

Relational Models and Program Logics: Logical Relations in Iris

Lars Birkedal
Aarhus University

Joint work with Amin Timany and Robbert Krebbers

October 2017, Shonan, Japan

Relational Models and Program Logics

- ▶ Wish to reason both about unary and relational properties.
 - ▶ relational properties include: contextual refinement, non-interference, compiler correctness
 - ▶ unary properties include ordinary specifications (Hoare triples)
- ▶ Wish to reason about properties of individual programs and also language properties
 - ▶ language properties include type safety or type-based program equivalences
- ▶ In this talk: we will see how the Iris program logic can also be used to reason about unary and relational language properties.

Logical Relations

A powerful technique to prove language properties

- ▶ Unary: **type safety**, (strong) normalization, ...
- ▶ Binary: **contextual refinement**, contextual equivalence, non-interference, ...

In this talk

- ▶ Formalization of a unary and binary logical relations
- ▶ In the Iris program logic which in turn is implemented in Coq
- ▶ For a programming language ($F_{\mu,ref,conc}$) with a very rich type system
- ▶ Use it to prove type safety and verify contextual refinement of concurrent algorithms

Unary logical relation

Proving type safety

Define *semantics* of types (by recursion on τ): $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}} : Expr \rightarrow Prop$

Unary logical relation

Proving type safety

Define *semantics* of types (by recursion on τ): $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}} : Expr \rightarrow Prop$

1. Prove *adequacy*: $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e) \Rightarrow Safe_{\tau}(e)$

Unary logical relation

Proving type safety

Define *semantics* of types (by recursion on τ): $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}} : Expr \rightarrow Prop$

1. Prove *adequacy*: $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e) \Rightarrow Safe_{\tau}(e)$
2. Prove *compatibility lemmas* for typing rules, e.g.:

$$\frac{\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_1) \quad \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_2)}{\llbracket \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_1, e_2)}$$

Unary logical relation

Proving type safety

Define *semantics* of types (by recursion on τ): $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}} : Expr \rightarrow Prop$

1. Prove *adequacy*: $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e) \Rightarrow Safe_{\tau}(e)$
2. Prove *compatibility lemmas* for typing rules, e.g.:

$$\frac{\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_1) \quad \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_2)}{\llbracket \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_1, e_2)}$$

3. Corollary (*soundness*): $\cdot \vdash e : \tau \Rightarrow Safe_{\tau}(e)$

Unary logical relation

Proving type safety

Remember adequacy: $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e) \Rightarrow \text{Safe}_{\tau}(e)$

- ▶ e need not syntactically be well-typed!

Unary logical relation

Proving type safety

Remember adequacy: $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e) \Rightarrow \text{Safe}_{\tau}(e)$

- ▶ e need not syntactically be well-typed!
- ▶ *Compatibility lemmas* say nothing about well-typedness:

$$\frac{\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_1) \quad \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_2)}{\llbracket \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_1, e_2)}$$

Unary logical relation

Proving type safety

Remember adequacy: $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e) \Rightarrow \text{Safe}_{\tau}(e)$

- ▶ e need not syntactically be well-typed!
- ▶ *Compatibility lemmas* say nothing about well-typedness:

$$\frac{\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_1) \quad \llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_2)}{\llbracket \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_1, e_2)}$$

Logical relation allows one to prove safety modularly in the presence of untyped code, i.e., when linking with *untyped* but *verified code*, e.g., the *unsafe blocks* of Rust

Motivation for using a high-level logic (Iris)

Recursive types and higher order references

- ▶ **Recursive types:** the logical relation usually involves step-indexing

The *crux* of the matter: semantics of a recursive type $\mu X. \tau$ is the fixed point of the semantics of τ

- ▶ **References:** the logical relation usually involves step-indexing and possible worlds

The *crux* of the matter: a memory location is of type $\text{ref}(\tau)$ if the value stored in it is in the semantics of type τ at *all times* (it is an invariant!)

- ▶ **Iris** provides support for invariants and guarded fixed points

Unary logical relation (for type safety) for $F_{\mu, \text{ref}, \text{conc}}$

Definition in Iris

$$\llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{E}}(e) \triangleq \{\text{True}\} e \{w. \llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}(w)\}$$

Unary logical relation (for type safety) for $F_{\mu, \text{ref}, \text{conc}}$

Definition in Iris

$$\llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{E}}(e) \triangleq \{\text{True}\} e \{w. \llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}(w)\}$$

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq v \in \mathbb{N}$$

Unary logical relation (for type safety) for $F_{\mu, \text{ref}, \text{conc}}$

Definition in Iris

$$\llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{E}}(e) \triangleq \{\text{True}\} e \{w. \llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}(w)\}$$

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq v \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\llbracket \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq \exists v_1, v_2. v = (v_1, v_2) \wedge \llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v_1) \wedge \llbracket \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v_2)$$

Unary logical relation (for type safety) for $F_{\mu, \text{ref}, \text{conc}}$

Definition in Iris

$$\llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{E}}(e) \triangleq \{\text{True}\} e \{w. \llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}(w)\}$$

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq v \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\llbracket \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq \exists v_1, v_2. v = (v_1, v_2) \wedge \llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v_1) \wedge \llbracket \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v_2)$$

$$\llbracket \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq \forall v'. \{\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v')\} v v' \{w. \llbracket \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(w)\}$$

Unary logical relation (for type safety) for $F_{\mu, \text{ref}, \text{conc}}$

Definition in Iris

$$\llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{E}}(e) \triangleq \{\text{True}\} e \{w. \llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}(w)\}$$

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq v \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\llbracket \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq \exists v_1, v_2. v = (v_1, v_2) \wedge \llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v_1) \wedge \llbracket \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v_2)$$

$$\llbracket \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq \forall v'. \{\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v')\} v v' \{w. \llbracket \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(w)\}$$

$$\llbracket \mu X. \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq \mu f. \exists w. v = \text{fold } w \wedge \triangleright \llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta[X \mapsto f]}(w)$$

$$\llbracket X \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq \Delta(X)(v)$$

Unary logical relation (for type safety) for $F_{\mu, \text{ref}, \text{conc}}$

Definition in Iris

$$\llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{E}}(e) \triangleq \{\text{True}\} e \{w. \llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}(w)\}$$

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq v \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\llbracket \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq \exists v_1, v_2. v = (v_1, v_2) \wedge \llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v_1) \wedge \llbracket \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v_2)$$

$$\llbracket \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq \forall v'. \{\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v')\} v v' \{w. \llbracket \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(w)\}$$

$$\llbracket \mu X. \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq \mu f. \exists w. v = \text{fold } w \wedge \triangleright \llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta[X \mapsto f]}(w)$$

$$\llbracket X \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq \Delta(X)(v)$$

$$\llbracket \text{ref}(\tau) \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v) \triangleq \exists \ell. v = \ell \wedge \boxed{\exists w. \ell \mapsto w * \llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}(w)}^{\mathcal{N}. \ell}$$

```

From iris.proofmode Require Import tactics.
From iris.program_logic Require Export weakestpre.
From iris.logrel.v _m_ref_conc Require Export rules typing.
From iris.algebra Require Import list.
From iris.base_logic Require Import big_op namespaces invariants.
Import uPred.

Definition logN : namespace := nroot _@ "logN".

{≡≡ interp : is a unary logical relation. ≡≡}
Section logrel.
Context {heapG I}.
Notation D := (valC -> iProp I).
Implicit Types τ1 : D.
Implicit Types Δ : listC D.
Implicit Types interp : listC D -> D.

Program Definition env_lookup (x : var) : listC D -> D := λne Δ w,
  from_option id (cconst v)AI (Δ !! x).
Solve Obligations with solve_proper_alt.

Definition interp_unit : listC D -> D := λne Δ w, (w = UnitV)AI.
Definition interp_nat : listC D -> D := λne Δ w, (∃ n, w = #nv n)AI.
Definition interp_bool : listC D -> D := λne Δ w, (∃ n, w = #sv n)AI.

Program Definition interp_prod
  (interp1 interp2 : listC D -> D) : listC D -> D := λne Δ w,
  (∃ w1 w2, w = PairV w1 w2 ∧ interp1 Δ w1 ∧ interp2 Δ w2)AI.
Solve Obligations with solve_proper.

Program Definition interp_sum
  (interp1 interp2 : listC D -> D) : listC D -> D := λne Δ w,
  (∃ w1 w2, w = InjLV w1 A interp1 Δ w1 v (∃ w2, w = InjRV w2 A interp2 Δ w2))AI.
Solve Obligations with solve_proper.

Program Definition interp_arrow
  (interp1 interp2 : listC D -> D) : listC D -> D := λne Δ w,
  (∃ v v', interp1 Δ v - MP App (of_val v) (of_val v') (interp2 Δ v'))AI.
Solve Obligations with solve_proper.

Program Definition interp_forall
  (interp : listC D -> D) : listC D -> D := λne Δ w,
  (∃ v τ1 : D,
   # (V v, PersistentP (τ1 v)) - MP TApp (of_val w) (interp (τ1 :: Δ)))AI.
Solve Obligations with solve_proper.

Definition interp_rec1
  (interp : listC D -> D) (Δ : listC D) (τ1 : D) : D := λne w,
  (∃ v v', w = FoldV v A ▷ interp (τ1 :: Δ) v)AI.

Global Instance interp_rec1_contractive
  (interp : listC D -> D) (Δ : listC D) : Contractive (interp_rec1 interp Δ).
Proof.
  intros n τ1 τ2 Hτ1 w1 cbn.
  apply always_ne, exist_ne; intros v; apply and_ne; trivial.
  apply later_contractive -i Hτ1. by rewrite Hτ1.
Qed.

Program Definition interp_rec (interp : listC D -> D) : listC D -> D := λne Δ,
  fixpoint (interp_rec1 interp Δ).
Next Obligation.
  intros interp n Δ1 Δ2 HΔ; apply fixpoint_ne = τ1 w. solve_proper.
Qed.

Program Definition interp_ref_inv (l : loc) : D -> iProp I := λne τ1,
  (∃ v, l == v * τ1 v)AI.
Solve Obligations with solve_proper.

Program Definition interp_ref
  (interp : listC D -> D) : listC D -> D := λne Δ w,
  (∃ l, w = LocV l A inv (logN .@ l) (interp_ref_inv l (interp Δ)))AI.
Solve Obligations with solve_proper.

Fixpoint interp (τ : type) : listC D -> D :=
  match τ return _ with
  | Tunit => interp_unit
  | Tnat => interp_nat
  | Tbool => interp_bool
  | Tprod τ1 τ2 => interp_prod (interp τ1) (interp τ2)
  | Tsum τ1 τ2 => interp_sum (interp τ1) (interp τ2)
  | Tarrow τ1 τ2 => interp_arrow (interp τ1) (interp τ2)
  | Tvar x => env_lookup x
  | Tforall τ' => interp_forall (interp τ')
  | Trec τ' => interp_rec (interp τ')
  | Tref τ' => interp_ref (interp τ')
  end.
Notation "[ τ ]" := (interp τ).

Definition interp_env (Γ : list type)
  (Δ : listC D) (vs : list val) : iProp I :=
  (length Γ = length vs * #[] zip_with (λ τ, [ τ ] Δ) Γ vs)AI.
Notation "E Γ Δ" := (interp_env Γ).

[[U:— logrel_unary.v Top (27,0) Git-master (Coq -l company-@ yas nu [[U:— logrel_unary.v 24% (66,0) Git-master (Coq -l company-@ yas hs

```


Contextual refinement

e_i contextually refines e_s ($\Gamma \vdash e_i \preceq_{ctx} e_s : \tau$):

$$\Gamma \vdash e_i \preceq_{ctx} e_s : \tau \triangleq \Gamma \vdash e_i : \tau \wedge$$

$$\Gamma \vdash e_s : \tau \wedge$$

$$\forall \mathcal{C} : (\Gamma \vdash \tau \rightsquigarrow \cdot \vdash 1). \mathcal{C}[e_i] \downarrow \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}[e_s] \downarrow$$

Useful when: e_i is a more efficient version of e_s (e.g., optimized by the compiler) or when e_s is easier to verify than e_i

The idea: Use a binary logical relation such that being related implies contextual refinement

Binary logical relation

To establish contextual refinement

Define *semantics* of types (by recursion on τ):

$$\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}} : Expr \rightarrow Expr \rightarrow iProp$$

Binary logical relation

To establish contextual refinement

Define *semantics* of types (by recursion on τ):

$$\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}} : Expr \rightarrow Expr \rightarrow iProp$$

1. Prove *Adequacy*: $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e, e') \Rightarrow e \Downarrow \Rightarrow e' \Downarrow$

Binary logical relation

To establish contextual refinement

Define *semantics* of types (by recursion on τ):

$\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}} : Expr \rightarrow Expr \rightarrow iProp$

1. Prove *Adequacy*: $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e, e') \Rightarrow e \Downarrow \Rightarrow e' \Downarrow$
2. Prove *compatibility* lemmas for typing rules, e.g.:

$$\frac{\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_1, e'_1) \quad \llbracket \tau_2 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_2, e'_2)}{\llbracket \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}((e_1, e_2), (e'_1, e'_2))}$$

Binary logical relation

To establish contextual refinement

Define *semantics* of types (by recursion on τ):

$\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}} : Expr \rightarrow Expr \rightarrow iProp$

1. Prove *Adequacy*: $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e, e') \Rightarrow e \Downarrow \Rightarrow e' \Downarrow$
2. Prove *compatibility* lemmas for typing rules, e.g.:

$$\frac{\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_1, e'_1) \quad \llbracket \tau_2 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}(e_2, e'_2)}{\llbracket \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \rrbracket^{\mathcal{E}}((e_1, e_2), (e'_1, e'_2))}$$

3. Corollary (*soundness*): $\Gamma \models e \preceq_{log} e' : \tau \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash e \preceq_{ctx} e' : \tau$

Binary logical relation (for contextual refinement)

Definition in Iris: value relations

$$\llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v, v') \triangleq v = v' \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\llbracket \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v, v') \triangleq \exists v_1, v_2, v'_1, v'_2. v = (v_1, v_2) \wedge v' = (v'_1, v'_2) \wedge \\ \llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v_1, v'_1) \wedge \llbracket \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v_2, v'_2)$$

$$\llbracket \mu X. \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v, v') \triangleq \mu f. \exists w, w'. v = \mathbf{fold} \ w \wedge v' = \mathbf{fold} \ w' \wedge \\ \triangleright \llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta[X \mapsto f]}(w, w')$$

$$\llbracket X \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v, v') \triangleq \Delta(X)(v, v')$$

$$\llbracket \mathbf{ref}(\tau) \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v, v') \triangleq \exists \ell, \ell'. v = \ell \wedge v' = \ell' \wedge$$

$$\boxed{\exists w, w'. \ell \mapsto_i w * \ell' \mapsto_s w' * \llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}(w, w')}^{\mathcal{N}. \ell. \ell'}$$

Binary logical relation (for contextual refinement)

Definition in Iris: expression relation

The idea¹: simulate the running of the right hand side as *ghost state*

- ▶ Ghost state for threads on the right hand side: $j \Vdash e$
- ▶ Ghost state for the heap of the right hand side: $\ell \mapsto_s v$

¹See: A. Turon, D. Dreyer, and L. Birkedal. **Unifying refinement and hoare-style reasoning in a logic for higher-order concurrency**. In Proceedings of ICFP, 2013.
and M. Krogh-Jespersen, K. Svendsen, and L. Birkedal. **A relational model of types-and-effects in higher-order concurrent separation logic**. In Proceedings of POPL 2017, 2017.

Binary logical relation (for contextual refinement)

Definition in Iris: expression relation

The idea¹: simulate the running of the right hand side as *ghost state*

- ▶ Ghost state for threads on the right hand side: $j \Vdash e$
- ▶ Ghost state for the heap of the right hand side: $\ell \mapsto_s v$

$$\llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{E}}(e, e') \triangleq \forall j, K \{j \Vdash K[e']\} e \{w. \exists w'. j \Vdash K[w'] * \llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}(w, w')\}$$

¹See: A. Turon, D. Dreyer, and L. Birkedal. **Unifying refinement and hoare-style reasoning in a logic for higher-order concurrency**. In Proceedings of ICFP, 2013.

and M. Krogh-Jespersen, K. Svendsen, and L. Birkedal. **A relational model of types-and-effects in higher-order concurrent separation logic**. In Proceedings of POPL 2017, 2017.

Binary logical relation (for contextual refinement)

Definition in Iris: expression relation

The idea¹: simulate the running of the right hand side as *ghost state*

- ▶ Ghost state for threads on the right hand side: $j \Vdash e$
- ▶ Ghost state for the heap of the right hand side: $\ell \mapsto_s v$

$$\llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}^{\mathcal{E}}(e, e') \triangleq \forall j, K \{j \Vdash K[e']\} e \{w. \exists w'. j \Vdash K[w'] * \llbracket \tau \rrbracket_{\Delta}(w, w')\}$$

$$\llbracket \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(v, v') \triangleq \forall w, w', j, K.$$

$$\{\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(w, w') * j \Vdash K[v' w']\} v w \{z. \exists z'. j \Vdash K[z'] * \llbracket \tau_2 \rrbracket_{\Delta}(z, z')\}$$

¹See: A. Turon, D. Dreyer, and L. Birkedal. **Unifying refinement and hoare-style reasoning in a logic for higher-order concurrency.** In Proceedings of ICFP, 2013.

and M. Krogh-Jespersen, K. Svendsen, and L. Birkedal. **A relational model of types-and-effects in higher-order concurrent separation logic.** In Proceedings of POPL 2017, 2017.

Remark

- ▶ Much simpler than previous explicit definitions
 - even when formalized!

Auxiliary definitions

20

D. Dreyer et al.

HeapAtom _u	≝	{(W, h ₁ , h ₂) W ∈ World _u }
HeapRel _u	≝	{ψ ⊆ HeapAtom _u ∀(W, h ₁ , h ₂) ∈ ψ. ∀W' ⊇ W. (W', h ₁ , h ₂) ∈ ψ}
Island _u	≝	{t = (s, δ, φ, †, H) s ∈ State ∧ δ ⊆ State ² ∧ φ ⊆ δ ∧ δ, φ reflexive ∧ δ, φ transitive ∧ † ⊆ State ∧ H ∈ State → HeapRel _u }
World _u	≝	{W = (k, Σ ₁ , Σ ₂ , ω) k < n ∧ ∃m. ω ∈ Island _u ^m }
ContAtom _u [τ ₁ , τ ₂]	≝	{(W, K ₁ , K ₂) W ∈ World _u ∧ W.Σ ₁ ; · ⊢ K ₁ ÷ τ ₁ ∧ W.Σ ₂ ; · ⊢ K ₂ ÷ τ ₂ }
TermAtom _u [τ ₁ , τ ₂]	≝	{(W, e ₁ , e ₂) W ∈ World _u ∧ W.Σ ₁ ; · ⊢ e ₁ : τ ₁ ∧ W.Σ ₂ ; · ⊢ e ₂ : τ ₂ }
HeapAtom[τ ₁ , τ ₂]	≝	⋃ _u HeapAtom _u [τ ₁ , τ ₂]
World	≝	⋃ _u World _u
ContAtom[τ ₁ , τ ₂]	≝	⋃ _u ContAtom _u [τ ₁ , τ ₂]
TermAtom[τ ₁ , τ ₂]	≝	⋃ _u TermAtom _u [τ ₁ , τ ₂]
ValRel[τ ₁ , τ ₂]	≝	{r ⊆ TermAtom ^{val} [τ ₁ , τ ₂] ∀(W, v ₁ , v ₂) ∈ r. ∀W' ⊇ W. (W', v ₁ , v ₂) ∈ r}
SomeValRel	≝	{R = (τ ₁ , τ ₂ , r) r ∈ ValRel[τ ₁ , τ ₂]}
[(t ₁ , ..., t _m)] _k	≝	[(t ₁] _k , ..., [t _m] _k]
[(s, δ, φ, †, H)] _k	≝	(s, δ, φ, †, [H] _k)
		[ψ] _k ≝ { (W, h ₁ , h ₂) ∈ r W.k < k }

▷(k+1, Σ ₁ , Σ ₂ , ω)	≝	(k, Σ ₁ , Σ ₂ , [ω] _k)
▷r	≝	{(W, e ₁ , e ₂) W.k > 0 ⇒ (▷W, e ₁ , e ₂) ∈ r}
(k', Σ' ₁ , Σ' ₂ , ω')	⊇	(k, Σ ₁ , Σ ₂ , ω)
(t' ₁ , ..., t' _m)	⊇	(t ₁ , ..., t _m)
(s', δ', φ', †', H')	≝	(s, δ, φ, †, H)
(k', Σ' ₁ , Σ' ₂ , ω')	⊇ ^{pub}	(k, Σ ₁ , Σ ₂ , ω)
(t' ₁ , ..., t' _m)	⊇ ^{pub}	(t ₁ , ..., t _m)
(s', δ', φ', †', H')	⊇ ^{pub}	(s, δ, φ, †, H)
safe(W)	≝	∀t ∈ W.ω. safe(t)
		safe(t) ≝ ∀s'. (t.s, s') ∈ t.φ ⇒ s' ∉ t.‡
		consistent(W) ≝ ‡t ∈ W.ω. t.s ∈ t.‡
ψ ⊗ ψ'	≝	{(W, h ₁ ⊔ h' ₁ , h ₂ ⊔ h' ₂) (W, h ₁ , h ₂) ∈ ψ ∧ (W, h' ₁ , h' ₂) ∈ ψ'}
(h ₁ , h ₂) : W	≝	⊢ h ₁ : W.Σ ₁ ∧ ⊢ h ₂ : W.Σ ₂ ∧ (W.k > 0 ⇒ (▷W, h ₁ , h ₂) ∈ ⊗{t.H(t.s) t ∈ W.ω})

Fig. 5. Worlds and auxiliary definitions.

it is defined on a particular set of “states of interest”—whether there is other junk in the State space is irrelevant.

Based on the two transition relations (full and public), we define two notions

Examples of refinement of concurrent programs

- ▶ Fine-grained/coarse-grained counter pair

```
let FG_counter =  
  let c = ref 0 in  
    let read () = !c in  
    let rec increment () =  
      let x = !c in if CAS(c, x, x+1) then () else  
increment ()  
    in (increment, read)
```

```
let CG_counter =  
  let c = ref 0 in let l = make_lock () in  
    let read () = !c in  
    let increment () = acquire l; c := !c + 1;  
release l  
    in (increment, read)
```

We show: $\llbracket (1 \rightarrow 1) \times (1 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}) \rrbracket_{\emptyset}^{\mathcal{E}}(\text{FG_counter}, \text{CG_counter})$

- ▶ Fine-grained/coarse-grained stack pair with push, pop and iter operations

Trusted computing base

- ▶ The only thing that needs be trusted is **Coq**
- ▶ We use the **adequacy** of Iris to prove theorems (contextual refinement, type safety, ...) in Coq

The refinement proven in Coq

Theorem counter_ctx_refinement :

$$[] \models \text{FG_counter} \leq_{\text{ctx}} \text{CG_counter} :$$
$$\text{TProd (TArrow TUnit TUnit) (TArrow TUnit TUnit)}.$$

Definition ctx_refines (Γ : list type)

$$(e \ e' : \text{expr}) (\tau : \text{type}) := \forall K \text{ thp } \sigma \ v,$$
$$\text{typed_ctx } K \ \Gamma \ \tau \ [] \ \text{TUnit} \rightarrow$$
$$\text{rtc step } ([\text{fill_ctx } K \ e], \emptyset) (\text{of_val } v :: \text{thp}, \sigma)$$
$$\rightarrow$$
$$\exists \text{ thp}' \ \sigma' \ v', \text{ rtc step } ([\text{fill_ctx } K \ e'], \emptyset) (\text{of_val } v' :: \text{thp}', \sigma').$$

Notation " $\Gamma \models e \leq_{\text{ctx}} e' : \tau$ " :=

$$(\text{ctx_refines } \Gamma \ e \ e' \ \tau) \text{ (at level 74, } e, e', \tau \text{ at next level)}.$$

Models for More Advanced Type Systems

- ▶ M. Krogh-Jespersen, K. Svendsen, and L. Birkedal. **A relational model of types-and-effects in higher-order concurrent separation logic** [POPL 2017]
 - ▶ Relational model.
 - ▶ Used to show soundness of type-based parallelization.
- ▶ A. Timany, L. Stefanescu, M. Krogh-Jespersen, and L. Birkedal. **A Logical Relation for Monadic Encapsulation of State: Proving contextual equivalences in the presence of runST** [POPL 2018]
 - ▶ Relational model.
 - ▶ Used to show soundness of pure program equivalences in the presence of runST encapsulated state.
- ▶ R. Jung, J-H. Jourdan, R. Krebbers, D. Dreyer. **RustBelt: Securing the Foundations of the Rust Programming Language** [POPL 2018]
 - ▶ Unary model.
 - ▶ Used to model and show soundness of Rust type system.

Future work

- ▶ On the technical side:
 - ▶ Use a more sensible binding representation (we currently use De Bruijn indexes)
 - ▶ Better facilitate symbolic execution for $F_{\mu,ref,conc}$
- ▶ Prove more interesting (and larger) cases of contextual refinements
 - ▶ Dan Frumin and Amin Timany just proved that a fine-grained stack *with helping* refines a coarse-grained stack.
- ▶ Logical relations for languages with richer type systems and features (e.g., continuations, type-and-effect systems, algebraic effects, ...)
- ▶ Apply it to other application (e.g., non-interference proofs, compiler correctness, secure compilation, ...)
- ▶ Your logical relation applications?! Please do not hesitate to talk to us!

Thanks

Thanks!