An Abstract Stack Based Approach to Verified Compositional Compilation to Machine Code

Yuting Wang\textsuperscript{1}, Pierre Wilke\textsuperscript{1,2}, Zhong Shao\textsuperscript{1}

Yale University\textsuperscript{1}, CentraleSupélec\textsuperscript{2}

POPL'19 – January 18\textsuperscript{th}, 2019
Verified compilation

CompCert: verified C compiler (Leroy et al., first released in 2008)

Used as a basis for a large number of extensions:

- alternate semantics: CompCertTSO (weak memory model, Sevcík et al., JACM’13), CompCertS (undefined pointer arithmetic, Besson et al., ITP’17)
- a more concrete view of the stack: Quantitative CompCert (merge the stack blocks into a single stack region, Carbonneaux et al., PLDI’14)
- compositional compilation: Compositional CompCert (Stewart et al., POPL’15), compositional semantics (Ramananandro et al., CPP’15), SepCompCert (Kang et al., POPL’16)

Open problems:
- verified compilation to machine code
- port all compiler passes of CompCert, including challenging inlining and tailcall recognition
- verified compilation of heterogeneous modules (mix C and Asm modules)
Contribution: Stack-Aware CompCert

A version of CompCert with:

1. compilation to **machine code**
   - merge the stack blocks into a unique stack region
   - eliminate CompCert’s **pseudo-instructions**
   - generate **machine code**

2. complete extension: we support all CompCert passes
   - including challenging optimizations (**function inlining**, **tailcall elimination**)

3. **compositional compilation**
   - stack access policy
   - mix C and Asm programs
**CompCert: memory model and values**

```c
void swap(int * p1, int * p2) {
    int tmp = *p1;
    *p1 = *p2;
    *p2 = tmp;
}

int main() {
    int i = 3, j = 9;
    int * x = &i;
    int * y = &j;
    swap(x, y);
    return 0;
}
```
The memory model stays the same throughout compilation, but the memory blocks change shapes.

The stack frames in Asm are in distinct blocks!
The abstract stack

We maintain an abstract stack in memory states, that reflects the structure of the concrete stack.

Abstract stack: a list of abstract frames.

An abstract frame records useful information about a concrete stack frame:

- the size of this stack frame at the assembly level;
- which blocks are part of that stack frame;
- which locations of these blocks are public or private
The abstract stack at the C level is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{C} & : \quad \{ b_i, b_j, b_x, b_y \} \\
\text{Clight} & : \quad \{ b_i, b_j \} \\
\text{Cminor} & : \quad \{ b_i, b_j \} \\
\text{Asm} & : \quad \{ b_{\text{main}}, b_{\text{tmp}} \}
\end{align*}
\]
The abstract stack at the Asm level is:

```
main

\[ b_{\text{swap}} \]

\[ b_{\text{main}} \]
```

Stack-access policy: we may write to

- all of \( b_{\text{swap}} \)
- public locations in \( b_{\text{main}} \)
Abstract stack primitives

Semantics of all intermediate languages instrumented with `push_frame` and `pop_frame`

Key argument for merging stack blocks:
The `push_frame` primitive only succeeds if the sum of the frames’ sizes is lower than `MAX_STACK`.
Preservation of stack usage with compilation

Since the semantics include stack consumption, it must be preserved by compilation.

**Property to ensure:** at each program point, the size of source stack should be larger than (or equal to) the size of target stack.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Function f" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Function f" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Function g" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Function g" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regular case

The sizes of the source and target stacks are equal.

\[ |f| + |g| = |f| + |g| \]

Recall \(|f|\) is the size of \(f\)’s stack frame at the Asm level!
Preservation of stack usage with compilation

Since the semantics include stack consumption, it must be preserved by compilation

**Property to ensure:** at each program point, the size of source stack should be larger than (or equal to) the size of target stack.

Function inlining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[f]</td>
<td>[f]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
|f| + |g| \geq |f|
\]

The sizes of the source stack is larger than the target stack.
Preservation of stack usage with compilation

Since the semantics include stack consumption, it must be preserved by compilation.

**Property to ensure**: at each program point, the size of source stack should be larger than (or equal to) the size of target stack.

The sizes of the source stack is larger than the target stack.

\[ |f| \geq |f| \]
Preservation of stack usage with compilation

Since the semantics include stack consumption, it must be preserved by compilation

**Property to ensure**: at each program point, the size of source stack should be larger than (or equal to) the size of target stack.

Source

```
void g()
⇒ G;
}
```

```
void f()

F;
tail g();
```

Target

```
void g()

G;
```

```
void f()

F;
⇒ G;
```

Problem: How to compare the sizes of the source and target stacks

\[ |g| \geq |f| \]
Preservation of stack usage with compilation

Since the semantics include stack consumption, it must be preserved by compilation

**Property to ensure:** at each program point, the size of source stack should be larger than (or equal to) the size of target stack.

```
Source

void g(){
 ⇒ G;
}

void f(){
 F;
 tail g();
}

Target

void g(){
 G;
}

void f(){
 F;
 ⇒ G;
}
```

We keep the history of tailcalled functions:

\[ \max(|f|, |g|) \geq |f| \]
The structure of the abstract stack

The abstract stack is actually a list of list of abstract frames.
From CompCert Assembly to Machine Code

CompCert Asm

“Single-Stack” Asm

“Flat” Asm

Plain Memory

merging stack blocks

pseudo-instructions elimination

flat memory layout

instruction encoding

(Yuting Wang, Pierre Wilke, Zhong Shao, PLDI’12)
Eliminating pseudo-instructions

Mismatch between CompCert semantics and expected semantics

We get rid of the pseudo-register RA and can do away with pseudo-instructions (simple pointer arithmetic)
Stack access policy

Accessible locations are either top-frame locations or public locations.
Contextual compilation

When a function $f$ calls a function $g$, the **private regions** of $f$’s stack frame should not be altered.

Programs compiled from C **comply** with that policy.

Characterization of **acceptable Asm functions**.

We apply this principle to CompCertX (Gu *et al.*, POPL’15)

- contextual compiler developed for CertiKOS
- ability to mix C and Asm functions
## Comparison with existing work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Completeness</th>
<th>Compositionality</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CompCert (3.0.1)</td>
<td>CompCert Asm</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>separate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stack-Aware CompCert</td>
<td>Machine Code</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>contextual</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative CompCert</td>
<td>SingleStack Asm</td>
<td>w.o. some opts.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compositional CompCert</td>
<td>CompCert Asm</td>
<td>w.o. some opts.</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+3k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SepCompCert</td>
<td>CompCert Asm</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>separate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+8k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CompCertX</td>
<td>CompCert Asm</td>
<td>no s.a. data</td>
<td>contextual</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>+8k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CompCert-TSO</td>
<td>x86-TSO</td>
<td>w.o. some opts.</td>
<td>concurrency</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CompCertS</td>
<td>CompCert Asm</td>
<td>w.o. some opts.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>220k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Conclusion

We develop Stack-Aware CompCert, with three distinguishing features:

1. compilation to machine code
   - finite-size stack
   - more concrete memory layout for Asm
   - closer to actual machine code: reduction of unverified part of the compiler

2. complete extension of CompCert
   - function inlining and tailcall elimination

3. compositional compilation
   - extension of CompCertX
   - stack access policy

Further work and perspectives:

- port to other backends: ARM, RISC-V, x86-64
  - main challenge: encoding and decoding of instructions
- define a stack analysis / verification framework to reason about the stack usage of programs and prove they run in bounded stack