This document uses the slide template from the "Interactive
Theorem Proving Course" by Thomas Tuerk
(https://www.thomas-tuerk.de):
https://github.com/thtuerk/ITP-course

Karl Palmskog (https://setoid.com) is the document author.

Interactive Theorem Proving and Program Verification
Lecture 10

Pablo Buiras and Karl Palmskog

Academic Year 2019/20, Period 3–4

Based on slides by Thomas Tuerk

Part XVIII

Practical Program Verification with CakeML

CakeML Recap

- CakeML is a functional programming language in the SML family
- CakeML has a verified compiler which takes a long time to bootstrap in HOL4
- Even without boostrapping the compiler, we can use CakeML theories to verify (HOL4) functions
- We use the v1009 release of CakeML:
  https://github.com/CakeML/cakeml/releases/download/v1009/cake-x64-64.tar.gz
  https://github.com/CakeML/cakeml/archive/v1009.tar.gz

The CakeML Translator

- SML `translate` function, taking HOL4 function/data as input
- if successful, adds CakeML AST to current program state and outputs equivalence theorem
- has been used to generate and prove correct a significant fraction of the SML basis library for CakeML
- separate from the post-hoc verification environment (better suited for imperative programs)

Simple Finite Map Encoding in HOL4

```
val _ = new_theory "simple_bst";

val _ = Datatype 'btree = Leaf | Node 'k 'v btree btree ';

val singleton_def = Define'
  singleton k v = Node k v Leaf Leaf ';

val lookup_def = Define'
  lookup cmp k Leaf = NONE
  lookup cmp k (Node k' v' l r) =
    case cmp k k' of
    | Less => lookup cmp k l
    | Greater => lookup cmp k r
    | Equal => SOME v' ';

val insert_def = Define'
  insert cmp k v Leaf = singleton k v
  insert cmp k v (Node k' v' l r) =
    case cmp k k' of
    | Less => Node k' v' (insert cmp k v l) r
    | Greater => Node k' v' l (insert cmp k v r)
    | Equal => Node k' v l r ';
```

Holmakefile for using CakeML Translator

```
CAKEMLDIR = /path/to/cakeml % location of unpacked v1009.tar.gz
INCLUDES = $(CAKEMLDIR)/misc $(CAKEMLDIR)/semantics\
  $(CAKEMLDIR)/semantics/proofs\
  $(CAKEMLDIR)/basis/pure\
  $(CAKEMLDIR)/basis\
  $(CAKEMLDIR)/translator\
  $(CAKEMLDIR)/characteristic

all: $(DEFAULT_TARGETS)
.PHONY: all
```

CakeML Translating and Printing Boilerplate

```
open preamble ml_progLib ml_translatorLib astPP simple_bstTheory;

fun get_current_prog() =
let
  val state = get_ml_prog_state()
  val state_thm =
    state |> ml_progLib.remove_snocs |>
    ml_progLib.clean_state |> get_thm
  val current_prog =
    state_thm |> concl |> strip_comb |> #2 |> el 2
in current_prog end;

val res = translate singleton_def;
val res = translate lookup_def;
val res = translate insert_def;

val _ = astPP.enable_astPP();
print_term (get_current_prog());
```

Pretty Printed Translator Output

```
datatype 'a option =  Some ('a )  |  None;

datatype ( 'k  ,  'w ) simple_bst_btree =
Node ('k ) ('w ) (('k  ,  'w ) simple_bst_btree)
 (('k  ,  'w ) simple_bst_btree) | Leaf;

fun  singleton v1 = (fn  v2 => (Node (v1) (v2) (Leaf) (Leaf)));

datatype ternaryComparisons_ordering =  Greater |  Equal  | Less;

fun  insert v5 v6 v8 v7 =
case  v7
of  Leaf => (singleton v6 v8)
|  (Node (v4) (v3) (v2) (v1)) => (case  (v5 v6 v4)
of  Less => ((Node (v4) (v3) (insert v5 v6 v8 v2) (v1)))
|  Equal => ((Node (v4) (v8) (v2) (v1)))
|  Greater => ((Node (v4) (v3) (v2) (insert v5 v6 v8 v1))));

   fun  lookup v5 v6 v7 =
case  v7
of  Leaf =>  None
|  (Node (v4) (v3) (v2) (v1)) => (case  (v5 v6 v4)
of  Less => (lookup v5 v6 v2)
|  Equal => ((Some (v3)))
|  Greater => (lookup v5 v6 v1));
```

Organizing the Program Verification Effort

- definitions can be suitable for reasoning or execution, but seldom both
- correctness arguments should be done at high abstraction level
- certification of programs can be separated from correctness reasoning

One Possible Methodology

1. encode problem using **proof-friendly** datatypes in HOL4 (lists, sets)
2. state and prove main correctness properties **abstractly**, e.g., using relations and pure functions
3. figure out and encode execution-friendly datatypes
4. refine proof-friendly functions and data to execution-friendly ones
5. apply CakeML translator on execution-friendly functions and data
6. compile translated functions and data using standalone compiler, or generate machine code directly

Case Study: Propositional Logic Proof Checker

- proof system taken from the book "Logic for Computer Science" by Huth and Ryan
- system (specification) is a set of inference rules
- correctness of the system is that rules are sound
- an executable proof checker validates that a given proof adheres to the inference rules
- code at https://github.com/palmskog/fitch

Example Proof With Box

```
q |- p -> q
[
  1 p assumption
  2 q premise
]
3 p -> q impi 1-2
```

Examples of Inference Rules

$$\frac{\Gamma(l') = \phi \wedge \phi'}{\Gamma, \overline{\phi} \vdash l \; \phi \;\; \wedge e_1 \; l'} \quad \text{VD\_ANDE}1 \qquad \frac{\begin{array}{c}\Gamma(l_1) = \phi \rightarrow \phi' \\ \Gamma(l_2) = \neg\phi'\end{array}}{\Gamma, \overline{\phi} \vdash l \; \neg\phi \;\; \text{MT} \; l_1, l_2} \quad \text{VD\_MT}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma(l') = \phi}{\Gamma, \overline{\phi} \vdash l \; \phi \vee \phi' \;\; \vee i_1 \; l'} \quad \text{VD\_ORI}1 \qquad \frac{\Gamma(l') = \phi}{\Gamma, \overline{\phi} \vdash l \; \neg\neg\phi \;\; \neg\neg i \; l'} \quad \text{VD\_NEGNEGI}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma(l') = \bot}{\Gamma, \overline{\phi} \vdash l \; \phi \;\; \bot e \; l'} \quad \text{VD\_CONTE} \qquad \frac{\Gamma(l_1, l_2) = (\phi, \phi')}{\Gamma, \overline{\phi} \vdash l \; \phi \rightarrow \phi' \;\; \rightarrow i \; l_1 - l_2} \quad \text{VD\_IMPI}$$

Reasoning Friendly Function

```
Definition valid_derivation_deriv_impi:
  valid_derivation_deriv_impi G l1 l2 p =
    case p of
    | prop_imp p1 p2 =>
      (case FLOOKUP G (INR (l1, l2)) of
      | SOME (INR (p3, p4)) => p1 = p3 /\ p2 = p4
      | _ => F)
    | _ => F
End

Theorem valid_derivation_deriv_impi_sound:
 !G pl l1 l2 l' p.
  valid_derivation_deriv_impi G l1 l2 p <=>
   valid_derivation G pl (derivation_deriv l' p
   (reason_justification (justification_impi l1 l2)))
Proof
(* ... *)
QED
```

CakeML Friendly HOL4 Function

```
Definition valid_derivation_deriv_impi_cake:
  valid_derivation_deriv_impi_cake t l1 l2 p =
    case p of
    | prop_imp p1 p2 =>
      (case lookup t (INR (l1, l2)) of
      | SOME (INR (p3, p4)) => p1 = p3 /\ p2 = p4
      | _ => F)
    | _ => F
End

Theorem valid_derivation_deriv_impi_eq:
 !t l1 l2 p. map_ok t ==>
  valid_derivation_deriv_impi_cake t l1 l2 p =
    valid_derivation_deriv_impi (to_fmap t) l1 l2 p
Proof
rw [valid_derivation_deriv_impi_cake,valid_derivation_deriv_impi] \\
rw [lookup_thm]
QED
```

Generated CakeML Function

```
fun  valid_derivation_deriv_impi_cake v17 =
    (fn  v14 =>
     (fn  v15 =>
       (fn  v16 =>
         case v16
         of  (Prop_p (v1)) =>  (0 < 0)
         |   (Prop_neg (v2)) =>  (0 < 0)
         |   (Prop_and (v4)  (v3)) =>  (0 < 0)
         |   (Prop_or (v6)  (v5)) =>  (0 < 0)
         |   (Prop_imp (v13)  (v12)) =>
          (case  (Map.lookup v17 (let val  x = (v14,v15)
         in
           (Inr (x))
         end))
         of  None =>  (0 < 0)
         |   ((Some (v11))) =>  (case  v11
         of  ((Inl (v7))) =>  (0 < 0)
         |   ((Inr (v10))) =>  (case  v10
         of  (v9,v8) =>  ((v13 = v9) andalso  (v12 = v8)))))
         |   Prop_cont =>  (0 < 0))));
```