Translating PVS to C

SRI International

Gaspard Férey

Ecole Polytechnique

September 1st, 2014

Table of Contents

- Context
- Static analysis
 - The update issue
 - Reference tracking
 - Mutable analysis
- The PVS Translator
 - Architecture
 - Implementation
- Conclusion
 - Demonstration

Table of Contents

- Context
- Static analysis
 - The update issue
 - Reference tracking
 - Mutable analysis
- The PVS Translator
 - Architecture
 - Implementation
- 4 Conclusion
 - Demonstration

What is PVS?

- A specification language
 - Typed expression definition
 - ► Theories, datatypes, ...
- A semi automated theorem prover
 - Higher order logic
 - ► Type system, judgments, ...
 - ▶ Theorems, properties, ...
 - ► SMT solvers integrated, tools, ...
- A functional programming language (?)

Why translate PVS?

- To be able to execute PVS
 - Testing
 - Debugging
- To integrate high-insurance PVS code into systems

Table of Contents

- Context
- Static analysis
 - The update issue
 - Reference tracking
 - Mutable analysis
- The PVS Translator
 - Architecture
 - Implementation
- 4 Conclusion
 - Demonstration

Update expression

In functional programming languages,

$$E := A \text{ WITH } [(x) := y]$$

refers
$$i \mapsto \begin{cases} A(i) & \text{if } i \neq x \\ y & \text{if } i = x \end{cases}$$

- In imperative languages
 - ▶ A[x := y] a non destructive update using a copy of A.
 - ► A[x <- y] a destructive, in-place update of the aggregate structure representing A.

Two dangers

Unsafe occurrence

The array represented by A is used later in the code.

Trapped reference

LET
$$A = B(0)$$
 IN $f(A WITH [(0) := 0], B(0))$

B is affected by a destructive update of the array represented by A.

Previous analysis

Shankar's analysis relies on sets of variables

- Av active variables
- Ov output variables
- Fv free variables
- Lv live variables in an update context

Cerny and Shankar's analysis adds flow analysis.

The intermediate language

Syntax

- Integers, nil pointer
- Variables (X, x, y, ...)
- newArray(x, y)
- X[x := y]
- X[x <- y]
- X[x]
- let x = a in e
- if(x) e_1 else e_2
- $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$

Memory state representation:

- Variables space Var
- ullet Reference space ${\cal R}$
- ullet Value space $\mathcal{V}:=\mathbb{N}\cup\mathcal{R}$
- Store $R: \mathcal{R} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}$
- Stack $S: Var \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}$

Evaluation context

- hole {}
- let x = {} in e
- $E_1\{E_2\}$

The intermediate language

Operational semantics

Simple reduction rules:

Introducing variables

$$\langle f(x_1, ..., x_n) | R, S \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{pop}([f]) | R, \left(\biguplus_{1 \le i \le n} f_i \mapsto S(x_i) \right) :: S \rangle$$

$$\langle \text{let } x = v \text{ in } e | R, S \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{pop}(e) | R, (x \mapsto v) :: S \rangle$$

$$\langle \text{pop}(v) | R, S \rangle \rightarrow \langle v | R, pop(S) \rangle$$

The intermediate language

Operational semantics

Modifying the store

$$< \operatorname{newArray}(x,y) | R,S> \to < r | R \uplus \left(r \mapsto (S(y))_{0 \leq i < S(x)}\right), S>$$
 where r is a fresh pointer
$$< X [x := y] | R,S> \to < r | R',S>$$
 where r fresh pointer
$$\text{and} \quad R' := R \uplus (r \mapsto A)$$

$$\text{and} \quad A := R(S(X)) \uplus (S(x) \mapsto S(y))$$

$$< X [x <-y] | R,S> \to < X | R',S>$$
 where $R' := R \uplus (S(X)) \uplus (S(x) \mapsto S(y))$ and $A := R(S(X)) \uplus (S(x) \mapsto S(y))$

For a context in the body of a function

```
f(A, B) =
  let C = if(A[0] = 1) then A else B in
  let D =
    let E = C in E[0 := 0] in
  D[0] + A(0)
```

we can define the reference graph $\mathcal{G}(R)(r)$ as

$$r \in \mathcal{G}(r)$$


 $\mathcal{R} \cap R(\mathcal{G}(r)) \subset \mathcal{G}(r)$

We are interested in

$$\bigcup_{R} S^{-1}(\mathcal{G}(R)(S(x)))$$

Definition of f

Reference graph




Variables lives in the context

 $\{\mathtt{B},\mathtt{D},\mathtt{E},\mathtt{F},\mathtt{G},\mathtt{H},\mathtt{X}\}$

Destructive update would impose too many requirements to f.

Definition of f

Reference graph




Variables lives in the context

$$\{\mathtt{B},\mathtt{C},\mathtt{D},\mathtt{F},\mathtt{G},\mathtt{H},\mathtt{X}\}$$

B is live in the context.

Reference graph





Variables lives in the context

$$\{\mathtt{B},\mathtt{C},\mathtt{G},\mathtt{H}\}$$


Destructive update possible.

Variables lives in the context

{}

Destructive update possible.

Reference graph



The flags

We implement an approximation of the analysis using three flags

mutable

- Variable: Every other variable that may point to that variable is not live.
- Argument: Variables passed as this argument must be flagged mutable and safe.
- ▶ Function: The result of a call to that function is "fresh".

dupl

- Argument: Possible active variable in a call to this function.
- Expression: May be aliased to the return value.

safe

▶ Last of occurrence of a variable

The rules

- Two versions for each function
 - destructive
 - non destructive
- mutable flag:

• dupl flag:

Destructive version of f

C no flags

Destructive version of f

f(A, B) =

Destructive version of f

let C = A[0]

in

C no flags

D mutable

← non destructive update

Destructive version of f

C no flags
D **mutable**← non destructive update
E no flags

Destructive version of f

C no flags

D mutable

non destructive update

E no flags

X mutable

mon destructive update

Destructive version of f

C no flags

D mutable

non destructive update

E no flags

X mutable

non destructive update

F mutable

← D and X safe and mutable

Destructive version of f

C no flags

D mutable

non destructive update

E no flags

X mutable

non destructive update

F mutable

 \longleftarrow D and X **safe** and **mutable**

G mutable

← F safe and mutable

Destructive version of f

C no flags

D mutable

non destructive update

E no flags

X mutable

non destructive update

F mutable

← D and X safe and mutable

G mutable

 \longleftarrow F safe and mutable

H mutable

← G and B safe and mutable

Destructive version of f

C no flags

D mutable

non destructive update

E no flags

X mutable

non destructive update

F mutable

← D and X safe and mutable

G mutable

← F safe and mutable

H mutable

← G and B safe and mutable

⇒ Arguments B gets mutable

Destructive version of f

C no flags

D mutable

non destructive update

E no flags

X mutable

non destructive update

F mutable

← D and X safe and mutable

G mutable

← F safe and mutable

H mutable

 \longleftarrow G and B **safe** and **mutable**

⇒ Arguments B gets **mutable**

H safe

A reference counting GC

We complete the static analysis with a reference counting garbage collector (GC)

- Easy to implement in C (hashtable of pointers)
- Memory freed soon
- The reference count can allow safe update to be made destructive

Table of Contents

- Context
- Static analysis
 - The update issue
 - Reference tracking
 - Mutable analysis
- The PVS Translator
 - Architecture
 - Implementation
- 4 Conclusion
 - Demonstration

Translation steps

- Typechecking: PVS typechecker
 - ► TCCs are generated
- Lexical and syntactic analysis: PVS lexer and parser
 - ▶ PVS → CLOS representation
- Translation:
 - lackbox CLOS representation \longrightarrow intermediate language

Translation steps (2)

- Static analysis:
 - destructive updates added
- Optimizations: Several passes
 - Choosing C types
 - Declaring and freeing variables
- Code generation:
 - $\blacktriangleright \ \ intermediate \ language \longrightarrow compilable \ C \ code$

Implementation details

- In Common Lisp
- Directly integrated to PVS (soon)
- Require the GMP library to run C code

Table of Contents

- Context
- Static analysis
 - The update issue
 - Reference tracking
 - Mutable analysis
- The PVS Translator
 - Architecture
 - Implementation
- Conclusion
 - Demonstration

Conclusion

Questions?



Demonstration

