

# Meeting agenda

- 1 New developments in translation to Alloy
- 2 Design choices in the semantics of behavioral Clafer
  - Meaning of current structural(cross-tree) constraints
  - Default behavior of subclafers: mutable vs immutable
- 3 Design choices in the concrete syntax

# Translation to Alloy

We reconsidered translation to Alloy. Issues using Amir's library:

- Need for global state
- Issues with identity when cardinality is more than 1
- Not compatible with current compiler Alloy output
- Logical expression require use of library functions, instead of using Alloy operators
- Suffers from state explosion

# New solution

New solution is still similar and based on Bounded Model Checking with Alloy paper<sup>1</sup>. Instead of global state we introduce local state concept:

- 1 Define discrete Time ordered using util / ordering module.
- 2 Since Time set is finite we add a loop relation from last Time instance to any other one.
- 3 Each mutable field relation gets additional Time column.
- 4 Define behavioral constraints using LTL. LTL encoding over Time is presented in the paper.
- 5 Traces are modeled according to the ordering of Time atoms. A snapshot in a trace is assembly of immutable values and projection of mutable values at specific Time instance.

---

<sup>1</sup>Alcino Cunha. "Bounded Model Checking of Temporal Formulas with Alloy". In: *CoRR* abs/1207.2746 (2012).

# Meaning of current cross-tree constraints

Current cross-tree constraints may have two different semantics in behavioral Clafer.

## Restricts the first state

- Similar to LTL/CTL
- Often meant to restrict all states, so models will need to be altered with global modalities

## Restrict globally

- Easy to restrict all states in the trace
- Different semantics from LTL/CTL, so temporal constraints need new concrete syntax
- Otherwise hard to reason about initial states

# Subclafers mutability

It can be difficult to implicitly imply which subclafers are mutable. Therefore we need some kind of assumption about default mutability and concrete syntax to express opposite.

- Should top level clafers be immutable?
- Should we imply that subclafers are immutable or mutable by default?

All fields are immutable by default

PM

heart -> Heart

CaseHandler

[mutable] current -> Case

All fields are mutable by default

Person

name: String

[immutable name]

Person

age: int