# Using Iris for Program Verification

#### Abel Nieto

March 27, 2020

## 1 Monotone Counter

 ${\color{red} \triangleright}\ \mathbf{Coq}\ \mathbf{code:}\ \mathtt{https://github.com/abeln/iris-practice/blob/master/counter.v} \mathrel{\vartriangleleft}$ 

This is the counter example from Section 7.7 of the notes. The module exports three methods:

 newCounter creates a new counter. Counters are represented simply with an int reference.

```
Definition newCounter : val := \lambda: <>, ref #0.
```

• read returns the value currently stored in a counter.

```
Definition read : val := \lambda: "c", !"c".
```

• incr takes a counter, increments it, and returns unit.

```
Definition incr : val :=
  rec: "incr" "c" :=
  let: "n" := !"c" in
  let: "m" := #1 + "n" in
  if: CAS "c" "n" "m" then #() else "incr" "c".
```

The client for the counter is a program that instantiates a counter, spawns two threads each incrementing the counter, and then reads the value off the counter:

```
Definition client : val :=
\lambda: <>,
  let: "c" := newCounter #() in
  ((incr "c") ||| (incr "c")) ;;
  read "c".
```

## 1.1 Specs

We can prove two different specs for the code above:

• Authoritative RA

In the first spec, our resource algebra is AUTH( $\mathbb{N}$ ). Elements of this RA are of the form either  $\bullet n$  (authoritative) or  $\circ n$  (non-authoritative), where  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

The important properties of this RA (for the counter example) are:

- $-\bullet 0\cdot \circ 0\in \mathcal{V}$
- $-\bullet m \cdot \circ n \in \mathcal{V} \text{ implies } m \geq n$
- $-\bullet m \cdot \circ n \leadsto \bullet (m+1) \cdot \circ (n+1)$
- $| \circ n | = \circ n$

Then we can define our predicate for the counter:

$$isCounter(l, n, \gamma) = \left[ \circ \bar{n} \right]^{\gamma \gamma} * \exists s. \quad \exists m.l \hookrightarrow m \land \left[ \bar{\bullet} \bar{m} \right]^{\gamma \gamma}$$

This predicate is persistent because the invariant component is persistent and  $\circ n$  is also persistent (via the Persistently-core rule), because the core of  $\circ n$  is  $\circ n$  itself.

The intuition behind the predicate is that if we own is Counter  $(l, n, \gamma)$  then, at an atomic step (e.g. a load), we can know that l is allocated and it points to a value that's  $\geq n$ .

Additionally, after an increment, we can update the resource to is Counter  $(l, n+1, \gamma)$ .

We then prove the following specs for the counter methods:

- $\{ \top \}$  newCounter ()  $\{ l. \exists \gamma. isCounter(l, 0, \gamma) \}$
- {isCounter $(l, n, \gamma)$ } read l { $v.v \ge n$ }. Notice how we don't have to give the counter back, because it's persistent.
- {isCounter $(l, n, \gamma)$ } incr l {isCounter $(l, n + 1, \gamma)$ }

We can also prove the client spec:

$$\{\top\}$$
client  $()\{n.n \ge 1\}$ 

The "problem" with this specification *isCounter* doesn't tell us anything about what other threads are doing with the counter. So in the verification of the client code, after both threads return, we know

$$isCounter(l, 1, \gamma) * isCounter(l, 1, \gamma) \equiv isCounter(l, 1, \gamma)$$

So we know that the counter must be  $\geq 1$ , but we don't know that it's 2.

#### • Authoritative RA + Fractions

The second spec we can give is more precise, and allows us to conclude that the client reads exactly 2 once the two threads finish.

The resource algebra we use is  $Auth((\mathbb{Q}_p \times \mathbb{N})_?)$ :

- $\mathbb{Q}_p$  is the RA of positive fractions, where the valid elements are those < 1.
- The ? is the *optional RA* construction. In this case, it's needed because to use the authoritative RA we need the argument algebra to be *unital*. And  $\mathbb{Q}_p \times \mathbb{N}$  is not unital because 0 is not an element of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ .

The important properties of this RA are:

- $-\circ(1,0)\cdot\bullet(1,0)\in\mathcal{V}$
- $-\circ(p,n)\cdot\bullet(1,m)\in\mathcal{V}$  implies  $m\geq n$
- $-\circ(1,n)\cdot\bullet(1,m)\in\mathcal{V}$  implies m=n. This is the rule that will allows us to give a more precise specification.
- $-\circ(p,n)\cdot\bullet(q,m)\leadsto\circ(p,n+1)\cdot\bullet(q,m+1)$

With this RA, we get the new counter resource

$$\mathrm{isCounter}(l,n,p,\gamma) = \left[ \circ (p,n) \right]^{\gamma} * \exists s. \quad \exists m.l \hookrightarrow m \land \left[ \bullet (1,m) \right]$$

This resource is no longer persistent, because the core |p| is undefined. However, we can show the following

$$isCounter(l, n + m, p + q, \gamma) \dashv \vdash isCounter(l, n, p, \gamma) * isCounter(l, m, q, \gamma)$$

We then prove the following specs for the counter methods:

- $\{\top\}$  newCounter ()  $\{l.\exists \gamma. isCounter(l, 0, 1, \gamma)\}$
- {isCounter $(l, n, p, \gamma)$ } read l { $v.v \ge n *$ isCounter(l, n, p,)}. Notice how we need to give back the counter in this case.
- {isCounter $(l, n, 1, \gamma)$ } read l {v.v = n \* isCounter(l, n, p,)}. Notice that since we have the entire fraction, we can get the exact value of the counter.
- {isCounter $(l, n, p, \gamma)$ } incr l {isCounter $(l, n + 1, p, \gamma)$ }

With this, we get the more precise client spec

$$\{\top\}$$
client  $()\{n.n=2\}$ 

## 2 Locks and Coarse-Grained Bags

This is the spin lock example from Section 7.6 of the notes. The spin lock is a module with three methods:

- newlock creates a new lock. Locks are represented as a reference to a boolean. If false, the lock is free; if true, then it's taken.
- acquire uses a CAS cycle to spin until it can acquire the lock.
- release just sets the lock to false.

The code is as above:

```
Definition newlock : val := \lam: <>, ref #false.

Definition acquire : val :=
   rec: "acquire" "l" :=
    if: CAS "l" #false #true then #() else "acquire" "l".

Definition release : val := \lam: "l", "l" <- #false.</pre>
```

## 2.1 Spec

The involved RA is Ex(UNIT). Notice that unlike other RA constructions, Ex(S) just requires S to be a *set*, as opposed to another RA.

The exclusive RA is defined by adding an element  $\bot$  to the carrier set. For any two elements  $x, y \ne \bot$ , we have  $x \cdot y = \bot$ . Every element except for  $\bot$  is valid

What this means is that if we own  $\lceil \bar{x} \rceil^{\gamma}$ , no other thread can own another  $\lceil \bar{y} \rceil^{\gamma}$ , because their product would be invalid.

#### 2.2 Client: Coarsed-Grained Bags