

Certifying and Signing Data in Multiparty Session Types

BETTY Meeting

Bernardo Toninho, Nobuko Yoshida

18 March 2016

Introduction

Context

- ▶ Multiparty session types [Honda et al.,08-]
 - ▶ Specify coordination of multiple communicating agents.
 - ▶ **Global types** specify interactions involving multiple peers,
 - ▶ Automatically mapped to **local** types,
 - ▶ Checked against individual endpoint processes.

Introduction

Context

- ▶ Multiparty session types [Honda et al.,08-]
 - ▶ Specify coordination of multiple communicating agents.
 - ▶ **Global types** specify interactions involving multiple peers,
 - ▶ Automatically mapped to **local** types,
 - ▶ Checked against individual endpoint processes.
- ▶ Value-dependent session types [Toninho et al.,2011]
 - ▶ Extend binary session types with dependent data I/O.
 - ▶ Types specify interaction + properties of exchanged data.
 - ▶ Properties are witnessed by explicit proofs.
 - ▶ Type safety entails comm. safety + property satisfaction.

Introduction

Trip to Malta

$G_{BM} = B \rightarrow \text{AirMalta} : (\text{String}, \text{Int}). \quad \text{Destination} + \text{date}$
 $\text{AirMalta} \rightarrow B : (\text{String}). \quad \text{Flight Info.}$

Introduction

Trip to Malta

G_{BM} = B \rightarrow AirMalta : (String, Int). Destination + date
AirMalta \rightarrow B : (String). Flight Info.
B \rightarrow Booking : (String, Int). Destination + date

Introduction

Trip to Malta

G_{BM} = B \rightarrow AirMalta : (String, Int). Destination + date
AirMalta \rightarrow B : (String). Flight Info.
B \rightarrow Booking : (String, Int). Destination + date
Booking \rightarrow B : (List String). Options
B \rightarrow Booking : (String). Choose
Booking \rightarrow B : (Int). Receipt

Introduction

Trip to Malta

G_{BM} = B \rightarrow AirMalta : (String, Int). Destination + date
AirMalta \rightarrow B : (String). Flight Info.
B \rightarrow Booking : (String, Int). Destination + date
Booking \rightarrow B : (List String). Options
B \rightarrow Booking : (String). Choose
Booking \rightarrow B : (Int). Receipt
B \rightarrow COST : (String, Int). Expense claims
ICClaims \rightarrow B : (ok : **end**;
nok : **end**)

Introduction

Trip to Malta

G_{BM}	=	$B \rightarrow \text{AirMalta} : (\text{String}, \text{Int}).$	Destination + date
		$\text{AirMalta} \rightarrow B : (\text{String}).$	Flight Info.
		$B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\text{String}, \text{Int}).$	Destination + date
		$\text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (\text{List String}).$	Options
		$B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\text{String}).$	Choose
		$\text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (\text{Int}).$	Receipt
		$B \rightarrow \text{COST} : (\text{String}, \text{Int}).$	Expense claims
		$\text{ICClaims} \rightarrow B : (\text{ok} : \mathbf{end};$	ok or not
		$\text{nok} : \mathbf{end})$	

- ▶ Type specifies the communication between the parties.
- ▶ The majority of the functionality is absent from the type.

Introduction

Motivation

- ▶ MPST ensure communication safety in multi-agent protocols.
- ▶ Do not capture functional constraints of protocols.

Introduction

Motivation

- ▶ MPST ensure communication safety in multi-agent protocols.
- ▶ Do not capture functional constraints of protocols.

Our Proposal

- ▶ A session type discipline for certifying **global** properties of exchanged data, based on value dependent MPST.
- ▶ Ensures adherence to session discipline,
- ▶ + rich constraint satisfaction based on explicit runtime witnesses.

Certifying Data in MPST

Revisiting the trip to Malta

G_{BM} = $B \rightarrow \text{AirMalta} : (d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}).$ Dest. + date
 $\text{AirMalta} \rightarrow B : (f:\text{String}).$ Flight Info.
 $B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\text{String}(d_1), \text{Int}(d_2)).$ Dest. + date

Certifying Data in MPST

Revisiting the trip to Malta

G_{BM}	=	$B \rightarrow \text{AirMalta} : (d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}).$	Dest. + date
		$\text{AirMalta} \rightarrow B : (f:\text{String}).$	Flight Info.
		$B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\text{String}(d_1), \text{Int}(d_2)).$	Dest. + date
		$\text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (opt:\text{List String}).$	Options
		$B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\sum s:\text{String}.s \in opt).$	Choose
		$\text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (r:\text{Int}).$	Receipt

Certifying Data in MPST

Revisiting the trip to Malta

G_{BM}	$=$	$B \rightarrow \text{AirMalta} : (d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}).$	Dest. + date
		$\text{AirMalta} \rightarrow B : (f:\text{String}).$	Flight Info.
		$B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\text{String}(d_1), \text{Int}(d_2)).$	Dest. + date
		$\text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (\text{opt}:\text{List String}).$	Options
		$B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\Sigma s:\text{String}. s \in \text{opt}).$	Choose
		$\text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (r:\text{Int}).$	Receipt
		$B \rightarrow \text{COST} : (\text{String}(f), \text{Int}(r)).$	Expense claims
		$\text{ICClaims} \rightarrow B : (\text{ok} : \mathbf{end};$	ok or not
		$\text{nok} : \mathbf{end})$	

- ▶ Type families and dependent tuples allow for a richer spec.
- ▶ Singleton types (e.g. $\text{String}(d)$) specify equality constraints.

Certifying Data in MPST

Types

Global and Message Types

$$\begin{aligned} G & ::= p \rightarrow q : (x:\tau).G \\ & \quad | p \rightarrow q : (l_j:G_j)_{j \in J} \\ & \quad | p \rightarrow q : (T).G \\ & \quad | \mu t (x = M:\tau).G \mid t \langle M \rangle \\ & \quad | \mathbf{end} \end{aligned}$$
$$\tau, \sigma ::=$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Types

Global and Message Types

$$\begin{aligned} G & ::= p \rightarrow q : (x:\tau).G \\ & \quad | p \rightarrow q : (l_j:G_j)_{j \in J} \\ & \quad | p \rightarrow q : (T).G \\ & \quad | \mu t (x = M:\tau).G \mid t \langle M \rangle \\ & \quad | \mathbf{end} \end{aligned}$$
$$\tau, \sigma ::= \prod x:\tau. \sigma$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Types

Global and Message Types

$$\begin{aligned} G & ::= p \rightarrow q : (x:\tau).G \\ & \quad | p \rightarrow q : (l_j:G_j)_{j \in J} \\ & \quad | p \rightarrow q : (T).G \\ & \quad | \mu t (x = M:\tau).G \mid t \langle M \rangle \\ & \quad | \mathbf{end} \\ \\ \tau, \sigma & ::= \prod x:\tau. \sigma \mid \sum x:\tau. \sigma \mid b \end{aligned}$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Types

Global and Message Types

$$\begin{aligned} G & ::= p \rightarrow q : (x:\tau).G \\ & \quad | p \rightarrow q : (l_j:G_j)_{j \in J} \\ & \quad | p \rightarrow q : (T).G \\ & \quad | \mu t (x = M:\tau).G \mid t\langle M \rangle \\ & \quad | \mathbf{end} \\ \\ \tau, \sigma & ::= \prod x:\tau.\sigma \mid \sum x:\tau.\sigma \mid b \mid \mathcal{S}(M) \end{aligned}$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Types

Global and Message Types

$$\begin{aligned} G & ::= p \rightarrow q : (x:\tau).G \\ & \quad | p \rightarrow q : (l_j:G_j)_{j \in J} \\ & \quad | p \rightarrow q : (T).G \\ & \quad | \mu t (x = M:\tau).G \mid t\langle M \rangle \\ & \quad | \mathbf{end} \\ \\ \tau, \sigma & ::= \prod_{x:\tau} \sigma \mid \sum_{x:\tau} \sigma \mid b \mid S(M) \end{aligned}$$

Singleton Types

- ▶ $S(M)$, where $M : b$.
- ▶ $S(M)$ denotes a value of type b equal to M .

Certifying Data in MPST

Types

Global and Message Types

$$\begin{aligned} G & ::= p \rightarrow q : (x:\tau).G \\ & \quad | p \rightarrow q : (l_j:G_j)_{j \in J} \\ & \quad | p \rightarrow q : (T).G \\ & \quad | \mu t (x = M:\tau).G \mid t\langle M \rangle \\ & \quad | \mathbf{end} \\ \\ \tau, \sigma & ::= \prod x:\tau.\sigma \mid \sum x:\tau.\sigma \mid b \mid S(M) \end{aligned}$$

Singleton Types

- ▶ $S(M)$, where $M : b$.
- ▶ $S(M)$ denotes a value of type b equal to M .
- ▶ $4 : \mathbf{Nat}(4)$, $x:\mathbf{Nat}(4) \vdash 4 \equiv x : \mathbf{Nat}$.

Certifying Data in MPST

Types

Global and Message Types

$$\begin{aligned} G & ::= p \rightarrow q : (x:\tau).G \\ & \quad | p \rightarrow q : (l_j:G_j)_{j \in J} \\ & \quad | p \rightarrow q : (T).G \\ & \quad | \mu t (x = M:\tau).G \mid t\langle M \rangle \\ & \quad | \mathbf{end} \\ \\ \tau, \sigma & ::= \prod x:\tau.\sigma \mid \sum x:\tau.\sigma \mid b \mid S(M) \end{aligned}$$

Singleton Types

- ▶ $S(M)$, where $M : b$.
- ▶ $S(M)$ denotes a value of type b equal to M .
- ▶ $4 : \text{Nat}(4)$, $x:\text{Nat}(4) \vdash 4 \equiv x : \text{Nat}$.

Certifying Data in MPST

Challenges

- ▶ Well-formedness of global types with dependencies:

Certifying Data in MPST

Challenges

- ▶ Well-formedness of global types with dependencies:
 - ▶ Global types often specify data dependencies between multiple endpoints:

$$p \rightarrow q : (x : \tau_1). p \rightarrow s : (y : \mathcal{P}(x)). G$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Challenges

- ▶ Well-formedness of global types with dependencies:
 - ▶ Global types often specify data dependencies between multiple endpoints:

$$p \rightarrow q : (x : \tau_1). p \rightarrow s : (y : \mathcal{P}(x)). G$$

- ▶ $\mathcal{P}(x)$ is sent to s , but s may not know x (but p does!).

Certifying Data in MPST

Challenges

- ▶ Well-formedness of global types with dependencies:
 - ▶ Global types often specify data dependencies between multiple endpoints:

$$p \rightarrow q : (x : \tau_1). p \rightarrow s : (y : \mathcal{P}(x)). G$$

- ▶ $\mathcal{P}(x)$ is sent to s , but s may not know x (but p does!).
- ▶ Projection:
 - ▶ Ensure that endpoints know all contents of **sent** messages.
 - ▶ Generate message types that “make sense” for the recipients.

Certifying Data in MPST

Challenges

- ▶ Well-formedness of global types with dependencies:
 - ▶ Global types often specify data dependencies between multiple endpoints:

$$p \rightarrow q : (x : \tau_1). p \rightarrow s : (y : \mathcal{P}(x)). G$$

- ▶ $\mathcal{P}(x)$ is sent to s , but s may not know x (but p does!).
- ▶ Projection:
 - ▶ Ensure that endpoints know all contents of **sent** messages.
 - ▶ Generate message types that “make sense” for the recipients.
 - ▶ Preserve global dependencies on a local level.

Certifying Data in MPST

Design Choices

- ▶ Maintain a general specification language (type theory).
- ▶ Specs may not be decidable (need explicit proof!).

Certifying Data in MPST

Design Choices

- ▶ Maintain a general specification language (type theory).
- ▶ Specs may not be decidable (need explicit proof!).
- ▶ Global type well-formedness:
 - ▶ Projection of a well-formed global type produces well-formed local types by a simple projection rule;
 - ▶ If a collection of processes satisfying local types exist, the global specification is satisfied.

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection – A naive attempt

Consider the global type:

$$G = p \rightarrow q : (x:\text{Nat}).p \rightarrow r : (y:x < 10).G'$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection – A naive attempt

Consider the global type:

$$G = p \rightarrow q : (x:\text{Nat}).p \rightarrow r : (y:x < 10).G'$$

An attempt at $G \upharpoonright p$ and $G \upharpoonright r$:

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection – A naive attempt

Consider the global type:

$$G = p \rightarrow q : (x:\text{Nat}).p \rightarrow r : (y:x < 10).G'$$

An attempt at $G \upharpoonright p$ and $G \upharpoonright r$:

$$G \upharpoonright p \stackrel{?}{=} q!(x:\text{Nat}); r!(y:x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright p)$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection – A naive attempt

Consider the global type:

$$G = p \rightarrow q : (x:\text{Nat}).p \rightarrow r : (y:x < 10).G'$$

An attempt at $G \upharpoonright p$ and $G \upharpoonright r$:

$$G \upharpoonright p \stackrel{?}{=} q!(x:\text{Nat}); r!(y:x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright p)$$

$$G \upharpoonright r \stackrel{?}{=} p?(y:x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright r)$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection – A naive attempt

Consider the global type:

$$G = p \rightarrow q : (x:\text{Nat}).p \rightarrow r : (y:x < 10).G'$$

An attempt at $G \upharpoonright p$ and $G \upharpoonright r$:

$$G \upharpoonright p \stackrel{?}{=} q!(x:\text{Nat}); r!(y:x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright p)$$

$$G \upharpoonright r \stackrel{?}{=} p?(y:x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright r)$$

Participant r does not know x !

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection - Data Dependencies

- ▶ Local types must only refer to locally available msg. variables;
- ▶ constraints/Dependencies must be preserved:

$$G = p \rightarrow q : (x:\text{Nat}).p \rightarrow r : (y:x < 10).G'$$

$$G \upharpoonright r = p?(y:x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright r)$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection - Data Dependencies

- ▶ Local types must only refer to locally available msg. variables;
- ▶ constraints/Dependencies must be preserved:

$$G = p \rightarrow q : (x:\text{Nat}).p \rightarrow r : (y:x < 10).G'$$

$$G \upharpoonright r = p?(y:\Sigma x:\text{Nat}.x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright r)$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection - Data Dependencies

- ▶ Local types must only refer to locally available msg. variables;
- ▶ constraints/Dependencies must be preserved:

$$G = p \rightarrow q : (x:\text{Nat}).p \rightarrow r : (y:x < 10).G'$$

$$G \upharpoonright r = p?(y:\Sigma x:\text{Nat}.x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright r)$$

$$G \upharpoonright p \stackrel{?}{=} q!(x:\text{Nat}); r!(y:\Sigma x:\text{Nat}.x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright p)$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection - Data Dependencies

- ▶ Local types must only refer to locally available msg. variables;
- ▶ constraints/Dependencies must be preserved:

$$G = p \rightarrow q : (x:\text{Nat}).p \rightarrow r : (y:x < 10).G'$$

$$G \upharpoonright r = p?(y:\Sigma x:\text{Nat}.x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright r)$$

$$G \upharpoonright p = q!(x:\text{Nat}); r!(y:\Sigma x':\text{Nat}(x).x' < 10); (G' \upharpoonright p)$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection - Data Dependencies

- ▶ Local types must only refer to locally available msg. variables;
- ▶ constraints/Dependencies must be preserved:

$$G = p \rightarrow q : (x:\text{Nat}).p \rightarrow r : (y:x < 10).G'$$

$$G \upharpoonright r = p?(y:\Sigma x:\text{Nat}.x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright r)$$

$$G \upharpoonright p = q!(x:\text{Nat}); r!(y:\Sigma x':\text{Nat}(x).x' < 10); (G' \upharpoonright p)$$

Proposed solution:

- ▶ Use Σ -types to existentially quantify on the receiver side.
- ▶ Use singletons to preserve dependencies on the sender side.

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection - Data Dependencies

$G \upharpoonright r = p?(y:\Sigma x:\text{Nat}.x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright r)$

$G \upharpoonright p = q!(x:\text{Nat}); r!(y:\Sigma x':\text{Nat}(x).x' < 10); (G' \upharpoonright p)$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection - Data Dependencies

$G \upharpoonright r = p?(y:\Sigma x:\text{Nat}.x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright r)$

$G \upharpoonright p = q!(x:\text{Nat}); r!(y:\Sigma x':\text{Nat}(x).x' < 10); (G' \upharpoonright p)$

How do we match the input and output types?

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection - Data Dependencies

$$G \upharpoonright r = p?(y:\Sigma x:\text{Nat}.x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright r)$$
$$G \upharpoonright p = q!(x:\text{Nat}); r!(y:\Sigma x':\text{Nat}(x).x' < 10); (G' \upharpoonright p)$$

How do we match the input and output types? Subtyping!

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection - Data Dependencies

$$G \upharpoonright r = p?(y:\Sigma x:\text{Nat}.x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright r)$$
$$G \upharpoonright p = q!(x:\text{Nat}); r!(y:\Sigma x':\text{Nat}(x).x' < 10); (G' \upharpoonright p)$$

How do we match the input and output types? Subtyping!

$$\frac{\Psi \vdash M : b}{\Psi \vdash \mathcal{S}(M) \leq b}$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection - Data Dependencies

$$G \upharpoonright r = p?(y:\Sigma x:\text{Nat}.x < 10); (G' \upharpoonright r)$$
$$G \upharpoonright p = q!(x:\text{Nat}); r!(y:\Sigma x':\text{Nat}(x).x' < 10); (G' \upharpoonright p)$$

How do we match the input and output types? Subtyping!

$$\frac{\Psi \vdash M : b}{\Psi \vdash \mathcal{S}(M) \leq b} \quad \frac{\Psi \vdash \tau \leq \tau' \quad \Psi, x:\tau' \vdash T \leq T'}{\Psi \vdash p?(x:\tau).T \leq p?(x:\tau').T'}$$

$$\frac{\Psi \vdash \tau' \leq \tau \quad \Psi, x:\tau \vdash T \leq T'}{\Psi \vdash p!(x:\tau).T \leq p!(x:\tau').T'}$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection

- ▶ We use a function CTB to generate **compatible** type bindings for the sender.

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection

- ▶ We use a function CTB to generate **compatible** type bindings for the sender.
- ▶ Use a singleton erasure function \dagger for the recipient.

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection

- ▶ We use a function CTB to generate **compatible** type bindings for the sender.
- ▶ Use a singleton erasure function \dagger for the recipient.

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection

- ▶ We use a function CTB to generate **compatible** type bindings for the sender.
- ▶ Use a singleton erasure function \dagger for the recipient.

Projection – Data I/O

$$s \rightarrow r : (x : \tau). G' \upharpoonright p = \left\{ \right.$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection

- ▶ We use a function CTB to generate **compatible** type bindings for the sender.
- ▶ Use a singleton erasure function \dagger for the recipient.

Projection – Data I/O

$$s \rightarrow r : (x : \tau). G' \upharpoonright p = \begin{cases} r!(x:(CTB(x:\tau))); (G' \upharpoonright p) & \text{if } p = s \end{cases}$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection

- ▶ We use a function CTB to generate **compatible** type bindings for the sender.
- ▶ Use a singleton erasure function \dagger for the recipient.

Projection – Data I/O

$$s \rightarrow r : (x : \tau). G' \upharpoonright p = \begin{cases} r!(x:(CTB(x:\tau)); (G' \upharpoonright p)) & \text{if } p = s \\ s?(x:(CTB(x:\tau))^\dagger); (G' \upharpoonright p) & \text{if } p = r \\ G' \upharpoonright p & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection

Recall our initial example:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{BM} = & B \rightarrow \text{AirMalta} : (d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}). \\ & \text{AirMalta} \rightarrow B : (f:\text{String}). \\ & B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\text{String}(d_1), \text{Int}(d_2)). \\ & \text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (\text{opt}:\text{List String}). \\ & B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\Sigma s:\text{String}.s \in \text{opt}). \\ & \text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (r:\text{Int}). \\ & B \rightarrow \text{COST} : (\text{String}(f), \text{Int}(r)). \\ & \text{COST} \rightarrow B : (\text{ok} : \mathbf{end}, \text{nok} : \mathbf{end}) \end{aligned}$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection

Recall our initial example:

$$\begin{aligned}G_{BM} &= B \rightarrow \text{AirMalta} : (d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}). \\ &\quad \text{AirMalta} \rightarrow B : (f:\text{String}). \\ &\quad B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\text{String}(d_1), \text{Int}(d_2)). \\ &\quad \text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (opt:\text{List String}). \\ &\quad B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\Sigma s:\text{String}.s \in opt). \\ &\quad \text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (r:\text{Int}). \\ &\quad B \rightarrow \text{COST} : (\text{String}(f), \text{Int}(r)). \\ &\quad \text{COST} \rightarrow B : (ok : \mathbf{end}, nok : \mathbf{end})\end{aligned}$$

$$G_{BM} \upharpoonright B = \text{AirMalta}!(d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}).\text{AirMalta}?(f:\text{String}).$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection

Recall our initial example:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{BM} = & B \rightarrow \text{AirMalta} : (d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}). \\ & \text{AirMalta} \rightarrow B : (f:\text{String}). \\ & B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\text{String}(d_1), \text{Int}(d_2)). \\ & \text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (\text{opt}:\text{List String}). \\ & B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\Sigma s:\text{String}.s \in \text{opt}). \\ & \text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (r:\text{Int}). \\ & B \rightarrow \text{COST} : (\text{String}(f), \text{Int}(r)). \\ & \text{COST} \rightarrow B : (\text{ok} : \mathbf{end}, \text{nok} : \mathbf{end}) \end{aligned}$$
$$\begin{aligned} G_{BM} \upharpoonright B = & \text{AirMalta}!(d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}).\text{AirMalta}?(f:\text{String}). \\ & \text{Book}!(\Sigma d'_1:\text{String}(d_1), d'_2:\text{Int}(d_2).\text{String}(d'_1), \text{Int}(d'_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection

Recall our initial example:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{BM} = & B \rightarrow \text{AirMalta} : (d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}). \\ & \text{AirMalta} \rightarrow B : (f:\text{String}). \\ & B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\text{String}(d_1), \text{Int}(d_2)). \\ & \text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (\text{opt}:\text{List String}). \\ & B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\Sigma s:\text{String}.s \in \text{opt}). \\ & \text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (r:\text{Int}). \\ & B \rightarrow \text{COST} : (\text{String}(f), \text{Int}(r)). \\ & \text{COST} \rightarrow B : (\text{ok} : \mathbf{end}, \text{nok} : \mathbf{end}) \end{aligned}$$
$$\begin{aligned} G_{BM} \upharpoonright B = & \text{AirMalta}!(d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}).\text{AirMalta}?(f:\text{String}). \\ & \text{Book}!(\Sigma d'_1:\text{String}(d_1), d'_2:\text{Int}(d_2).\text{String}(d'_1), \text{Int}(d'_2)). \\ & \text{Book}?(opt:\text{List String}).\text{Booking}!(\Sigma s:\text{String}.s \in opt). \end{aligned}$$

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection

Recall our initial example:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{BM} = & B \rightarrow \text{AirMalta} : (d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}). \\ & \text{AirMalta} \rightarrow B : (f:\text{String}). \\ & B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\text{String}(d_1), \text{Int}(d_2)). \\ & \text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (opt:\text{List String}). \\ & B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\Sigma s:\text{String}.s \in opt). \\ & \text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (r:\text{Int}). \\ & B \rightarrow \text{COST} : (\text{String}(f), \text{Int}(r)). \\ & \text{COST} \rightarrow B : (ok : \mathbf{end}, nok : \mathbf{end}) \end{aligned}$$
$$\begin{aligned} G_{BM} \upharpoonright B = & \text{AirMalta}!(d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}).\text{AirMalta}?(f:\text{String}). \\ & \text{Book}!(\Sigma d'_1:\text{String}(d_1), d'_2:\text{Int}(d_2).\text{String}(d'_1), \text{Int}(d'_2)). \\ & \text{Book}?(opt:\text{List String}).\text{Booking}!(\Sigma s:\text{String}.s \in opt). \\ & \text{Book}?(r:\text{Int}).\text{COST}!(\Sigma f':\text{String}(f), r':\text{Int}(r).\text{String}(f'), \text{Int}(r')). \end{aligned}$$

...

Certifying Data in MPST

Projection – Methodology

To summarize:

- ▶ Given a well-formed global type G
- ▶ Project well-formed local types $\{G \upharpoonright p_i\}_{i \in \text{pid}(G)}$, preserving dependencies.
- ▶ Find endpoint processes that satisfy each of $G \upharpoonright p_i$.

Results

Type Safety

Typing Judgment

$$\Psi; \Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \quad \Psi \vdash M : \tau$$

Process P uses its session channels as specified in Δ ; shared channels as specified in Γ and message variables as in Ψ .

Results

Type Safety

Typing Judgment

$$\Psi; \Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \quad \Psi \vdash M : \tau$$

Process P uses its session channels as specified in Δ ; shared channels as specified in Γ and message variables as in Ψ .

Substitution

If $\Psi, x:\tau, \Psi'; \Gamma; \Delta \vdash P$ and $\Psi \vdash M:\tau$ then
 $\Psi, \Psi'\{M/x\}; \Gamma; \Delta\{M/x\} \vdash P\{M/x\}$.

Results

Type Safety

Typing Judgment

$$\Psi; \Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \quad \Psi \vdash M : \tau$$

Process P uses its session channels as specified in Δ ; shared channels as specified in Γ and message variables as in Ψ .

Subject Transition

If $\Psi; \Gamma; \Delta \vdash P$ and $P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'$ then:

Results

Type Safety

Typing Judgment

$$\Psi; \Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \quad \Psi \vdash M : \tau$$

Process P uses its session channels as specified in Δ ; shared channels as specified in Γ and message variables as in Ψ .

Subject Transition

If $\Psi; \Gamma; \Delta \vdash P$ and $P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'$ then:

Results

Type Safety

Typing Judgment

$$\Psi; \Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \quad \Psi \vdash M : \tau$$

Process P uses its session channels as specified in Δ ; shared channels as specified in Γ and message variables as in Ψ .

Subject Transition

If $\Psi; \Gamma; \Delta \vdash P$ and $P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'$ then:

- (a) If α is an output, selection or action on a shared name, there exists Δ' s.t $\Psi; \Gamma; \Delta' \vdash P'$ and $\langle \Gamma; \Delta \rangle \xrightarrow{\alpha} \langle \Gamma; \Delta' \rangle$.

Results

Type Safety

Typing Judgment

$$\Psi; \Gamma; \Delta \vdash P \quad \Psi \vdash M : \tau$$

Process P uses its session channels as specified in Δ ; shared channels as specified in Γ and message variables as in Ψ .

Subject Transition

If $\Psi; \Gamma; \Delta \vdash P$ and $P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'$ then:

- (a) If α is an output, selection or action on a shared name, there exists Δ' s.t $\Psi; \Gamma; \Delta' \vdash P'$ and $\langle \Gamma; \Delta \rangle \xrightarrow{\alpha} \langle \Gamma; \Delta' \rangle$.
- (b) If α is an input or a branching then for all Δ' , if $\langle \Gamma; \Delta \rangle \xrightarrow{\alpha} \langle \Gamma; \Delta' \rangle$ then $\Psi; \Gamma; \Delta' \vdash P'$.

Applications

Digital Certificates

- ▶ Properties expressed via dependencies require explicit proof.

Applications

Digital Certificates

- ▶ Properties expressed via dependencies require explicit proof.
- ▶ In general, might be too strong of a requirement:
 - ▶ Sometimes we (partially) trust communicating parties.

Applications

Digital Certificates

- ▶ Properties expressed via dependencies require explicit proof.
- ▶ In general, might be too strong of a requirement:
 - ▶ Sometimes we (partially) trust communicating parties.
 - ▶ Exchange digital proof **certificates** instead?

Applications

Digital Certificates

- ▶ Properties expressed via dependencies require explicit proof.
- ▶ In general, might be too strong of a requirement:
 - ▶ Sometimes we (partially) trust communicating parties.
 - ▶ Exchange digital proof **certificates** instead?
- ▶ Combine signed messages $\diamond_p \tau$ and erasable $[\tau]$.

Applications

Digital Certificates

- ▶ Properties expressed via dependencies require explicit proof.
- ▶ In general, might be too strong of a requirement:
 - ▶ Sometimes we (partially) trust communicating parties.
 - ▶ Exchange digital proof **certificates** instead?
- ▶ Combine signed messages $\diamond_p \tau$ and erasable $[\tau]$.
- ▶ A message $M : \diamond_p[\tau]$ denotes:
 - ▶ A term M signed by participant p (public key infrastructure).
 - ▶ Denotes the existence of a proof of τ .
 - ▶ May not itself contain such a proof (erasure of []'d terms).

Applications

Signed Messages

- ▶ $\diamond_p \mathcal{T}$ is a **strong** (role-indexed) monad.

Applications

Signed Messages

- ▶ $\diamond_p \tau$ is a **strong** (role-indexed) monad.
- ▶ “Diamonds are forever” – From $M : \diamond_p \tau$ cannot extract $N : \tau$.

Applications

Signed Messages

- ▶ $\diamond_p \tau$ is a **strong** (role-indexed) monad.
- ▶ “Diamonds are forever” – From $M : \diamond_p \tau$ cannot extract $N : \tau$.
- ▶ A process can sign a message with **any** role.
- ▶ ... but global types help with this.

Applications

Signed Messages

- ▶ $\diamond_p \tau$ is a **strong** (role-indexed) monad.
- ▶ “Diamonds are forever” – From $M : \diamond_p \tau$ cannot extract $N : \tau$.
- ▶ A process can sign a message with **any** role.
- ▶ ... but global types help with this.

Well-signed Global Type (informally)

If $p \rightarrow q : (\diamond_{p'} \tau).G' \sqsubseteq G$ then $p' = p$ or $r \rightarrow p : (\diamond_{p'} \tau).G'' \sqsubseteq G$ “earlier”.

Applications

Signed Messages

- ▶ $\diamond_p \tau$ is a **strong** (role-indexed) monad.
- ▶ “Diamonds are forever” – From $M : \diamond_p \tau$ cannot extract $N : \tau$.
- ▶ A process can sign a message with **any** role.
- ▶ ... but global types help with this.

Well-signed Global Type (informally)

Signatures in G cannot be forged.

- ▶ Signatures allow us to encode **provenance** information.

Applications

Digital Certificates

$G_{BM} =$	$B \rightarrow \text{AirMalta} : (d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}).$	Dest. + date
	$\text{AirMalta} \rightarrow B : (f:\text{String}).$	Flight Info.
	$B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\text{String}(d_1), \text{Int}(d_2)).$	Dest. + date
	$\text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (opt:\text{List String}).$	Options
	$B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\sum s:\text{String}.s \in opt).$	Choose
	$\text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (r:\text{Int}).$	Receipt
	$B \rightarrow \text{COST} : (\text{String}, \text{Int}).$	Expense claims
	$\text{COST} \rightarrow B : (ok : \mathbf{end};$ $\quad \quad \quad \text{nok} : \mathbf{end})$	ok or not

Applications

Digital Certificates

$G_{BM} =$	$B \rightarrow \text{AirMalta} : (d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}).$	Dest. + date
	$\text{AirMalta} \rightarrow B : (f:\diamond_{AM}\text{String}).$	Flight Info.
	$B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\text{String}(d_1), \text{Int}(d_2)).$	Dest. + date
	$\text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (opt:\text{List String}).$	Options
	$B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\Sigma s:\text{String}.s \in opt).$	Choose
	$\text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (r:\diamond_{BK}\text{Int}).$	Receipt
	$B \rightarrow \text{COST} : (\diamond_{AM}\text{String}, \diamond_{BK}\text{Int}).$	Expense claims
	$\text{COST} \rightarrow B : (\text{ok} : \mathbf{end};$ $\text{nok} : \mathbf{end})$	ok or not

Trust no one, sign “everything”.

Applications

Digital Certificates

G_{BM}	$=$	$B \rightarrow \text{AirMalta} : (d_1:\text{String}, d_2:\text{Int}).$	Dest. + date
		$\text{AirMalta} \rightarrow B : (f:\text{String}, \diamond_{AM}[\text{String}]).$	Flight Info.
		$B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\text{String}(d_1), \text{Int}(d_2)).$	Dest. + date
		$\text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (opt:\text{List String}).$	Options
		$B \rightarrow \text{Booking} : (\sum s:\text{String}.s \in opt).$	Choose
		$\text{Booking} \rightarrow B : (r:\text{Int}, \diamond_{BK}[\text{Int}]).$	Receipt
		$B \rightarrow \text{COST} : (\diamond_{AM}[\text{String}], \diamond_{BK}[\text{Int}]).$	Expense claims
		$\text{COST} \rightarrow B : (\text{ok} : \mathbf{end};$	ok or not
		$\text{nok} : \mathbf{end})$	

Trust a bit more, allow for erasure at runtime.

Applications

Digital Certificates

A slight variation:

$G_{BM} =$	Booking \rightarrow B : (opt :List String).	Options
	B \rightarrow Booking : (c : Σs :String. $s \in opt$).	Choose
	Booking \rightarrow B : (r : Σi :Int. $receipt(\pi_1(c))$).	Better Receipt
	B \rightarrow COST : ($Int(\pi_1(r))$).	Claim
	...	

Applications

Digital Certificates

A slight variation:

$G_{BM} =$	Booking \rightarrow B : (<i>opt</i> :List String).	Options
	B \rightarrow Booking : (<i>c</i> : Σ <i>s</i> :String. <i>s</i> \in <i>opt</i>).	Choose
	Booking \rightarrow B : (<i>r</i> : Σ <i>i</i> :Int.receive(π_1 (<i>c</i>))).	Better Receipt
	B \rightarrow COST : (Int(π_1 (<i>r</i>))).	Claim
	...	

$G_{BM} \upharpoonright \text{COST} = \text{B}?(\Sigma \text{opt} : \dots, c : \dots, r : (\Sigma i : \text{Int.receive}(\pi_1(c))). \text{Int}(\pi_1(r)))$

Applications

Digital Certificates

A slight variation:

$G_{BM} =$	Booking $\rightarrow B : (opt:List\ String).$	Options
	B \rightarrow Booking $: (c:\Sigma s:String.s \in opt).$	Choose
	Booking $\rightarrow B : (r:\Sigma i:Int.[receipt(\pi_1(c))]).$	Better Receipt
	B \rightarrow COST $: (Int(\pi_1(r))).$	Claim
	...	

Applications

Digital Certificates

A slight variation:

G_{BM}	=	Booking \rightarrow B : (<i>opt</i> :List String).	Options
		B \rightarrow Booking : (<i>c</i> : Σ s:String. <i>s</i> \in <i>opt</i>).	Choose
		Booking \rightarrow B : (<i>r</i> : Σ i:Int.[receipt(π_1 (<i>c</i>))]).	Better Receipt
		B \rightarrow COST : (Int(π_1 (<i>r</i>))).	Claim
		...	

Using the runtime-erased global type G_{BM}^\downarrow :

$$G_{BM}^\downarrow \upharpoonright \text{COST} = \text{B?}(\text{Int})$$

Erasure gives us both “trust” and (potential) optimizations!

Concluding Remarks

- ▶ We have introduced a framework for certifying data in MPST.
- ▶ Properties in global types consistently mapped to local types.
- ▶ Explicit proof object exchange as witnesses to properties.
- ▶ Digital proof certificates introduce considerations of trust.
- ▶ Future work:
 - ▶ Dynamic monitoring.
 - ▶ Auto. proof generation.
 - ▶ Implementation