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Abstract

The FermaT transformation system, based on research carried out over the last sixteen years at Durham University, De Montfort University and Software Migrations Ltd., is an industrial-strength formal transformation engine with many applications in program comprehension and language migration. This paper is a case study which uses automated plus manually-directed transformations and abstractions to convert an IBM 370 Assembler code program into a very high-level abstract specification.
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2 Introduction

There is a vast collection of operational software systems which are vitally important to their users, yet are becoming increasingly difficult to maintain, enhance and keep up to date with rapidly changing requirements. For many of these so called legacy systems the option of throwing the system away and re-writing it from scratch is not economically viable. Methods are therefore urgently required which enable these systems to evolve in a controlled manner. In particular, legacy assembler systems have high maintenance costs, and migrating such systems to a different environment (eg. a client-server architecture) is much more difficult than for high-level language systems. The FermaT transformation system uses formal proven program transformations, which preserve or refine the semantics of a program while changing its form. These transformations are applied to restructure and simplify the legacy systems and to extract higher-level representations.

By using an appropriate sequence of transformations, the extracted representation is guaranteed to be equivalent to the original code logic. The method is based on a formal wide spectrum language, called WSL, with accompanying formal method. Over the last sixteen years we have developed a large catalogue of proven transformations, together with mechanically verifiable applicability conditions. These have been applied to many software development, reverse engineering and maintenance problems.

3 Theoretical Foundation

The theoretical work on which FermaT is based originated not in software maintenance, but in research on the development of a language in which proofs of equivalence for program transformations could be achieved as easily as possible for a wide range of constructs.

WSL is the “Wide Spectrum Language” used in our program transformation work, which includes low-level programming constructs and high-level abstract specifications within a single language. This has the advantage that one does not need to differentiate between programming and specification languages: the entire transformational development of a program from abstract specification to detailed implementation can be carried out in a single language. Conversely,
the entire reverse-engineering process, from a transliteration of the source program to a high-level specification, can also be carried out in the same language. During either of these processes, different parts of the program may be expressed at different levels of abstraction. So a wide-spectrum language forms an ideal tool for developing methods for formal program development and also for formal reverse engineering (for which we have coined the term inverse engineering).

A program transformation is an operation which modifies a program into a different form which has the same external behaviour (i.e. it is equivalent under a precisely defined denotational semantics). Since both programs and specifications are part of the same language, transformations can be used to demonstrate that a given program is a correct implementation of a given specification.

A refinement is an operation which modifies a program to make its behaviour more defined and/or more deterministic. A typical implementation of a non-deterministic specification will be a refinement rather than a strict equivalence. The opposite of refinement is abstraction: we say that a specification is an abstraction of a program which implements it. See [5,6] and [1] for a description of refinement.

The syntax and semantics of WSL are described in [8,9,12] so will not be discussed in detail here. Most of the constructs in WSL, for example if statements, while loops, procedures and functions, are common to many programming languages. However there are some features relating to the “specification level” of the language which are unusual. Expressions and conditions (formulae) in WSL are taken directly from the language which are unusual. Expressions and conditions (formulae) in WSL are taken directly from first order logic: in fact, an infinitary first order logic is used (see [4] for details), which allows countably infinite disjunctions and conjunctions. This use of first order logic means that statements in WSL can include existential and universal quantification over infinite sets, and similar (non-executable) operations. Two list operators are also used in specifications: for a unary function \( f \) and list \( L = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle \) the map operator \( * \) is defined:

\[
 f * L =_{df} \langle f(a_1), f(a_2), \ldots, f(a_n) \rangle
\]

For a binary operator \( g \) and non-empty list \( L \) the reduce operator \( / \) is defined:

\[
 g / L = def a_1 \quad \text{if } n = 1 \\
 =_{df} g(a_1, g/\langle a_2, \ldots, a_n \rangle) \quad \text{if } \ell(L) > 1
\]

For example, if \( f \) is a function which returns integers, and \( L \) is a non-empty list of suitable arguments for \( f \), then \(+/f * L\) is the result of applying \( f \) to every element of \( L \) and adding up the results. We also use \( \ell(L) \) to denote the length of list \( L \) and \( L[i \ldots j] \) to denote the sublist \( \langle a_i, \ldots, a_j \rangle \).

Over the last sixteen years we have been developing the WSL language, in parallel with the development of a transformation theory and proof methods. Over this time the language has developed from a simple and tractable kernel language [9] to a complete and powerful programming language. At the “low-level” end of the language there exist automatic translators from IBM Assembler into WSL, and from a subset of WSL into C. At the “high-level” end it is possible to write abstract specifications, similar to Z and VDM.

In [10,13] program transformations are used to derive a variety of efficient algorithms from abstract specifications. In [10,12,13] the same transformations are used in the reverse direction: using transformations to derive a concise abstract representation of the specification for several challenging programs.

In [11] we describe a case study using FermaT to migrate an assembler program to modular and maintainable C code, using purely automatic transformations with no manual intervention. As far as we know, none of the other researchers in program transformations (for example, [2,7]) have attempted to apply their methods to assembler code. The nearest research is Cristina Cifuentes work on decompilation and binary translation [Cifuentes CSMR00].

In this paper we go even further in the reverse engineering process. Starting with the same assembler program from [11] we use formal transformations to abstract an equivalent high-level specification of the program.

4 Example Transformations in FermaT

In this section we describe a small number of the transformations implemented in FermaT which are used in the case study. If \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \) are any WSL statements and \( \Delta \) is any countable set of formulae with no free variables, then we write \( \Delta \vdash S_1 \leq S_2 \) to denote that \( S_2 \) is a refinement of \( S_1 \) whenever all the formulae on \( \Delta \) are true. If \( \Delta \vdash S_1 \leq S_2 \) and \( \Delta \vdash S_2 \leq S_1 \) then we write \( \Delta \vdash S_1 \approx S_2 \) and say that \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \) are equivalent. If \( S_2 \) is generated from \( S_1 \) by a program transformation, then \( \Delta \vdash S_1 \approx S_2 \), where \( \Delta \) is the set of applicability conditions for the transformation.
4.1 Expand Forwards

If $B$ is any condition and $S_1$, $S_2$ and $S_3$ are any statements then:

$$\Delta \vdash \mbox{if } B \mbox{ then } S_1 \mbox{ else } S_2 \mbox{ fi}; \quad S_3 \equiv \mbox{if } B \mbox{ then } S_1; \quad S_3 \mbox{ else } S_2; \quad S_3$$

4.2 Loops

As well as the usual for and while loops, there is a notation for unbounded loops. Statements of the form do $S$ od, where $S$ is a statement, are “infinite” or “unbounded” loops which can only be terminated by the execution of a statement of the form exit(n) which causes the program to exit the $n$ enclosing loops. We use exit as an abbreviation for exit(1). To simplify the language we disallow exits which leave a block or a loop other than an unbounded loop. We also insist that $n$ be an integer, not a variable or expression—this ensures that we can always determine the target of the exit.

Definition 4.1 Global Substitution

If $P(S, p)$ is a predicate on a statement $S$ and position $p$ within $S$, and $S'(S, p)$ is a function which returns a statement for any given statement $S$ and $p$, then the effect of replacing or appending to the statement at position $p$ in $S$ with $S'(S, p)$ for every $p$ such that $P(S, p)$ holds is denoted:

$$S \left[ S'(S, p) / p \mid P(S, p) \right]$$

If the statement at position $p$ in $S$ is an exit statement, then it is replaced by $S'(S, p)$. Otherwise, $S'(S, p)$ is appended in sequence after the statement at position $p$.

Within a global substitution we use $\delta(S, p)$ to denote the depth of a component of a statement. This is the number of enclosing do ... od loops surrounding the component. We use $\tau(S, p)$ to denote the terminal value of a statement. This is the number of enclosing loops around $S$ which might be terminated by execution of the statement at position $p$ in $S$. If the statement at position $p$ in $S$ does not terminate $S$ then $\tau(S, p) = -1$. For example, any exit(n) has terminal value $n$. If $S$ contains an exit(n) within $m$ nested loops (where $m \leq n$) then the terminal value of $S$ itself, denoted $\tau(S, \langle \rangle)$, will be at least $n - m$. A statement $S$ with terminal value zero cannot terminate any enclosing loops, so the next thing to be executed after $S$ will be the next statement in the sequence containing $S$ (if there is one). Such a statement is called a proper sequence. If $S$ is a proper sequence, then:

$$\Delta \vdash \mbox{do if } B \mbox{ then exit fi; } S \mbox{ od } \equiv \mbox{while } \neg B \mbox{ do } S \mbox{ od}$$

In the following transformations, the global substitutions are all applied to the simple terminal statements of $S$. These are the statements which are neither a sequence, a conditional, or a do ... od loop and which will terminate $S$ if they are executed. For example, in:

if $B$ then $x := 1; \ y := 2$ else exit fi

the terminal statements are $y := 2$ and exit. If the statement is enclosed in a do ... od loop, only the exit will be a terminal statement.

We usually omit the parameters from $\delta$ and $\tau$ in a global substitution when these are obvious from the context.

Definition 4.2 Incrementation

The incrementation of $S$ by $n$ (where $n$ is any non-negative integer) is defined as the incrementation of all simple terminal statements in $S$. An exit is incremented by incrementing its parameter, while any other simple statement is incremented by appending an exit:

$$S + n = _{df} S \left[ \mbox{exit}(n + \delta) / p \mid \tau \geq 0 \right]$$

For example:

$$\mbox{if } B \mbox{ then } x := 1; \ y := 2 \mbox{ else exit fi } + 2$$

= $$\mbox{if } B \mbox{ then } x := 1; \ y := 2; \ \mbox{exit}(2) \mbox{ else exit}(3) \mbox{ fi } + 2$$

while:

$$\mbox{do if } B \mbox{ then } x := 1; \ y := 2 \mbox{ else exit fi } \mbox{ od } + 2$$

= $$\mbox{do if } B \mbox{ then } x := 1; \ y := 2 \mbox{ else exit}(3) \mbox{ fi } \mbox{ od } + 2$$

Definition 4.3 Partial Incrementation

The notation $S + (n, m)$ where $m \geq 0$ denotes incrementation of the terminal statements in $S$ with terminal value $m$ or greater:

$$S + (n, m) = _{df} S \left[ \mbox{exit}(n + \delta) / p \mid \tau \geq m \right]$$

Note that $\mbox{do } S \mbox{ od } + (n, m) = \mbox{do } S + (n, m + 1) \mbox{ od}$. 

4.3 Absorption

For any statements $S_1$ and $S_2$:

$$\Delta \vdash S_1; S_2 \approx S_1 [S_2 + \delta / p | \tau = 0]$$

For example:

```plaintext
do if B then x := 1; y := 2 else exit fi od; z := 1
```

do if B then x := 1; y := 2 else z := 1; exit fi od

This transformation can be applied in reverse to “take out” code from a loop.

4.4 False Loop

We can insert a loop around any statement, by incrementing it first:

$$\Delta \vdash S \approx \text{do } S + 1 \text{ od}$$

(This is a “false loop” because the body of the loop can only be executed once).

4.5 Loop Doubling

Any loop can be converted to a double loop by the last transformation, or by incrementing the body of the loop:

$$\Delta \vdash \text{do } S \text{ od} \approx \text{do } \text{do } S \text{ od} + 1 \text{ od} \approx \text{do } S + 1 \text{ od od}$$

More generally, we can arbitrarily decide whether or not to increment each terminal statement in $S$ with terminal value zero:

$$\Delta \vdash \text{do } S \text{ od} \approx \text{do do } S \text{ exit(}\delta + 1)/p\text{ od od}$$

$$\approx \text{do } S \text{ exit(}\delta + 1)/p\text{ od od}$$

Where $\psi$ is any condition on $S$ and $p$.

This can be combined with the inverse of absorption to “isolate” part of a loop body. For example:

$$\Delta \vdash \text{do } S; \text{ if } B \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else } S_2 \text{ fi od} \approx \text{do } S + (1, 1);$$

if B then exit else $S_2 + (1, 1)$ fi od;

$h_1$ od

4.6 Loop Inversion

If $S_1$ is a proper sequence then:

$$\Delta \vdash \text{do } S_1; S_2 \text{ od} \approx \text{do } S_1; \text{ do } S_2; S_1 \text{ od}$$

More generally, for any statements $S_1$ and $S_2$:

$$\Delta \vdash \text{do } S_1; S_2 \text{ od} \approx \text{do } S_1; \text{ do } S_2; S_1 \text{ od + 1 od}$$

4.7 Loop Unrolling

We can unroll the first step of a loop:

$$\Delta \vdash \text{do } S \text{ od} \approx S[\text{do } S \text{ od} + \delta + 1/p | \tau = 0]$$

$$[\text{exit}(\tau + \delta - 1)/p | \tau \geq 1]$$

where the RHS contains two successive global substitutions on $S$.

More generally, we can insert a copy of the whole loop, with certain terminal statements of the loop body incremented, after certain terminal statements in the loop body. Let $S'$ be formed from $S$ by incrementing selected terminal statements with terminal value zero:

$$S' = S[\text{exit}(\delta + 1)/p | \tau = 0 \land \Phi(S, p)]$$

where $\Phi$ is any condition (see Section 4.3). Then:

$$\Delta \vdash \text{do } S \text{ od} \approx \text{do } S \text{ do } S' \text{ od + } \delta + 1/p | \tau = 0 \land \Psi(S, p) \text{ od}$$

$$[\text{exit}(\tau + \delta - 1)/p | \tau \geq 1]$$

where $\Psi$ is any condition.

5 Modelling Assembler in WSL

Constructing a useful scientific model necessarily involves throwing away some information: in other words, to be useful a model must be inaccurate, or at least idealised, to a certain extent. For example “ideal gases”, “incompressible fluids” and “billiard ball molecules” are all useful models which gain their utility by abstracting away some details of the real world. In the case of modelling a programming language, such as Assembler, it is theoretically possible to have a perfect model of the language which correctly captures the behaviour of all assembler programs. Certain features of Assembler, such as branching to register addresses, self-modifying code and so on, would imply that such a model would have to record the entire state of the machine, including all registers, memory, disk space, and external devices, and “interpret” this state as each instruction is executed. (Consider the effect of loading some data from a disk file into memory, performing arithmetic at arbitrary places in the data, and then branching to the start of the data block!) Unfortunately, such a model is useless for reverse engineering or migration purposes.

What we need is a practical model for assembler programs which is suitable for reverse engineering, and is accurate enough to deal with all the programming constructs which are likely to be encountered.
5.1 Assembler to WSL Translation

The aim of the assembler to WSL translator is to generate WSL code which models as accurately as possible the behaviour of the original assembler module, without worrying too much about the size, efficiency or complexity of the resulting code. Typically, the raw WSL translation of an assembler module will be three to five times bigger than the source file and have a very high McCabe cyclomatic complexity (typically in the hundreds, often in the thousands). This is, in part, because every “branch to register” instruction branches to the dispatch routine, which in turn contains branches to every possible return point. In addition, every instruction which sets the “condition code” flags will is translated into WSL code which assigns an appropriate value to a special variable cc (to emulate the condition code): whether or not the condition code is subsequently tested. See [11] for further details of the assembler to WSL translation process and the various features of commercial assembler code which it has to deal with.

However, the Fermat transformation engine includes some very powerful transformations for simplifying WSL code, removing redundancies, tracking dispatch codes, and so on. In most cases Fermat can automatically unscramble the tangle of “branch and save” and “branch to register” code to extract self-contained, single-entry single-exit procedures and so eliminate the dispatch procedure. In addition, Fermat can nearly always eliminate the cc variable by constructing appropriate conditional statements.

6 The Sample Program

Our sample program is from “A Guided Tour of Program Design Methodologies”, by G. D. Bergland [3] who in turn took it from a story called “Getting it Wrong” that has been related by Michael Jackson on numerous occasions:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{proc} & \text{ Management Report} \equiv \\
\text{var} & \quad \text{SW1} := 0, \text{SW2} := 0 : \\
& \quad \text{Produce Heading;} \\
& \quad \text{read(stuff);} \\
& \quad \text{while NOT eof(stuff) do} \\
& \quad \quad \text{if First Record In Group} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \text{then if SW1 = 1} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{then Process End Of Previous Group} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \fi \\
& \quad \quad \quad \text{SW1 := 1;} \\
& \quad \quad \text{Process Start Of New Group;} \\
& \quad \quad \text{else} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \text{Process Record; SW2 := 1} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \text{fi;} \\
& \quad \quad \text{read(stuff)} \\
& \quad \quad \text{od;} \\
& \quad \quad \text{if SW2 = 1 then Process End Of Last Group} \\
& \quad \quad \text{fi;} \\
& \quad \text{Produce Summary} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The program is a simple report generator which reads a sorted transaction file: each transaction contains the name of an item and the amount received or distributed from the warehouse. The program generates a report showing the net change in inventory for each item in the transaction file.

Our resident assembler guru was given the above pseudocode and asked to write an assembler implementation which uses as many “features” of assembler as possible. The result is given in Section 11 (I should like to point out on his behalf that this is not his normal coding style!) The program includes self-modifying code: the “first time through switch” SW1 is implemented by modifying the branch labelled LAAA to a NOP in the instruction labelled LAB, and an EXecute statement has been used to get a variable length move.

7 Automatic Program Transformation

The first stage in the transformation process is Data Translation. This transformation uses the restructured data file to change the data representation in the program. Initially all data is accessed directly from memory (represented as the byte array a) by adding the base register to the displacement to get an address. The restructured data file gives the layout of all data in memory, so by making some reasonable assumptions about non-overlapping DSECTS etc., Fermat is able to transform the program into an equivalent program where the data is accessed directly through variables and structures. For example, consider the “raw WSL” statement:

\[
!P \text{ mvc}(a[db(witem, r3), 3 + 1]) \\
\text{var } a[db(wlast, r3), 3 + 1];
\]

Here, the IP indicates an external procedure call to the mvc procedure which implements the MVC (move characters) instruction. This moves the given number of characters from the given source address to
the given destination address. The function \(db(x, y)\) simply returns \(x + y\), the displacement plus the base register, so the source address is \(writem + r3\) and the destination address is \(wlast + r3\). After data translation, the same names are used as the actual variables and the base registers are eliminated.

This statement is automatically transformed into the simple assignment:

\[
\text{wlast} := \text{wrec} \cdot \text{writem};
\]

In the case of our simple program, there is only one structure to uncover: the \text{wrec} print record which contains fields \text{writem}, \text{wrtype} and \text{wrqty} plus some unnamed fillers.

The next stage is control flow restructuring: eliminating non-essential labels and branches, introducing loops. This is carried out in a series of passes through the program, at each iteration the program is searched for points where a simplifying transformation (such as loop insertion or branch merging) can be applied. The iteration is continued until no further improvement can be achieved.

The raw WSL is written as an action system, a collection of parameterless procedures (actions) where execution of any actuin will always lead to either calling another action, or calling the special action that terminates the whole action system. An action system itself is a simple statement, so action systems can be nested inside each other, but a sub-action system cannot call actions in the main system.

The system then analyses the remaining actions to determine which actions may form the body of a simple procedure. To do this it uses both control flow and data flow analysis. If it determines that a collection of actions form a procedure, then these actions are extracted out as a sub-action system in the body of the procedure.

After control flow restructuring we have data flow analysis: in particular an extended form of constant propagation which can propagate return addresses through procedure calls. If a dispatch call is encountered with a known destination value, then it can be unfolded and simplified. The same transformation also deals with conditional assignments to the condition code (cc) in order to remove references to cc where possible.

FermalT was able to extract a collection of actions to form the \text{endgroup} procedure, so that the code:

\[
r10 := 112; \text{call endgroup}
\]

becomes:

\[
r10 := 112; \text{endgroup(); call dispatch}
\]

FermalT determines that the value in \text{r10} will be copied into destination by the body of \text{endgroup}. Within dispatch the value in destination is compared against the offsets of all the possible return points. Offset 112 is associated with the label \text{lab}, so this call dispatch can be replaced by call \text{lab}.

The control flow and data flow restructuring transformations are iterated until no further improvement is possible. Figure 1 lists the metrics for the raw WSL translation and after automatic restructuring and simplifying transformations have been applied. This order of magnitude improvement in most of the metrics is typical for all sizes of assembler module. See [11] for more details of this part of the transformation process.

| Metric         | Raw WSL | Structured WSL |
|----------------|---------|-----------------|
| Statements     | 561     | 106             |
| Expressions    | 1,589   | 210             |
| McCabe         | 184     | 17              |
| Control/Data Flow | 520  | 156             |
| Branch–Loop    | 145     | 17              |
| Structural     | 6,685   | 751             |

Figure 1: Metrics Before and After Transformation

begin
\f_{\text{aaaa}} := 1;
!P open(ddin_ddname, input var os);
!P open(rdsout_ddname, output var os);
wprt[1..17] := "MANAGEMENT REPORT";
write1(); write1();
wprt[1..20] := "ITEM NET CHANGE";
write1(); write1();
xsw1 := 0;
do r0 := 0; r1 := 0; r15 := 0;
!P get(ddin_ddname var os, r0, r1, r15, wrec);
if \text{XC end_of_file(ddin_ddname)}
then exit(1) fi;
if wrec.writem \neq \text{wlast}
then if \f_{\text{aaaa}} \neq 1
then \text{endgroup()} fi;
\f_{\text{aaaa}} := 0;
\text{wlast} := \text{wrec} \cdot \text{writem}.
\text{wnet} := \text{!XF zap(“hex 0x0C”)} fi;
\text{worka} := \text{!XF pack(wrec.wrqty, 2)};
if \text{wrec.wrtype} \neq “R”
then \text{wnet} := \text{!XF sp(wnet, worka)}
else \text{wnet} := \text{!XF ap(wnet, worka)} fi;
xsw1 := “hex 0xFF” od;
if xsw1 = "hex 0xFF" then endgroup() fi;
wp[1..17] := "NUMBER CHANGED = ";
!P edmk(wp[1..10] var workb);
r4 := !XF address_of(workb); r1 := 9;
do if a[r4, 1] ≠ " " then exit(1) fi;
r4 := r4 + 1;
r1 := r1 - 1;
if r1 = 0 then exit(1) fi od;
a[!XF address_of(wp) + 17, r1 + 1] := a[r4, r1 + 1];
write1();
!P close(ddin_ddname var os);
!P close(rdsout_ddname var os)
where
proc endgroup() ≡
wp[1..4] := wlast;
wsign := "+";
if wnet < "hex 0x0C" then wsign := "-" fi;
wp[8..17] := "hex 0x4206B202068B02120";
!P edmk(wnet[1..10] var wp[8..17], r1);
r1 := r1 - 1;
a[r1, 1] := wsign;
write1(); write1();
wchange := !XF ap(wchange, "hex 0x1C") end,
proc write1() ≡
!P put(rdsout_ddname, wp var os);
wp := wspaces end
end

8 Abstracting a Specification

This is about as far as the FermaT system can get by purely automatic transformation applications with no human intervention. The next step in the abstraction process is to change the data representation so that files become lists. We unfold the write1 procedure and replace zap, ap and sp calls by their actual operations. We abstract away from the layout of the output file by creating a list of the data elements that appear on each line of output and appending this list to the output array:

begin
  i := 0; f_laaa := 1;
  output := ⟨⟨"MANAGEMENT REPORT"),
            ("ITEM NET CHANGE")⟩;
xsw1 := 0;
do i := i + 1; wrec := input[i];
    if i ≥ n then exit(1) fi;
    if wrec.writem ≠ wlast then if f_laaa ≠ 1
      then endgroup() fi;
  fi
  f_laaa := 0;
  wlast := wrec.writem;
  wnet := 0 fi;
if wrec.wrtype ≠ "R"
  then wnet := wnet - wrec.wrqty
  else wnet := wnet + wrec.wrqty fi;
xsw1 := "hex 0xFF" od;
if xsw1 = "hex 0xFF" then endgroup() fi;
output := output + ⟨⟨wlast, wnet⟩;
  wchange := wchange + 1 end
end

We can get rid of the switches xsw1 and f_laaa by unrolling the first step of the do ... od loop and simplifying. We then use loop inversion to move some statements to the top of the loop:

begin
  i := i + 1; wrec := input[i];
  if i ≥ n then skip
    else wlast := wrec.writem;
      wnet := 0;
      do if wrec.wrtype ≠ "R"
        then wnet := wnet - wrec.wrqty
        else wnet := wnet + wrec.wrqty fi;
        i := i + 1; wrec := input[i];
        if wrec.writem ≠ wlast fi
      then endgroup();
      if i ≥ n
        then exit(1)
          else wlast := wrec.writem;
            wnet := 0 fi fi od fi;
  fi
end

We want to roll the two statements LAST := wrec.writem; wnet := 0 into the top of the loop, so convert the loop to a double-nested loop (loop doubling) and take the statements out of the inner loop (take out of loop). Then apply loop inversion. We can then take the statements starting with endgroup() out of the inner loop also:

begin
  i := i + 1; wrec := input[i];
  if i ≥ n then skip
    else do wlast := wrec.writem;
      wnet := 0;
      do if wrec.wrtype ≠ "R"
        then wnet := wnet - wrec.wrqty
        else wnet := wnet + wrec.wrqty fi;
        i := i + 1; wrec := input[i];
  fi
end
if wrec.wrtype ≠ wlast ∨ i ≥ n
  then exit(1) fi od;
endgroup();
if i ≥ n exit(1) fi od fi;

Finally, the outer if statement can be removed by converting the outer loop to a while loop (this is the 

while loop to while transformation):

i := i + 1; wrec := input[i];
while i < n do
  wlast := wrec.wrtype;
  wnet := 0;
  do if wrec.wrtype ≠ “R”
    then wnet := wnet − wrc.wrtype
    else wnet := wnet + wrc.wrtype fi;
  i := i + 1; wrec := input[i];
  if wrec.wrtype ≠ wlast ∨ i ≥ n
    then exit(1) fi od;
endgroup();

Note that, after the initialisation code, the invariant wrec = input[i] is always true, and for i > 1, wlast = input[i − 1].writem is also true, as is the invariant wchange = ℓ(output) − 2. So we can remove these three variables from the program.

The program now consists of two simple nested loops, the outer while loop iterates over the groups of records and ends with a call to endgroup(), while the inner do . . . do loop iterates over the records in the group.

This suggests that we restructure the data to more closely match the control structure of the program by converting the input array to a list of lists where each sublist consists of a single group of data elements, so that the outer loop processes sublists one at a time and the inner loop processes elements of each sublist. The key to the data restructuring is to split the input sequence into sections where the outer loop processes one segment per iteration. This is easily achieved with a function split(p, B) which splits p into non-empty sections with the section breaks occurring between those pairs of elements of p where B is false. (See [12] for a formal definition of split). In our case, the terminating condition on the inner loop provides the predicate on which to split:

func same_item(x, y) ≡
  x.writem = y.writem.

Then the new variable q is introduced with the assignment: q := split(input, same_item). We index the q list with two variables k1 and k2 so that q[k1][k2] = input[i]. To do this we preserve the invariant:

i = +(ℓ * q[1 . . k1 − 1]) + k

which, together with the invariant input = ]+ /q gives the required relationship. Adding these ghost variables to the program we get:

q := split(input, same_item);

i := 1; k1 := 1; k2 := 1;
while i < ℓ(input) do
  wnet := 0;
  do if input[i].wrtype ≠ “R”
    then wnet := wnet − input[i].wrtype
    else wnet := wnet + input[i].wrtype fi;
  i := i + 1;
  k2 := k2 + 1;
  if k2 > ℓ(q[k1]) then k1 := k1 + 1; k2 := 1 fi;
  if input[i].wrtype ≠ input[i − 1].writem
    ∨ i ≥ ℓ(input) then exit(1) fi od;
endgroup();

We can now replace references to the concrete variables input and i by references to the new variables q, k1 and k2. The key point is that i < ℓ(input) if and only if k1 < ℓ(q) and

input[i].writem ≠ input[i − 1].writem

is true when we have just moved into a new section of the input: in other words, precisely when k2 = 1. So we can remove the concrete variables from the program:

q := split(input, same_item);

k1 := 1; k2 := 1;
while k1 < ℓ(q) do
  wnet := 0;
  do if q[k1][k2].wrtype ≠ “R”
    then wnet := wnet − q[k1][k2].wrtype
    else wnet := wnet + q[k1][k2].wrtype fi;
  k2 := k2 + 1;
  if k2 > ℓ(q[k1]) then k1 := k1 + 1; k2 := 1 fi;
  if k2 = 1 then exit(1) fi od;
endgroup();

Now the inner loop reduces to a simple for loop:

q := split(input, same_item);

k1 := 1;
while k1 < ℓ(q) do
  wnet := 0;
  for k2 := 1 to ℓ(q[k1]) step 1 do
    if q[k1][k2].wrtype ≠ “R”
      then wnet := wnet − q[k1][k2].wrtype
      else wnet := wnet + q[k1][k2].wrtype fi;
    k1 := k1 + 1;
  endgroup();


We can express the change to wnet as a function of the structure:

\[
\text{funct } \text{change}(s) \equiv \\
\text{if } s.\text{wrtype} \neq \text{"R"} \text{ then } -s.\text{wrqty} \text{ else } s.\text{wrqty} \text{ fi.}
\]

It is clear that the inner loop is computing the sum of the change outputs for all the structures in the sub list \(q[k_1]\), so we can collapse the inner loop to a reduce of a map operation:

\[
\begin{align*}
q &:= \text{split(input, same_item);} \\
k_1 &:= 1; \\
\text{while } k_1 < \ell(q) \text{ do} \\
 &\quad \text{wnet} := +/\text{change} \ast q[k_1]; \\
 &\quad k_1 := k_1 + 1; \\
&\quad \text{endgroup() od;} \\
The \text{endgroup} \text{ procedure simply appends an element to the output list:} \\
q &:= \text{split(input, same_item);} \\
k_1 &:= 1; \\
\text{while } k_1 < \ell(q) \text{ do} \\
 &\quad \text{wnet} := +/\text{change} \ast q[k_1]; \\
 &\quad \text{output} := \text{output} \# (q[k_1][1], \text{wnet}); \\
 &\quad k_1 := k_1 + 1; \\
&\quad \text{endgroup() od;} \\
\end{align*}
\]

so we can collapse the outer loop to a map operation. See Section 12 for the final specification.

This extracted specification looks very different to the original assembler (see Section 11) but both programs are semantically equivalent and generate identical output files (when the output from the specification is formatted to match the assembler).

### 9 Conclusion

This paper describes a particularly challenging reverse engineering task: using formal program transformations to extract a high-level abstract specification from an IBM 370 assembler program. The original assembler program contains several “layers” of complexity including self-modifying code, a flag used to direct control flow, a convoluted control flow structure and so on. Fortunately the powerful automatic transformations implemented in FermaT allow us to remove the first few layers of complexity before we even have to look at the program. Moving to higher levels of abstraction requires a certain amount of human intervention: particularly to select appropriate abstract data structures. However, this intervention requires only localised analysis of the program. The higher-level control flow transformations such as loop unrolling, loop rolling, taking code out of loops etc., are all implemented in the FermaT system and any global analysis required by these transformations is handled automatically.
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11 The Assembler Source

```
11 The Assembler Source

*****************************************
* TST004A0 SAMPLE PROGRAM (MCDONALDS) *
*****************************************
*
REGEQU
*
* PRINT NOGEN
TST004A0 CSECT
  STM R14,R12,12(R13)
  LR R3,R15
  USING TST004A0,R3
  ST R13,WSAVE+4
  LA R14,WSAVE
  LA R14,WSAVE
  LA R13,WSAVE
  OPEN (DDIN,(INPUT))
  OPEN (RDSOUT,(OUTPUT))
  MVC WPRT(17),=CL17'MANAGEMENT REPORT'
  BAL R10,WRITE1
  BAL R10,WRITE1
  MVC WPRT(20),=CL20'ITEM NET CHANGE'
  BAL R10,WRITE1
  BAL R10,WRITE1
  MVI XSW1,0
  LAA EQU *
  GET DDIN,WREC
  CLC WRITEM,WLAST
  BE LAC
  LAAA B LAB
  BAL R10,ENDGROUP
  LAB MVI LAAA+1,0
  PLC WRST1,WRQTY
  ED WCHANGE,WCHANGE
  ED WORKB,=P'0'
  LA R4,WORKB
  LA R1,9
  LADB CLI 0(R4),C' '
  BNE LADC
  LA R4,1(R4)
  BCT R1,LADB
  LADC EX R1,WMVC1
  MVC WPRT+17(1),0(R4)
  BAL R10,WRITE1
  LAC BAL R10,PROCGRP
  MVI XSW1,X'FF'
  B LAC
  LBA SP WNET,WORKA
  LBB L R10,WST10A
  BR R10
*  PROCGRP EQU *
  ST R10,WST10A
  PACK WORKA,WRQTY
  CLI WRQTY,C'R'
  BNE LBA
  AP WNET,WORKA
  B LBB
  LBA SP WNET,WORKA
  LBB L R10,WST10A
  BR R10
*  ENDGROUP EQU *
  ST R10,WST10A
  MVC WPRT(4),WLAST
  MVI WSIGN,C'+'
  CP WNET,+P'+'
  EMDK WPRT(7(10),,WNET
  BCTR R1,0
  MVC 0(1,R1),WSIGN
  BAL R10,WRITE1
  BAL R10,WRITE1
  AP WCHANGE,+P'1'
  L R10,WST10A
  BR R10
*  WRITE1 EQU *
  PUT RDSOUT,WPRT
  MVC WPRT,WSPACES
  BR R10
*  WMVC1 MVC WPRT+17(1),0(R4)
*  WSAVE DC 18F'0'
*  WST10A DS F
*  WREC DS OCL80
*  WRITEM DS CL4
*  WRQTY DS CL1
*  WRTYPE DS CL1
*  WRKTY DS CL3
*  WSPACES DC CL80
*  WPRT DC CL17
*  WSIGN DC CL1
*  WCHANGE DC PL4'0'
*  WNET DC PL4'0'
*  WORKA DC PL2'0'
*  WORKB DC XL10'40206B2020206B202120'
*  WSIGN DC CL1
*  XSW1 DC X'00'
*  LTORG
*  DDIN DCB DDNAME=DDIN,
  DSORG=PS,
  EODAD=LAD,
  MACRF=GM
  RDSOUT DCB DDNAME=RDSOUT,
  DSORG=PS,
  MACRF=GM
*  END
```

12 The WSL Specification

```
begin
  q := split(input, same_item);
  output := header ++ process * q
  where
  funct same_item(x, y) ≡ x.writem = y.writem.
  funct process(L) ≡ ⟨L[1],/+change * L⟩.
  funct change(s) ≡
  if s.wrtype ≠ ”R” then −s.wrqty else s.wrqty fi.
end
```