



**HAL**  
open science

# BmcMT: Bounded Model Checking of TLA + Specifications with SMT

Igor Konnov, Jure Kukovec, Thanh Hai Tran

► **To cite this version:**

Igor Konnov, Jure Kukovec, Thanh Hai Tran. BmcMT: Bounded Model Checking of TLA + Specifications with SMT. TLA+ Community Meeting 2018, Jul 2018, Oxford, United Kingdom. hal-01899719

**HAL Id: hal-01899719**

**<https://inria.hal.science/hal-01899719>**

Submitted on 19 Oct 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# BMCMT: Bounded Model Checking of TLA<sup>+</sup> Specifications with SMT

Igor Konnov<sup>1</sup>, Jure Kukovec<sup>2</sup>, and Thanh Hai Tran<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Lorraine, CNRS, Inria, LORIA, F-54000 Nancy, France

Email: `firstname.lastname@inria.fr`

<sup>2</sup> TU Wien (Vienna University of Technology), Vienna, Austria \*

Email: `{jkukovec,tran}@forsyte.at`

April 15, 2018

## Abstract

We present the development version of BMCMT—a symbolic model checker for TLA<sup>+</sup>. It finds, whether a TLA<sup>+</sup> specification satisfies an invariant candidate by checking satisfiability of an SMT formula that encodes: (1) an execution of bounded length, and (2) preservation of the invariant candidate in every state of the execution. Our tool is still in the experimental phase, due to a number of challenges posed by TLA<sup>+</sup> semantics to SMT solvers. We will discuss these challenges and our current approach to them in the talk. Our preliminary experiments show that BMCMT scales better than the standard TLA<sup>+</sup> model checker TLC for large parameter values, e.g., when a TLA<sup>+</sup> specification models a system of 10 processes, though TLC is more efficient for tiny parameters, e.g., when the system has 3 processes.

We believe that early feedback from the TLA<sup>+</sup> community will help us to focus on the most important language features and improve our tool.

## 1 Overview

Our work is motivated by the success story of software model checkers that use SAT and SMT solvers in the back-end, as well as by the work of Stephan Merz and Hernán Vanzetto on automating TLA<sup>+</sup> proofs with SMT [3]. In contrast to automated theorem provers, our goal is to develop a tool that, in principle, should work on all TLA<sup>+</sup> specifications that are accepted by TLC. Hence, to avoid quantifiers in SMT formulas, we use the following pragmatic assumptions, similar to the assumptions of TLC:

- **Finite states.** As in TLC, all sets, function domains, and function co-domains constructed during an execution of a TLA<sup>+</sup> specification should be finite.
- **Fixed and finite constants.** The user initializes all the specification parameters. Again, the parameter values should be finite.

---

\*This research supported in part by the Vienna Science and Technology Fund (WWTF) through project APALACHE (ICT15-103).

- **Restrictions on the formula structure.** Under certain circumstances, we interpret an equality  $x' = e$  as an assignment of the  $e$ 's value to the variable  $x$ . Likewise, a membership test  $x' \in S$  is sometimes interpreted as a non-deterministic assignment of values from the set  $S$  to the variable  $x$ . Finding such assignments symbolically, that is, without evaluating the specification, happened to be a non-trivial problem. We reported on a solution to this problem in [2].

In order to encode  $\text{TLA}^+$  values in SMT, we are using a type system similar to [3]. However, our tool is running type inference on-the-fly: It finds the types for the initial states based on the user input; then, given the types of the values at the  $i$ th state, it finds the types of the values computed at the  $(i + 1)$ th state. Due to this approach, type inference BMCMT is fairly simple.

To translate action-level  $\text{TLA}^+$  expressions to SMT, we define operational semantics over finite  $\text{TLA}^+$  values. To this end, our tool computes a static layout of the data structures that may be created during an execution of a  $\text{TLA}^+$  specification. This static layout overapproximates the data structures that are computed in an actual execution, whereas the precise shape of the data structures is defined by constraints within the SMT solver. We use the static layout to define operations such as set equality, which otherwise would require us to write axioms similar to [3] and thus introduce quantified formulas. Similarly, quantified  $\text{TLA}^+$  expressions  $\forall x \in S. P$  and  $\exists x \in S. P$  are expanded to finite disjunctions and conjunctions over potential elements of  $S$ . By doing so, we manage to stay within the theory of QF-UFLIA, that is, quantifier-free linear integer arithmetics with uninterpreted functions.

So far, we have defined and implemented semantics of the following  $\text{TLA}^+$  features:

- Logical operators, except CHOOSE and unbounded quantifiers  $\forall x. e$  and  $\exists x. e$ ;
- Integer operators, including the range operator  $a..b$  for constant  $a$  and  $b$ ;
- Set operators over finite sets:  $\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$ ,  $\{x \in S : P\}$ ,  $\{e : x \in S\}$ ,  $x \in S$ ,  $X \subset Y$ ,  $X = Y$ ,  $X \cup Y$ ,  $X \cap Y$ , SUBSET  $S$ , and UNION  $S$ .
- Function operators over functions with finite domains and co-domains:  $[x \in S \mapsto e]$ ,  $f[e]$ ,  $[f \text{ EXCEPT } ![e_1] = e_2]$ ,  $[S \rightarrow T]$ , DOMAIN  $f$ , and equality.
- Operators over tuples and records with constant domains, as well as IF-THEN-ELSE.

We believe that most of the other  $\text{TLA}^+$  operators can be encoded in SMT using our approach. However, the following operators are particularly challenging: set cardinality and sequence operators with non-constant arguments like  $x..y$ . Interestingly, these operators are not a problem for TLC, as it computes the exact variable values by state enumeration.

The development version of the tool is available at [1].

## References

- [1] I. Konnov, J. Kukovec, and T. H. Tran. APALACHE BMCMT (development version). URL: <https://github.com/konnov/apalache/tree/unstable>. Accessed: Apr, 2018.
- [2] J. Kukovec, T. H. Tran, and I. Konnov. Extracting symbolic transitions from  $\text{TLA}^+$  specifications. In *ABZ 2018, 6th International ABZ Conference ASM, Alloy, B, TLA, VDM, Z*, 2018. (To appear). URL: [http://forsyte.at/wp-content/uploads/abz2018\\_full.pdf](http://forsyte.at/wp-content/uploads/abz2018_full.pdf).
- [3] S. Merz and H. Vanzetto. Encoding  $\text{TLA}^+$  into many-sorted first-order logic. In *ABZ*, pages 54–69, 2016.