

# Coq

LASER 2011 Summerschool  
Elba Island, Italy

Christine Paulin-Mohring

<http://www.lri.fr/~paulin/LASER>

Université Paris Sud & INRIA Saclay - Île-de-France

September 2011

## Lecture 5 : Proof automation

- ▶ Example : `board_tac.v`

# Why/When should I use COQ ?

Coq is **not**:

- ▶ a direct tool to find bugs in C, Java, concurrent programs . . .

Is it really your job ?

- ▶ design methods, tools to **help others** write correct programs!

Coq is **helpful** for:

- ▶ developing complex mathematical proofs with high guaranty
  - ▶ **theorems** in your papers (semantics)
  - ▶ **back-end** for program verification
- ▶ develop/prove **pure functional** programs (algorithms, tools)

# Why/When should I use Coq ?

Coq is **not**:

- ▶ a direct tool to find bugs in C, Java, concurrent programs . . .

Is it really your job ?

- ▶ design methods, tools to **help others** write correct programs!

Coq is **helpful** for:

- ▶ developing complex mathematical proofs with high guaranty
  - ▶ **theorems** in your papers (semantics)
  - ▶ **back-end** for program verification
- ▶ develop/prove **pure functional** programs (algorithms, tools)

# Why/When should I use COQ ?

COQ is **not**:

- ▶ a direct tool to find bugs in C, Java, concurrent programs . . .

Is it really your job ?

- ▶ design methods, tools to **help others** write correct programs!

COQ is **helpful** for:

- ▶ developing complex mathematical proofs with high guaranty
  - ▶ **theorems** in your papers (semantics)
  - ▶ **back-end** for program verification
- ▶ develop/prove **pure functional** programs (algorithms, tools)

# Misunderstanding?

- ▶ Can you **solve** this equation?
- ▶ OK, lets learn how to **program** a solution !
  
- ▶ The entry cost is a lot **higher**
- ▶ The possibility are much **larger**
- ▶ It is hard (but you are **good**, and it is also **fun!**)
- ▶ If you are lucky, somebody has developed a similar application that you can reuse.

# Misunderstanding?

- ▶ Can you **solve** this equation?
- ▶ OK, lets learn how to **program** a solution !
  
- ▶ The entry cost is a lot **higher**
- ▶ The possibility are much **larger**
- ▶ It is hard (but you are **good**, and it is also **fun!**)
- ▶ If you are lucky, somebody has developed a similar application that you can reuse.

# Misunderstanding?

- ▶ Can you **solve** this equation?
- ▶ OK, lets learn how to **program** a solution !
  
- ▶ The entry cost is a lot **higher**
- ▶ The possibility are much **larger**
- ▶ It is hard (but you are **good**, and it is also **fun!**)
- ▶ If you are lucky, somebody has developed a similar application that you can reuse.

# Using a theorem prover as a back-end

Program correctness has been reduced to a logical statement.  
Is it true ?

- ▶ use a first-order theorem prover
  - ▶ automatic
  - ▶ it possibly fails (undecidable), what can you do ?
  - ▶ if it succeeds, can you trust it ?  
(bug, inconsistent or inadequate theories ?)
  
- ▶ use a proof assistant
  - ▶ interactive : requires expertise and time
  - ▶ not much help to prove or refute a statement, use your brain!
  - ▶ reasonably trustable



# Using a theorem prover as a back-end

Program correctness has been reduced to a logical statement.  
Is it true ?

- ▶ use a first-order theorem prover
  - ▶ automatic
  - ▶ it possibly fails (undecidable), what can you do ?
  - ▶ if it succeeds, can you trust it ?  
(bug, inconsistent or inadequate theories ?)
  
- ▶ use a proof assistant
  - ▶ interactive : requires expertise and time
  - ▶ not much help to prove or refute a statement, use your brain!
  - ▶ reasonably trustable

# Where automated deduction meets proof assistants

- ▶ most first-order theorem provers produce traces
- ▶ most proof assistants provides automated strategies (internal or external)

Do we have to choose ?

# Why3 platform

`http://why3.lri.fr`

(J-C. Filliâtre, F. Bobot, C. Marché, A. Paskevich and others)

see *Why3: Shepherd Your Herd of Provers (BOOGIE 2011)*

New version of the WHY platform (still under development)

- ▶ Description of **theories** (polymorphic multi-sorted logic)
  - ▶ functions, algebraic data-types, axioms, lemma
  - ▶ modules
- ▶ Translation to **multiple provers**
  - ▶ proof assistants,
  - ▶ SMT/TPTP solvers,
  - ▶ Specialized solver: Gappa
- ▶ A **programming** language with **annotations**

Examples from the distribution: `genealogy`, `vstte10_queens`

# The Frama-C platform

Static analysis tools for C programs

<http://frama-c.com/>

(B. Monate, L. Correnson, CEA LIST)

- ▶ ACSL : specification language for C programs
- ▶ Jessie : interpretation of C programs in WHY
- ▶ Examples (from P. Cousot course)

# Which proof assistant?

## Practical reasons:

- ▶ What they use in my team/company
- ▶ I have an expert next door
- ▶ The one I learned at school
- ▶ The library I need exists in that proof assistant

## Ideological reason

- ▶ Classical versus intuitionistic logic
- ▶ Trust base

Great achievements by great people in all proof assistants

Coq, HOL, PVS ...

Biodiversity is healthy!

# Which proof assistant?

## Practical reasons:

- ▶ What they use in my team/company
- ▶ I have an expert next door
- ▶ The one I learned at school
- ▶ The library I need exists in that proof assistant

## Ideological reason

- ▶ Classical versus intuitionistic logic
- ▶ Trust base

Great achievements by great people in all proof assistants

Coq, HOL, PVS . . .

**Biodiversity is healthy!**

# Basic automation in Coq

- ▶ Database search: `auto`, `trivial`
- ▶ Decision procedure: `tauto`, `firstorder`, `omega`
- ▶ Propositional simplification: `intuition`
- ▶ Algebraic manipulations: `ring`, `field`

# Specialized automation

- ▶ `gappa`, `interval` (G. Melquiond) (see PVS example)
- ▶ see also manual :
  - ▶ Psatz  
(F. Besson and E. Makarov, arithmetics over ordered rings)
  - ▶ Nsatz (L. Pottier, equalities in integral domains)
- ▶ external tools
  - ▶ resolution (M. Bezem, D. Hendriks and H. de Nivelle)
  - ▶ rewriting : `color` (F. Blanqui), `coccinelle` (E. Contejean)
  - ▶ ongoing work on integrating SAT/SMT solvers :  
MiniSat, VeriT (B. GrÃ©goire, C. Keller and al.)  
alt-ergo (S. Lescuyer)



# A language for writing tactics

Ltac designed by D. Delahaye

- ▶ Write complex tactics without writing ML code.
- ▶ Specific language
  - ▶ specific patterns for matching goals (non-linear)

```
match goal with
  id:?A /\ ?B |- ?A => destruct id; trivial
  | _ => idtac
end
match goal with |- context[?a+0] => rewrite ...
```

- ▶ specific backtracking
  - ▶ patterns are tried until the right-hand side succeeds
- ▶ specific constructions : **fresh name**, **type of term** ...
- ▶ COQ data structures and terms

Example on the board

# Computation

- ▶ Computation is part of type-checking (verification of convertibility)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash U : s \quad \Gamma \vdash t : T \quad T \equiv U}{\Gamma \vdash t : U}$$

- ▶ Internal programming language (functional kernel of CAML)
- ▶ Write complex programs and use them in proofs
  - ▶ Four colors theorem
  - ▶ Reflexive tactics
- ▶ Efficient reduction technics:  
byte-code compiling, machine integers (B. Grégoire)

# Reflexive tactics

$$\frac{\text{refl\_eq} : t = t \quad t \equiv u}{\text{refl\_eq} : t = u}$$

## ▶ Principle

- ▶ function  $r2b : A \rightarrow \text{bool}$ ,
- ▶ function  $r2P : A \rightarrow \text{Prop}$ ,
- ▶ proof  $\text{rcor} : \forall a : A, r2b\ a = \text{true} \rightarrow r2P\ a$

$\text{rcor}\ a(\text{eq\_refl}\ \text{true}) : r2P\ a$

is well-typed when  $r2b\ a \equiv \text{true}$

## ▶ Problems

- ▶  $a : A$  should be closed (reification), and preferably **small**.
- ▶  $r2b$  should be **proved** and reduce **efficiently**

## ▶ Applications

- ▶ Ring, (R)Omega, Setoid Rewrite...
- ▶ Interfaces between Coq and other systems using traces.

# Example of reflection

```
Coq? Inductive form : Set :=  
Coq?   T | F | Var : nat -> form  
Coq?   | Conj : form -> form -> form.
```

```
Coq? Fixpoint f2P e (f:form) {struct f} : Prop :=  
Coq?   match f with  
Coq?     T => True | F => False  
Coq?   | Conj p q => f2P e p /\ f2P e q  
Coq?   | Var n => e n  
Coq? end.
```

```
Coq? Definition e n := match n with  
Coq?   0 => (0=0) | 1 => (1=2) | _ => True end.  
e is defined
```

```
Coq? Eval compute in  
Coq?   (f2P e (Conj (Var 0) (Conj (Var 1) (Var 1)))).  
= 0 = 0 /\ 1 = 2 /\ 1 = 2  
: Prop
```

# Example on the board

Small reflexion: deciding  $\forall b : \text{board}, P(b)$

See `board_tac.v`

# Want to learn more about Coq ?

- ▶ CEA-EDF-INRIA summer school on: Modelling and verifying algorithms in Coq: an introduction, 14-18 November 2011 - INRIA Paris, France.

<http://moscova.inria.fr/~zappa/teaching/coq/ecole11/> (register before sept 15)

- ▶ International Spring School on FORMALIZATION OF MATHEMATICS

March 12-16, 2012 - INRIA, Sophia Antipolis, France

<http://www-sop.inria.fr/marelle/Map-Spring-School.html>