

A type checking algorithm for qualified session types

Marco Giunti

INRIA & LIX, École Polytechnique Palaiseau

WWV June 9 2011, Reykjavik

Structured-oriented programming_{SOP}

- Session types are a static analysis technique for service oriented protocols
- Allow for analyzing the message-passing interaction among a service provider and a client
- Introduced for the pi calculus and now embedded also in other paradigms:
 - functional programming
 - object oriented programming
- Idea: allowing typing of communication channels by using polymorphic *sequences* of types as:

output Integer . Output Boolean . input Boolean . end

Qualified session types

• Session types core: input, output and termination

?T.S	input
!T.S	output
end	termination

• Qualifiers

SOP in the pi calculus

- Example: event scheduling (e.g. Doodle)
- Two-steps service protocol for scheduling a meeting (client side)
 - 1. Ask to create a poll
 - provide a title for the meeting
 - provide a provisional date
 - 2. Invite participants
- Implementation: send request to create poll / receive poll channel

 $\overline{poll}\langle y \rangle . y(p) . (\overline{p} \langle Workshop \rangle . \overline{p} \langle 9 June \rangle . (\overline{z_1} \langle p \rangle | \cdots | \overline{z_n} \langle p \rangle))$

• Challenge: concurrent distribution of the poll channel

Session type for the poll

- Poll channel used first in linear mode then in unrestricted mode
 - 1. Send a title for the poll (linear mode)
 - 2. Send a date for the poll (linear mode)
 - 3. Distribute the poll (unrestricted mode)

 \overline{p} (Workshop). \overline{p} (9June). $(\overline{z_1}\langle p \rangle | \cdots | \overline{z_n}\langle p \rangle)$

- End point session type for channel *p* is lin !string.lin !date.*un !date
- Recursive type *un !date allows for distribution of poll channel

Concurrent session types

• Service: instantiation generates poll

Service =!poll(w).($\nu p : T$) $\overline{w}\langle p \rangle.p(title).p(date).!p(date)$

One channel end sent to the invoker

 $S_1 = \text{lin !string.lin !date. } * \text{ un !date}$

• The other channel end used in the continuation

 $S_2 = \text{lin ?string.lin ?date. } * \text{un ?date}$

• Full type for p describes *concurrent* behavior of two channel ends

$$T = (S_1, S_2)$$

This talk

• We present a type checking algorithm for qualified session types of the form

 $T = (S_1, S_2)$

- The algorithm can be seen as an implementation of type system

 f [G&V@Concur'10]
- ullet Soundness proved by resorting to dash
- We discuss ongoing work on semantic completeness

Algorithmic type checking

- Well-known idea: in typing $P \mid Q$ remove linear identifiers used by P before type check Q (e.g. [Gay&Hole'05])
- Our approach: we reason at the type level and forbid (o) use of (parts of) types that have been:
 - 1. delegated
 - 2. consumed

 $(\sim ML)$ fun typeVar $(\Gamma, x: (Iin?T_1.S_1, Iin!T_2.S_2), x: Iin?T_1.S_1) = \Gamma, x: (\circ, Iin!T_2.S_2)$

ML patterns

• Typings for processes are patterns of function:

```
fun check(g : context, p : process) : context
```

- Patterns matching deterministic for safe types (no backtracking)
 - 1. dual unrestricted channel ends: (*un?T, *un!T) and T safe

2. dual linear ends: $(Iin?T.S_1, Iin!T.S_2)$ and T and (S_1, S_2) safe

• E.g.: typing an input process in linear mode

 $\mathsf{check}(\Gamma, x \colon (\mathsf{lin}?T.S_1, \mathsf{lin}!T.S_2) \ , \ x(y).P) = \\ \mathsf{let} \ \mathsf{val} \ \mathsf{d} \ = \mathsf{check}(\Gamma, x \colon S_1, y \colon T \ , \ P) \ \mathsf{in} \ \ldots$

Motivation of the design

- Algorithm works only for safe types = generalization *balancing*
- As usual, subject reduction only for balanced contexts
- The very reason is to preserve the soundness of the exchanges

$$\begin{split} P &= x(y) \text{.if } y \text{ then } \mathbf{0} \text{ else } \mathbf{0} \mid (\nu z : \text{end}) \overline{x} \langle z \rangle . \mathbf{0} \\ x \colon (\text{lin?bool.end}, \text{lin!end.end}) \vdash P \\ P &\to (\nu z : \text{end}) \text{if } z \text{ then } \mathbf{0} \text{ else } \mathbf{0} \\ \not\vdash (\nu z : \text{end}) \text{if } z \text{ then } \mathbf{0} \text{ else } \mathbf{0} \end{split}$$

• Soundness: algorithm rejects non balanced types

Type checking algorithm

- The top level call accepts the process if:
- 1. The environment in input is safe
- 2. An environment is given in output (no patterns exception)
- 3. The domain of the environment in output contains only *consumed* types of the form \circ , un p, $(unp_1, unp_2), (unp, \circ), (\circ, \circ)$

fun typeCheck(Γ : context, P : process) : bool = if safe(Γ) then let val Δ = check(Γ , P) in if consumed(Δ) then true

A run

• Protocol described by concurrent execution of

$$\begin{split} & \textit{Service} = !\textit{poll}(w).(\nu p:T) \left(\overline{w} \langle p \rangle.\textit{p}(\textit{title}).\textit{p}(\textit{date}).!\textit{p}(\textit{date}) \right. \\ & \textit{Invoker} = \overline{\textit{poll}} \langle y \rangle.\textit{y}(p).(\overline{p} \langle \textit{Workshop} \rangle.\overline{p} \langle \textit{9June} \rangle.(\overline{z_1} \langle p \rangle \mid .. \mid \overline{z_n} \langle p \rangle)) \\ & \textit{S}_1 = \textit{lin} !\textit{string.lin} !\textit{date.} *\textit{un} !\textit{date} \\ & \textit{S}_2 = \textit{lin} ?\textit{string.lin} ?\textit{date.} *\textit{un} ?\textit{date} \\ & T = (S_1, S_2) \\ & T_w = \textit{lin} !S_1.\textit{un} \textit{end} \end{split}$$

• Type checking succeeds

typeCheck $(\Gamma, poll : (*un ?T_w, *un !T_w), Service | Invoker)$

Checking the service continuation

• Replicated input spawns a thread for the poll

$$\begin{split} &\textit{Service} = !C \\ &C = \textit{poll}(w).(\nu p:T)\overline{w}\langle p\rangle.p(\textit{title}).p(\textit{date}).!p(\textit{date}) \end{split}$$

- Call requires environment in output = environment in input
- Intuition: only linear types change!

 $\begin{aligned} \mathsf{check}(\Gamma, \textit{Service}) &= \\ \mathsf{let} \; \mathsf{val} \; \Delta &= \mathsf{check}(\Gamma, C) \mathsf{in} \\ \mathsf{if} \; (\Delta &= \Gamma) \; \mathsf{then} \; \Delta \end{aligned}$

Checking unrestricted input

Service instantiation generates poll

$$\begin{split} C &= \textit{poll}(\textit{w}).(\nu p:(S_1,S_2))\,\overline{w}\langle p\rangle.p(\textit{title}).p(\textit{date}).!p(\textit{date})\\ C' &= (\nu p:(S_1,S_2))\,\overline{w}\langle p\rangle.p(\textit{title}).p(\textit{date}).!p(\textit{date})\\ T_w &= \text{lin}!S_1.\text{un end} \end{split}$$

- Call: type of channel does not change, bound variable added
- Return: checks types for the bound variable to be consumed

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{check}(\Gamma, \textit{poll} : (*\mathsf{un} ? T_w, *\mathsf{un} ! T_w), C) &= \\ \mathsf{let} \ \mathsf{val} \ \Delta &= \mathsf{check}(\Gamma, \textit{poll} : (*\mathsf{un} ? T_w, *\mathsf{un} ! T_w), \textit{w} : \textit{T}_w, C') \ \mathsf{in} \\ \mathsf{if} \ (\Delta &= \Delta', \textit{w} : \textit{S}) \ \mathsf{and} \ (\textit{S} = \circ \ \mathsf{or} \ \textit{S} = \mathsf{un} \ p) \ \mathsf{then} \ \Delta' \end{aligned}$$

Checking restriction

• A poll with safe channel type is generated

 $C' = (\nu p : (S_1, S_2))\overline{w}\langle p \rangle.Q$

 $\Omega = \Gamma, \textit{poll}: (* \mathsf{un} \, ?T_w, * \mathsf{un} \, !T_w), w : T_w$

- Call: add bound variable given that the type is safe
- Return: checks type for bound variable to be consumed

 $\begin{aligned} \mathsf{check}(\Omega\ ,C') &= \\ &\text{if }\mathsf{safe}((S_1,S_2)) \text{ then} \\ &\text{let }\mathsf{val}\ \Delta = \mathsf{check}(\Omega,p:(S_1,S_2)\ ,\ \overline{w}\langle p\rangle.Q) \text{ in} \\ &\text{if }(\Delta = \Delta',p:(S',S'')) \\ &\text{ and }(S' = \circ \text{ or }S' = \mathsf{un}\ p) \\ &\text{ and }(S'' = \circ \text{ or }S'' = \mathsf{un}\ p) \\ &\text{ then }\Delta' \end{aligned}$

Delegation of a linear session

• Poll write capability S_1 delegated over w of type $T_w = \lim |S_1|$ un end

 $\overline{w}\langle \mathbf{p}\rangle.Q$

- Call for the continuation
 - 1. session type for the channel unrolled
 - 2. delegated end point S_1 set to \circ by calling fun checkVar
- Return
 - 1. checks type for channel to be consumed
 - 2. returns context with type for channel set to \circ

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{check}(\Omega_1, w : \pmb{T_w}, p : (\pmb{S_1}, S_2) \ , \ \overline{w} \langle p \rangle.Q) &= \ \mathsf{let}... \ \mathsf{in} \\ \mathsf{let} \ \mathsf{val} \ \Delta &= \mathsf{check}(\Omega_1, w : \mathsf{un} \ \mathsf{end}, p : (\mathbf{o}, S_2) \ , \ Q) \ \mathsf{in} \\ \mathsf{if} \ \Delta &= \Delta', w : S \ \mathsf{and} \ S &= \mathsf{o} \ \mathsf{or} \ S &= \mathsf{un} \ p \ \mathsf{then} \ \Delta', w : \mathsf{o} \end{aligned}$$

Checking parallel processes

• Concurrent delegation of poll channel to participants

$$\begin{split} P &= \overline{z_1} \langle p \rangle \mid \overline{z_2} \langle p \rangle \mid \cdots \mid \overline{z_n} \langle p \rangle \\ S &= * \text{un !date} \\ \Gamma &= \Gamma_1, z_1 : \text{lin!} S.\text{end}, \cdots, z_n : \text{lin!} S.\text{end}, p : (\circ, S) \end{split}$$

• Parallel processes typed compositionally

 $\begin{aligned} \mathsf{check}(\Gamma \ , \ P) &= \\ \mathsf{let} \ \mathsf{val} \ \Delta &= \mathsf{check}(\Gamma \ , \ \overline{z_1} \langle p \rangle) \ \mathsf{in} \\ \mathsf{check}(\Delta \ , \ \overline{z_2} \langle p \rangle \ | \ \cdots \ | \ \overline{z_n} \langle p \rangle) \end{aligned}$

 \bullet In each call, the type of p in the input environment is (\circ,S)

Exchanging compositions' order

• Type checking the service protocol

 $check(\Gamma, Service | Invoker) = \\check(check(\Gamma, Service), Invoker)$

• Preservation of structural congruence!

 $\mathsf{check}(\Gamma\,,\,\mathit{\textit{Invoker}}\mid \mathit{\textit{Service}}) = \mathsf{check}(\Gamma\,,\,\mathit{\textit{Service}}\mid \mathit{\textit{Invoker}})$

Soundness

- ullet We resort to declarative type system dash
- System ⊢ relies on non deterministic operation to split contexts

$$\frac{\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \cdot \Gamma_2 \qquad \Gamma_1, p : \mathbf{S}_1 \vdash p : S_1 \qquad \Gamma_2, w : \mathsf{end}, p : \mathbf{S}_2 \vdash Q}{\Gamma, p : (\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2), w : \mathsf{lin} \, !S_1.\mathsf{end} \vdash \overline{w} \langle p \rangle.Q}$$

 $\bullet \ \mathrm{typeCheck}(\Gamma,P) \ \mathrm{implies} \ \Gamma \vdash P$

Expressivity

- First, we type checked our motivating example
- Still, there are process accepted by \vdash that we do not type check

1. $\Gamma_1, x : (\lim ?T.S_1, \lim !T.S_2) \vdash \overline{x} \langle v \rangle.C[x(y).P]$

- **2.** $\Gamma_2, x: (\lim ?T.S_1, \lim !T.S_2) \vdash x(y).C[\overline{x}\langle v \rangle.Q]$
- **3.** $\Gamma_3, x: (\lim ?T.S_1, \lim !T.S_2) \vdash \overline{x}\langle x \rangle.P$
- But these processes are deadlocked!
- How to prove?

Typed behavioral theory

In parallel work we proposed typed barbed equivalence for sessions

$$\Delta \models P \cong Q$$

- **1**. $\Gamma_1 \vdash P, \Gamma_2 \vdash Q$
- 2. Δ *compatible* with Γ_1, Γ_2 (e.g. no interference with a session)

3. P and Q have same barbs in all contexts type checked by Δ

- Proof technique: typed bisimulation
- Technical framework: polyadic pi calculus with matching, meet operation over types...

Application

- Let $\Gamma_i, x : (\lim ?T.S_1, \lim !T.S_2) \vdash P_i$ for i = 1, 2, 3
- Let Δ_i be compatible with $\Gamma_i, x : (\lim ?T.S_1, \lim !T.S_2)$ for i = 1, 2, 3

1.
$$\Delta_1 \models \overline{x} \langle v \rangle . C[x(y).P] \cong \mathbf{0}$$

- **2.** $\Delta_2 \models x(y).C[\overline{x}\langle v \rangle.Q] \cong \mathbf{0}$
- **3**. $\Delta_3 \models \overline{x} \langle x \rangle . P \cong \mathbf{0}$
 - Wow! So, what?

Towards semantic completeness

- Proof transformation: $\Gamma_1 \vdash P_1$ transformed in $\Gamma_2 \vdash P_2$
- Construction: take derivation tree for $\Gamma_1 \vdash P_1$ and substitute each occurrence of $\Gamma, x : (\lim ?T.S_1, \lim !T.S_2) \vdash \overline{x} \langle v \rangle.Q$ with $\emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}$
- Typed equivalence: Δ compatible with Γ_1,Γ_2 implies

$$\Delta \models P_1 \cong P_2$$

• Semantic completeness (in progress): If $\Gamma_1 \vdash P_1$ with Γ_1 balanced, then there is a transformation $\Gamma_2 \vdash P_2$ such that $\Delta \models P_1 \cong P_2$ and typeCheck (Γ_2, P_2) .

Conclusions

- We introduced a type checking algorithm for the analysis of structured-oriented programs in the pi calculus
- Technique relies on construct that describes the two ends of the same channel
 - Each end point is a linear or an unrestricted session type
 - Linear types evolve to unrestricted types
- ullet The algorithm is sound w.r.t. type system dash
- ullet We claim to type check all interesting processes accepted by dash

Usefulness

- \bullet System \vdash enjoys type-preserving encodings of
 - 1. linear lambda calculus [Walker&05]
 - 2. linear pi calculus [KPT&TOPLAS'99]
 - 3. pi calculus with polarities [GH&Acta'05]
- We therefore offer an algorithm for typing functional and mobile languages based on linearity
- Other systems can be considered

 $[\![(\nu xy \colon S)P]\!] = (\nu x \colon (S, \overline{S}))[\![P[x/y]]\!] \qquad [V @SFM'09]$

Ongoing and future work

- Semantic completeness in progress
- Still, there are interesting processes that are not typable by \vdash $!x(y).(\nu a)(\overline{y}\langle a \rangle.a(title).a(date).(!a(date) | \overline{a}\langle 22March \rangle)$
- Both capabilities needed in continuation for receive and send date
- Sub typing à la Pierce&Sangiorgi would fix this