Verifying filesystems in ACL2

Project report, CS380L Fall 2017

Mihir Mehta

Department of Computer Science
University of Texas at Austin

mihir@cs.utexas.edu

07 December, 2017

Outline

Outline

Motivation

Our approach

Progress so far

Future work

Why we need a verified filesystem

- Modern filesystems have become increasingly complex, and so have the tools to analyse and recover data from them.
- It would be worthwhile to specify and formally verify, in the ACL2 theorem prover, the guarantees claimed by filesystems and tools.
- Work on this project started last year - since then I've built 5 increasingly complex models.
- This talk will be focussed on the 4th and 5th models.

Outline

File system models



Minimal set of operations?

- The Google filesystem suggests a minimal set of operations:
  - `create`
  - `delete`
  - `open`
  - `close`
  - `read`
  - `write`
- Of these, `open` and `close` require the maintenance of file descriptor state - so they can wait.
- However, they are essential when describing concurrency and multiprogramming behaviour.
- Thus, we can start modelling a filesystem, and several refinements thereof.

Quick overview of models

- What follows is a sequence of **increasingly refined** models.
- Model 1: Tree representation of directory structure with unbounded file size and unbounded filesystem size.
- Model 2: Model 1 with file length as metadata.
- Model 3: Tree representation of directory structure with file contents stored in a "disk" (unbounded in length).
- Model 4: Model 3 with bounded filesystem size and garbage collection.
- Model 5: Model 4 with permissions for read/write for the user and others (no groups as yet)

Model 1



Model 1



Model 1



Model 1



Model 2

- Model 1 supports nested directory structures, unbounded file size and unbounded filesystem size.
- However, there's no metadata, either to provide additional information or to validate the contents of the file.
- With an extra field for length, we can create a simple version of fsck that checks file contents for consistency.
- Further, we can verify that create, write, delete etc preserve this notion of consistency.

Model 2



Model 2



Model 2



Model 2



Model 3

- As the next step, we focus on externalising the storage of file contents.
- We also choose to break up file contents into "blocks" of a constant length (8).
  - Note: this would mean storing file length is no longer optional, to avoid reading garbage past end of file at the end of a block.

Model 3



Table: Disk

0	\0\0\0
1	Sun 19:0
2	0

Model 3



Table: Disk

0	\0\0\0
1	Sun 19:0
2	0
3	Tue 21:0
4	0

Model 3



Table: Disk

0	\0\0\0
1	Sun 19:0
2	0
3	Tue 21:0
4	0

Model 3



Table: Disk

0	\0\0\0
1	Sun 19:0
2	0
3	Tue 21:0
4	0
5	Wed 01:0
6	0

Model 4

- In the fourth model, we attempt to implement garbage collection in the form of an allocation vector.
- The allocation vector tracks whether blocks in the filesystem are in use by a file. This allows us to reuse unused blocks.

Model 4



Table: Disk and allocation vector

0	\0\0\0	true
1	Sun 19:0	true
2	0	true
3		false
4		false
5		false

Model 4



Table: Disk and allocation vector

0	\0\0\0	true
1	Sun 19:0	true
2	0	true
3	Tue 21:0	true
4	0	true
5		false

Model 4



Table: Disk and allocation vector

0	\0\0\0	true
1	Sun 19:0	false
2	0	false
3	Tue 21:0	true
4	0	true
5		false

Model 4



Table: Disk and allocation vector

0	\0\0\0	true
1	Wed 01:0	true
2	0	true
3	Tue 21:0	false
4	0	false
5		false

Outline

Proof approaches and techniques

- There are many properties that could be considered for correctness, but we choose to focus on the read-over-write theorems from the first-order theory of arrays.
- Read `n` characters starting at position `start` in the file at path `hns` in filesystem `fs`:
  `l1-rdchs(hns, fs, start, n)`
- Write string `text` characters starting at position `start` in the file at path `hns` in filesystem `fs`:
  `l1-wrchs(hns, fs, start, text)`

Proof approaches and techniques

- The first read-over-write theorem defines the semantics of reading from a location after writing to the same location. Formally, assuming `n = length(text)` and suitable "type" hypotheses (omitted here):

```
l1-rdchs(hns, l1-wrchs(hns, fs, start, text),
                start, n) =
text
```

- The second read-over-write theorem defines the semantics of reading from a location after writing to a different location. Formally, assuming `hns1 != hns2` and suitable "type" hypotheses (omitted here):

```
l1-rdchs(hns1, l1-wrchs(hns2, fs, start2, text2),
                start1, n1) =
l1-rdchs(hns1, fs, start1, n1)
```

Proof approaches and techniques

- For each of the models 1, 2, 3 and 4, we have proofs of correctness of the two read-after-write properties, making use of the proofs of equivalence between models and their successors.
- Model 4 presented some unique challenges - proving the read-after-write properties required proving an equivalence between model 4 and model 2, rather than model 3.

Proof example: first read-over-write in model 2

$$\begin{tikzcd}
l2 \arrow[r, "\text{write(text)}"'] \arrow[d, "\text{l2-to-l1-fs}"'] & l2 \arrow[d, "\text{l2-to-l1-fs}"'] \\
l1 \arrow[r, "\text{write(text)}"'] & l1
\end{tikzcd}$$

Figure: l2-wrchs-correctness-1

$$\begin{tikzcd}
l2 \arrow[r, "\text{read}"'] \arrow[d, "\text{l2-to-l1-fs}"'] & text \\
l1 \arrow[ur, "\text{read}"] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Figure: l2-rdchs-correctness-1

Proof example: first read-over-write in model 2

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
l2 \arrow[r, "\text{write(text)}"'] \arrow[d, "\text{l2-to-l1-fs}"'] & l2 \arrow[r, "\text{read}"'] \arrow[d, "\text{l2-to-l1-fs}"'] & \mathit{text} \\
l1 \arrow[r, "\text{write(text)}"'] & l1 \arrow[ur, "\text{read}"] &
\end{tikzcd}
$$

Figure: l2-read-over-write-1

Source analysis

Table: Code written for this project

Source lines of code (ACL2)	4964
defun events (function definitions)	106
defthm events (lemmas and proofs)	374

Outline

Future work

- Model and verify file permissions.
- Linearise the tree, leaving only the disk.
- Add the system calls open and close with the introduction of file descriptors.
  This would be a step towards the study of concurrent FS operations.
- Eventually emulate the FAT32 filesystem as a convincing proof of concept, and move on to fsck and file recovery tools.