

Verifying Safety Properties With the TLA⁺ Proof System

Kaustuv Chaudhuri¹, Damien Doligez², Leslie Lamport³, and Stephan Merz⁴

¹ INRIA Saclay, France, kaustuv.chaudhuri@inria.fr

² INRIA Rocquencourt, France, damien.doligez@inria.fr

³ Microsoft Research Silicon Valley, USA, <http://lamport.org>

⁴ INRIA Nancy, France, stephan.merz@inria.fr

1 Overview

TLAPS, the TLA⁺ proof system, is a platform for the development and mechanical verification of TLA⁺ proofs. The TLA⁺ proof language is declarative, and understanding proofs requires little background beyond elementary mathematics. The language supports hierarchical and non-linear proof construction and verification, and it is independent of any verification tool or strategy. Proofs are written in the same language as specifications; engineers do not have to translate their high-level designs into the language of a particular verification tool. A *proof manager* interprets a TLA⁺ proof as a collection of *proof obligations* to be verified, which it sends to *backend verifiers* that include theorem provers, proof assistants, SMT solvers, and decision procedures.

The first public release of TLAPS is available from [1], distributed with a BSD-like license. It handles almost all the non-temporal part of TLA⁺ as well as the temporal reasoning needed to prove standard safety properties, in particular invariance and step simulation, but not liveness properties. Intuitively, a safety property asserts what is permitted to happen; a liveness property asserts what must happen; for a more formal overview, see [3, 10].

2 Foundations

TLA⁺ is a formal language based on TLA (the Temporal Logic of Actions) [12]. It was designed for specifying the high-level behavior of concurrent and distributed systems, but it can be used to specify safety and liveness properties of any discrete system or algorithm. A behavior is a sequence of states, where a state is an assignment of values to *state variables*. Safety properties are expressed by describing the allowed steps (state transitions) in terms of *actions*, which are first-order formulas involving two copies v and v' of each state variable, where v denotes the value of the variable at the *current* state and v' its value at the *next* state. These properties are proved by reasoning about actions, using a small and restricted amount of temporal reasoning. Proving liveness properties requires propositional linear-time temporal logic reasoning plus a few TLA proof rules.

It has always been possible to assert correctness properties of systems in TLA⁺, but not to write their proofs. We have added proof constructs based on a hierarchical style for writing informal proofs [11]. The current version of the language is essentially the

same as the version described elsewhere [7]. Here, we describe only the TLAPS proof system. Hierarchical proofs are a stylistic variant of natural deduction with lemmas and have been used in other declarative proof languages [8, 14, 15]. A hierarchical proof is either a sequence of steps together with their proofs, or a leaf (lowest-level) proof that simply states the known facts (previous steps and theorems) and definitions from which the desired conclusion follows. The human reader or a backend verifier must ensure that the leaf proofs are correct in their interpretation of TLA^+ to believe the entire proof.

The TLAPS proof manager, TLAPM, reads a (possibly incomplete) hierarchical proof and invokes the backend verifiers to verify the leaf proofs. One important backend is Isabelle/ TLA^+ , which is an implementation of TLA^+ as an Isabelle object logic (see Section 4.1). Isabelle/ TLA^+ can be used directly with Isabelle’s generic proof methods, or other certifying backend verifiers can produce proofs that are checked by Isabelle/ TLA^+ . Currently, the only certifying backend is the Zenon theorem prover [4]. Among the non-certifying backends is a generic SMT-LIB-based backend for SMT solvers, and a decision procedure for Presburger arithmetic. We plan to replace these with certifying implementations such as the SMT solver veriT [5] and certifying implementations of decision procedures [6].

TLAPS is intended for avoiding high-level errors in systems, not for providing a formal foundation for mathematics. It is far more likely for a system error to be caused by an incomplete or incorrect specification than by an incorrect proof inadvertently accepted as correct due to bugs in TLAPS. Although we prefer certifying backends whenever possible, we include non-certifying backends for automated reasoning in important theories such as arithmetic.

3 Proof management

A TLA^+ specification consists of a root module that can (transitively) import other modules by extension and parametric instantiation. Each module consists of a number of parameters (state variables and uninterpreted constants), definitions, and theorems that may have proofs. TLAPS is run by invoking the Proof Manager (TLAPM) on the root module and telling it which proofs to check. In the current version, we use pragmas to indicate the proofs that are not to be checked, but this will change when TLAPS is integrated into the TLA^+ Toolbox IDE [2]. The design of TLAPM for the simple constant expressions of TLA^+ was described in [7]; this section explains the further processing required to support more of the features of TLA^+ . TLAPM first flattens the module structure, since the module language of TLA^+ is not supported by backend verifiers, which will likely remain so in the future.

Non-constant reasoning: A TLA^+ module parameter is either a *constant* or a (state) *variable*. Constants are independent of behaviors and have the same value in each state of the behavior, while a variable can have different values in different states. Following the tradition of modal and temporal logics, TLA^+ formulas do not explicitly refer to states. Instead, action formulas are built from two copies v and v' of variables that refer to the values before and after the transition. More generally, the prime operator $'$ can be applied to an entire expression e , with e' representing the value of e at the state after

a step. A *constant expression* e is one that does not involve any state variables, and is therefore equal to e' . (Double priming is not allowed in TLA^+ ; the TLA^+ syntactic analyzer catches such errors.)

Currently, all TLAPS backends support logical reasoning only on constant expressions. The semantics of the prime operator is therefore syntactically approximated as follows: it is commuted with all ordinary operators of mathematics and is absorbed by constant parameters. Thus, if e is the expression $(u = v + 2 * c)$ where u and v are variables and c a constant, then e' equals $u' = v' + 2 * c$. TLAPM currently performs such rewrites and its rewrite engine is trusted.

Operators and substitutivity: At any point in the scope of its definition, a user-defined operator is in one of two states: *usable* or *hidden*. A usable operator is one whose definition may be *expanded* in a proof; for example, if the operator P defined by $P(x, y) \triangleq x + 2 * y$ is usable, then TLAPM may replace $P(2, 20)$ with $2 + 2 * 20$ (but *not* with 42, which requires proving that $2 + 2 * 20 = 42$). A user-defined operator is hidden by default; it is made usable in a particular leaf proof by explicitly citing its definition, or for the rest of the current subproof by a *USE* step (see [7] for the semantics of *USE*).

Because TLA^+ is a modal logic, it contains operators that do not obey substitutivity, which underlies Leibniz's principle of equality. For example, from $(u = 42) = \text{TRUE}$ one cannot deduce $(u = 42)' = \text{TRUE}'$, i.e., $u' = 42$. A unary operator $O(_)$ is *substitutive* if $e = f$ implies $O(e) = O(f)$, for all expressions e and f . This definition is extended in the obvious way to operators with multiple arguments. Most of the modal primitive operators of TLA^+ are not substitutive; and an operator defined in terms of non-substitutive operators can be non-substitutive. If a non-substitutive operator is usable, then TLAPM expands its definition during preprocessing, as described in the previous paragraph; if it is hidden, then TLAPM replaces its applications by cryptographic hashes of its text to prevent unsound inferences by backend verifiers. This is a conservative approximation: for example, it prevents proving $O(e \wedge f) = O(f \wedge e)$ for a hidden non-substitutive operator O . Users rarely define non-substitutive operators, so there seems to be no urgent need for a more sophisticated treatment.

Subexpression references: A fairly novel feature of the TLA^+ proof language is the ability to refer to arbitrary subexpressions and instances of operators, theorems, and proof steps that appear earlier in the module or in imported modules, reducing the verbosity and increasing the maintainability of TLA^+ proofs. *Positional* references denote a path through the abstract syntax; for example, for the definition, $O(x, y) \triangleq x = 20 * y + 2$, the reference $O(3, 4)!2!1$ resolves to the first subexpression of the second subexpression of $O(3, 4)$, i.e., $20 * 4$. Subexpressions can also be labelled and accessed via *labelled* references. For example, for $O(x, y) \triangleq x = l::(y * 20) + 2$, the reference $O(3, 4)!l$ refers to $4 * 20$ and will continue to refer to this expression even if the definition of O is later modified to $O(x, y) \triangleq x = 7 * y^2 + l::(20 * y) + 2$. TLAPM replaces all subexpression references with the expressions they resolve to prior to further processing.

Verifying obligations: Once an obligation is produced and processed as described before, TLAPM invokes backend verifiers on the proof obligations corresponding to the leaf proofs. The default procedure is to invoke the Zenon theorem prover first. If Zenon

succeeds in verifying the obligation, it produces an Isabelle/Isar proof script that can be checked by Isabelle/TLA⁺. If Zenon fails to prove an obligation, then Isabelle/TLA⁺ is instructed to use one of its automated proof methods. The default procedure can be modified through pragmas that instruct TLAPM to bypass Zenon, use particular Isabelle tactics, or use other backends. Most users will invoke the pragmas indirectly by using particular theorems from the standard TLAPS module. For instance, using the theorem named `SimpleArithmetic` in a leaf proof causes TLAPM to invoke a decision procedure for Presburger arithmetic for that proof. The user can learn what standard theorems can prove what kinds of assertions by reading the documentation, but she does not need to know how such standard theorems are interpreted by TLAPM.

4 Backend verifiers

4.1 Isabelle/TLA⁺

Isabelle/TLA⁺ is an axiomatization of TLA⁺ in the generic proof assistant Isabelle [13]. It embodies the semantics of the constant fragment of TLA⁺ in TLAPS; as mentioned in Section 2, it is used to certify proofs found by automatic backend verifiers. We initially considered encoding TLA⁺ in one of the existing object logics that come with the Isabelle distribution, such as Isabelle/ZF or Isabelle/HOL. However, this turned out to be inconvenient, mainly because TLA⁺ is untyped. (Indeed, TLA⁺ does not even distinguish between propositions and terms.) We would have had to define a type of TLA⁺ values inside an existing object logic and build TLA⁺-specific theories for sets, functions, arithmetic *etc.*, essentially precluding reuse of the existing infrastructure.

Isabelle/TLA⁺ defines classical first-order logic based on equality, conditionals, and Hilbert’s choice operator. All operators take arguments and return values of the single type `c` representing TLA⁺ values. Set theory is based on the uninterpreted predicate symbol \in and standard Zermelo-Fr nkel axioms. Unlike most presentations of ZF, TLA⁺ considers functions to be primitive objects rather than sets of ordered pairs. Natural numbers with zero and successor are introduced using Hilbert’s choice as some set satisfying the Peano axioms; the existence of such a set is established from the ZF axioms. Basic arithmetic operators over natural numbers such as \leq , $+$, and $*$ are defined by primitive recursion, and division and modulus are defined in terms of $+$ and $*$. Tuples and sequences are defined as functions whose domains are initial intervals of the natural numbers. Characters are introduced as pairs of hexadecimal digits, and strings as sequences of characters. Records are functions whose domains are finite sets of strings. Isabelle’s flexible parser and pretty-printer transparently converts between the surface syntax and the internal representation. The standard library introduces basic operations for these data structures and proves elementary lemmas about them. It currently provides more than 1400 lemmas and theorems, corresponding to about 200 pages of pretty-printed Isar text. Isabelle/TLA⁺ sets up Isabelle’s generic automated proof methods (rewriting, tableau and resolution provers, and their combinations).

It is a testimony to the genericity of Isabelle that setting up a new object logic was mostly a matter of perseverance and engineering. Because TLA⁺ is untyped, many theorems come with hypotheses that express “typing conditions”. For example, proving $n + 0 = n$ requires proving that n is a number. When the semantics of TLA⁺ allowed

us to do so, we set up operators so that they return the expected “type”; for example, $p \wedge q$ is guaranteed to be a Boolean value whatever its arguments p and q are. In other cases, typechecking is left to Isabelle’s automatic proof methods; support for conditional rewrite rules in Isabelle’s simplifier was essential to make this work.

4.2 Zenon

Zenon is a theorem prover for first-order logic with Hilbert’s choice operator and equality. It is a *proof-producing* theorem prover: it outputs formal proof scripts for the theorems it proves. Zenon was extended with a backend that produces proofs in Isar syntax; these proofs use lemmas based on the Isabelle/TLA⁺ object logic and are passed to Isabelle for verification. Zenon is therefore not part of the trusted code base of TLAPS.

Zenon had to be extended with deduction rules specific to TLA⁺: rules for reasoning about set-theoretic operators, for the `CASE` operator of TLA⁺, for set extensionality and function extensionality, for reasoning directly on bounded quantifiers (which is not needed in theory but is quite important for efficiency), and for reasoning about functions, strings, *etc.* Interestingly, Hilbert’s choice operator was already used in Zenon for Skolemization, so we were easily able to support the `CHOOSE` operator of TLA⁺.

Future work includes adding rules to deal with tuples, sequences, records, and arithmetic, and improving the handling of equality. While there is some overlap between Zenon and Isabelle’s automatic methods as they are instantiated in Isabelle/TLA⁺, in practice they have different strong points and there are many obligations where one succeeds while the other fails. Zenon uses Isabelle’s automatic proof tactics for some of the elementary steps when it knows they will succeed, in effect using these tactics as high-level inference rules.

4.3 Other backends

The first release of TLAPS comes with some additional non-certifying backends. For arithmetic reasoning we have:

- An SMT-LIB based backend that can be linked to any SMT solver. Obligations are rewritten into the AUFLIRA theory of SMT-LIB, which generally requires omitting assumptions that lie outside this theory. This backend is needed for reasoning about real numbers. We have successfully used Yices, CVC3, Z3, veriT and Alt-Ergo in our examples. In future work we might specialize this generic backend for particular solvers that can reason about larger theories.
- A Presburger arithmetic backend, for which we have implemented Cooper’s algorithm. Our implementation is tailored to certain elements of TLA⁺ that are not normally part of the Presburger fragment, but can be (conservatively) injected.

For both these backends, TLAPM performs a simple and highly conservative sort detection pass for bound identifiers. Both backends are currently non-certifying, but we plan to replace them with certifying backends in the future. In particular, we are integrating the proof-producing SMT solver veriT [5], with the goal of tailoring it for discharging TLA⁺ proof obligations.

5 Proof development

Writing proofs is hard and error-prone. Before attempting to prove correctness of a TLA⁺ specification, we first check finite instances with the TLC model checker [12]. This usually catches numerous errors quickly – much more quickly than by trying to prove it correct. Only after TLC can find no more errors do we try to write a proof.

The TLA⁺ language supports a hierarchical, non-linear proof development process that we find indispensable for larger proofs [9]. The highest-level proof steps are derived almost without thinking from the structure of the theorem to be proved. For example, a step of the form $P_1 \vee \dots \vee P_n \Rightarrow Q$ is proved by the sequence of steps asserting $P_i \Rightarrow Q$, for each i . When the user reaches a simple enough step, she first tries a fully automatic proof using a leaf directive citing the facts and definitions that appear relevant. If that fails, she begins a new level with a sequence of proof-less assertion steps that simplify the assertion, and a final QED step asserting that the goal follows from these steps. These new lower-level steps are tuned until the QED step is successfully verified. Then, the steps are proved in any order. (The user can ask TLAPM what steps have no proofs.) The most common reason that leaf proofs fail to verify is that the user has forgotten to use some fact or definition. When a proof fails, TLAPM prints the usable hypotheses and the goal, with usable definitions expanded. Examining this output often reveals the omission.

This kind of hierarchical development cries for a user interface that allows one to see what has been proved, hide irrelevant parts of the proof, and easily tell TLAPM what it should try to prove next. Eventually, these functions will be provided by the TLA⁺ Toolbox. (It now performs only the hiding.) When TLAPS is integrated into the Toolbox, writing the specification, model-checking it, and writing a proof will be one seamless process. Meanwhile, we have written an Emacs mode that allows hierarchical viewing of proofs and choosing which parts to prove.

We expect most users to assume simple facts about data structures such as sequences rather than spending time proving them – especially at the beginning, before we have developed libraries of such facts for common data structures. Relying on unchecked assumptions would be a likely source of errors; it is easy to make a mistake when writing an “obviously true” assumption. Such assumptions should therefore be model-checked with TLC.

5.1 Example developments

We have written a number of proofs, mainly to find bugs and see how well the prover works. Most of them are in the `examples` sub-directory of the TLAPS distribution. Here are the most noteworthy:

- *Peterson’s Mutual Exclusion Algorithm*. This is a standard shared memory mutual exclusion algorithm. The algorithm (in its 2-process version) is described in a dozen lines of PlusCal, an algorithm language that is automatically translated to TLA⁺. The proof of mutual exclusion is about 130 lines long.
- *The Bakery Algorithm with Atomic Reads and Writes*. This is a more complicated standard mutual exclusion example; its proof (for the N -process version) is 800 lines long.

- *Paxos*. We have specified a high-level version of the well-known Paxos consensus algorithm as a trivial specification of consensus and two refinement steps—a total of 100 lines of TLA⁺. We have completed the proof of the first refinement and most of the proof of the second. The first refinement proof is 550 lines long; we estimate that the second will be somewhat over 1000 lines.

Tuning the back-end provers has made them more powerful, making proofs easier to write. While writing machine-checked proofs remains tiresome and more time consuming than we would like, it has not turned out to be difficult once the proof idea has been understood.

Acknowledgements Georges Gonthier helped design the TLA⁺ proof language. Jean-Baptiste Tristan wrote the (incomplete) Paxos proof.

References

1. TLAPS web-site. <http://www.msr-inria.inria.fr/~doligez/tlaps>.
2. TLA⁺ Toolbox. <http://www.tlaplus.net/tools/tla-toolbox/>.
3. B. Alpern and F. B. Schneider. Defining liveness. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 21(4):181–185, Oct. 1985.
4. R. Bonichon, D. Delahaye, and D. Doligez. Zenon : An extensible automated theorem prover producing checkable proofs. In N. Dershowitz and A. Voronkov, editors, *Proc. 14th LPAR*, pages 151–165. Springer LNCS 4790, Oct. 2007.
5. T. Bouton, D. C. de Oliveira, D. Déharbe, and P. Fontaine. veriT: An open, trustable and efficient SMT-solver. In R. Schmidt, editor, *CADE 22*, pages 151–156, Montreal, Canada, 2009. Springer LNCS 5663.
6. A. Chaieb and T. Nipkow. Proof synthesis and reflection for linear arithmetic. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 41:33–59, 2008.
7. K. Chaudhuri, D. Doligez, L. Lamport, and S. Merz. A TLA⁺ Proof System. In G. Sutcliffe, P. Rudnicki, R. Schmidt, B. Konev, and S. Schulz, editors, *Workshop on Knowledge Exchange: Automated Provers and Proof Assistants*, number 418 in CEUR Workshop Proceedings, pages 17–37, 2008.
8. P. Corbineau. A declarative proof language for the Coq proof assistant. In F. Honsell, M. Miculan, and I. Scagnetto, editors, *Workshop on Types for Proofs and Programs*, pages 69–84, Udine, Italy, 2007. Springer LNCS 4941.
9. E. Gafni and L. Lamport. Disk Paxos. *Distributed Computing*, 16(1):1–20, 2003.
10. L. Lamport. Proving the correctness of multiprocess programs. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.*, SE-3(2):125–143, Mar. 1977.
11. L. Lamport. How to write a proof. *American Mathematical Monthly*, 102(7):600–608, Aug. 1995.
12. L. Lamport. *Specifying Systems*. Addison-Wesley, Boston, 2003.
13. L. C. Paulson. *Isabelle: A Generic Theorem Prover*. Springer Verlag LNCS 828, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1994.
14. P. Rudnicki. An overview of the Mizar project. In *Workshop on Types for Proofs and Programs*, pages 311–332, Bastad, Sweden, 1992.
15. M. Wenzel. The Isabelle/Isar reference manual, Dec. 2009. <http://isabelle.in.tum.de/dist/Isabelle/doc/isar-ref.pdf>.