

- (i) Equip each OCL (1) basic type with a reasonable domain, i.e. define function I with $\text{dom}(I) = T_B$
 - (ii) Equip each object type τ_C with a reasonable domain, i.e. define function I with $\text{dom}(I) = \tau_C$
 - (iii) Equip each set type $\text{Set}(C)$ determined by structure \mathcal{S} of τ_C with reasonable domain, i.e. define function I with $\text{dom}(I) = \{\text{Set}(\tau_C) \mid \tau_C \in T_B \cup T_C\}$
 - (iv) Equip each arithmetical operation with a reasonable interpretation (that is, with a function operating on the corresponding domain) I with $\text{dom}(I) = \{+, -, \dots\}$, e.g. $I(+) \in I(\text{Int}) \times I(\text{Int}) \rightarrow I(\text{Int})$
 - (v) Set operations similar: I with $\text{dom}(I) = \{\text{isEmpty}, \dots\}$
 - (vi) Equip each expression with a reasonable interpretation, i.e. define function $I : Expr \times \Sigma_{\tau}^{\tau} \times (V \rightarrow I(\mathcal{S} \cup T_B \cup T_C)) \rightarrow I(\text{Bool})$
- ...except for OCL being a three-valued logic, and the "iterate" expression.

(i) Domains of Basic Types of OCL

- Recall: $T_B = \{\text{Bool}, \text{Int}, \text{String}\}$
 - $I(\text{Bool}) := \{\text{true}, \text{false}\} \cup \{\perp_{\text{Bool}}\}$
 - assume both sides
 - disjunctive
 - read "bottom" or "undefined"
 - $I(\text{Int}) := \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\perp_{\text{Int}}\}$
 - $I(\text{String}) := \text{conc}(\perp_{\text{String}}) \cup \{\text{finite sequences of characters}\}$
- We may omit index τ of \perp_{τ} if it is clear from context.

(ii) Domains of Object and (iii) Set Types

- Now we need a structure \mathcal{S} of our signature $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}, V, \text{attr})$.
 - Recall: \mathcal{S} assigns an (infinite) domain $\mathcal{D}(C)$ to each class $C \in \mathcal{C}$.
 - Let τ_C be an (OCL) object type for a class $C \in \mathcal{C}$.
 - We set $I(\tau_C) := \mathcal{D}(C) \cup \{\perp_{\tau_C}\}$
 - Let τ be a type from $T_B \cup T_C$.
 - We set $I(\text{Set}(\tau)) := \mathcal{P}(\tau) \cup \{\perp_{\text{Set}(\tau)}\}$
- Note: in the OCL standard, only finite subsets of $I(\tau)$. But infinity doesn't scare us, so we simply allow it.

(iv) Interpretation of Arithmetic Operations

- Literals map to fixed values: $I(\text{true}) := \text{true}$, $I(\text{false}) := \text{false}$, $I(0) := 0$, $I(1) := 1, \dots$

(iv) Interpretation of Arithmetic Operations

- Literals map to fixed values: $I(\text{true}) := \text{true}$, $I(\text{false}) := \text{false}$, $I(0) := 0$, $I(1) := 1, \dots$
- Boolean operations (defined point-wise for $x_1, x_2 \in I(\tau)$): $I(\text{and})(x_1, x_2) := \text{and}(x_1, x_2)$, $I(\text{or})(x_1, x_2) := \text{or}(x_1, x_2)$, $I(\text{not})(x) := \text{not}(x)$

(iv) Interpretation of Arithmetic Operations

- Literals map to fixed values: $I(\text{true}) := \text{true}$, $I(\text{false}) := \text{false}$, $I(0) := 0$, $I(1) := 1, \dots$
- Boolean operations (defined point-wise for $x_1, x_2 \in I(\tau)$): $I(\text{and})(x_1, x_2) := \text{and}(x_1, x_2)$, $I(\text{or})(x_1, x_2) := \text{or}(x_1, x_2)$, $I(\text{not})(x) := \text{not}(x)$
- Integer operations (defined point-wise for $x_1, x_2 \in I(\text{Int})$): $I(+)(x_1, x_2) := x_1 + x_2$, $I(-)(x_1, x_2) := x_1 - x_2$, $I(*) (x_1, x_2) := x_1 * x_2$, $I(/)(x_1, x_2) := x_1 / x_2$, $I(\%)(x_1, x_2) := x_1 \% x_2$

(vi) Putting It All Together...

$$\begin{aligned} \text{expr} &::= w \mid \omega(\text{expr}_1, \dots, \text{expr}_n) \mid \text{allInstancesC} \mid \forall(\text{expr}_1) \mid r_1(\text{expr}_1) \\ &\mid r_2(\text{expr}_1) \mid \text{expr}_1 \rightarrow \text{iterate}(\alpha : \tau_1, \nu_2 : \tau_2 = \text{expr}_2 \mid \text{expr}_3) \end{aligned}$$

- $I[w](\alpha, \beta) := \beta \omega$
- $I[\omega(\text{expr}_1, \dots, \text{expr}_n)](\alpha, \beta) := (I[\alpha]) \langle \prod_{i=1}^n I[\text{expr}_i](\alpha, \beta) \rangle \cdot I[\text{Expr}_3](\alpha, \beta)$
- $I[\text{allInstancesC}]_C(\alpha, \beta) := \text{dom}(C) \wedge \mathcal{D}(C)$

Note: in the OCL standard, $\text{dom}(C)$ is assumed to be finite. Again, doesn't scare us.

(vi) Putting It All Together...

$$\begin{aligned} \text{expr} &::= w \mid \omega(\text{expr}_1, \dots, \text{expr}_n) \mid \text{allInstancesC} \mid \forall(\text{expr}_1) \mid r_1(\text{expr}_1) \\ &\mid r_2(\text{expr}_1) \mid \text{expr}_1 \rightarrow \text{iterate}(\alpha : \tau_1, \nu_2 : \tau_2 = \text{expr}_2 \mid \text{expr}_3) \end{aligned}$$

Assume $\text{expr}_1 : \tau_C$ for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Set $\nu_1 := I[\text{expr}_1](\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{D}(\tau_C)$.

- $I[\forall(\text{expr}_1)](\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} \text{false}(\nu_1) & , \text{ if } \nu_1 \in \text{dom}(C) \\ \perp & , \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$
 - $I[r_1(\text{expr}_1)](\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} \nu & , \text{ if } \nu \in \text{dom}(C) \text{ and } \sigma(\omega)(\nu) = \tau_C \\ \perp & , \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$
 - $I[r_2(\text{expr}_1)](\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} \sigma(\omega)(\nu) & , \text{ if } \nu \in \text{dom}(C) \\ \perp & , \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$
- (Recall: σ evaluates r_2 of type C , to a set)

(vi) Putting It All Together...

$$\begin{aligned} \text{expr} &::= w \mid \omega(\text{expr}_1, \dots, \text{expr}_n) \mid \text{allInstancesC} \mid \forall(\text{expr}_1) \mid r_1(\text{expr}_1) \\ &\mid r_2(\text{expr}_1) \mid \text{expr}_1 \rightarrow \text{iterate}(\alpha : \tau_1, \nu_2 : \tau_2 = \text{expr}_2 \mid \text{expr}_3) \end{aligned}$$

- $I[\text{expr}_1 \rightarrow \text{iterate}(\alpha : \tau_1, \nu_2 : \tau_2 = \text{expr}_2 \mid \text{expr}_3)](\alpha, \beta)$

$$:= \begin{cases} I[\text{expr}_2](\alpha, \beta) & , \text{ if } I[\text{expr}_1](\alpha, \beta) = \emptyset \\ \text{iterate}(\text{thp}, \nu_1, \nu_2, \text{expr}_2, \sigma, \beta') & , \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\beta' = \beta[\text{thp} \mapsto I[\text{expr}_1](\alpha, \beta), \nu_2 \mapsto I[\text{expr}_2](\alpha, \beta)]$ and

$$:= \begin{cases} I[\text{expr}_2](\alpha, \beta') & , \text{ if } \beta'(\text{thp}) = \{x\} \\ I[\text{expr}_3](\alpha, \beta') & , \text{ if } \beta'(\text{thp}) = X \cup \{x\} \text{ and } X \neq \emptyset \end{cases}$$
 where $\beta' = \beta[x \mapsto x, \nu_2 \mapsto \text{iterate}(\text{thp}, \nu_1, \nu_2, \text{expr}_2, \sigma, \beta')[\text{thp} \mapsto X]]$

(vi) Putting It All Together...

$$\begin{aligned} \text{expr} &::= w \mid \omega(\text{expr}_1, \dots, \text{expr}_n) \mid \text{allInstancesC} \mid \forall(\text{expr}_1) \mid r_1(\text{expr}_1) \\ &\mid r_2(\text{expr}_1) \mid \text{expr}_1 \rightarrow \text{iterate}(\alpha : \tau_1, \nu_2 : \tau_2 = \text{expr}_2 \mid \text{expr}_3) \end{aligned}$$

- $I[\text{expr}_1 \rightarrow \text{iterate}(\alpha : \tau_1, \nu_2 : \tau_2 = \text{expr}_2 \mid \text{expr}_3)](\alpha, \beta)$

$$:= \begin{cases} I[\text{expr}_2](\alpha, \beta) & , \text{ if } I[\text{expr}_1](\alpha, \beta) = \emptyset \\ \text{iterate}(\text{thp}, \nu_1, \nu_2, \text{expr}_2, \sigma, \beta') & , \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\beta' = \beta[\text{thp} \mapsto I[\text{expr}_1](\alpha, \beta), \nu_2 \mapsto I[\text{expr}_2](\alpha, \beta)]$ and

$$:= \begin{cases} I[\text{expr}_2](\alpha, \beta') & , \text{ if } \beta'(\text{thp}) = \{x\} \\ I[\text{expr}_3](\alpha, \beta') & , \text{ if } \beta'(\text{thp}) = X \cup \{x\} \text{ and } X \neq \emptyset \end{cases}$$
 where $\beta' = \beta[x \mapsto x, \nu_2 \mapsto \text{iterate}(\text{thp}, \nu_1, \nu_2, \text{expr}_2, \sigma, \beta')[\text{thp} \mapsto X]]$

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{all}) = \mathcal{N}_k$$

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{all}) = \mathcal{N}_k$$

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{all}) = \mathcal{N}_k$$

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{all}) = \mathcal{N}_k$$

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{all}) = \mathcal{N}_k$$

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{all}) = \mathcal{N}_k$$

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{all}) = \mathcal{N}_k$$

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{all}) = \mathcal{N}_k$$

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{all}) = \mathcal{N}_k$$

References

- [Cabot and Clavel, 2008] Cabot, J. and Clavel, R. (2008). UML-OCL verification in practice. In Chaudron, M. R. V., editor, *MODELS Workshops*, volume 5421 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer.
- [Cengelle and Krapp, 2001] Cengelle, M. V. and Krapp, A. (2001). On the expressive power of pure OCL. Technical Report 0101, Institut für Informatik, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.
- [Cengelle and Krapp, 2002] Cengelle, M. V. and Krapp, A. (2002). Towards OCL/PT. In Eriksson, L.-H. and Lindex, P. A., editors, *FME*, volume 2391 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 390–409. Springer-Verlag.
- [Fahse and Müller, 2003] Fahse, S. and Müller, W. (2003). Formal semantics of static and temporal state-oriented OCL constraints. *Software and Systems Modeling*, 2(3):164–186.
- [Jackson, 2002] Jackson, D. (2002). Alloy: A lightweight object modeling notation. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 11(2):256–290.
- [OMG, 2006] OMG (2006). Object Constraint Language, version 2.0. Technical Report formal/06-05-01.
- [OMG, 2007a] OMG (2007a). Unified modeling language: Infrastructure, version 2.1.2. Technical Report formal/07-11-04.
- [OMG, 2007b] OMG (2007b). Unified modeling language: Superstructure, version 2.1.2. Technical Report formal/07-11-02.