Programming and Proving with Concurrent Resources

Ilya Sergey

AUGL PPLV

joint work with Aleks Nanevski, Anindya Banerjee, Ruy Ley-Wild and Germán Delbianco

What and why

- Concurrency \Rightarrow parallelism \Rightarrow efficiency
- A gap between *informal* and *formal* reasoning
- Scalable formalisation requires compositionality

This talk

A logical framework for *implementation* and compositional verification of concurrent programs.





- Subjectivity
- Time-stamped Histories
- Reasoning about Deep Sharing

Subjectivity

• Time-stamped Histories

Reasoning about Deep Sharing

Hoare-style program specifications

{P} c {Q} precondition

If the *initial* state satisfies P, then, after **c** terminates, the *final* state satisfies Q.

Abstract specifications for a stack

push(x)

pop()

Abstract specifications for a stack

$$\{S = xs\} push(x) \{S' = x :: xs\}$$

{
$$S = xs$$
 } pop() { res = None $\land S = Nil$
 $\lor \exists x, xs'. res = Some x \land$
 $xs = x :: xs' \land S' = xs'$ }

Suitable for sequential case

Abstract specifications for a stack

$$\{S = xs\} push(x) \{S' = x :: xs\}$$

{
$$S = xs$$
 } pop() { res = None $\land S = Nil$
 $\lor \exists x, xs'. res = Some x \land$
 $xs = x :: xs' \land S' = xs'$ }

Not so good for concurrent use: useless in the presence of interference

y := pop(){ y = ??? }

y := pop();

{ S = Nil }

y := pop();{ $y \in Some \{1, 2\} \lor y = None \}$

push(2);

push(1);

{ S = Nil }

$$\{ y \in \text{Some } \{1, 2, 3\} \lor y = \text{None } \}$$

{ **S** = **Nil** }

push(3);

Thread-modular spec for pop?

{ S = Nil }

y := pop();

{ y = ??? }



Capture the effect of self, abstract over the others.

(subjective specification)

Subjective stack specifications

- H_s history of my **pushes/pops** to the stack
- H_0 history of **pushes/pops** by all other threads

 $\{H_s = \emptyset\}$

y := pop();

{ $y = None \lor y = Some(v)$, where $v \in H_o$ }

Subjective stack specifications

- H_s history of my **pushes/pops** to the stack
- H_o history of **pushes/pops** by all other threads

 $\{ H_s = \emptyset \}$ y := pop(); $\{ y = None \lor y = Some(v), where v \in H_o \}$ what I popped depends on what the others have pushed

Subjective stack specifications

Valid only if the history is changed by registering actual push/pops.

$$\{H_s = \emptyset\}$$

y := pop();

 $\{ y = None \lor y = Some(v), where v \in H_o \}$

what I popped depends on what the *others* have pushed Specifies expected
thread interference
C ⊢ { P } y := pop(); { Q }

Model of shared state with manifested interference

Concurrent Resources



Concurrent Resources

Owicki, Gries [CACM'77]



Subjective Concurrent Resources

Ley-Wild, Nanevski [POPL'13]



Subjective Concurrent Resources

Jones [TOPLAS'83]



What I have = what I can do and what I have done.

Concurrent Resources

State Transition Systems with Subjective Auxiliary State

Nanevski et al [ESOP'14]

Resource-based specifications



- Self state controlled by me
- Other state controlled by all other threads
- Joint modified by everyone, as allowed by transitions

Resource-based specifications



C ⊢ { P } c { Q }@C

defines resources, touched by **c**, their transitions and invariants

Resource-based specifications





specify self/other/joint parts

Fine-grained Concurrent Separation Logic

Nanevski, Ley-Wild, Sergey, Delbianco [ESOP'14]

- Logic for reasoning with (fine-grained) concurrent resources
- Emphasis on subjective specifications

- Subjectivity
- Histories
- Deep Sharing

- Subjectivity reasoning with self and other
- Histories
- Deep Sharing

• Subjectivity — reasoning with self and other

- Histories
- Deep Sharing

Partial Commutative Monoids

(S, ⊕, **0)**

- A set S of elements
- Join (

): commutative, associative, partial
- Unit element $\mathbf{0}$: $\forall e \in S, e \oplus \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0} \oplus e = e$

Logical state split





- unit *idle* thread
- partial

Logical state split





State that belongs to child₁
Logical state split



State that belongs to child₂

Logical state split





Logical state split



PCMs: a uniform interface for *splittable* state

Familiar PCM: finite heaps

- Heaps are partial finite maps $nat \rightarrow Val$
- \bullet Join operation \oplus is disjoint union
- Unit element ${\bm 0}$ is the empty heap \varnothing

Resource for thread-local state

Concurrent Separation Logic O'Hearn [CONCUR'04]



- h_s heap, logically owned by this thread
- h_0 heap, owned by others
- Transitions writes into h_s

disjoint by resource definition

$$\begin{cases} h_s = x \mapsto - \oplus y \mapsto - \wedge h_o = h \\ h_s = x \mapsto - \wedge h_o = y \mapsto - \oplus h \\ *x := 5; \\ \{h_s = x \mapsto 5 \wedge h_o = y \mapsto - \oplus h \} \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} h_s = y \mapsto - \wedge h_o = x \mapsto - \oplus h \\ *y := 7; \\ \{h_s = y \mapsto 7 \wedge h_o = x \mapsto - \oplus h \\ \end{cases}$$

 $\{h_s = x \mapsto 5 \oplus y \mapsto 7 \land h_o = h\}$

Less familiar PCM: histories

Sergey, Nanevski, Banerjee [ESOP'15]

Describing *atomic* state updates via auxiliary state

Atomic stack specifications

 $\{S = xs\} \text{ push}(x) \{S' = x :: xs\}$

Atomic stack specifications





Changes by this thread



Changes by other threads





 H_s , H_o — self/other contributions to the resource history

Histories are like heaps!

- Histories are partial finite maps $nat \rightarrow AbsOp$
- Join operation \oplus is disjoint union
- Unit element ${\bm 0}$ is the empty history \varnothing

Stack specification



Stack specification

 $\{H_{s} = \emptyset \land H \subseteq H_{o}\}$

pop()

{ res. if (res = Some x) then $\exists t, xs. H \subseteq H_0 \land H < t \land H_s = t \mapsto (x::xs, xs)$) else $\exists t. H \subseteq H_0 \land H \leq t$ $\land H_s = \emptyset \land [t \mapsto (_, Nil) \subseteq H_0] @C_{stack}$

• pop has hit Nil during its execution at the moment t

Stack specification

no self-contributions initially?

pop()

 $\{H_{s} = \emptyset \land H \subseteq H_{o}\}$

{ res. if (res = Some x) then $\exists t, xs. H \subseteq H_0 \land H < t \land H_s = t \mapsto (x::xs, xs)$) else $\exists t. H \subseteq H_0 \land H \leq t$ $\land H_s = \emptyset \land t \mapsto (_, Nil) \subseteq H_0$ }@C_{stack}

Framing in FCSL



my_program



Framing in FCSL



my_program



Works for any PCM, not just heaps (e.g., SL and CSL)!

Framing histories

 $\{H_{s} = \emptyset \land H \subseteq H_{o}\}$

push(x)

 $\{ \exists t, xs. H \subseteq H_o \land H < t \land H_s = t \mapsto (xs, x::xs) \} @C_{stack}$



How clients use splittable histories?

A stack client program

- Two threads: producer and consumer
- Ap an n-element producer array
- Ac an n-element consumer array
- A shared concurrent stack S is used as a buffer
- **Goal**: prove the exchange correct

Auxiliary Predicates

- Pushed H E iff
 E is a multiset of elements, pushed in H
- Popped H E iff
 E is a multiset of elements, popped in H

```
{ Ap \mapsto L \land Pushed H_s L[\leq i] \land Popped H_s \emptyset }
     letrec produce(i : nat) = {
        if (i == n)
        then return;
        else {
           S.push(Ap[i]);
           produce(i+1);
        }
{ Ap \mapsto L \land Pushed H_s L[< n] \land Popped H_s \emptyset }
```

```
\{\exists L, AC \mapsto L \land Pushed H_s \varnothing \land Popped H_s L[< i]\}
         letrec consume(i : nat) = {
            if (i == n)
            then return;
            else {
               t \leftarrow S.pop();
               if t == Some v
               then {
                  Ac[i] := v;
                  consume(i+1);
               }
               else consume(i);
            }
         }
\{\exists L, AC \mapsto L \land Pushed H_s \emptyset \land Popped H_s L[< n]\}
```

No other threads can interfere on S

hide $C_{stack}(h_s)$ in

produce(0)

consume(0)

$\{\operatorname{Ap} \mapsto L \oplus \operatorname{Ac} \mapsto L' \oplus h_{S}\}$ hide $C_{\operatorname{stack}}(h_{S})$ in

produce(0)

consume(0)

$\{\operatorname{Ap} \mapsto L \oplus \operatorname{Ac} \mapsto L' \oplus \mathfrak{h}_{S}\}$

hide C_{stack}(h_S) in

$\{ Ap \mapsto L \oplus Ac \mapsto L' \oplus h_S \}$

hide C_{stack}(h_s) in



$\{\operatorname{Ap} \mapsto L \oplus \operatorname{Ac} \mapsto L' \oplus \mathbf{h}_{\mathrm{S}}\}\$

hide C_{stack}(h_S) in

$$\{ Ap \mapsto L \oplus Ac \mapsto L'' \oplus hs' \land L =_{set} L'' \}$$

Key insights

• Subjectivity — reasoning with self and other

- Histories
- Deep Sharing

Key insights

- Subjectivity reasoning with self and other
- Histories temporal specification via state
- Deep Sharing

Key insights

- Subjectivity reasoning with self and other
- Histories temporal specification via state
- Deep Sharing

Ramified data structures



In-place concurrent spanning tree construction














Why verifying span is difficult?

The recursion scheme does not follow the shape of the structure.



Assumptions for correctness

```
letrec span (x : ptr) : bool = {
    if x == null then return false;
    else
        b ← CAS(x->m, 0, 1);
        if b then
            (r<sub>1</sub>,r<sub>r</sub>) ← (span(x->1) || span(x->r));
        if ¬r<sub>1</sub> then x->1 := null;
        if ¬r<sub>r</sub> then x->r := null;
        return true;
    else return false;
}
```

• The graph modified only by the commands of span

• The initial call is done from a root node

Graph Resource: State



Graph Resource: State



Graph Resource: marking a node



Graph Resource: marking a node



Graph Resource: pruning an edge



No other thread can do it!

 $\{P\}$ span(x) $\{Q\}$ OC SpanTree

span(x) : span_tp (x, C_{SpanTree}, P, Q)

```
Definition span_tp (x : ptr) :=
  {i (g1 : graph (joint i))}, STsep [SpanTree]
  (fun s1 => i = s1 ∧ (x == null ∨ x ∈ dom (joint s1)),
  fun (r : bool) s2 => exists g2 : graph (joint s2),
    subgraph g1 g2 ∧
    if r then x != null ∧
        exists (t : set ptr),
            self s2 = self i ⊕ t ∧
                tree g2 x t ∧
                   maximal g2 t ∧
                front g1 t (self s2 ⊕ other s2)
  else (x == null ∨ mark g2 x) ∧
                self s2 = self i).
```

concurrent resource

```
Definition span_tp (x : ptr) :=
{i (g1 : graph (joint i))}, STsep [SpanTree]
(fun s1 => i = s1 ^ (x == null ^ x e dom (joint s1)),
fun (r : bool) s2 => exists g2 : graph (joint s2),
subgraph g1 g2 ^
if r then x != null ^
exists (t : set ptr),
self s2 = self i ⊕ t ^
tree g2 x t ^
maximal g2 t ^
front g1 t (self s2 ⊕ other s2)
else (x == null ^ mark g2 x) ^
self s2 = self i).
```

precondition

```
Definition span_tp (x : ptr) :=
{i (g1 : graph (joint i))}, STsep [SpanTree]
(fun s1 => i = s1 ^ (x == null ∨ x ∈ dom (joint s1)),
fun (r : bool) s2 => exists g2 : graph (joint s2),
subgraph g1 g2 ^
if r then x != null ^
exists (t : set ptr),
self s2 = self i ⊕ t ^
tree g2 x t ^
maximal g2 t ^
front g1 t (self s2 ⊕ other s2)
else (x == null ∨ mark g2 x) ^
self s2 = self i).
```

```
Definition span_tp (x : ptr) :=
   {i (g1 : graph (joint i))}, STsep [SpanTree]
```

(fun s1 => i = s1 \land (x == null \lor x \in dom (joint s1)),

```
fun (r : bool) s2 => exists g2 : graph (joint s2),
subgraph g1 g2 ^
if r then x != null ^
            exists (t : set ptr),
                self s2 = self i ⊕ t ^
                tree g2 x t ^
                    maximal g2 t ^
                front g1 t (self s2 ⊕ other s2)
else (x == null ∨ mark g2 x) ^
                self s2 = self i).
```

postcondition



```
Definition span_tp (x : ptr) :=
  {i (gl : graph (joint i))}, STsep [SpanTree]
  (fun s1 => i = s1 ∧ (x == null ∨ x ∈ dom (joint s1)),
  fun (r : bool) s2 => exists g2 : graph (joint s2),
    subgraph g1 g2 ∧
    if r then x != null ∧
        exists (t : set ptr),
            self s2 = self i ⊕ t ∧
            tree g2 x t ∧
            maximal g2 t ∧
            front g1 t (self s2 ⊕ other s2)
  else (x == null ∨ mark g2 x) ∧
        self s2 = self i).
```

```
Definition span_tp (x : ptr) :=
  {i (g1 : graph (joint i))}, STsep [SpanTree]
  (fun s1 => i = s1 ^ (x == null ∨ x ∈ dom (joint s1)),
  fun (r : bool) s2 => exists g2 : graph (joint s2),
    subgraph g1 g2 ^
    if r then x != null ^
        exists (t : set ptr),
            self s2 = self i ⊕ t ^
            tree g2 x t ^
            maximal g2 t ^
            front g1 t (self s2 ⊕ other s2)
    else (x == null ∨ mark g2 x) ^
            self s2 = self i).
```

```
Definition span_tp (x : ptr) :=
{i (g1 : graph (joint i))}, STsep [SpanTree]
(fun s1 => i = s1 ^ (x == null ^ x e dom (joint s1)),
fun (r : bool) s2 => exists g2 : graph (joint s2),
subgraph g1 g2 ^
if r then x != null ^
exists (t : set ptr),
self s2 = self i ⊕ t ^
tree g2 x t ^
maximal g2 t ^
front g1 t (self s2 ⊕ other s2)
else (x == null ^ mark g2 x) ^
self s2 = self i).
```

```
Definition span_tp (x : ptr) :=
{i (g1 : graph (joint i))}, STsep [SpanTree]
(fun sl => i = sl ^ (x == null ∨ x ∈ dom (joint sl)),
fun (r : bool) s2 => exists g2 : graph (joint s2),
subgraph g1 g2 ^
if r then x != null ^
exists (t : set ptr),
self s2 = self i ⊕ t ^
tree g2 x t ^
maximal g2 t ^
front g1 t (self s2 ⊕ other s2)
else (x == null ∨ mark g2 x) ^
self s2 = self i).
```

```
Definition span_tp (x : ptr) :=
{i (g1 : graph (joint i))}, STsep [SpanTree]
(fun s1 => i = s1 ^ (x == null ^ x e dom (joint s1)),
fun (r : bool) s2 => exists g2 : graph (joint s2),
subgraph g1 g2 ^
if r then x != null ^
exists (t : set ptr),
self s2 = self i ⊕ t ^
tree g2 x t ^
maximal g2 t ^
else (x == null ^ mark g2 x) ^
self s2 = self i).
```

```
Definition span tp (x : ptr) :=
  {i (g1 : graph (joint i))}, STsep [SpanTree]
    (fun s1 => i = s1 \land (x == null \lor x \in dom (joint s1)),
     fun (r : bool) s2 => exists g2 : graph (joint s2),
       subgraph g1 g2 \wedge
       if r then x != null 
                  exists (t : set ptr),
                     self s2 = self i \oplus t \wedge
                     tree g2 x t \wedge
                     maximal g2 t \land
                     front g1 t (self s2 \oplus other s2)
       else (x == null V mark q2 x) A
             self s2 = self i).
```

Open world assumption (assuming other-interference)







front g1 t (self s2)

hide C_{SpanTree}(h₁) in { span(a) }



follow from postcondition and graph connectivity





Key insights

- Subjectivity reasoning with self and other
- Histories temporal specification via state
- Deep Sharing

Key insights

- Subjectivity reasoning with self and other
- Histories temporal specification via state
- Deep Sharing splitting *auxiliary* state

Bonus

Composing programs and proofs



Composing programs and proofs



Composing programs and proofs



non-linearizable data structures
To take away

• Subjectivity:

thread-modularity = reasoning in terms of self and other

- Histories: capturing temporal aspects via auxiliary state
- **Deep Sharing**: reasoning about ramified data structures by splitting not *real*, but *auxiliary* state

