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Abstract
We will demonstrate MoCHi, a fully-automated program verification tool (so called a “software model checker”) for a subset of OCaml, supporting integers, recursive data types (such as lists), exceptions, higher-order functions and recursion. MoCHi is based on higher-order model checking, and consists of three layers. The top layer transforms a source program into an intermediate program of a core language, which is a simply-typed call-by-value higher-order functional language with recursion, booleans and integers (a la “PCF”). The transformation is carried out by encoding exceptions and recursive data types using higher-order functions. The middle layer further transforms the intermediate program into a higher-order boolean functional program (a la “finitary PCF”), by using predicate abstraction and counterexample-guided abstraction refinement (CEGAR). Finally, on the bottom layer, the higher-order boolean functional program is verified by using a higher-order model checker.

In the presentation, we use MoCHi to verify several sample programs, and explain how it works internally. We will also discuss the current limitations and ongoing/future work.

1. Introduction
MoCHi is a software model checker for a subset of OCaml, constructed based on higher-order model checking [1–4], predicate abstraction, and counter-example-guided abstraction refinement (CEGAR) [5]. This can be viewed as a higher-order counterpart of previous software model checkers for imperative languages like BLAST [6] and SLAM [7]. MoCHi takes an OCaml program as an input, and statically checks lack of assertion failures, pattern match errors, and uncaught exceptions. The supported language features includes higher-order functions and recursion, base types, some recursive data types (such as lists and trees), and exceptions. Certain restrictions are imposed on recursive data types and exceptions, which will be explained later.

In the rest of this paper, we explain the features of MoCHi from a user’s point of view in Section 2, and the internal structure of MoCHi in Section 3.

2. Overview of MoCHi
Given a program written in OCaml, MoCHi checks whether the program is safe or not. The input language supports the following features:

- base types (unit, booleans, and integers),
- tuples,
- recursion,
- higher-order functions,
- exceptions, and
- algebraic data types.

The following restrictions are imposed on exceptions and algebraic data types. As for exceptions, we do not allow those carrying function arguments. For algebraic data types, we do not support parametrized data types (such as passing a list of integers as an argument), and more importantly, recursive type variables cannot occur under function constructors. Thus, `Unit + (int → int) * (int → int)` is OK, but neither `μa. Unit + (int → int) * (int → int) a` (which corresponds to `μa. (int → int) list`) is OK, and `μa. a` is not allowed.

MoCHi checks the following properties:

- The assertions in the program never fail.
- The pattern matches in the program are exhaustive.
- An uncaught exception does not occur.

MoCHi outputs “safe” with a certificate when the program satisfies all the three properties above. Otherwise, MoCHi outputs “unsafe” with a counterexample that consists of an input of the main function and an execution sequence that reaches an error.

Figures 1 and 2 show verification examples of McCarthy 91 function using MoCHi. Programs assert that `mc91 n = 91` for all `n ≤ 101` and for all `n ≤ 200`, respectively. MoCHi verifies that the first program is safe, i.e., the assertion never fails, and outputs a certificate that represents the abstraction of the program.

---

1 A certificate consists of abstraction types, that represent how to abstract the program, and intersection types, that is a certificate for the safety of the abstracted program. See papers [2, 5] for details.
• Input:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{let rec mc91 } x &= \text{if } x > 100 \text{ then } x - 10 \\
&\quad\text{else mc91 (mc91 (x + 11))} \\
\text{let main } n &= \text{if } n <= 200 \text{ then assert (mc91 } n = 91) 
\end{align*}
\]

• Output:

... Unsafe!

Inputs:

\[
\begin{align*}
n &= 102; \\
\text{Error trace:} \quad \text{main } \ldots \quad \text{assert } \ldots \quad \text{ERROR!}
\end{align*}
\]

total: 0.104983 sec

Figure 2. Verification Example for Unsafe Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: CPS transformation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program with control operations + recursive data structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2: Encoding recursive data structures as functions on lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program with recursive data structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3: Encoding lists as functions on integers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program with integers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 4: Predicate Abstraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Predicates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 5: Higher-Order Model Checking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 6: Unsafe Check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 7: Predicate Discovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unsafe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Internals of MoCHi

A binary tree is encoded as a term of the type \( \text{int list} \rightarrow \text{int} \). For example, a binary tree \( \text{node(leaf, node(leaf, leaf))} \) is encoded as a function \([\text{[]}] \rightarrow \text{node, } [\text{1}] \rightarrow \text{leaf, } [\text{2}] \rightarrow \text{node, } [\text{2, 2}] \rightarrow \text{leaf} \) where \( \text{leaf} \) and \( \text{node} \) are defined as some integers. Note that the restriction on recursive types mentioned in Section 2 is necessary to make this encoding work. In Step 3, a list is encoded as a pair of its length and a function that maps indices to the elements of the list. For example, the list \([2; 3; 5]\) is encoded as the pair \((3, f)\) where \(f(0) = 2, f(1) = 3, \) and \(f(2) = 5\). See [8] for more details.

The translated program with integers is verified by higher-order model checking with predicate abstraction and CEGAR. In Step 4, the program with integers is abstracted to a higher-order boolean program, that is a higher-order program only with boolean, by using given predicates for abstraction. The abstracted program is verified by a higher-order model checker (that is sound and complete) in Step 5. If the abstracted program is safe, the original functional program is also safe. If the latter, we discover new predicates to refine abstraction in Step 7. We repeat these steps until we find whether the program is safe or not. See [5] for more details.

MoCHi uses TRecS [2, 4] as the underlying higher-order model checker (for Step 5 in Figure 3), and uses CSIsat [9] for predicate discovery (for Step 7). CVC3 [10] is used for unsafety check (for Step 6) and predicate abstraction (for Step 4).

4. Conclusion

We have implemented MoCHi, a verifier for a subset of OCaml with some base types (unit, booleans, and integers), higher-order functions, recursions, recursive data structures, and exceptions.

Future work includes:

• Supporting a larger subset of OCaml (references, modules, etc.)
• Supporting a larger class of properties such as resource usage safety [2].
• Making the implementation scalable for larger programs.
• Improving the usability of reports of verification results. For example, we can actually recover dependent types from the current output of MoCHi and show them as a certificate.
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