# Using Iris for Program Verification

#### Abel Nieto

April 2, 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:

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

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  $\leq 1$ .
- 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

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

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

- ▷ Coq code: https://github.com/abeln/iris-practice/blob/master/lock.v ◁
  - 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.

The lock predicate is then

$$\mathrm{isLock}(l,P,\gamma) = \exists s \boxed{l \hookrightarrow \mathtt{false} \land P \land \llbracket \, \bar{\bigcirc} \, \rrbracket^{\gamma} \lor l \hookrightarrow \mathtt{true}}^s$$

A first observation is that the lock protects an arbitrary predicate P, which is what the client uses to prove its correctness.

The intuition is the following:

If the lock is unlocked (l → false), then we need to give away to the invariant the predicate P protected by the lock and the key (). Because () ∈ Ex(UNIT), we know that no other key can be created.

- When the lock is *locked* ( $l \hookrightarrow \mathsf{true}$ ), we don't need to give away any resources.
- When the lock transitions from unlocked to locked, we gain resources.
- When the lock transitions from locked to unlocked, we *lose* resources.

The last two points are reflected in the specs for the lock methods:

•  $\{P\}$ newlock  $()\{l.\exists \gamma. isLock(l,P,\gamma)\}$ . Notice that even though only one element of EX(UNIT) is allowed, this restriction is  $per\ location/ghost\ name$ , so we're allowed to allocate a new

(exclusive) ghost resource, provided we furnish a new ghost name  $\gamma$ .

- {isLock $(l, P, \gamma)$ } acquire  $l\{P * [\bar{Q}]^{\gamma}\}$  After acquiring the lock, we gain ownership of the predicate P and the key ().
- $\{isLock(l, P, \gamma) * P * [\bigcap_{j=1}^{\gamma}] \}$  release  $l\{\top\}$  To release the lock, we need to show that P continues to hold, and that we have the key  $[\bigcap_{j=1}^{\gamma}]$ .

Also note that the lock predicate is *persistent*, since it's protected inside an invariant. This is important because multiple threads need to know that a given lock exists (so they can synchronize).

### 2.2 Client: Coarsed-Grained Bags

This client is also from the notes, and it consists of a *bag* data structure. We can create new bags, add items to it, and remove (the first) items from it.

 $\triangleright$  The implementation of the bag looks just like a stack. But the specification says nothing about the order of insertions/removals, that's why it's a bag and not a stack  $\triangleleft$ .

The bag code follows:

Section bag\_code.

```
(* A bag is a pair of (optional list of values, lock) *)
Definition new_bag : val :=
    \lam: <>, (newlock #(), ref NONEV).

(* Insert a value into the bag. Return unit. *)
Definition insert : val :=
    \lam: "bag" "v",
    let: "lst" := Snd "bag" in
    let: "lock" := Fst "bag" in
    acquire "lock";;
```

```
"lst" <- SOME ("v", !"lst");;
    release "lock";;
    #().
(* Remove the value last-added to the bag (wrapped in an option), if the
   bag is non-empty. If the bag is empty, return NONE. *)
Definition remove : val :=
  \lam: "bag",
    let: "lst" := Snd "bag" in
    let: "lock" := Fst "bag" in
    acquire "lock";;
    let: "res" :=
       match: !"lst" with
         NONE => NONEV
       | SOME "pair" =>
         "lst" <- Snd "pair";;
         SOME (Fst "pair")
       end
    in
    release "lock";;
    "res".
```

End bag\_code.

#### 2.2.1 Bag Specification

The spec we want to show says only elements satisfying some predicate  $\Phi$  can be added to the bag. In turn, we guarantee that any element x removed from the bag satisfies  $\Phi x$ .

The bag predicate looks like

```
isBag(b, \Phi, \gamma) = \exists l, lst.b = (lock, lst) \land isLock(l, \exists n, vs.lst \hookrightarrow vs \land baglist(vs, n, \Phi), \gamma)
```

In turn,  $baglist(vs, n, \Phi)$  is a predicate that expresses that vs is a HeapLang list of n elements, all of which satisfy  $\Phi$ .

```
\begin{split} \operatorname{baglist}(vs, n, \Phi) = & (n = 0 \land vs = \mathtt{None}) \\ & \lor (n = Sn' \land \\ & \exists v, vs'. vs = \mathtt{Some}((v, vs')) \land \Phi v \land \operatorname{baglist}(vs, n', \Phi)) \end{split}
```

 $\triangleright$  The notes use guarded recursion to define baglist. I ended using the index n. Need to try the guarded recursion approach.  $\triangleleft$ 

The specs for the different methods are:

•  $\{T\}$ newbag  $()\{v.\gamma isBag(v,\Phi,\gamma)\}$ 

- $\{\Phi v * \mathrm{isBag}(b, \Phi, \gamma)\}$ insert  $b \ v\{T\}$
- $\{isBag(b, \Phi, \gamma)\}$ remove $b\{v.v = None \lor \exists x.v = Some(x) * \Phi x\}$

Notice that isBag is also persistent/duplicable.

▶ Need to implement concurrent client for bags <</p>

## 3 Message-Passing Idiom

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

This is the "message passing" example from the "Strong Logic for Weak Memory' paper': https://people.mpi-sws.org/~dreyer/papers/iris-weak/paper.pdf.

#### 3.1 Code

The program is simple: we have two variables x and y that start as 0, and are then mutated by two threads. The second thread loops until y is non-zero, which restricts the order of execution:

```
(* First we have a function 'repeat l', which reads l until its value is non-zero,
   at which point it returns l's value. *)

Definition repeat_prog : val :=
   rec: "repeat" "l" :=
   let: "vl" := !"l" in
   if: "vl" = #0 then ("repeat" "l") else "vl".

(* Then we have the code for the example. *)

Definition mp : val :=
   \lambda: <>,
    let: "x" := ref #0 in
   let: "y" := ref #0 in
   let: "res" := (("x" <- #37;; "y" <- #1) ||| (repeat_prog "y";; !"x")) in
   Snd "res".</pre>
```

#### 3.2 Specification

This example uses impredicative invariants: specifically one invariant for x that's embedded inside another invariant that talks about y (notice we're interested in the value of x at the end):

- The (inner) invariant for x is  $Inv_x \triangleq x \hookrightarrow 37 \lor \begin{bmatrix} \bar{0} & \gamma \\ \bar{0} & \bar{0} \end{bmatrix}^{l_x}$ .
- The (outer) invariant for y is  $Inv_y \triangleq y \hookrightarrow 0 \lor y \hookrightarrow 1 \land Inv_x^{t_y}$

How should we read the invariants above?

•

Notice we use the EX(UNIT) RA.

## 3.3 $\triangleright$ Questions $\triangleleft$

• Can we open invariants at "dummy atomic statements"? We might want to do this to "exchange" some tokens by others.