

Preservation

Part 1

Assume:

$$\vdash H : \star$$

$$H \vdash F : \sigma$$

$$H; a \vdash F \text{ ok}$$

$$H, F \rightarrow H', F'$$

Shown in LaCava

Show:

$$\vdash H' : \star$$

$$H' \vdash F' : \sigma$$

$$H'; a \vdash F' \text{ ok}$$

Part 2

$$\vdash H : \star$$

$$\vdash H' : \star$$

$$H \vdash FS$$

$$H' \vdash FS'$$

$$H; a \vdash FS \text{ ok}$$

$$H'; b \vdash FS' \text{ ok}$$

$$H, FS \rightarrow H', FS'$$

Shown in LaCava

Part 3: Taskset reduction

Assume:

Show:

Cases of \leadsto

$$1) \vdash H : *$$

$$\vdash H' : * \xrightarrow{\checkmark} \text{Trivial as } H = H'$$

E-ASYNC

$$2) H \vdash TS, WS$$

$$\text{I } H' \vdash TS', WS'$$

or proof identical to Lalasa

E-FINISH1

$$3) H, TS, WS \text{ ok}$$

$$\text{II } H', TS', WS' \text{ ok}$$

E-FINISH2

$$4) H, TS, WS \leadsto H', TS', WS'$$

E-TASK-DONE

E-BOX

E-Async

E-CAPTURE

E-SWAP

$$L' = [x \rightarrow 0] \quad P = \emptyset \quad \Gamma' = x : C$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Gamma; \text{ocap} \vdash t : \tau \text{ by } 2, T\text{-ASYNC} \\ - H \vdash \Gamma; L' \text{ by } WF\text{-ENV?} \\ - \vdash \Gamma; L; P \text{ by } WF\text{-PERM} \end{array} \right.$$

$$\rightarrow H \vdash \{T_1\}, \{\}$$

$$\Gamma'' = \Gamma \setminus \text{Perm}[Q]$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Gamma''; a \vdash s : \sigma \text{ by } 2, T\text{-ASYNC} \\ - H \vdash \Gamma''; L \text{ by } 2, \Gamma'' \subseteq \Gamma, WF\text{-ENV?} \\ - \vdash \vdash \Gamma''; L; P \setminus \{p\} \text{ by } WF\text{-PERM?} \end{array} \right.$$

$$\rightarrow H \vdash \{T_2\}, \{\}$$

$$\rightarrow H \vdash \{T_1, T_2\} \cup TS, WS' \text{ I}$$

$$\rightarrow H \vdash \{T_1, T_2\} \cup TS, WS' \text{ I}$$

$$\rightarrow H \vdash \{T_1, T_2\} \cup TS, WS' \text{ I}$$

$$\rightarrow H \vdash \{T_1, T_2\} \cup TS, WS' \text{ I}$$

$$\rightarrow H \vdash \{T_1, T_2\} \cup TS, WS' \text{ I}$$

I $H' \vdash TS'$ checks for coherency between types and heap+variable bindings. The other rules are likely easy to prove and any problems require only minor changes to the typing rules.

$$\text{II } H' \vdash TS' \text{ ok}$$

ID-ordering trivial

ID-Uniqueness trivial

isolation see other file

$$H \vdash \{T_1, T_2\} + TS, WS \text{ ok}$$

Two cases:

- Async was checked with ocap

-> T1 + T2 are also checked with ocap

-> TS' ok

- Async wasn't checked with ocap

-> T1 is ocap, T2 not

-> TS' ok because we still have only one non-ocap active task

E-FINISH1

Current task becomes inactive, awaits new task

Currently ocap -> new also ocap -> no problem

Currently not ocap -> current becomes inactive, new also not ocap
-> no problem

E-FINISH2

if task was not ocap -> no non-ocap active tasks exist (only it and its direct ancestors are allowed to be non-ocap. I.e. if no active tasks exist, only this inactive task does) -> This task becomes the new non-ocap active task

E-TASK-DONE

Only one non-ocap active task:

If task was non-ocap

-> No active non-ocap task exists

-> Its parent might become next (see E-FINISH2), otherwise everything is ocap

E-BOX/CAPTURE/SWAP

only one non-ocap active task trivial.

Removing tasks does not invalidate any invariant