SECURE_RENEGOTIATION} = \text{disabled}) \land (\text{request} = \text{ClientHello}) \land (\text{RenegotiationExtension} = \text{false}) \land (\neg(\text{RENEGOTIATED_CONNECTION} = \text{empty})) \rightarrow X(G(\text{response} = \text{ServerHello})) \]

26. **TD**₈
   If SECURE_RENEGOTIATION is enabled and the server receive ClientHello with SCSV (TLS_EMPTY_RENEGOTIATION_INFO_SCSV), must give a HandshakeFailure response.

   \[ G(\text{SECURE_RENEGOTIATION} = \text{enabled}) \land (\text{request} = \text{ClientHello}) \land (\text{SCSV} = \text{enabled}) \rightarrow X(G(\text{response} = \text{HandshakeFailure})) \]

27. **TD**₉
   If SECURE_RENEGOTIATION is enabled and the server receives a ClientHello request without renegotiation extension, must then abort the handshake with a HandshakeFailure response.

   \[ G(\text{SECURE_RENEGOTIATION} = \text{enabled}) \land (\text{request} = \text{ClientHello}) \land (\text{RenegotiationExtension} = \text{false}) \rightarrow X(G(\text{response} = \text{HandshakeFailure})) \]

28. **TD**₁₀
   If SECURE_RENEGOTIATION is enabled and the server receives ClientHello request but 'RENEGOTIATED_CONNECTION' field is not the same as the saved CLIENT_VERIFY_DATA value, must give a HandshakeFailure response.

   \[ G(\text{SECURE_RENEGOTIATION} = \text{enabled}) \land (\text{request} = \text{ClientHello}) \land (\neg(\text{RENEGOTIATED_CONNECTION} = \text{CLIENT_VERIFY_DATA})) \rightarrow X(G(\text{response} = \text{HandshakeFailure})) \]

29. **TD**₁₁
   After the server receives a ClientHello request without renegotiation extension and gives a ServerHello response, then receives a ClientHello again, must refuse the renegotiation with an Alert.

   \[ G(\neg \text{((request} = \text{ClientHello}) \land \neg(\text{RenegotiationExtension} = \text{diabled}) \land \neg(\text{Xresponse} = \text{ServerHello}))) \land (\text{X(request} = \text{ClientHello})))) \rightarrow X(G(\text{response} = \text{Alert}))) \]

30. **TD**₁₂
    After the server receives a clientHello request and gives a ServerHello response, then receives a ClientKeyExchange request with a different epoch value than that of ClientHello, server must not give ChangeCipherSpec responses.

    \[ G(\text{request} = \text{ClientHello}) \land (\text{X(request} = \text{ServerHello}) \land (\text{X(request} = \text{ClientKeyExchange}) \land (\neg(\text{EpochValue_{ae} = EpochValue_{e0})))) \rightarrow X(G(\neg(\text{ChangeCipherSpec}))) \]

31. **TD**₁₃
    After the server receives a ClientHello request and gives a ServerHello response, then receives a ClientHello request with the same epoch value as that of the first one, server must not give ServerHello.

    \[ G(\text{request} = \text{ClientHello}) \land (\text{X(request} = \text{ServerHello}) \land (\text{X(request} = \text{ClientHello}) \land (\text{EpochValue_{ae} = EpochValue_{e0})))) \rightarrow X(G(\neg(\text{ServerHello}))) \]

32. **TD**₁₄
    If the server receives a ClientHello request and gives a HelloVerifyResponse request, and then receives a over-large packet even with valid cookies, the server must refuse it with an Alert.

    \[ G(\text{request} = \text{ClientHello}) \land (\text{response} = \text{HelloVerifyRequest}) \rightarrow X(G(\text{response} = \text{Alert}))) \rightarrow X(G(\neg(\text{response} = \text{ServerHello}))) \]

33. **CT**₁
    After WILL request is received and the corresponding option is disabled, must send DO or DONT responses.

    \[ G(\text{request} = \text{WILL}) \land (\text{option} = \text{Disabled}) \rightarrow X(G(\text{response} = \text{DO}) \lor \text{response} = \text{DONT})) \]

34. **CT**₂
    After DO request is received and the corresponding option is disabled, must send WILL or WONT responses.

    \[ G(\text{request} = \text{DO}) \land (\text{option} = \text{Disabled}) \rightarrow X(G(\text{response} = \text{WILL}) \lor \text{response} = \text{WONT})) \]

35. **CT**₃
    After WILL request is received and the corresponding option is enabled, must not give responses.

    \[ G(\text{request} = \text{WILL}) \land (\text{option} = \text{Enabled}) \rightarrow X(G(\text{response} = \text{NOResponse})) \]

36. **CT**₄
    After DO request is received and the corresponding option is enabled, must not give responses.

    \[ G(\text{request} = \text{DO}) \land (\text{option} = \text{Enabled}) \rightarrow X(G(\text{NOResponse})) \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>CT₅</td>
<td>After WONT request is received and the corresponding option is enabled, must send the DONT response.</td>
<td>G((request = WONT) ∧ (option = Enabled)) → X(G(response = DONT))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>CT₆</td>
<td>After DONT request is received and the corresponding option is enabled, must send the WONT response.</td>
<td>G((request = DONT) ∧ (option = Enabled)) → X(G(response = WONT))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>CT₇</td>
<td>After WONT request is received and the corresponding option is disabled, must not give responses.</td>
<td>G((request = WONT) ∧ (option = Disabled)) → X(G(NOResponse))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>CT₈</td>
<td>After DONT request is received and the corresponding option is disabled, must not give responses.</td>
<td>G((request = DONT) ∧ (option = Disabled)) → X(G(NOResponse))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>CT₉</td>
<td>If receive IAC in NORMAL state, next go to the SIAC state and finally go back to the NORMAL state.</td>
<td>G(((request = IAC) ∧ (state = NORMAL)) → X(G(state = IAC))) → X(F(state = NORMAL)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>CT₁₀</td>
<td>Before Disconnection, must send an Alert to disconnect with clients.</td>
<td>G(¬(Disconnection)) ∨ (response = Alert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>CT₁₁</td>
<td>If conduct COMMAND without AbortOutput, the response must be same as the real execution results.</td>
<td>G(((request = COMMAND) ∧ (¬(AbortOutput))) → X(G(response = realResults)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>PuF₁</td>
<td>If receiving invalid username or invalid password, the server must always show the same message to the user.</td>
<td>G(((request = InvalidUsername) ∨ (request = InvalidPassword)) → X(G(sameResponse)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>PuF₂</td>
<td>After one client succeeds to connect with a sever, the server should finally give responses for requests from the connected client.</td>
<td>G(LogIN) → X(G((Requests) → X(F(Responses))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PuF₃</td>
<td>If receiving the CWD request without login, the server must not give the CommandOkay response.</td>
<td>G(¬(state = LogIN) ∧ (request = CWD)) → X(G(¬(response = CommandOkay)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>PuF₄</td>
<td>If a client doesn’t log in successfully, the server must not allow this client to copy files.</td>
<td>G(¬(LogIN)) → X(G((request = CopyFiles) → X(G(¬(response = CopySuccessful)))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>PuF₅</td>
<td>If user directory size is larger than the set quota when the quota mechanism is activated, must finally reply that the quota is exceeded.</td>
<td>G(((quota_activated = true) ∧ (user_dir_size &gt; user_quota)) → F(msg_quota_exceeded= true))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>PuF₆</td>
<td>After a connection is constructed successfully, there should be a successful login and after that without failed login.</td>
<td>G(((request = ValidUserName) ∧ (request = ValidPasswd)) → (response = LoginSuccess)) → X(G(¬(response = LoginFailed)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>PuF₇</td>
<td>After the connection is lost after a long time, responses should be always timeout.</td>
<td>G(LostConnection → X(G(response = Timeout)))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>