# An introduction to Alloy Alcino Cunha 

## Alloy in a nutshell

- Declarative modeling language
- Automated analysis
- Lightweight formal method


## hitovalloymitedu

## Key ingredients

- Everything is a relation
- Non-specialized logic
- Counterexamples within scope
- Analysis by off the shelf SAT Solvers


## Small scope hypothesis

- Most bugs have small counterexamples
- Instead of building a proof look for a refútation
- A scope is defined that limits the size of instances




## Relations



$$
\{(A 1, B 1),(A 1, B 2),(A 2, B 1),(A 3, B 2)\}
$$

## Relations

* Sets are relations of arity 1
- Scalars are relations with size 1
- Relations are first order . but we have multirelations

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { File }=\{(\mathrm{F} 1),(\mathrm{F} 2),(\mathrm{F} 3)\} \\
& \text { Dir }=\{(\mathrm{D} 1),(\mathrm{D} 2)\} \\
& \text { Time }=\{(\mathrm{T} 1),(\mathrm{T} 2),(\mathrm{T} 3),(\mathrm{T} 4)\} \\
& \text { root }=\{(\mathrm{D} 1)\} \\
& \text { now }=\{(\mathrm{T} 4)\} \\
& \text { path }=\{(\mathrm{D} 2)\} \\
& \text { parent }=\{(\mathrm{F} 1, \mathrm{D} 1),(\mathrm{D} 2, \mathrm{D} 1),(\mathrm{F} 2, \mathrm{D} 2)\} \\
& \text { log }
\end{aligned}=\{(\mathrm{T} 1, \mathrm{~F} 1, \mathrm{D} 1),(\mathrm{T} 3, \mathrm{D} 2, \mathrm{D} 1),(\mathrm{T} 4, \mathrm{~F} 2, \mathrm{D} 2)\} \text { ) }
$$

## The special ones

none

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { File }=\{(F 1),(F 2),(F 3)\} \\
& \text { Dir }=\{(D 1),(D 2)\} \\
& \text { none }=\{ \} \\
& \text { univ }=\{(F 1),(F 2),(F 3),(D 1),(D 2)\} \\
& \text { iden }=\{(F 1, F 1),(F 2, F 2),(F 3, F 3),(D 1, D 1),(D 2, D 2)\}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Composition



$$
\begin{aligned}
& R=\{(A 1, B 1),(A 1, B 2),(A 2, B 1),(A 3, B 2)\} \\
& S=\{(B 1, C 2),(B 1, C 3),(B 2, C 2),(B 3, C 1)\} \\
& R \cdot S=\{(A 1, C 2),(A 1, C 3),(A 2, C 2),(A 2, C 3),(A 3, C 2)\}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Composition

* The swiss army knife of Alloy
- It subsumes function application
- Encourages a navigational (point-free) style
- R. S $[X], x \cdot(R \cdot S)$

```
Person = {(P1),(P2),(P3),(P4)}
parent = {(P1,P2),(P1,P3),(P2,P4)}
me = {(P1)}
me.parent = {(P2),(P3)}
parent.parent[me] = {(P4)}
Person.parent = {(P2),(P3),(P4)}
```


## Operators

|  | composition |
| :---: | :---: |
| t | Union |
| ++ | override |
| 8 | intersection |
| - | difference |
| $\rightarrow$ | cartesian product |
| < : | domain restriction |
| \% | range restriction |
| $\sim$ | converse |
| $\wedge$ | transitive closure |
| * | transitive-reflexive closure |

## Operators

```
File = {(F1),(F2),(F3)}
Dir = {(D1),(D2)}
root = {(D1)}
new = {(F3,D2),(F1,D1),(F2,D1)}
parent = {(F1,D1),(D2,D1),(F2,D2)}
File + Dir = {(F1),(F2),(F3),(D1),(D2)}
parent + new = {(F1,D1),(D2,D1),(F2,D2),(F3,D2),(F2,D1)}
parent ++ new = {(F1,D1),(D2,D1),(F3,D2),(F2,D1)}
parent - new = {(D2,D1),(F2,D2)}
parent & new = {(F1,D1)}
parent :> root = {(F1,D1),(D2,D1)}
File -> root = {(F1,D1),(F2,D1),(F3,D1)}
new -> Dir = {(F3,D2,D1),(F3,D2,D2),(F1,D1,D1),\ldots}
~parent = {(D1,F1),(D1,D2),(D2,F2)}
```


## Closures

- No recursion. but we have closures
$\because \wedge R=R+R \cdot R+R \cdot R \cdot R+$
$\because * R=\wedge R+$ iden



## Multiplicities

| $A m \rightarrow m B$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| set | any number |
| one | exactly one |
| some | at least one |
| Lone | at most one |

## Bestiary

A lone $\rightarrow$ B $\quad A \quad>$ some $B \quad A \quad \rightarrow$ lone $B \quad A \quad$ some $\rightarrow B$

| $A$ lone $->$ some $B$ | $A \rightarrow>$ one $B$ | A some $\rightarrow$ lone B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| representation | function | abstraction |
| A lone $\rightarrow>$ one |  | A some $->$ one B |
| injection |  | surjection |
| A one $\gg$ one B |  |  |

## Signatures

* Signatures allow us to introduce sets
- Top-level signatures are mutually disjoint

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { sig File }\} \\
& \text { sig Dir }\} \\
& \text { sig Name }\}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Signatures

- A signature can extend another signature
* The extensions are mutually olisjoint
- Signatures can be constrained with a multiplicity

```
sig Object {}
sig File extends Object {}
sig Dir extends Object {}
sig Exe,Txt extends File {}
one sig Root extends Dir {}
```


## Signatures

- A signature can be abstract
- They have no elements outside extensions
- Arbitrary subset relations can also be declared

```
abstract sig Object {}
abstract sig File extends Object {}
sig Dir extends Object {}
sig Exe, Txt extends File {}
one sig Root extends Dir {}
sig Temp in Object {}
```


## Fields

- Relations can be declared as fields
- By default binary relations are functions
- The range can be constrained with a multiplicity

```
abstract sig Object {
    name: Name,
    parent: lone Dir
}
sig File extends Object {}
sig Dir extends Object {}
sig Name {}
```


## Fields

* Higher arity relations can also be declared as fields
* Fields can depend on other fields
- Overloading is allowed for non-overlapping signatures

```
abstract sig Object {}
sig File, Dir extends Object {}
sig Name {}
sig FileSystem {
    objects: set Object,
    parent: objects -> lone (Dir & objects),
    name: objects lone -> one Name
}
```


## Command run

* Instructs analyzer to search for instances within scope
- Scope can be fine tuned for each signature
- The default scope is 3
- Instances are built by populating sets with atoms up to the given scope
- Atoms are uninterpreted, indivisible, immutable
- It returns all (non-symmetric) instances of the model


## Command run

```
abstract sig Object {
    name: Name,
    parent: lone Dir
}
sig File, Dir extends Object {}
sig Name {}
run {} for 3 but 2 Dir, exactly 3 Name
```



## Facts

* Constraints that are assumed to always hold
- Be careful what you wish for:.
- First-order logic + relational calculus

```
abstract sig Object {
    name: Name,
    parent: lone Dir
}
sig File, Dir extends Object {}
sig Name {}
fact AllNamesDifferent {}
fact ParentIsATree {}
```


## Operators

| $!$ | not | negation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 88 | and | Conjunction |
| 11 | or | disjunction |
| $\xrightarrow{2}$ | amplies | mplication |
| <> | iff | equivalence |
| $A \Rightarrow B$ else $C \times \%$ (A \&\& B) 11 ( 1 \& \& C) |  |  |

## Operators



## Quantifiers

| $\triangle \mathrm{x}: \mathrm{A} \mid \mathrm{P}[\mathrm{X}]$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| al1. | P holds for every $x$ in A |
| some | P holds for at least one x in A |
| lone | P holds for at most one $x$ in $A$ |
| one | P holds for exactly one $x$ in A |
| no | P holds for no $x$ in $A$ |
| $\Delta$ disj $x, y: A \mid P[x, y] \Leftrightarrow \Delta x, y: A \quad 1 \quad x!=y \Rightarrow P[x, y]$ |  |

## A question of style

* The classic (point-wise) logic style

$$
\text { all disj } x, y \text { : Object } \mid \text { name }[x]!=\text { name }[y]
$$

- The navigational style

$$
\text { all } x \text { : Name I lone name. } x
$$

- The multiplicities style
name in Object lone $\rightarrow$ Name
- The relational (point-free) style
name. nname in iden


## A static filesystem

```
abstract sig Object {
    name: Name,
    parent: lone Dir
}
sig File, Dir extends Object {}
sig Name {}
fact AllNamesDifferent {
    name in Object lone -> Name // name is injective
}
fact ParentIsATree {
    all f : File I some f.parent // no orphan files
    lone r : Dir I no r.parent // only one root
    no o : Object I o in o.^parent // no cycles
}
```


## Assertions and check

* Assertions are constraints intended to follow from facts of the model
- check instructs analyzer to search for counterexamples within scope

```
assert AllDescendFromRoot {
    lone r : Object I Object in *parent.r
}
```

check AllDescendFromRoot for 6
check \{name in Object lone $\rightarrow$ Name $<=>$ name. nname in iden\}

## Predicates and functions

- A predicate is a named formula with zero or more declarations for arguments
- A function also has a declaration for the result

```
fun content [d : Dir] : set Object {
    parent.d
}
pred leaf [o : Object] {
    o in File || no content[0]
}
```


## Lets and comprehensions

$$
\text { let } x=\mathrm{e} \mid \mathrm{P}[\mathrm{x}]
$$

fun siblings [o : Object] : set Object \{ let $p=0$.parent $\mid$ parent. $p$
\}
check \{all o: Object | o in siblings[0]\}
fun iden : univ $\rightarrow$ univ $\{$

$$
\{x, y: \text { univ } \mid x=y\}
$$

\}

## Modules

* util/ordering[elem]
- Creates a single linear ordering over atoms in elem
- Constrains all the permitted atoms to exist
- Good for abstracting time model traces,.
- util/integer
- Collection of utility functions over integers


## Integers

* Scope for Int defined bitwidth
- Default semantics is 2s complement arithmetic
- Be careful with overiflows!
- Forbid overflows semantics also available

```
open util/integer
check {all x,y : Int I pos[y] => gt[add[x,y],x]}
```


## Subtleties of bounded verification

```
sig Set { elems : set Elem }
sig Elem {}
check {
    all s0, s1 : Set I
        some s2 : Set | s2.elems = s0.elems + s1.elems
}
```

- Counterexamples are found
- Set is not saturated' enough
- Not all possible sets are forced to exist in an instance


## Subtleties of bounded verification

- As long as universal quantifiers in runs, or existential quantifiers in checks, are bounded there are no problems
- Bounded means that the quantifier scope does not mention names of problematic signatures

```
check {
    all s0, s1, s2 : Set |
    s0.elems + s1.elems = s2.elems =>
    s1.elems + s0.elems = s2.elems
```

\}

## Generator axioms

```
fact SetGenerator {
    some s : Set I no s.elems
    all s : Set, e : Elem I
        some s': Set I s'.elems = s.elems + e
}
```

- A generator axiom could be used to force the existence of all possible sets
- Unfortunately the scope explodes
- To verify a model with $n$ elements $2 n$ sets are needed
- Sometimes generator axioms force infinite scopes
* The risk of inconsistency is very high

