

DSLs in finance, an overview

Vittorio Zaccaria

January 30, 2018

Introduction

Contract languages

- Contracts are expressed in relative times
- Can describe stipulation between multiple parties (& operator)
- Can describe *observable external decisions*:

if $\underbrace{\text{Obs}(X \text{ exercises option}, 0)}_{\text{eval'd at the beginning of each day}}$ in $\underbrace{90}_{\text{days' range}}$ then $100 * \underbrace{\text{DKK}(Y \rightarrow X)}_{\text{atomic exchange contract}}$ else 0

- Absolute times;
- Syntax similar to others but no intuitive reference to parties involved as contracts change over time:

$$\underbrace{\text{Give}(10 * \text{One}(\text{USD}))}_{\text{Bob pays 10 now}} \wedge \overbrace{\text{At}(\text{now} + 1 \text{ years}, 11 * \text{One}(\text{USD}))}^{\text{Bob expects to receive 11 in a year}}$$

Semantics

Subdivides semantics into **contract** and **expression** (denotational) semantics.
 Contract semantics maps expressions into a cash-flow trace:

$$C : \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \underbrace{Party \times Party \times Asset}_{\text{transaction}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

trace

for example (note the delay \uparrow and *unit transfer* \rightarrow operators)¹:

$$\begin{aligned} C\llbracket 0 \rrbracket &= \lambda n. \lambda t. 0 \\ C\llbracket c_1 \&c_2 \rrbracket &= C\llbracket c_1 \rrbracket + C\llbracket c_2 \rrbracket \\ C\llbracket d \uparrow c \rrbracket &= \lambda n. C\llbracket c \rrbracket (n - d) \\ C\llbracket a(p_1 \rightarrow p_2) \rrbracket &= \lambda n. \lambda t. \delta_{0,(p_1,p_2,a)}(n, t) - \delta_{0,(p_2,p_1,a)}(n, t) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

¹ δ = Kronecker's delta

Certified symbolic management

Contract transforms consist in specialisation and advancement, i.e., instantiation of a contract to a concrete starting time or simplification. Consider the following contract:

$$\text{DKK}(Y \rightarrow Z) \ \& \ \text{if } \text{Obs}(X \text{ defaults}, 0) \text{ in } 30 \text{ then } \text{DKK}(Z \rightarrow Y) \text{ else } 0$$

and assume that

$$\text{default}(X, i) = \top \text{ if } i = 15, \perp \text{ otherwise}$$

Then, at time $i = 16$, the contract can be transformed into:

$$\text{DKK}(Y \rightarrow Z) \ \& \ \text{DKK}(Z \rightarrow Y) \sim 0$$

Software verification and certified software

Type systems

- **Problem:** Simple expressions could involve non-causality, e.g.:

$$\underbrace{\text{obs}(FX(USD, DKK), 1)}_{\text{tomorrow's observation}} \times \underbrace{DKK(X \rightarrow Y)}_{\text{pay today}}$$

- **Solution:** time-indexed types;

Examples of typing rules using time-indexed types:

- an observation at time t is available at all times t' after t :

$$\frac{t \leq t'}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{Obs}(l, t) : \tau^{t'}}$$

- an expression e can only meaningfully scale a contract c if e is available at some time t' and c makes no stipulations strictly before t' :

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \mathit{Real}^{t'} \quad \Gamma \vdash c : \mathit{Contr}^{t'} \quad t \leq t'}{\Gamma \vdash e \times c : \mathit{Contr}^t}$$

Most of the typing for financial DSLs is based on *functional reactive programming*, i.e., pure functions over signals. This includes loops as well.

Linear-time Temporal Logic (LTL) [cite:Jeffrey:2012fh](#), [cite:Pnueli:1977wy](#) is a natural extension of the type system for FRP, which constrains the temporal behaviour of reactive programs.

Functional reactive programs

- LTL can be defined in a dependently typed functional language, and reactive programs form proofs of constructive LTL properties. Types are indexed over time²:

$$RSet = Time \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_0, \quad RSet \in \mathcal{U}_1$$

- One of the inhabitant of $RSet$ is the function $Past$:

²we use \mathcal{U}_i to represent the universe of types i .

Correctness over time can be reduced to

- **Invariance**: a property holding throughout the execution of a program
- **Eventuality**: temporal implication, or a property Q eventually follows from P

References

`bibliographystyle:unsrt bibliography:biblio.bib`