

CPM: A Declarative Package Manager with Semantic Versioning

Michael Hanus

Kiel University
Programming Languages and Compiler Construction

WFLP 2017

Joint work with Jonas Oberschweiber



Software packages as building blocks

- several modules with well-defined APIs
- evolve over time (efficiency improvements, new functionality)
 \rightsquigarrow *versioning* with version numbers (1.4.3)

Package dependencies

Package A depends on: package B version $\geq 1.2.5 \wedge < 2.0.0$
 package C version $\geq 2.3.7 \wedge < 4.0.0$

Semantic versioning: $\langle major \rangle . \langle minor \rangle . \langle patch \rangle$

Version numbers describe semantic properties:

- alternative implementation \rightsquigarrow increase $\langle patch \rangle$
- extend API \rightsquigarrow increase $\langle minor \rangle$
- change API \rightsquigarrow increase $\langle major \rangle$



Advantages

- describe necessary dependencies
- choose newest packages (\rightsquigarrow package manager)
- upgrade to newer versions without code breaks

Requirements

Packages with identical *<major>* must be *semantically compatible*

Semantic compatibility

- important to support automatic upgrading
- not checked in contemporary package managers

Our proposal:
check it automatically with property-based test tools



Properties: tests parameterized over some arguments

Property: List concatenation is associative

```
[] ++ ys = ys
```

```
(x:xs) ++ ys = x : (xs ++ ys)
```

```
conclIsAssociative xs ys zs = (xs ++ ys) ++ zs <~> xs ++ (ys ++ zs)
```

Checking declarative properties

- no side effects \rightsquigarrow repeatable tests
- generate input values:
 - random (QuickCheck, PrologCheck, PropEr)
 - systematic enumeration (SmallCheck, GAST)
 - systematic (non-deterministic) guessing (EasyCheck, CurryCheck)

Here: Curry (Haskell syntax, logic features) + CurryCheck [LOPSTR'16]



Non-deterministic list insertion

```
ins :: a → [a] → [a]
```

```
ins x ys      = x : ys
```

```
ins x (y:ys) = y : ins x ys
```

```
> ins0 [1,2]  ~>  [0,1,2] ? [1,0,2] ? [1,2,0]
```

Property: insertion increments list length

```
insLength x xs = length (ins x xs) <~> length xs + 1
```

Set-based interpretation relevant:

```
 $e_1 <~> e_2 \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad e_1 \text{ and } e_2 \text{ have identical sets of results}$ 
```



Idea:

f defined in module M of some package in versions v_1 and v_2 :

1 create renamed modules M_{v_1} and M_{v_2}

2 create new “comparison” module:

```
import qualified M_v1
import qualified M_v2

check_M_f x = M_v1.f x <~> M_v2.f x
```

3 run CurryCheck on this module

Main problem: f might not terminate

use termination analysis

↪ no check or specific check for productive operations



Lazy languages supports infinite data structures:

```
ints :: Int → [Int]           ints2 :: Int → [Int]
ints n = n : ints (n+1)       ints2 n = n : ints2 (n+2)
ints 0 ≈ 0 : 1 : 2 : ...      ints2 0 ≈ 0 : 2 : 4 : ...
```

-- Equivalence testing:

```
checkInts x = ints x <~> ints2 x  ≈ no counter example...
```

Non-terminating but productive operations

f *productive* ⇔ no infinite reduction without producing root-constructors

```
ints, ints2: productive
```

```
loop n = loop (n+1)  -- not productive
```



Limit the size of values

```
data Nat = Z | S Nat    -- Peano numbers

limList :: Nat -> [Int] -> [Int]
limList Z     _       = []
limList (S n) []      = []
limList (S n) (x:xs) = x : limList n xs
```

Checking with size limits

```
limCheckInts n x = limList n (ints x) <~> limList n (ints2 x)
↪ CurryCheck finds counter-example: n=(S (S Z)) x=1
```

Proposition [ICLP'17]:

Limited equivalence checking is sound and complete (for total operations) for equivalence checking.



- tool to distribute and install Curry software packages
- central package index (currently: > 50 packages, > 400 modules)
- package: Curry modules + **package specification**:
 - metadata in JSON format
 - standard fields: version number, author, name, synopsis,...
 - *dependency constraints*:

```
"B" : ">= 2.0.0, < 3.0.0 || > 4.1.0"
```

↪ depends on package B with major version 2 or in a version greater than 4.1.0

Some CPM commands

cpm update download newest version of package index

cpm search search in package index

cpm install installs a package (resolve all dependency constraints) with local copies of all required packages

cpm upgrade re-install with newer package versions

cpm test run CurryCheck on all source modules



`cpm diff 1.2.4` check current package version against 1.2.4

Implementation of semantic versioning checking

- rename modules with version numbers
- generate comparison module
- analyze each operation defined in two package versions:
 - terminating: use standard equivalence check
 - non-terminating but productive: use equivalence checks with limits
 \rightsquigarrow generate limit operations for each data type
 - otherwise: no check, warning
- program analysis implemented with CASS [PEPM'14]

Curry prelude: 126 operations

Analysis result: 112 terminating, 11 productive, 3 non-terminating



User annotations to override analysis results:

Annotate terminating operations

```
{-# TERMINATE -#}  
mcCarthy n = if n<=100 then mcCarthy (mcCarthy (n+11))  
             else n-10
```

Annotate productive operations

```
{-# PRODUCTIVE -#}  
primes = sieve (ints 2)  
  where sieve (p:xs) =  
    p : sieve (filter ( $\lambda x \rightarrow \text{mod } x \text{ } p > 0$ ) xs)
```

Annotate unchecked operations

```
{-# NOCOMPARE -#}  
f ... = ...code with bug fixes...
```



CPM: Curry Package Manager

- first package manager with semantic versioning checker (Elm package manager: purely syntactic API comparison)
- termination important for automatic tool \rightsquigarrow program analysis
- productivity: check also non-terminating operations (data generators)
- supports *specification-based software development*
 - package $n.0.0$ contains specification [PADL'12]
 - newer package versions: better implementations
- approach applicable to all kinds of declarative languages
functional (QuickCheck), logic (PrologCheck), functional-logic (CurryCheck), ...

Future work:

- better termination analysis
- avoid *testing*:
 - check structural equivalence of source code
 - use theorem provers to proof equivalence