Write You Some Proofs for Great Good

https://github.com/rpeszek/present-proofs-lc19

https://github.com/rpeszek/present-proofs-lc19/blob/master/doc/slides.pdf

Robert Peszek r_peszek@hollandhart.com Holland & Hart LLC Innovation Lab

FP @ Innovation Lab, Holland & Hart

https://www.meetup.com/Boulder-Haskell-Programmers/

Jason Adaska - JWAdaska@hollandhart.com

Nihil Shah - NAShah@hollandhart.com

Robert Peszek - RPeszek@hollandhart.com



Topics

- Precise Types (Vect (n :: Nat) a, MaybeB (b :: Bool) a, Dec)
- Mathematics and Software Engineering
 - Type Precision Gentlemen's agreements
 - Progs == Proofs Software == has Bugs
 - Dependent Types Implementation Hiding
 - Proofs
 Maintenance Cost
- Termination / Totality (can prove nonsense by throwing exception)
- Performance, Maintenance, Peano Nat vs GHC. TypeLits

Proofs by who writes them

	Programmers	Automated Logic Solvers
Amount of Work		Free Lunch!
What can be done	A Lot	Limitted
Implementations	Dependently Typed Languages	Refinement Types LiquidHaskell
(!!) :: Vect n a -> Fin n ->	{-@ (!!) :: x: [a] -> { i:Nat i < len x} -> a @-} (!!) :: [a] -> Int -> a
	(focus of this talk)	

Motivation (implementation safety)

(code)

https://github.com/rpeszek/present-proofs-lc19/tree/master/src/Motivation/Exfer.idr

Motivation (call-side safety)

```
(!!) :: [a] -> Int -> a

safeGet :: [a] -> Int -> Maybe a

questionable improvement

(!!) :: Vect n a -> Fin n -> a

(!!) :: Vect n a -> SNat m -> MaybeB (m < n) a

(!!) : (xs:List a) -> (n:Nat) -> {auto ok: InBounds n xs} -> a

... still imprecise
```

Why proofs?

- Curry Howard (Why proofs == Why programs)
- Formal verification
- Enable `Type Precision` (focus of this talk)
 - (proofs replace unsafe coercion)

```
data Vect (n :: Nat) a where
Empty :: Vect 0 a
Cons :: a -> Vect n a -> Vect (1 + n) a
```

```
id_sanity :: Vect (n + 0) a -> Vect n a
id_sanity = unsafeCoerce -- ghrrr (2)
```

Curry-Howard to MaybeB

(code)

https://github.com/rpeszek/present-proofs-lc19/blob/master/src/Present/AnIntro.hs

https://github.com/rpeszek/present-proofs-lc19/blob/master/src/Present/MaybeB.hs

Problem in Paradise - Questions

Should type checker know basic algebra?

```
a | True <==> True (Bool algebra)
a + b == b + a (Nat, Int, Float ... algebra) ...
```

- Dependently Types Langs: **No** (③ *Programmers supply proofs*)
- Refinement Types / LiquidHaskell: **Yes** (□♂ *SMT solver does the work*)

Type Equality

```
data a :~: b where
Refl :: a :~: a
```

```
test1 = Refl :: 5 :~: 5 -- GOOD

test10 = Refl :: 4 :~: 5 -- ERR

test2 = Refl :: 2 + 3 :~: 3 + 2 -- GOOD

test20 :: SNat n1 -> SNat n2 -> n1 + n2 :~: n2 + n1

test20 __ = Refl -- ERR
```

(base) Data.Type.Equality

Type Equality

same for Bool

```
testb1 = Refl :: False :~: False --- GOOD
testb10 = Refl :: True :~: False --- ERR

testb2 = Refl :: (True : | | False) :~: (False : | | True) --- GOOD

testb20 :: SBool b1 -> SBool b2 -> (b1 : | | b2) :~: (b2 : | | b1)
testb20 _ _ = Refl --- ERR
```

Just reduce to what it already knows!

Example Combinators

- library over op semantics
- "pattern-matching on a variable of type (a :~: b) produces a proof that a ~ b" - haddoc

```
sym :: (a :~: b) -> (b :~: a)

trans :: (a :~: b) -> (b :~: c) -> (a :~: c)

apply :: (f :~: g) -> (a :~: b) -> (f a :~: g b)

inner :: (f a :~: g b) -> (a :~: b)

castWith :: (a :~: b) -> a -> b

gcastWith :: (a :~: b) -> ((a ~ b) => r) -> r

gcastWith Refl x = x
```

(base) Data. Type. Equality

Proofs - Bool Algebra

(code)

https://github.com/rpeszek/present-proofs-lc19/blob/master/src/Present/ProofsBoolAlg.hs

Proofs - Bool Algebra (Lessons Learned)

- (||) implementation is lifted to type level
- case splits define type equality
- implementation details impact type system behavior

Can we refrain from basing proofs on 'private' implementation details? Decouple base (axiomatic?) propositions like `orCommutes`

Proofs - Peano Nats

(code)

- Recursive Proofs
- Performance: unsafeCoerce replacements
 - rewrite rules
 - proveFast combinators
 - CPP
- Totality
 - QuickCheck to the rescue

Proofs - working with TypeLits

(code)

- hidden implementation (good and bad)
- Peano Nat is slow
- TypeLits can inform us how to make (previous) Peano proofs maintainable

https://github.com/rpeszek/present-proofs-lc19/blob/master/src/Present/WorkingWithTypeLits.hs

TypeLits (lessons learned)

Opinionated maintainable proofs:

- Need for some decoupling ((+) implementation from (+) propositions)
- Identify stable set of propositions, keep them close to implementation
- Refactor implementation and proofs together, isolate client code as much as possible

Better Bool ... Decidability

(code)



- Programming contradictions
 - -XEmptyCase
- Forced Type Precision
- Programs are proofs!

Some Learning/References

- intro books
 - Type Driven Development in Idris great book
 - https://github.com/rpeszek/ldrisTddNotes/wiki
 - TAPL great book (not really dep types but still)
 - Programming foundation books (penn/Pierce et al, Wadler)
- Haskell projects (with reading references)
 - singletons
 - equational-reasoning-in-haskell
 - liquidhaskell
- blogs
 - <u>blog.jle.im</u> (Justin Le)
 - typesandkinds (Richard Eisenberg)
- youtube
 - <u>Introduction to Agda</u> series by Daniel Peebles published by Edward Kmett