

MSc Project Notes

Opale

May 7, 2024

1 Memory model constructor cheatsheet

Note $X^? \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \uplus \perp$, $X^\emptyset \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \uplus \emptyset$

1.1 Examples per language

Language	Memory Model
WISL	$\text{PMap}(\text{Loc}, \text{OneShot}(\text{List}(\text{Exc}(\text{Val}))))$
JSIL	$\text{PMap}(\text{Loc}, \text{PMap}(\text{Str}, \text{Exc}(\text{Val}^\emptyset)) \otimes \text{PMap}(\text{Loc}, \text{Ag}(\text{Val})))$

1.2 State Models

Base building blocks for later transformers. They store values of type τ , usually *Value* or something derived from it. They all define a **load** and **store** action.

Name	Purpose	Type	Predicates
Exc	Exclusive ownership of a specific resources	$\tau^?$	PointsTo
Ag	Multiple parties agree on the same value for a resource	τ	Agree
Frac	Allow partial (readonly) ownership of an object	$\tau \times (0, 1]$	Frac

1.3 State Model Transformers

State model transformers take one or more input state models \mathbb{S} (and an auxiliary sort I in the case of PMap), and result in a new state model. Here the “Type” column only specifies the type of the resulting memory model, the inputs are inferred. $\mathbb{S}.\Sigma$ stands for the heap type of memory model \mathbb{S} .

Name	Purpose	Type	Actions	Predicates
Product (\otimes)	Two simultaneous states, each being updated separately (eg. <i>List</i>)	$\mathbb{S}_1.\Sigma \times \mathbb{S}_2.\Sigma$	lift with A1 , A2	
Sum (\oplus)	Either of two states existing	$\mathbb{S}_1.\Sigma \uplus \mathbb{S}_2.\Sigma$	lift with A1 , A2	
PMap	Define memory as a map of address (a sort I) to value	$(I \xrightarrow{\text{fin}} \mathbb{S}.\Sigma) \times \mathcal{P}(I)^? \text{ *1}$	lift with index in-param	
List	Ensure continuous memory allocation	$(\mathbb{N} \xrightarrow{\text{fin}} \mathbb{S}.\Sigma) \times \mathbb{N}^? \text{ *2}$	lift with index in-param	
Freeable	The program only has one go at something (eg. freeing memory)	$\text{Exc}(\mathbb{S}.\Sigma) \oplus \text{Exc}(\{\emptyset\})$	free	

*1 Full definition: $\{(h, d) \in (I \xrightarrow{\text{fin}} \tau) \times \mathcal{P}(I)^? \mid \text{dom}(h)^? \subseteq d\}$, with the heap h and d the domain set indicating the non-missing indices.

*2 Full definition: $\{(b, n^?) \in (\mathbb{N} \xrightarrow{\text{fin}} \tau) \times \mathbb{N}^? \mid \text{dom}(b) \subseteq [0, n^?]\}$, with b the block and n the size of the block if known.

2 MonadicSMemory Functions

Name/Type	Description
type init_data	Data needed to initialise the memory model (global context)
type vt = SVal.M.t	Type of GIL Values - always SVal.M
type st = SVal.SESubst.t	Type of substitutions
type c_fix_t	How to fix missing errors
type err_t	Errors encountered (missing, program errors, logical errors)
type t	State type
type action_ret = (t * vt list, err_t) result	Alias for return type of actions/consume
val init init_data -> t	Construct the state model, with init_data obtained from ParserAndCompiler
val get_init_data t -> init_data	Returns the init_data used to construct this memory model, to avoid having the engine keep track of it
val clear t -> t	Returns an “empty” copy of the state, ie. the state when it is constructed from init_data
val execute_action action_name:string -> t -> vt list -> action_ret Delayed.t	Executes a GIL action with given parameters, returns a symbolic outcome
val consume core_pred:string -> t -> vt list -> action_ret Delayed.t	Subtract the state corresponding to the given core predicate, the given vt list being the in-params of the predicate, and the vt list of the returned action_ret being the out-params.
val produce core_pred:string -> t -> vt list -> t Delayed.t	Extend the state with the given core predicate – vt list are the in-params AND the out-params of the predicate
val is_overlapping_asrt string -> bool	Always false, to make Gillian handle overlapping equality stuff
val copy t -> t	Produces a copy of the state (in case it is mutable)
val pp Format.formatter -> t -> unit	Pretty print the state
val substitution_in_place st -> t -> t Delayed.t	Applies substitution to the state, replacing variables with their values. Not in place.
val clean_up ?keep:Expr.Set.t -> t -> Expr.Set.t * Expr.Set.t	Ignore
val lvars t -> Containers.SS.t	Returns all logical values in the state to ensure that simplifications don’t remove variables we need
val alocs t -> Containers.SS.t	Returns all the abstract locations in the state – ignore for now or return recursively
val assertions ?to_keep:Containers.SS.t -> t -> Asrt.t list	Make a list of logical assertions from the state (*, predicates, formulae, typing...). Note sure what to_keep is.
val mem_constraints t -> Formula.t list	Weird extra well-formedness assertions, that shouldn’t matter because they should be handled in produce anyways.
val pp_c_fix Format.formatter -> c_fix_t -> unit	Pretty print fix value
val get_recovery_tactic t -> err_t -> vt Recovery_tactic.t	Given a state and error, returns two lists of values that should be folded and unfolded respectively
val pp_err Format.formatter -> err_t -> unit	Pretty print error
val get_failing_constraint err_t -> Formula.t	A formula that must be satisfied to avoid causing the given error (?)
val get_fixes t -> PFS.t -> Type.env.t -> err_t -> (c_fix_t list * Formula.t list * (string * Type.t) list * Containers.SS.t) list	???

Name/Type	Description
val can_fix err_t -> bool	If an error is fixable (if missing)
val apply_fix t -> c_fix_t -> (t, err_t) result Delayed.t	Apply a given fix to a state, possibly resulting in a new error
val pp_by_need Containers.SS.t -> Format.formatter -> t -> unit	Pretty print the state (?)
val get_print_info Containers.SS.t -> t -> Containers.SS.t * Containers.SS.t	Given ? and a state, returns a tuple of ? and ? to print
val sure_is_nonempty t -> bool	If this state fragment is empty - can be over-approximated to always be false
val split_further t -> string -> vt list -> err_t -> (vt list list * vt list) option	If an error occurred when trying to split a core predicate, offers a new way of splitting it, with a list of ins and ways of learning the outs. Related to wands. Can always return None

3 Mismatches

Differences between the theory and what is implemented in Gillian.

Theory	Gillian
val eval_action : $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Sigma \rightarrow Val\ list \rightarrow (\mathcal{O} \times Val \times \Sigma)\ set$	val execute_action : $string \rightarrow t \rightarrow vt\ list \rightarrow action_ret\ Delayed.t$ with $action_ret = (t * vt\ list, err_t)\ result$ (note vt list, rather than vt)
produce $\sigma\ \delta\ \vec{v}_i\ \vec{v}_o = \{\sigma \cdot \sigma_\delta \mid \sigma_\delta \models \langle \delta \rangle (\vec{v}_i, \vec{v}_o)\}$, ie. val produce : $\Sigma \rightarrow \Delta \rightarrow Val\ list \rightarrow Val\ list \rightarrow \Sigma\ list$	val produce : $core_pred: string \rightarrow t \rightarrow vt\ list \rightarrow t\ Delayed.t$ (note there is only one vt list input, for \vec{v}_i)

4 Emptiness in state models

4.1 Current State

There exists a source of unsoundness in the current definition of state models, related to the representation of empty states, as there may exist multiple different observably empty states, leading to composition rules being unsound if not accounted for.

To demonstrate this, we may consider the Freeable state. It is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Freeable}(X) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \perp \mid \emptyset \mid \text{Val } X \\ \underline{\text{Freeable}}(X) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \emptyset \mid \text{Val } X\end{aligned}$$

With composition:

$$\begin{aligned}f \cdot \perp &= f \\ \perp \cdot f &= f \\ \text{Val } f_1 \cdot \text{Val } f_2 &= \text{Val } (f_1 \cdot f_2)\end{aligned}$$

This forms a valid partially commutative monoid (PCM). We may now look at an example of using this state model that proves to be unsound. Assume the state model $\text{PMap}(\mathbb{N}, \text{Freeable}(\text{Exc}))$, with PMap representing a partial map, that is initially with no mappings, $[]$. We omit the domain set for brevity.

State	Operation applied
\perp	Initial State
$0 \mapsto \text{Val } a$	Produce $\langle \text{PointsTo} \rangle (0; a)$
$0 \mapsto \text{Val } \perp$	Consume $\langle \text{PointsTo} \rangle (0; a)$
undefined!	Produce $\langle \text{Free} \rangle (0;)$

This is, of course, unsound, as the state at the end should indeed be $0 \mapsto \emptyset$. This is due to the fact what is effectively an empty state, $\text{Val } \perp$, is different from the Freeable empty state, \perp , rendering the composition $\text{Val } \perp \cdot \emptyset$ undefined. Note that consuming `PointsTo` doesn't result in a $0 \mapsto \perp$ state, as PMap must pass consumption down, and so must Freeable, as neither are “aware” of the meaning of `PointsTo`.

To fix this, Freeable would need to be able to know if its contents are observably empty after consuming a predicate, and if so become \perp . This seems to hint at a definition or property of our state models missing.

This error can also be shown to exist in the implementation itself, by writing a specification with `True` as the precondition, `False` as the postcondition.

```
spec free_cell(x)
  [[ (x == #x) * <points_to>(#x;#anything) ]]
  [[ (ret == null) * <freed>(#x;) ]]
  normal
proc free_cell(x) {
  n := [free](x);
  ret := null;
  return
};

spec test_unsoundness()
  [[ True ]]
  [[ False ]]
  normal
proc test_unsoundness() {
  x := [alloc]();
  x := l_nth(x, 0i);
  n := "free_cell"(x);
  ret := null;
  return
};
```

This GIL code is then succesfully verified, with the following output.

```
Parsing and compiling...
Preprocessing...
Obtaining specs to verify...
Obtaining lemmas to verify...
Obtained 2 symbolic tests in total
Running symbolic tests: 0.002729
Verifying one spec of procedure free_cell... s Success
Verifying one spec of procedure test_unsoundness... Success
All specs succeeded: 0.004729
```

4.2 Proof of Unsoundness

First we may take a look at the rules consumers and producers must follow to be sound. Given a set of core predicates $(\Delta \ni \delta, \models)$:

$$\text{produce } \sigma \delta \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o = \{\sigma \cdot \sigma_\delta \mid \sigma_\delta \models \langle \delta \rangle (\vec{v}_i; \vec{v}_o), \sigma \# \sigma_\delta\}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma.\text{consume}_\delta(\vec{v}_i) \rightarrow \text{Ok} : (\vec{v}_o, \sigma') \\ \implies & \exists \sigma_\delta. \sigma = \sigma' \cdot \sigma_\delta \wedge \sigma_\delta \models \langle \delta \rangle (\vec{v}_i; \vec{v}_o) \end{aligned}$$

The **produce** rule in particular states that the result of **produce** must be the given state extended by all disjoint resources that could be associated to a given core predicate.

Freeable(X) being a derivative of a sum state model (in the form of $X + \text{Freed}$), and similar unsoundness being present in the sum state model, we may look at what property sum breaks to exhibit such unsoundness. First, we may have take a look at how sum is originally defined.

The sum $\mathbb{S}.1 \oplus \mathbb{S}.2$ is defined as **type** $\Sigma = \perp_\oplus \mid \mathbb{S}1 \text{ of } \mathbb{S}1.\Sigma \mid \mathbb{S}2 \text{ of } \mathbb{S}2.\Sigma$, with the following composition rules and **produce** implementation (note we annotate the sum's \perp element as \perp_\oplus to later distinguish it from the \perp of other state models):

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma \cdot \perp_\oplus &= \perp_\oplus \cdot \sigma = \sigma \\ (\mathbb{S}1 \sigma_1) \cdot (\mathbb{S}1 \sigma'_1) &= \mathbb{S}1 (\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma'_1) \\ (\mathbb{S}2 \sigma_2) \cdot (\mathbb{S}2 \sigma'_2) &= \mathbb{S}2 (\sigma_2 \cdot \sigma'_2) \\ &\text{undefined otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

```
produce  $\sigma \delta \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o =$ 
  match  $\sigma, \delta$  with
  |  $\mathbb{S}1 \sigma_1, \mathbb{P}1 \delta_1 \rightarrow$ 
    let*  $\delta'_1 = \text{produce } \sigma_1 \delta_1 \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o$  in
     $\mathbb{S}1 \delta'_1$ 
  |  $\perp_\oplus, \mathbb{P}1 \delta_1 \rightarrow$ 
    let*  $\delta'_1 = \text{produce } \mathbb{S}1.0 \delta_1 \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o$  in
     $\mathbb{S}1 \delta'_1$ 
  |  $\mathbb{S}2 \sigma_2, \mathbb{P}2 \delta_2 \rightarrow$ 
    let*  $\delta'_2 = \text{produce } \sigma_2 \delta_2 \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o$  in
     $\mathbb{S}2 \delta'_2$ 
  |  $\perp_\oplus, \mathbb{P}2 \delta_2 \rightarrow$ 
    let*  $\delta'_2 = \text{produce } \mathbb{S}2.0 \delta_2 \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o$  in
     $\mathbb{S}2 \delta'_2$ 
  |  $\_, \_ \rightarrow \text{vanish}$ 
```

This function simply dispatches the predicate to the corresponding state model, default to the relevant empty state if needed, and vanishes if a mismatch occurs (for either $\mathbb{S}1 \sigma_1, \mathbb{P}2 \delta_2$ or $\mathbb{S}2 \sigma_2, \mathbb{P}1 \delta_1$).

Now, let there be a state model A that defines a bottom element \perp_A , such that $\forall \sigma. \sigma \cdot \perp_A = \sigma$, and a second state model B . Given the state model $A \oplus B$, and the above implementation of **produce**, we get the following results:

$$\text{produce } \sigma \delta \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o = \begin{cases} \text{produce } \sigma_A \delta_A \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o & \text{if } \delta = \text{P1 } \delta_A \wedge \sigma = \text{S1 } \sigma_A \\ \text{produce } A.0 \delta_A \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o & \text{if } \delta = \text{P1 } \delta_A \wedge \sigma = \perp_{\oplus} \\ \text{produce } \sigma_B \delta_B \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o & \text{if } \delta = \text{P2 } \delta_B \wedge \sigma = \text{S2 } \sigma_B \\ \text{produce } B.0 \delta_B \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o & \text{if } \delta = \text{P2 } \delta_B \wedge \sigma = \perp_{\oplus} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Let the current state be $\text{S1 } \perp_A$. As \perp_A is the empty state for the A memory model, it is disjoint from any other state. Given a core predicate δ_B and its ins and outs, there may exist a state σ_B such that $\sigma_B \models \langle \delta_B \rangle (\vec{v}_i; \vec{v}_o)$ and we know that $\perp_A \# \sigma_B$.

As such, we would expect $\text{produce } \text{S1 } \perp_A \delta_B \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o = \{\text{S2 } \sigma_B \mid \sigma_B \in \text{produce } B.0 \delta_B \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o\}$, however that is not the case:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{produce } \text{S1 } \perp_A \delta_B \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o &= \text{produce } (\text{S1 } \perp_A \cdot \text{S2 } \sigma_B) \delta_B \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o && \text{from core predicates producers rule} \\ &= \emptyset && (\text{as } \text{S1 } \perp_A \cdot \text{S2 } \sigma_B \text{ is undefined}) \end{aligned}$$

For the result of **produce** to match what's expected, new rules would need to be added to composition and **produce** to handle $\text{S1 } \perp_A$ in the same way it handles \perp_{\oplus} . However there currently is no way of doing this, as the existence of an empty element in A or B is not exposed – while some state models (like **Exc**) may have one, others (like **Ag**) may not.

4.3 Sound Emptiness

A fix to this is to define a “global” emptiness, that replaces the different “local” empty states each state model may define. Consuming a predicate, or executing an action, may result in a new state *or* a global \perp . This forces state model transformers to handle such empty states, and ensures a state becoming empty deep within a now-observably-empty construction will naturally unwrap into a shallow empty. We also lift the composition operation defined by state models to handle \perp : $a \cdot \perp = \perp \cdot a = a$.

A side-effect of this is that a non- \perp state is never considered observably-empty, as otherwise it would be \perp – this allows us to remove the **is_empty** function that was used for some optimisations, as it is sufficient to compare a given state with \perp .

An advantage of this approach is that lifting a full state model to a complete state model doesn't require anything (aside from handling \perp in **produce** and **consume**), as the empty compositional state is already added!

We now redefine some of the constructs used in the engine according to this new definition.

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^? &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Sigma \uplus \perp \\ \text{consume} : \Sigma &\rightarrow \Delta \rightarrow \text{Val list} \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}_l^+ \times \text{Val list} \times \Sigma^?) \\ \text{produce} : \Sigma^? &\rightarrow \Delta \rightarrow \text{Val list} \rightarrow \text{Val list} \rightarrow \Sigma \text{ set} \\ \text{eval_action} : \mathcal{A} &\rightarrow \Sigma^? \rightarrow \text{Val list} \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}_l^+ \times \text{Val list} \times \Sigma^?) \end{aligned}$$

A consideration with this is that **consume** only works on non- \perp elements, as no predicate is satisfied by the empty state (not sure about this). For **produce** however, a predicate can be produced from the absence of state.

We may now redefine some of the state models with this new idea.

4.3.1 State Sum

A state sum $\mathbb{S}_1 \oplus \mathbb{S}_2$ is now defined as **type** $\Sigma = \text{S1 of } \mathbb{S}_1.\Sigma \mid \text{S2 of } \mathbb{S}_2.\Sigma$. We define composition and **produce** as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{S1 } \sigma) \cdot (\text{S1 } \sigma') &= \text{S1 } (\sigma \cdot \sigma') \\ (\text{S2 } \sigma) \cdot (\text{S2 } \sigma') &= \text{S2 } (\sigma \cdot \sigma') \\ &\text{undefined otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

```

produce  $\sigma^? \delta \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o =$ 
  match  $\sigma^?, \delta$  with
  | S1  $\sigma_1$ , P1  $\delta_1 \rightarrow$ 
    let*  $\delta'_1 = \text{produce } \sigma_1 \delta_1 \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o$  in
    S1  $\delta'_1$ 
  |  $\perp$ , P1  $\delta_1 \rightarrow$ 
    let*  $\delta'_1 = \text{produce } \mathbb{S}_1.0 \delta_1 \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o$  in
    S1  $\delta'_1$ 
  | S2  $\sigma_2$ , P2  $\delta_2 \rightarrow$ 
    let*  $\delta'_2 = \text{produce } \sigma_2 \delta_2 \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o$  in
    S2  $\delta'_2$ 
  |  $\perp$ , P2  $\delta_2 \rightarrow$ 
    let*  $\delta'_2 = \text{produce } \mathbb{S}_2.0 \delta_2 \vec{v}_i \vec{v}_o$  in
    S2  $\delta'_2$ 
  |  $\_$ ,  $\_ \rightarrow$  vanish

```