

Towards Concurrent Type Theory

Luís Caires¹, Frank Pfenning², Bernardo Toninho^{1,2}

¹ Universidade Nova de Lisboa

² Carnegie Mellon University

Workshop on Types in Language Design
and Implementation (TLDI)

January 28, 2012

Proofs and programs

- In intuitionistic logic:
 - Propositions are simple types
 - Proofs are functional programs
 - Proof reduction is computation

Proofs and programs

- In intuitionistic logic:
 - Propositions are simple types
 - Proofs are functional programs
 - Proof reduction is computation
- Curry (1934)
 - Axiomatic proofs are combinators
 - Proof reduction is combinatory reduction
- Howard (1969)
 - Natural deductions are λ -terms
 - Proof reduction is functional computation

Proofs and programs

- In intuitionistic logic:
 - Propositions are simple types
 - Proofs are functional programs
 - Proof reduction is computation
- Curry (1934)
 - Axiomatic proofs are combinators
 - Proof reduction is combinatory reduction
- Howard (1969)
 - Natural deductions are λ -terms
 - Proof reduction is functional computation
- These are **isomorphisms!**

- Capture computational phenomena logically
 - Modal logic (JS4) and staged computation (Davies & Pf. 1996)
 - Temporal logic and partial evaluation (Davies 1996)
 - Lax logic and effects (Benton et al. 1998)
 - Modal logic (JT) and proof irrelevance (Pf. 2008)
 - ... (but not as easy as it looks)

- Capture computational phenomena logically
 - Modal logic (JS4) and staged computation (Davies & Pf. 1996)
 - Temporal logic and partial evaluation (Davies 1996)
 - Lax logic and effects (Benton et al. 1998)
 - Modal logic (JT) and proof irrelevance (Pf. 2008)
 - ... (but not as easy as it looks)
- This talk:
 - Linear propositions as session types
 - Sequent proofs as π -calculus processes
 - Cut reduction as communication

- Type theory (Martin-Löf 1980)
 - Generalizes intuitionistic logic
 - Types depend on programs
 - Full integration of reasoning and programming

- Type theory (Martin-Löf 1980)
 - Generalizes intuitionistic logic
 - Types depend on programs
 - Full integration of reasoning and programming
- Co-design of language and reasoning principles!

- Type theory (Martin-Löf 1980)
 - Generalizes intuitionistic logic
 - Types depend on programs
 - Full integration of reasoning and programming
- Co-design of language and reasoning principles!
- This talk:
 - Session types depend on functional values
 - Communicate channels and values (= proofs)

- Type theory (Martin-Löf 1980)
 - Generalizes intuitionistic logic
 - Types depend on programs
 - Full integration of reasoning and programming
- Co-design of language and reasoning principles!
- This talk:
 - Session types depend on functional values
 - Communicate channels and values (= proofs)
- Not yet:
 - Types do not depend on channels or processes
 - Processes are not communicated

- 1 Session types for π -calculus
- 2 Dependent session types
- 3 Proof irrelevance
- 4 Some results
- 5 Conclusion

Judgment forms

- Judgment $P :: x : A$
 - Process P offers service A along channel x
- Linear sequent

$$\underbrace{A_1, \dots, A_n}_{\Delta} \Rightarrow A$$

- Cut as composition

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow A \quad \Delta', A \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, \Delta' \Rightarrow C} \text{cut}_A$$

- Identity as forwarding

$$\frac{}{A \Rightarrow A} \text{id}_A$$

Judgment forms

- Judgment $P :: x : A$
 - Process P offers service A along channel x
- Linear sequent

$$\underbrace{x_1:A_1, \dots, x_n:A_n}_{\Delta} \Rightarrow P :: x : A$$

P uses $x_i:A_i$ and offers $x:A$.

- Cut as composition

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow A \quad \Delta', A \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, \Delta' \Rightarrow C} \text{cut}_A$$

- Identity as forwarding

$$\frac{}{A \Rightarrow A} \text{id}_A$$

Judgment forms

- Judgment $P :: x : A$
 - Process P offers service A along channel x
- Linear sequent

$$\underbrace{x_1:A_1, \dots, x_n:A_n}_{\Delta} \Rightarrow P :: x : A$$

P uses $x_i:A_i$ and offers $x:A$.

- Cut as composition

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow x : A \quad \Delta', x:A \Rightarrow z : C}{\Delta, \Delta' \Rightarrow z : C} \text{cut}_A$$

- Identity as forwarding

$$\frac{}{A \Rightarrow A} \text{id}_A$$

Judgment forms

- Judgment $P :: x : A$
 - Process P offers service A along channel x
- Linear sequent

$$\underbrace{x_1:A_1, \dots, x_n:A_n}_{\Delta} \Rightarrow P :: x : A$$

P uses $x_i:A_i$ and offers $x:A$.

- Cut as composition

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A \quad \Delta', x:A \Rightarrow Q :: z : C}{\Delta, \Delta' \Rightarrow (\nu x)(P \mid Q) :: z : C} \text{cut}_A$$

- Identity as forwarding

$$\frac{}{A \Rightarrow A} \text{id}_A$$

Judgment forms

- Judgment $P :: x : A$
 - Process P offers service A along channel x
- Linear sequent

$$\underbrace{x_1:A_1, \dots, x_n:A_n}_{\Delta} \Rightarrow P :: x : A$$

P uses $x_i:A_i$ and offers $x:A$.

- Cut as composition

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A \quad \Delta', x:A \Rightarrow Q :: z : C}{\Delta, \Delta' \Rightarrow (\nu x)(P \mid Q) :: z : C} \text{cut}_A$$

- Identity as forwarding

$$\frac{}{x:A \Rightarrow z : A} \text{id}_A$$

Judgment forms

- Judgment $P :: x : A$
 - Process P offers service A along channel x
- Linear sequent

$$\underbrace{x_1:A_1, \dots, x_n:A_n}_{\Delta} \Rightarrow P :: x : A$$

P uses $x_i:A_i$ and offers $x:A$.

- Cut as composition

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A \quad \Delta', x:A \Rightarrow Q :: z : C}{\Delta, \Delta' \Rightarrow (\nu x)(P \mid Q) :: z : C} \text{cut}_A$$

- Identity as forwarding

$$\frac{}{x:A \Rightarrow [x \leftrightarrow z] :: z : A} \text{id}_A$$

Offering input ($A \multimap B$)

- $P :: x : A \multimap B$
 - P inputs an A along x and then behaves as B
- Right rule: offer of service

$$\frac{\Delta, A \Rightarrow B}{\Delta \Rightarrow A \multimap B} \multimap R$$

- Left rule: matching use of service

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow A \quad \Delta', B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, \Delta', A \multimap B \Rightarrow C} \multimap L$$

Offering input ($A \multimap B$)

- $P :: x : A \multimap B$
 - P inputs an A along x and then behaves as B
- Right rule: offer of service

$$\frac{\Delta, A \Rightarrow \quad B}{\Delta \Rightarrow \quad A \multimap B} \multimap R$$

- Left rule: matching use of service

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow A \quad \Delta', B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, \Delta', A \multimap B \Rightarrow C} \multimap L$$

Offering input ($A \multimap B$)

- $P :: x : A \multimap B$
 - P inputs an A along x and then behaves as B
- Right rule: offer of service

$$\frac{\Delta, y:A \Rightarrow \quad x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow \quad x : A \multimap B} \multimap R$$

- Left rule: matching use of service

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow A \quad \Delta', B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, \Delta', A \multimap B \Rightarrow C} \multimap L$$

Offering input ($A \multimap B$)

- $P :: x : A \multimap B$
 - P inputs an A along x and then behaves as B
- Right rule: offer of service

$$\frac{\Delta, y:A \Rightarrow P :: x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow x(y).P :: x : A \multimap B} \multimap R$$

- Can reuse x , due to linearity!
- Left rule: matching use of service

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow A \quad \Delta', B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, \Delta', A \multimap B \Rightarrow C} \multimap L$$

Offering input ($A \multimap B$)

- $P :: x : A \multimap B$
 - P inputs an A along x and then behaves as B
- Right rule: offer of service

$$\frac{\Delta, y:A \Rightarrow P :: x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow x(y).P :: x : A \multimap B} \multimap R$$

- Can reuse x , due to linearity!
- Left rule: matching use of service

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow \quad A \quad \Delta', B \Rightarrow \quad C}{\Delta, \Delta', A \multimap B \Rightarrow \quad C} \multimap L$$

Offering input ($A \multimap B$)

- $P :: x : A \multimap B$
 - P inputs an A along x and then behaves as B
- Right rule: offer of service

$$\frac{\Delta, y:A \Rightarrow P :: x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow x(y).P :: x : A \multimap B} \multimap R$$

- Can reuse x , due to linearity!
- Left rule: matching use of service

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow y : A \quad \Delta', x:B \Rightarrow z : C}{\Delta, \Delta', x:A \multimap B \Rightarrow z : C} \multimap L$$

Offering input ($A \multimap B$)

- $P :: x : A \multimap B$
 - P inputs an A along x and then behaves as B
- Right rule: offer of service

$$\frac{\Delta, y:A \Rightarrow P :: x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow x(y).P :: x : A \multimap B} \multimap R$$

- Can reuse x , due to linearity!
- Left rule: matching use of service

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: y : A \quad \Delta', x:B \Rightarrow Q :: z : C}{\Delta, \Delta', x:A \multimap B \Rightarrow (\nu y)\bar{x}\langle y \rangle.(P \mid Q) :: z : C} \multimap L$$

- Can reuse x , due to linearity
 - Channel y must be new (bound output)

Proof and process reduction

■ Proof reduction

$$\frac{\frac{\Delta, A \Rightarrow B}{\Delta \Rightarrow A \multimap B} \multimap R \quad \frac{\Delta_1 \Rightarrow A \quad \Delta_2, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta_1, \Delta_2, A \multimap B \Rightarrow C} \multimap L}{\Delta, \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \Rightarrow C} \text{cut}_{A \multimap B}$$
$$\longrightarrow$$
$$\frac{\frac{\Delta_1 \Rightarrow A \quad \Delta, A \Rightarrow B}{\Delta, \Delta_1 \Rightarrow B} \text{cut}_A \quad \Delta_2, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \Rightarrow C} \text{cut}_B$$

■ Corresponding process reduction

$$\Delta, \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \Rightarrow (\nu x)(x(y).P_1 \mid (\nu w)(\bar{x}\langle w \rangle.(P_2 \mid Q))) :: z : C$$
$$\longrightarrow$$
$$\Delta, \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \Rightarrow (\nu x)((\nu w)(P_2 \mid P_1\{w/y\}) \mid Q) :: z : C$$

- Corresponding process reduction

$$(\nu x)(x(y).P_1 \mid (\nu w)(\bar{x}\langle w \rangle.(P_2 \mid Q)))$$

→

$$(\nu x)((\nu w)(P_2 \mid P_1\{w/y\}) \mid Q)$$

- Instance of (modulo structural congruence)

$$(x(y).P \mid \bar{x}\langle w \rangle.Q) \longrightarrow (P\{w/y\} \mid Q)$$

- Synchronous π -calculus
- Typing modulo structural congruence

- Linear propositions as session types

$P :: x : A \multimap B$	Input a $y:A$ along x and behave as B
$P :: x : A \otimes B$	Output new $y:A$ along x and behave as B
$P :: x : \mathbf{1}$	Terminate session on x
$P :: x : A \& B$	Offer choice between A and B along x
$P :: x : A \oplus B$	Offer either A or B along x
$P :: x : !A$	Offer A persistently along x

- Sequent proofs as process expressions

- Proof reduction as process reduction

Offering output ($A \otimes B$)

- $P :: x : A \otimes B$
 - P outputs a fresh $y:A$ along x and then behaves as B
- Right rule: offer output

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow A \quad \Delta' \Rightarrow B}{\Delta, \Delta' \Rightarrow A \otimes B} \otimes R$$

- Left rule: perform matching input

$$\frac{\Delta, A, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \otimes B \Rightarrow C} \otimes L$$

Offering output ($A \otimes B$)

- $P :: x : A \otimes B$
 - P outputs a fresh $y:A$ along x and then behaves as B
- Right rule: offer output

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow A \quad \Delta' \Rightarrow B}{\Delta, \Delta' \Rightarrow A \otimes B} \otimes R$$

- Left rule: perform matching input

$$\frac{\Delta, A, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \otimes B \Rightarrow C} \otimes L$$

Offering output ($A \otimes B$)

- $P :: x : A \otimes B$
 - P outputs a fresh $y:A$ along x and then behaves as B
- Right rule: offer output

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow y : A \quad \Delta' \Rightarrow x : B}{\Delta, \Delta' \Rightarrow x : A \otimes B} \otimes R$$

- Left rule: perform matching input

$$\frac{\Delta, A, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \otimes B \Rightarrow C} \otimes L$$

Offering output ($A \otimes B$)

- $P :: x : A \otimes B$
 - P outputs a fresh $y:A$ along x and then behaves as B
- Right rule: offer output

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: y : A \quad \Delta' \Rightarrow Q :: x : B}{\Delta, \Delta' \Rightarrow (\nu y)\bar{x}\langle y \rangle.(P \mid Q) :: x : A \otimes B} \otimes R$$

- Left rule: perform matching input

$$\frac{\Delta, A, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \otimes B \Rightarrow C} \otimes L$$

Offering output ($A \otimes B$)

- $P :: x : A \otimes B$
 - P outputs a fresh $y:A$ along x and then behaves as B
- Right rule: offer output

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: y : A \quad \Delta' \Rightarrow Q :: x : B}{\Delta, \Delta' \Rightarrow (\nu y)\bar{x}\langle y \rangle.(P \mid Q) :: x : A \otimes B} \otimes R$$

- Left rule: perform matching input

$$\frac{\Delta, A, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \otimes B \Rightarrow C} \otimes L$$

Offering output ($A \otimes B$)

- $P :: x : A \otimes B$
 - P outputs a fresh $y:A$ along x and then behaves as B
- Right rule: offer output

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: y : A \quad \Delta' \Rightarrow Q :: x : B}{\Delta, \Delta' \Rightarrow (\nu y)\bar{x}\langle y \rangle.(P \mid Q) :: x : A \otimes B} \otimes R$$

- Left rule: perform matching input

$$\frac{\Delta, y:A, x:B \Rightarrow \quad z : C}{\Delta, x:A \otimes B \Rightarrow \quad z : C} \otimes L$$

Offering output ($A \otimes B$)

- $P :: x : A \otimes B$
 - P outputs a fresh $y:A$ along x and then behaves as B
- Right rule: offer output

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: y : A \quad \Delta' \Rightarrow Q :: x : B}{\Delta, \Delta' \Rightarrow (\nu y)\bar{x}\langle y \rangle.(P \mid Q) :: x : A \otimes B} \otimes R$$

- Left rule: perform matching input

$$\frac{\Delta, y:A, x:B \Rightarrow P :: z : C}{\Delta, x:A \otimes B \Rightarrow x(y).P :: z : C} \otimes L$$

Offering output ($A \otimes B$)

- Proof reduction again corresponds to process reduction
- No new rules required
- Apparent asymmetry, but $A \otimes B \simeq B \otimes A$:

$$x:A \otimes B \Rightarrow x(y).(\nu w)\bar{z}\langle w \rangle.([x \leftrightarrow w] \mid [y \leftrightarrow z]) :: z : B \otimes A$$

Termination (1)

- $P :: x : \mathbf{1}$
 - P terminates session on x
- Right rule: offer of termination (unit of \otimes)

$$\frac{}{\cdot \Rightarrow \mathbf{1}} \mathbf{1}R$$

- Left rule: accept termination

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, \mathbf{1} \Rightarrow C} \mathbf{1}L$$

- Reduction

Termination (1)

- $P :: x : \mathbf{1}$
 - P terminates session on x
- Right rule: offer of termination (unit of \otimes)

$$\frac{}{\cdot \Rightarrow \mathbf{1}} \mathbf{1}R$$

- Left rule: accept termination

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, \mathbf{1} \Rightarrow C} \mathbf{1}L$$

- Reduction

Termination (**1**)

- $P :: x : \mathbf{1}$

- P terminates session on x

- Right rule: offer of termination (unit of \otimes)

$$\frac{}{\cdot \Rightarrow x : \mathbf{1}} \mathbf{1}R$$

- Left rule: accept termination

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, \mathbf{1} \Rightarrow C} \mathbf{1}L$$

- Reduction

Termination (1)

- $P :: x : \mathbf{1}$
 - P terminates session on x
- Right rule: offer of termination (unit of \otimes)

$$\frac{}{\cdot \Rightarrow \bar{x} \langle \rangle . \mathbf{0} :: x : \mathbf{1}} \mathbf{1}R$$

- Left rule: accept termination

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, \mathbf{1} \Rightarrow C} \mathbf{1}L$$

- Reduction

Termination (1)

- $P :: x : \mathbf{1}$

- P terminates session on x

- Right rule: offer of termination (unit of \otimes)

$$\frac{}{\cdot \Rightarrow \bar{x} \langle \rangle . \mathbf{0} :: x : \mathbf{1}} \mathbf{1}R$$

- Left rule: accept termination

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow}{\Delta, \mathbf{1} \Rightarrow} \frac{C}{C} \mathbf{1}L$$

- Reduction

Termination (1)

- $P :: x : \mathbf{1}$

- P terminates session on x

- Right rule: offer of termination (unit of \otimes)

$$\frac{}{\cdot \Rightarrow \bar{x} \langle \rangle . \mathbf{0} :: x : \mathbf{1}} \mathbf{1}R$$

- Left rule: accept termination

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow \quad z : C}{\Delta, x : \mathbf{1} \Rightarrow \quad z : C} \mathbf{1}L$$

- Reduction

Termination (1)

- $P :: x : \mathbf{1}$

- P terminates session on x

- Right rule: offer of termination (unit of \otimes)

$$\frac{}{\cdot \Rightarrow \bar{x} \langle \rangle . \mathbf{0} :: x : \mathbf{1}} \mathbf{1}R$$

- Left rule: accept termination

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: z : C}{\Delta, x : \mathbf{1} \Rightarrow x() . P :: z : C} \mathbf{1}L$$

- Reduction

Termination (1)

- $P :: x : \mathbf{1}$

- P terminates session on x

- Right rule: offer of termination (unit of \otimes)

$$\frac{}{\cdot \Rightarrow \bar{x}().\mathbf{0} :: x : \mathbf{1}} \mathbf{1}R$$

- Left rule: accept termination

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: z : C}{\Delta, x:\mathbf{1} \Rightarrow x().P :: z : C} \mathbf{1}L$$

- Reduction

$$(\bar{x}().\mathbf{0} \mid x().P) \longrightarrow P$$

Termination (1)

- This faithful process assignment models **synchronous termination**
- We can also model asynchronous termination
 - Use a different process assignment (Caires & Pf. 2010)
 - Contracting proofs to processes
 - Some proof reductions are process identities

Example: PDF indexing

- Abstract away communicated values for now

$$\text{index}_1 \triangleq \text{file} \multimap (\text{file} \otimes \mathbf{1})$$

- Shape of a server

$$\text{srv} \triangleq x(f).(\nu y)\bar{x}\langle y\rangle.(P \mid \bar{x}\langle \rangle.\mathbf{0}) :: x : \text{index}_1$$

- Shape of a client

$$\text{client} \triangleq (\nu pdf)\bar{x}\langle pdf\rangle.x(id_x).x().Q$$

- Composition of server and client

$$\frac{\cdot \Rightarrow \text{srv} :: x : \text{index}_1 \quad x : \text{index}_1 \Rightarrow \text{client} :: z : \mathbf{1}}{\cdot \Rightarrow (\nu x)(\text{srv} \mid \text{client}) :: z : \mathbf{1}} \text{ cut}$$

Taking stock I

- At this point we have

<i>Types</i>	A, B, C	$::=$	$A \multimap B$	input
			$A \otimes B$	output
			$\mathbf{1}$	termination
<i>Processes</i>	P, Q	$::=$	$[x \leftrightarrow z]$	forwarding
			$(P \mid Q)$	parallel composition
			$(\nu x)P$	name restriction
			$x(y).P$	input
			$(\nu y)\bar{x}\langle y \rangle.P$	bound output
			$x().P$	(wait)
			$\bar{x}\langle \rangle.\mathbf{0}$	(termination)

Offering external choice ($A \& B$)

- $P :: x : A \& B$
 - P offers the choice between A and B along x
- Right rule: offering choice between A and B

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow A \quad \Delta \Rightarrow B}{\Delta \Rightarrow A \& B} \&R$$

- Left rules: making a choice between A and B

$$\frac{\Delta, A \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \& B \Rightarrow C} \&L_1$$

$$\frac{\Delta, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \& B \Rightarrow C} \&L_2$$

Offering external choice ($A \& B$)

- $P :: x : A \& B$
 - P offers the choice between A and B along x
- Right rule: offering choice between A and B

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow A \quad \Delta \Rightarrow B}{\Delta \Rightarrow A \& B} \&R$$

- Left rules: making a choice between A and B

$$\frac{\Delta, A \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \& B \Rightarrow C} \&L_1$$

$$\frac{\Delta, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \& B \Rightarrow C} \&L_2$$

Offering external choice ($A \& B$)

- $P :: x : A \& B$
 - P offers the choice between A and B along x
- Right rule: offering choice between A and B

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow x : A \quad \Delta \Rightarrow x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow x : A \& B} \&R$$

- Left rules: making a choice between A and B

$$\frac{\Delta, A \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \& B \Rightarrow C} \&L_1$$

$$\frac{\Delta, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \& B \Rightarrow C} \&L_2$$

Offering external choice ($A \& B$)

- $P :: x : A \& B$
 - P offers the choice between A and B along x
- Right rule: offering choice between A and B

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A \quad \Delta \Rightarrow Q :: x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow x.\text{case}(P, Q) :: x : A \& B} \&R$$

- Left rules: making a choice between A and B

$$\frac{\Delta, A \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \& B \Rightarrow C} \&L_1$$

$$\frac{\Delta, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \& B \Rightarrow C} \&L_2$$

Offering external choice ($A \& B$)

- $P :: x : A \& B$
 - P offers the choice between A and B along x
- Right rule: offering choice between A and B

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A \quad \Delta \Rightarrow Q :: x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow x.\text{case}(P, Q) :: x : A \& B} \&R$$

- Left rules: making a choice between A and B

$$\frac{\Delta, A \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \& B \Rightarrow C} \&L_1$$

$$\frac{\Delta, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \& B \Rightarrow C} \&L_2$$

Offering external choice ($A \& B$)

- $P :: x : A \& B$
 - P offers the choice between A and B along x
- Right rule: offering choice between A and B

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A \quad \Delta \Rightarrow Q :: x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow x.\text{case}(P, Q) :: x : A \& B} \&R$$

- Left rules: making a choice between A and B

$$\frac{\Delta, x:A \Rightarrow \quad z : C}{\Delta, x:A \& B \Rightarrow \quad z : C} \&L_1$$

$$\frac{\Delta, x:B \Rightarrow \quad z : C}{\Delta, x:A \& B \Rightarrow \quad z : C} \&L_2$$

Offering external choice ($A \& B$)

- $P :: x : A \& B$
 - P offers the choice between A and B along x
- Right rule: offering choice between A and B

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A \quad \Delta \Rightarrow Q :: x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow x.\text{case}(P, Q) :: x : A \& B} \&R$$

- Left rules: making a choice between A and B

$$\frac{\Delta, x:A \Rightarrow Q :: z : C}{\Delta, x:A \& B \Rightarrow x.\text{inl}; Q :: z : C} \&L_1$$

$$\frac{\Delta, x:B \Rightarrow Q :: z : C}{\Delta, x:A \& B \Rightarrow x.\text{inr}; Q :: z : C} \&L_2$$

Offering external choice ($A \& B$)

- Need binary guarded choice construct
- New reductions

$$(x.\text{case}(P, Q) \mid x.\text{inl}; R) \longrightarrow (P \mid R)$$

$$(x.\text{case}(P, Q) \mid x.\text{inr}; R) \longrightarrow (Q \mid R)$$

Example: PDF compression

- Extend previous example
- Offer to index or compress the PDF

$$\text{server}_1 \triangleq (\text{file} \multimap (\text{file} \otimes \mathbf{1})) \\ \& (\text{file} \multimap (\text{file} \otimes \mathbf{1}))$$

- Different protocol: decision is made later

$$\text{server}_2 \triangleq \text{file} \multimap ((\text{file} \& \text{file}) \otimes \mathbf{1})$$

- In practice, should use labeled products $\&_i \{I_i : A_i\}$

Offering internal choice ($A \oplus B$)

- $P :: x : A \oplus B$
 - P offers either A or B along x
- Offering either A or B :

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow A}{\Delta \Rightarrow A \oplus B} \oplus R_1$$

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow B}{\Delta \Rightarrow A \oplus B} \oplus R_2$$

- Accounting for either A or B :

$$\frac{\Delta, A \Rightarrow C \quad \Delta, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \oplus B \Rightarrow C} \oplus L$$

- No new reductions

Offering internal choice ($A \oplus B$)

- $P :: x : A \oplus B$
 - P offers either A or B along x
- Offering either A or B :

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow \quad A}{\Delta \Rightarrow \quad A \oplus B} \oplus R_1$$

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow \quad B}{\Delta \Rightarrow \quad A \oplus B} \oplus R_2$$

- Accounting for either A or B :

$$\frac{\Delta, A \Rightarrow C \quad \Delta, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \oplus B \Rightarrow C} \oplus L$$

- No new reductions

Offering internal choice ($A \oplus B$)

- $P :: x : A \oplus B$
 - P offers either A or B along x
- Offering either A or B :

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow \quad x : A}{\Delta \Rightarrow \quad x : A \oplus B} \oplus R_1$$

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow \quad x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow \quad x : A \oplus B} \oplus R_2$$

- Accounting for either A or B :

$$\frac{\Delta, A \Rightarrow C \quad \Delta, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \oplus B \Rightarrow C} \oplus L$$

- No new reductions

Offering internal choice ($A \oplus B$)

- $P :: x : A \oplus B$
 - P offers either A or B along x
- Offering either A or B :

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A}{\Delta \Rightarrow x.inl; P :: x : A \oplus B} \oplus R_1$$

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow x.inr; P :: x : A \oplus B} \oplus R_2$$

- Accounting for either A or B :

$$\frac{\Delta, A \Rightarrow C \quad \Delta, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \oplus B \Rightarrow C} \oplus L$$

- No new reductions

Offering internal choice ($A \oplus B$)

- $P :: x : A \oplus B$
 - P offers either A or B along x
- Offering either A or B :

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A}{\Delta \Rightarrow x.inl; P :: x : A \oplus B} \oplus R_1$$

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow x.inr; P :: x : A \oplus B} \oplus R_2$$

- Accounting for either A or B :

$$\frac{\Delta, A \Rightarrow C \quad \Delta, B \Rightarrow C}{\Delta, A \oplus B \Rightarrow C} \oplus L$$

- No new reductions

Offering internal choice ($A \oplus B$)

- $P :: x : A \oplus B$
 - P offers either A or B along x
- Offering either A or B :

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A}{\Delta \Rightarrow x.inl; P :: x : A \oplus B} \oplus R_1$$

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow x.inr; P :: x : A \oplus B} \oplus R_2$$

- Accounting for either A or B :

$$\frac{\Delta, x:A \Rightarrow z : C \quad \Delta, x:B \Rightarrow z : C}{\Delta, x:A \oplus B \Rightarrow z : C} \oplus L$$

- No new reductions

Offering internal choice ($A \oplus B$)

- $P :: x : A \oplus B$
 - P offers either A or B along x
- Offering either A or B :

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A}{\Delta \Rightarrow x.inl; P :: x : A \oplus B} \oplus R_1$$

$$\frac{\Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : B}{\Delta \Rightarrow x.inr; P :: x : A \oplus B} \oplus R_2$$

- Accounting for either A or B :

$$\frac{\Delta, x:A \Rightarrow P :: z : C \quad \Delta, x:B \Rightarrow Q :: z : C}{\Delta, x:A \oplus B \Rightarrow x.case(P, Q) :: z : C} \oplus L$$

- No new reductions

Example: PDF indexing

- Offer to index PDF, or indicate failure

$$\text{index}_2 \triangleq (\text{file} \multimap ((\text{file} \otimes \mathbf{1}) \oplus \mathbf{1}))$$

- In practice, should use labeled sums $\oplus_i \{I_i : A_i\}$

Persistence

- To have persistent services, we generalize the judgment form (Hodas & Miller 1991; Andreoli 1992; Barber 1996)

$$\underbrace{B_1, \dots, B_k}_{\Gamma} \quad ; \quad \underbrace{A_1, \dots, A_n}_{\Delta} \Rightarrow C$$

persistently true linearly true

- Label with **shared** channels u and **linear** channels x

$$\underbrace{u_1:B_1, \dots, u_k:B_k}_{\Gamma} \quad ; \quad \underbrace{x_1:A_1, \dots, x_n:A_n}_{\Delta} \Rightarrow P :: z : C$$

shared linear

Structural rules

- cut! as composition with replicated input

$$\frac{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow A \quad \Gamma, A ; \Delta \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow C} \text{cut!}_A$$

- No linear channels in P except x
- To use u we have to send it a new channel y for x

$$\frac{\Gamma, A ; \Delta, A \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma, A ; \Delta \Rightarrow C} \text{copy}$$

Structural rules

- cut! as composition with replicated input

$$\frac{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow \quad A \quad \Gamma, A ; \Delta \Rightarrow \quad C}{\Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow \quad C} \text{cut!}_A$$

- No linear channels in P except x
- To use u we have to send it a new channel y for x

$$\frac{\Gamma, A ; \Delta, A \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma, A ; \Delta \Rightarrow C} \text{copy}$$

Structural rules

- cut! as composition with replicated input

$$\frac{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow \quad x : A \quad \Gamma, u:A ; \Delta \Rightarrow \quad z : C}{\Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow \quad z : C} \text{cut!}_A$$

- No linear channels in P except x
- To use u we have to send it a new channel y for x

$$\frac{\Gamma, A ; \Delta, A \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma, A ; \Delta \Rightarrow C} \text{copy}$$

Structural rules

- cut! as composition with replicated input

$$\frac{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow P :: x : A \quad \Gamma, u:A ; \Delta \Rightarrow Q :: z : C}{\Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow (\nu u)(!u(x).P \mid Q) :: z : C} \text{cut!}_A$$

- No linear channels in P except x
- To use u we have to send it a new channel y for x

$$\frac{\Gamma, A ; \Delta, A \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma, A ; \Delta \Rightarrow C} \text{copy}$$

Structural rules

- cut! as composition with replicated input

$$\frac{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow P :: x : A \quad \Gamma, u:A ; \Delta \Rightarrow Q :: z : C}{\Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow (\nu u)(!u(x).P \mid Q) :: z : C} \text{cut!}_A$$

- No linear channels in P except x
- To use u we have to send it a new channel y for x

$$\frac{\Gamma, A ; \Delta, A \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma, A ; \Delta \Rightarrow C} \text{copy}$$

Structural rules

- cut! as composition with replicated input

$$\frac{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow P :: x : A \quad \Gamma, u:A ; \Delta \Rightarrow Q :: z : C}{\Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow (\nu u)(!u(x).P \mid Q) :: z : C} \text{cut!}_A$$

- No linear channels in P except x
- To use u we have to send it a new channel y for x

$$\frac{\Gamma, u:A ; \Delta, y:A \Rightarrow z : C}{\Gamma, u:A ; \Delta \Rightarrow z : C} \text{copy}$$

Structural rules

- cut! as composition with replicated input

$$\frac{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow P :: x : A \quad \Gamma, u:A ; \Delta \Rightarrow Q :: z : C}{\Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow (\nu u)(!u(x).P \mid Q) :: z : C} \text{cut!}_A$$

- No linear channels in P except x
- To use u we have to send it a new channel y for x

$$\frac{\Gamma, u:A ; \Delta, y:A \Rightarrow P :: z : C}{\Gamma, u:A ; \Delta \Rightarrow (\nu y)\bar{u}\langle y \rangle.P :: z : C} \text{copy}$$

- y will be linear and behave according to A

- Replaying the proof reduction yields:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\nu u)(!u(x).P \mid (\nu y)\bar{u}\langle y\rangle.Q) \\ \longrightarrow & (\nu y)(P\{y/x\} \mid (\nu u)(!u(x).P \mid Q)) \end{aligned}$$

- Instance of standard rule

$$(!u(x).P \mid \bar{u}\langle y\rangle.Q) \longrightarrow (P\{y/x\} \mid Q \mid !u(x).P)$$

Offering persistent service (!A)

- Internalize persistence as a proposition
- $P :: x : !A$
 - P persistently offers A along x
- Creating a persistent service

$$\frac{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow A}{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow !A} !R$$

- Sharing a persistent service

$$\frac{\Gamma, A ; \Delta \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma ; \Delta, !A \Rightarrow C} !L$$

Offering persistent service (!A)

- Internalize persistence as a proposition
- $P :: x : !A$
 - P persistently offers A along x
- Creating a persistent service

$$\frac{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow \quad A}{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow \quad !A} !R$$

- Sharing a persistent service

$$\frac{\Gamma, A ; \Delta \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma ; \Delta, !A \Rightarrow C} !L$$

Offering persistent service (!A)

- Internalize persistence as a proposition
- $P :: x : !A$
 - P persistently offers A along x
- Creating a persistent service

$$\frac{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow \quad y : A}{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow \quad x : !A} !R$$

- Sharing a persistent service

$$\frac{\Gamma, A ; \Delta \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma ; \Delta, !A \Rightarrow C} !L$$

Offering persistent service (!A)

- Internalize persistence as a proposition
- $P :: x : !A$
 - P persistently offers A along x
- Creating a persistent service

$$\frac{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow P :: y : A}{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow !x(y).P :: x : !A} !R$$

- Sharing a persistent service

$$\frac{\Gamma, A ; \Delta \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma ; \Delta, !A \Rightarrow C} !L$$

Offering persistent service (!A)

- Internalize persistence as a proposition
- $P :: x : !A$
 - P persistently offers A along x
- Creating a persistent service

$$\frac{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow P :: y : A}{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow !x(y).P :: x : !A} !R$$

- Sharing a persistent service

$$\frac{\Gamma, A ; \Delta \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma ; \Delta, !A \Rightarrow C} !L$$

Offering persistent service (!A)

- Internalize persistence as a proposition
- $P :: x : !A$
 - P persistently offers A along x
- Creating a persistent service

$$\frac{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow P :: y : A}{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow !x(y).P :: x : !A} !R$$

- Sharing a persistent service

$$\frac{\Gamma, u:A ; \Delta \Rightarrow \quad z : C}{\Gamma ; \Delta, x:!A \Rightarrow \quad z : C} !L$$

Offering persistent service (!A)

- Internalize persistence as a proposition
- $P :: x : !A$
 - P persistently offers A along x
- Creating a persistent service

$$\frac{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow P :: y : A}{\Gamma ; \cdot \Rightarrow !x(y).P :: x : !A} !R$$

- Sharing a persistent service

$$\frac{\Gamma, u:A ; \Delta \Rightarrow Q :: z : C}{\Gamma ; \Delta, x:!A \Rightarrow x/u.Q :: z : C} !L$$

- $!L$ promotes linear channels to shared ones
- No significant operational consequences

$$(\nu x)(!x(y).P \mid x/u.Q) \longrightarrow (\nu u)(!u(y).P \mid Q)$$

Example: persistent storage

- Persistent PDF indexing service

$$\text{index}_3 : !(file \multimap file \otimes \mathbf{1})$$

Persistently offer to input a file, then output a file and terminate session.

- Store a file persistently

$$\text{store}_1 : !(file \multimap !(file \otimes \mathbf{1}))$$

Persistently offer to input a file, then output a persistent handle for retrieving this file.

Taking stock II

- At this point we have in addition

<i>Types</i>	A, B, C	$::=$	\dots	
			$A \& B$	external choice
			$A \oplus B$	internal choice
			$!A$	replication
<i>Processes</i>	P, Q	$::=$	\dots	
			$x.inl; P \mid x.inr; P$	selection
			$x.case(P, Q)$	branching
			$!u(x).P$	replicating input
			$x/u.P$	(promotion)

- 1 Session types for π -calculus
- 2 **Dependent session types**
- 3 Proof irrelevance
- 4 Some results
- 5 Conclusion

Passing terms

- Types τ from a (dependent) type theory
- Hypothetical judgment $\underbrace{x_1:\tau_1, \dots, x_k:\tau_k}_{\Psi} \vdash M : \tau$
- Some example type constructors

$\prod x:\tau. \sigma, \tau \rightarrow \sigma$	Functions from τ to σ
$\sum x:\tau. \sigma, \tau \times \sigma$	Pairs of a τ and a σ
nat	Natural numbers

- Integrate into sequent calculus

$$\underbrace{\Psi}_{\text{term variables}} \ ; \ \underbrace{\Gamma}_{\text{shared channels}} \ ; \ \underbrace{\Delta}_{\text{linear channels}} \ \Rightarrow \ P \ :: \ \underbrace{x : A}_{\text{linear}}$$

Offering term input ($\forall y:\tau.A$)

- $P :: x : \forall y:\tau.A$
 - P inputs an $M : \tau$ along x and then behaves as $A\{M/x\}$
- Right rule: offer of service

$$\frac{\Psi, y:\tau ; \Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow A}{\Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow \forall y:\tau.A} \forall R$$

- Left rule: matching use of service

$$\frac{\Psi \vdash M : \tau \quad \Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta', A\{M/y\} \Rightarrow C}{\Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta', \forall y:\tau.A \Rightarrow C} \forall L$$

- Proof reduction

Offering term input ($\forall y:\tau.A$)

- $P :: x : \forall y:\tau.A$
 - P inputs an $M : \tau$ along x and then behaves as $A\{M/x\}$
- Right rule: offer of service

$$\frac{\Psi, y:\tau ; \Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow \quad x : A}{\Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow \quad x : \forall y:\tau.A} \forall R$$

- Left rule: matching use of service

$$\frac{\Psi \vdash M : \tau \quad \Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta', A\{M/y\} \Rightarrow}{\Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta', \forall y:\tau.A \Rightarrow} \frac{C}{C} \forall L$$

- Proof reduction

Offering term input ($\forall y:\tau.A$)

- $P :: x : \forall y:\tau.A$
 - P inputs an $M : \tau$ along x and then behaves as $A\{M/x\}$
- Right rule: offer of service

$$\frac{\Psi, y:\tau ; \Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A}{\Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow x(y).P :: x : \forall y:\tau.A} \forall R$$

- Left rule: matching use of service

$$\frac{\Psi \vdash M : \tau \quad \Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta', A\{M/y\} \Rightarrow}{\Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta', \forall y:\tau.A \Rightarrow} \frac{C}{C} \forall L$$

- Proof reduction

Offering term input ($\forall y:\tau.A$)

- $P :: x : \forall y:\tau.A$
 - P inputs an $M : \tau$ along x and then behaves as $A\{M/x\}$
- Right rule: offer of service

$$\frac{\Psi, y:\tau ; \Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A}{\Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow x(y).P :: x : \forall y:\tau.A} \forall R$$

- Left rule: matching use of service

$$\frac{\Psi \vdash M : \tau \quad \Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta', x:A\{M/y\} \Rightarrow \quad z : C}{\Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta', x:\forall y:\tau.A \Rightarrow \quad z : C} \forall L$$

- Proof reduction

Offering term input ($\forall y:\tau.A$)

- $P :: x : \forall y:\tau.A$
 - P inputs an $M : \tau$ along x and then behaves as $A\{M/x\}$
- Right rule: offer of service

$$\frac{\Psi, y:\tau ; \Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A}{\Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow x(y).P :: x : \forall y:\tau.A} \forall R$$

- Left rule: matching use of service

$$\frac{\Psi \vdash M : \tau \quad \Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta', x:A\{M/y\} \Rightarrow Q :: z : C}{\Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta', x:\forall y:\tau.A \Rightarrow \bar{x}\langle M \rangle.Q :: z : C} \forall L$$

- Proof reduction

Offering term input ($\forall y:\tau.A$)

- $P :: x : \forall y:\tau.A$
 - P inputs an $M : \tau$ along x and then behaves as $A\{M/x\}$
- Right rule: offer of service

$$\frac{\Psi, y:\tau ; \Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow P :: x : A}{\Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta \Rightarrow x(y).P :: x : \forall y:\tau.A} \forall R$$

- Left rule: matching use of service

$$\frac{\Psi \vdash M : \tau \quad \Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta', x:A\{M/y\} \Rightarrow Q :: z : C}{\Psi ; \Gamma ; \Delta', x:\forall y:\tau.A \Rightarrow \bar{x}\langle M \rangle.Q :: z : C} \forall L$$

- Proof reduction

$$(\nu x)(x(y).P \mid \bar{x}\langle M \rangle.Q) \longrightarrow (\nu x)(P\{M/y\} \mid Q)$$

Term passing: other connectives

- Quantified proposition as dependent session types

$x : \forall y:\tau.A$ Input an $M : A$ along x and behave as $A\{M/y\}$

$x : \$\tau \multimap A$ Input an $M : A$ along x and behave as A

$x : \exists y:\tau.A$ Output an $M : A$ along x and behave as $A\{M/y\}$

$x : \$\tau \otimes A$ Output an $M : A$ along x and behave as A

- $\$\tau \multimap A$ as shorthand for $\forall y:\tau.A$ if y not free in A
- $\$\tau \otimes A$ as shorthand for $\exists y:\tau.A$ if y not free in A
- We will omit the '\$' for readability

Examples, carrying proofs

- PDF indexing service

$\text{index}_3 : !(file \multimap file \otimes \mathbf{1})$

$\text{index}_4 : !(\forall f:\text{file}. \text{pdf}(f) \multimap \exists g:\text{file}. \text{pdf}(g) \otimes \mathbf{1})$

Persistently offer to input a file f , a proof that f is in PDF format, then output a PDF file g , and a proof that g is in PDF format and terminate the session.

- Persistent file storage

$\text{store}_1 : !(file \multimap !(file \otimes \mathbf{1}))$

$\text{store}_2 : !(\forall f:\text{file}. !\exists g:\text{file}. g \doteq f \otimes \mathbf{1})$

Persistently offer to input a file, then output a persistent channel for retrieving this file and a proof that the two are equal.

- 1 Session types for π -calculus
- 2 Dependent session types
- 3 **Proof irrelevance**
- 4 Some results
- 5 Conclusion

Proof irrelevance

- In many examples, we want to know that proofs exist, but we do not want to transmit them
 - We can easily check $\text{pdf}(g)$ when using the indexing service
 - The proof of $g \doteq f$ (by reflexivity) would not be informative
- Use **proof irrelevance** in type theory
- $M : [\tau]$ — M is a term of type τ that is computationally irrelevant

Proof irrelevance: rules

- Introduction and elimination

$$\frac{\Psi^{\oplus} \vdash M : \tau}{\Psi \vdash [M] : [\tau]} \quad \square I \qquad \frac{\Psi \vdash M : [\tau] \quad \Psi, x \div \tau \vdash N : \sigma}{\Psi \vdash \mathbf{let} [x] = M \mathbf{in} N : \sigma} \quad \square E$$

- Ψ^{\oplus} promotes hypotheses $x \div \tau$ to $x : \tau$
- In examples, may use pattern matching instead of **let**
- By agreement, terms $[M]$ **will be erased before transmission**
- Typing guarantees this can be done consistently

Examples with proof irrelevance

- Mark proofs as computationally irrelevant
- PDF indexing service

$$\text{index}_4 : !(\forall f:\text{file}. \text{pdf}(f) \multimap \exists g:\text{file}. \text{pdf}(g) \otimes \mathbf{1})$$

$$\text{index}_5 : !(\forall f:\text{file}. [\text{pdf}(f)] \multimap \exists g:\text{file}. [\text{pdf}(g)] \otimes \mathbf{1})$$

- Persistent file storage

$$\text{store}_2 : !(\forall f:\text{file}. !\exists g:\text{file}. g \doteq f \otimes \mathbf{1})$$

$$\text{store}_3 : !(\forall f:\text{file}. !\exists g:\text{file}. [g \doteq f] \otimes \mathbf{1})$$

- After erasure, communication can be optimized further

Example: mobile code

- For sensitive documents we want to run indexing locally
- Specification

$$\text{index}_5 : !((\prod f:\text{file}. [\text{pdf}(f)] \rightarrow \Sigma g:\text{file}. [\text{pdf}(g)]) \otimes \mathbf{1})$$

- Service persistently offers a function for indexing
- Cannot leak information since only process layer can communicate

- 1 Session types for π -calculus
- 2 Dependent session types
- 3 Proof irrelevance
- 4 **Some results**
- 5 Conclusion

Some results

- Recall: typing is modulo (shallow) structural congruence
- Theorem: **type preservation = session fidelity**
- Theorem: **progress = deadlock freedom**
- Theorem: **termination**
 - Via linear logical relations (Pérez et al., ESOP 2012)
 - Some commuting conversions = behavioral equivalences
- Theorem: **proof reduction = process reduction**
 - **Permuting cut and cut! = structural equivalences**
 - **Identity elimination = structural reduction** (forwarding)
 - **Propositional reduction = communication**
 - Some commuting conversion needed if promotion is suppressed and termination is asynchronous

Further extensions and results

- Family of monads $\diamond_K \tau =$ digital signatures
 - Continuum of trust: from proofs to digital signatures (CPP 2011)
- Functions as session-typed processes (FoSSaCS 2012)
 - Translate from natural deduction to sequent calculus
 - Via linear natural deduction
 - $[T \rightarrow S] = ![T] \multimap [S]$: copying evaluation (by name)
 - $(T \rightarrow S)^* = !(T^* \multimap S^*)$: sharing evaluation (futures)
 - By-value and by-need are particular schedules for sharing

- Polymorphism
 - Immediate in the functional layer
 - Parametricity in the process layer (Pérez et al., ESOP 2012)
- Asynchronous session types (w. Henry DeYoung)
 - Also via Curry-Howard isomorphism!
 - Unlocking parallelism with commuting conversions
 - Each channel implementable as a bidirectional queue
- Classical linear logic
 - Superficially more economical
 - Does not enforce locality of shared channels
 - All standard session examples (and more) already expressible in intuitionistic system
 - Less likely to lead to full type theory

Concurrent dependent type theory?

- At present, we have a two-layer system
 - Communication layer (both linear and shared channels)
 - Value layer (dependent type theory)
- Can we have a concurrent dependently-typed language?
 - Problem of linear dependency
 - Equational reasoning about processes
 - Integrating natural deduction and sequent calculus
 - Dependently typed functional translation?
 - Monadic encapsulation, à la CLF?

Some related work

- Computational interpretations of linear logic (Abramsky 1993)
- Relating π -calculus and linear logic (Bellin & Scott 1994)
- Session types (Honda 1993) (Honda et al. 1998) ...
- Lollipop (Mazurak & Zdancewic 2010)
 - Natural deduction for classical linear logic
 - Purely linear (unrestricted version conjectured)
 - Tighter integration of functions with processes
 - Requires control operators and additional coercions
 - Dependent version unlikely?

- A Curry-Howard isomorphism
 - Linear propositions as session types
 $A \multimap B$ (input), $A \otimes B$ (output), $\mathbf{1}$ (termination)
 $A \& B$ (external choice), $A \oplus B$ (internal choice), $!A$ (replication)
 - Sequent proofs as π -calculus processes
with a binary guarded choice and channel forwarding
 - Cut reduction as π -calculus reduction
- Term-passing extension with a type theory
 - $\forall x:\tau.A$ (term input), $\exists x:\tau.A$ (term output)
- Additional type theory constructs
 - $[\tau]$ for proof irrelevance (not transmitted)
 - $\diamond_K \tau$ for affirmations (evidenced by digital signatures)