Computerate Specifying

@ Hackathon 112

2021-11-05

Marc Petit-Huguenin

Computerate Specifying

- "Computerate Specifying" original goal is to ensure that examples in RFCs are correct, because examples are often misunderstood as normative.
- A computerate specification is written in AsciiDoc, a variant-less markdown-like format that is extensible by design, and use a xml2rfc v3 renderer provided by the Metanorma project.
- Extensions allow to add code to a document (Literate Programming) and to insert the result of code evaluation in the document itself.

Example Specification

```
> t : String
> t = concat (take rc' (map (\t => show t ++ " ms, ")
>    (transmissions 0 rto)))
>    ++ "and " ++ show (transmission rto rc') ++ " ms"

For example, assuming an RTO of code:[rto]ms, requests would be sent at times code:[t].
If the client has not received a response after code:[transmission rto (cast (rc - 1)) + rto * rm] ms, the client will consider the transaction to have timed out.
```

tools computerate -t ietf -x rfc,txt,html,pdf rfc8489.lipkg

For example, assuming an RTO of 500 ms, requests would be sent at times 0 ms, 500 ms, 1500 ms, 3500 ms, 7500 ms, 15500 ms, and 31500 ms. If the client has not received a response after 39500 ms, the client will consider the transaction to have timed out.

Correct By Construction

- We have a tradition of verification tools at the IETF (MIB, ABNF, YANG) but instead computerate specifications allow to generate examples that are already correct by construction.
- That requires to use a programming language that has a type system that can encode higher order logic, which for computerate specifications is Idris2.

ABNF DSL

- The tooling is mostly done, now the work is on providing Idris modules (libraries) that can solve common problems for I-D authors.
- A Domain Specific Language (DSL) can be used to define ABNF grammars:

```
> alpha : Abnf True
> alpha = rule "ALPHA" $ hexRange 0x41 0x5a
> <|> hexRange 0x61 0x7a

code::[alpha]

ALPHA = %x41-5A / %x61-7A
```

ABNF Examples

 A discarded idea was to generate examples from an ABNF. This is wrong because not all the constraints in a PDU can be encoded in ABNF:

```
sexp = list / token
token = 1*digit ":" *OCTET
list = "(" sexp ")"
```

 Here the number of OCTET must be equal to the number that precedes the colon, which cannot be expressed in ABNF.

ABNF Examples

 The right way to generate an example is to define a type for sexp, and eventually a DSL:

```
> data SExp : Type where
> SList : SExp -> SExp
> SToken : String -> SExp

> (>>) = SList
> t = SToken
```

- But how to be sure that a printable value of that type (i.e., an example) is correct according to the ABNF?
- That was the subject of my work at the Hackathon.

Proof of Valid Example

 First we need a way to create a proof that a string is valid according to an Abnf:

```
> data Valid : List Int -> Abnf c -> Type
```

- A proof of that type can be inserted in the AsciiDoc document and will display the validated string.
- Then we just have to implement a conversion between our SExp type and this proof:

```
> example : SExp -> (s : List Int ** Valid s sexp)
```

Convert a Type Instance into a Proof

 Now we can directly insert in the document an example that is correct by construction:

```
code::[snd $ example (do (t "a"); (t "b"); do (T "c"))]
```

which will display:

```
(1:a1:b(1:c))
```

Links

Documentation:

https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-petithuguenincomputerate-specifying/

- The link to the tooling is inside the documentation.
- The feature explained here is part of -15, released on November