A Case Study in Dependent Type Theory: Extracting a Certified Program from the Formal Proof of its Specification

Andreas Salhus Bakseter

Department of Informatics University of Bergen

June 9, 2023

Overview

- 1. Background
- 2. The Case
- 3. Approach & Design Choices
- 4. Implementation
- 5. Examples & Results
- 6. Evaluation
- 7. Related & Future Work
- 8. Conclusion

proofs are an important part of mathematics

- proofs are an important part of mathematics
- two kinds of proofs:

- proofs are an important part of mathematics
- two kinds of proofs:
 - informal proofs, natural language, by humans for humans

∟ Proofs

- proofs are an important part of mathematics
- two kinds of proofs:
 - informal proofs, natural language, by humans for humans
 - formal proofs, formal language, hard for humans easy for computers

- proofs are an important part of mathematics
- two kinds of proofs:
 - informal proofs, natural language, by humans for humans
 - formal proofs, formal language, hard for humans easy for computers
- we can tranfsorm informal proofs into formal proofs (formalization)

- proofs are an important part of mathematics
- two kinds of proofs:
 - ▶ informal proofs, natural language, by humans for humans
 - formal proofs, formal language, hard for humans easy for computers
- we can tranfsorm informal proofs into formal proofs (formalization)
- using computers & proof assistants we can check formal proofs (verification)

- proofs are an important part of mathematics
- two kinds of proofs:
 - ▶ informal proofs, natural language, by humans for humans
 - formal proofs, formal language, hard for humans easy for computers
- we can tranfsorm informal proofs into formal proofs (formalization)
- using computers & proof assistants we can check formal proofs (verification)
- we can also extract programs from formal proofs

foundation of mathematics

- foundation of mathematics
- every object has a type, a: A, must know its construction

- foundation of mathematics
- every object has a type, a: A, must know its construction

- foundation of mathematics
- every object has a type, a: A, must know its construction
- provides us with rules of inference for manipulating types & objects

- foundation of mathematics
- every object has a type, a: A, must know its construction
- provides us with rules of inference for manipulating types & objects
- propositions as types:

- foundation of mathematics
- every object has a type, a: A, must know its construction
- provides us with rules of inference for manipulating types & objects
- propositions as types:
 - propositions are types

- foundation of mathematics
- every object has a type, a: A, must know its construction
- provides us with rules of inference for manipulating types & objects
- propositions as types:
 - propositions are types
 - proofs are objects

- foundation of mathematics
- every object has a type, a: A, must know its construction
- provides us with rules of inference for manipulating types & objects
- propositions as types:
 - propositions are types
 - proofs are objects
 - proof of a proposition is an object of that type

- foundation of mathematics
- every object has a type, a: A, must know its construction
- provides us with rules of inference for manipulating types & objects
- propositions as types:
 - propositions are types
 - proofs are objects
 - proof of a proposition is an object of that type
- dependent types:

- foundation of mathematics
- every object has a type, a: A, must know its construction
- provides us with rules of inference for manipulating types & objects
- propositions as types:
 - propositions are types
 - proofs are objects
 - proof of a proposition is an object of that type
- dependent types:
 - gives us more expressive types

- foundation of mathematics
- every object has a type, a: A, must know its construction
- provides us with rules of inference for manipulating types & objects
- propositions as types:
 - propositions are types
 - proofs are objects
 - proof of a proposition is an object of that type
- dependent types:
 - gives us more expressive types
 - Σ-types to model existential quantification

- foundation of mathematics
- every object has a type, a: A, must know its construction
- provides us with rules of inference for manipulating types & objects
- propositions as types:
 - propositions are types
 - proofs are objects
 - proof of a proposition is an object of that type
- dependent types:
 - gives us more expressive types
 - \triangleright Σ -types to model existential quantification
 - ► Π-types to model universal quantification

Proof Assistants

software tools for constructing & verifying formal proofs

- software tools for constructing & verifying formal proofs
- based on type theory, propositions as types

- software tools for constructing & verifying formal proofs
- based on type theory, propositions as types
- ► Coq:

- software tools for constructing & verifying formal proofs
- based on type theory, propositions as types
- ► Coq:
 - based on the type theory Calculus of Inductive Constructions

- software tools for constructing & verifying formal proofs
- based on type theory, propositions as types
- ► Coq:
 - based on the type theory Calculus of Inductive Constructions
 - uses Gallina as its specification language

- software tools for constructing & verifying formal proofs
- based on type theory, propositions as types
- ► Coq:
 - based on the type theory Calculus of Inductive Constructions
 - uses Gallina as its specification language
 - uses Ltac as its tactic language, for ease of use
 - supports extraction of programs

▶ two problems in lattice theory solved by Bezem & Coquand

- ▶ two problems in lattice theory solved by Bezem & Coquand
- we want to answer these questions:

- ▶ two problems in lattice theory solved by Bezem & Coquand
- we want to answer these questions:
 - are the results from Bezem & Coquand correct?

- ▶ two problems in lattice theory solved by Bezem & Coquand
- we want to answer these questions:
 - ▶ are the results from Bezem & Coquand correct?
 - is it feasible to formalize complex proofs, such as these?

- ▶ two problems in lattice theory solved by Bezem & Coquand
- we want to answer these questions:
 - ▶ are the results from Bezem & Coquand correct?
 - is it feasible to formalize complex proofs, such as these?
 - is the formalization process worth the effort?

Relevant parts of the paper

Overview of case

▶ join-semilattices: partially ordered set where any two elements have a least upper bound, called their join, denoted ∨

Relevant parts of the paper

ightharpoonup join-semilattices: partially ordered set where any two elements have a least upper bound, called their join, denoted \lor