

MC: Meta-level Compilation

Extending the Process of Code
Compilation with Application-Specific
Information – for the layman developer
(code monkey)

Gaurav S. Kc
8th October, 2003

Outline

- Dawson Engler
- Overview of the Compilation Process
- Meta-level Compilation
 - early days with MAGIK
 - current incarnation: MC
 - good for detecting bugs:
 - » NULL pointer misuse
 - » memory leak (failure to deallocate memory)
 - » memory corruption (illegal use of deallocated memory)
 - » security holes (buffer overflow, formatstring vulnerabilities)
- Conclusions

Dawson Engler

- The man behind MAGIK and MC
- PhD from MIT '98
- Stanford Faculty (Metalevel Compilation Group)
 - <http://metacomp.stanford.edu>
“The goal of the Meta-level Compilation (MC) project is to allow system implementors to easily build simple domain- and application-specific compiler extensions to check, optimize, and transform code.”
 - Publications on MC at OSDI, PLDI, SOSOP, Oakland Symposium, ACM CCS
- Coverity.com: commercialised MC

Compilers

- S/W lifecycle phases
 - Requirements engineering
 - Design, and implementation
 - Repeat, and maintain
- Compilation phases
 - Pre-process (**cpp**) : macro processing
 - Compiler proper (**cc1**)
 - front end synthesis: source $\rightarrow$ IR, symbol table, control-flow, data-flow
 - middle end optimisation: IR $\rightarrow$ IR
 - back end generation: IR $\rightarrow$ optimised machine assembly
 - Assembler (**as**): assembler macro processing, translate ASCII instructions into binary machine code
 - Linkage editor (**ld**): combine several object modules (and library files) to produce static or dynamically-linked executables

Meta-level Compilation

- Static information generated by the front-end synthesis phase is lost after compilation
- Application-specific compiler extensions & optimisations can benefit from this information
 - Compiler developer cannot anticipate all possible domain-specific extensions
 - Application writer doesn't want to learn compiler internals
- Need: Simpler mechanism for coding application-specific extensions for integration into compiler

MC Paper:

Incorporating Application Semantics and Control into Compilation

Dawson R. Engler, First Conference on Domain Specific Languages, 1997

- Programmers can be active users of compilers
- Incorporate domain-specific extensions into the compilation process
- Facilitate previously impossible “application-level” optimisations and semantic-checking (dereference **NULL**)
- Leave application source code unmodified
 - Source-level (IR) modifications for portable user extensions
 - Full compiler optimisations on modified IR
- Leave compiler source code unmodified
 - Extensions will exhibit "built-in" behaviour in compiler

magik: An ANSI-C api to LCC IR

- Dynamically linked into modified LCC compiler
- User extensions:
 - Code: invoked at every function definition
 - Data: invoked at every `struct` definition
- Examples:
 - Automatically replace a poly-typed function (*output*) with *printf* and appropriate format-string

```
output("i = ", i, ", j = ", j)
printf("%s%d%s%d", "i = ", i, ", j = ", j)
```
 - Mandatory checking of return codes for system calls

```
read(fd, buffer, size)
if (0 > read(fd, buffer, size))
    error("failed system call <read>\n")
```

magik: illustration

Replace poly-typed function with *printf* equivalent

```
foreach function-call ( "output" )
  foreach function-argument ( = arg )
    switch argument-type ( arg ) {

      case Integer:
        strcat ( typestring, "%d" ); break;

      case Pointer:
        if rawPointerType ( arg ) == CHAR
          strcat ( typestring, "%s" );
        else strcat ( typestring, "0x%p" );
        break;
    }

  replace-call ( function-call, "printf" )
  insert-argument (function-call, typestring )
```

MC Paper:

Checking System Rules Using System-Specific, Programmer-Written Compiler Extensions

Operating Systems Design and Implementation, 2000

- System rules for Operating System Kernel
 - Kernel sanitises user-space data before accessing it (**do X before Y**)
 - A lock must have a corresponding unlock on every code path (**when X, do Y**)
- Peer reviews for manual inspection of source code: not rigorous, human error.
- Automated enforcing of system rules
 - Testing: time-consuming, not exhaustive since complexity/size scale with system size. Impractical to test all device drivers for Linux
 - Formal Verification: model checkers, theorem provers/checkers to validate consistency of abstract specification of system. Hard to accurately represent system in specifications: over-simplification, omission of features, unless generating code from specs
- Compiler-based static analysis tools are useful
 - No scalability problem. Works directly on source code
 - System rules have straightforward mapping to source code
 - Rules are enforced as new phases in the compilation

metal:

A high-level, state machine language

- *yacc*-like specification for SM: matched patterns in source code causes transitions between different states
- Linkable object code compiled from *metal* specifications using *mcc*.
- Dynamically linked into compiler, xg++ (based on GNU g++, working on gcc version)
- SM is applied down all possible control-flow paths for each function

MC / *metal*: illustration

Ensure corresponding *sti* (re-enable interrupts) for every *cli*

```
sm check_interrupts {
```

```
  // Patterns
```

```
  pattern enable = { sti(); };
```

```
  pattern disable = { cli(); };
```

```
  // States and transitions / actions
```

```
  is_enabled : disable ==> is_disabled  
              | enable ==> { error( "double enable" ); }  
              ;
```

```
  is_disabled: enable ==> is_enabled  
              | disable ==> { error( "double disable" ); }  
              | $end-of-path$ ==> { error( "exit w/ intr" ) }  
              ;
```

```
}
```

Other MC / *metal* checks

- Make the kernel check user-space pointers before de-referencing (applicable to library interfaces)
- For states $\{unknown, null, not_null, freed\}$, find when pointers are used:
 - before being checked
 - on **NULL** paths
 - after being **free**'d
- Find double-free errors
- Find error paths (returning a negative value) that don't free allocated memory
- Cannot handle multi-threaded applications

Conclusions

- Meta-level compilation
- New phases for user-extensible compiler
- Domain-specific checks for
 - locating application bugs
 - enforcing system rules
 - ...
- Compiler experience  required