Melocoton: A Program Logic for Verified Interoperability Between OCaml and C

<u>Armaël Guéneau</u> Johannes Hostert Simon Spies Michael Sammler Lars Birkedal Derek Dreyer

Sept 11, 2023

Consider the *ocaml-ssl* library:

- Exposes OpenSSL (a C library) as an OCaml library
- To do so, it is implemented using a mix of both OCaml and C code:

i≣ README.md	Languages
OCaml-SSL - OCaml bindings for the libssl	 OCaml 49.1% C 45.7% Nix 3.6% Other 1.6%

OCaml

С

OCamlCStructured valuesIntegers and pointers λ_{ML} $V \in Val ::= (n \in \mathbb{Z}) \mid (\ell \in Loc)$ λ_{C} | true | false $| \langle \rangle | \langle V, V \rangle | \lambda x. e \cdots$

Garbage collection

Manual memory management



Garbage collection

Manual memory management

Write "glue code" using the OCaml FFI is tricky and unsafe.

mistake \Rightarrow memory corruption (often silent and hard to debug)



distinguished OCaml hacker Which rules should I follow to safely use the OCaml FFI?

We already have powerful program logics for OCaml and C

but those are for programs written in a single language



program logics expert

How do we **formally reason** about such multi-language code?

Key challenge (in this work)

Can we build a program logic for reasoning about interoperability with an FFI, while preserving language-local reasoning?



Can we build a program logic for reasoning about interoperability with an FFI, while preserving language-local reasoning?



Design choice: reuse most of existing semantics/program logics; do not drop down to a lowest-common denominator (assembly)!

Melocoton:

- Two instantiations of Iris for a ML-like and C-like language with *external calls*
- An operational semantics for the OCaml FFI, bridging between the two languages.
- A separation logic for the OCaml FFI, bridging between the two language logics.
- A number of interesting *case studies*

Melocoton:

- Two instantiations of Iris for a ML-like and C-like language with *external calls*
- An operational semantics for the OCaml FFI, bridging between the two languages.
- A separation logic for the OCaml FFI, bridging between the two language logics.
- A number of interesting *case studies*

Language-locality: Verification of mixed OCamI/C programs can be done *almost entirely* in logics for OCamI and C!

In Iris: the logic is proved sound and all proofs are checked in Coq

Outline

1. Language-local program logics with external calls



Outline

- 1. Language-local program logics with external calls
- 2. Program logic for FFI



Outline

- 1. Language-local program logics with external calls
- 2. Program logic for FFI
- 3. Focus: the language boundary



The OCaml FFI deals with two core challenges:

- mediating between the different views of the OCaml memory
- interacting with the OCaml GC

The OCaml FFI deals with two core challenges:

- mediating between the different views of the OCaml memory
- interacting with the OCaml GC

OCaml code:

```
let main () =
  let r = ref 0 in
  update_ref r; (* TODO call C code and use rand() *)
  print_int !r
```

C code:

int rand(int x) { ... }

OCaml code:	<pre>external update_ref : int ref -> unit = "caml_update_ref"</pre>
	let main () =
	let $r = ref 0$ in
	update_ref r;
	print_int !r
C code [.]	int rand(int x) $\{ \dots \}$

OCaml code:	<pre>external update_ref : int ref -> unit = "caml_update_ref"</pre>
	let main () =
	let $r = ref 0$ in
	update_ref r;
	print_int !r
C code:	<pre>int rand(int x) { }</pre>
Glue code:	<pre>value caml_update_ref(value r) {</pre>
	/* TODO */
	<pre>int y = rand(x);</pre>
	/* TODO */
	}

OCaml code:	<pre>external update_ref : int ref -> unit = "caml_update_ref"</pre>
	let main () =
	let r = ref 0 in
	update_ref r;
	print_int !r
C code:	<pre>int rand(int x) { }</pre>
Glue code:	value caml_update_ref(value r) {
	/* TODO */
	<pre>int y = rand(x);</pre>
	/* TODO */
	}

The runtime representation of OCaml values

At runtime, an OCaml value is either an integer or a pointer to a block:

 let x = 1
 x
 1

 let b = true
 b
 1

 let y = (1, 2)
 y

 let r = ref 42
 r

 let a = [| (1, 2); (3, 4) |]
 a



Glue code has access to this *low-level* representation of OCaml values.

OCaml code:	<pre>external update_ref : int ref -> unit = "caml_update_ref" let main () = let r = ref 0 in update_ref r; print_int !r</pre>
C code:	<pre>int rand(int x) { }</pre>
Glue code:	<pre>value caml_update_ref(value r) {</pre>
	<pre>int x = Int_val(Field(r, 0));</pre>
	int $y = rand(x);$
	<pre>Store_field(r, 0, Val_int(y));</pre>
	<pre>return Val_int(0);</pre>
	1

Glue code bridges between OCaml and C values by using powerful FFI primitives...

```
value caml_update_ref(value r) {
  int y = rand(x);
 return Val_int(0);
}
```

```
int x = Int_val(Field(r, 0)); /* read the first field of the input block */
                     /* get a random integer */
Store_field(r, 0, Val_int(y)); /* store the value in the block */
                       /* return () */
```

```
value caml_update_ref(value r) {<--</pre>
  int y = rand(x);
  return Val_int(0);
3
```

```
int x = Int_val(Field(r, 0)); /* read the first field of the input block */
                     /* get a random integer */
Store_field(r, 0, Val_int(y)); /* store the value in the block */
                      /* return () */
```





```
value caml_update_ref(value r) {
 int y = rand(x);  <-- /* get a random integer */
 Store_field(r, 0, Val_int(y)); /* store the value in the block */
 return Val_int(0);
}
```

```
int x = Int_val(Field(r, 0)); /* read the first field of the input block */
                /* return () */
```



```
value caml_update_ref(value r) {
  int x = Int_val(Field(r, 0));  /* read the first field of the input block */
  int y = rand(x);  /* get a random integer */
  Store_field(r, 0, Val_int(y));<-- /* store the value in the block */
  return Val_int(0);  /* return () */
}</pre>
```



```
value caml_update_ref(value r) {
  int y = rand(x);
  return Val_int(0); <-- /* return () */</pre>
}
```

```
int x = Int_val(Field(r, 0)); /* read the first field of the input block */
                   /* get a random integer */
Store_field(r, 0, Val_int(y)); /* store the value in the block */
```



The OCaml FFI deals with two core challenges:

- mediating between the different views of the OCaml memory
- interacting with the OCaml GC

Example: swapping an OCaml pair

OCaml code: external swap_pair : 'a * 'b -> 'b * 'a = "caml_swap_pair"

Example: swapping an OCaml pair

```
external swap_pair : 'a * 'b -> 'b * 'a = "caml_swap_pair"
OCaml code:
Glue code:
                 value caml_swap_pair(value p)
                 ł
(first attempt)
                   value r = caml_alloc(0, 2); /* allocate a block for the result */
                   value x = Field(p, 0);  /* read the input pair */
                   value y = Field(p, 1);
                   Store_field(r, 0, y);  /* initialize the output pair */
                   Store_field(r, 1, x);
                                              /* return it */
                  return r;
```

Example: swapping an OCaml pair

```
external swap_pair : 'a * 'b -> 'b * 'a = "caml_swap_pair"
OCaml code:
Glue code:
                 value caml_swap_pair(value p)
                 ł
(first attempt)
                   value r = caml_alloc(0, 2); /* allocate a block for the result */
                   value x = Field(p, 0);  /* read the input pair */
                   value y = Field(p, 1);
                   Store_field(r, 0, y);  /* initialize the output pair */
                   Store_field(r, 1, x);
                                              /* return it */
                   return r;
```

This implementation is unfortunately **incorrect** and will silently corrupt memory!

caml_alloc may run the GC which does not know about C variables and arguments...

OCaml has a "tracing" garbage collector.

00

Starts from roots; collects unreachable blocks; may also move blocks in memory.

```
racines
                                                         tas
let x, y =
  let l = [1; 2; 3] in
                                                           3
  (List.filter even 1, List.tl 1)
                                                           2
```

Swapping pairs in the presence of a garbage collector

This implementation is unfortunately incorrect!



This implementation is unfortunately incorrect!

```
value caml_swap_pair(value p)
{
  value r = caml_alloc(0, 2); <--
  value x = Field(p, 0);
  value y = Field(p, 1);
  Store_field(r, 0, y);
  Store_field(r, 1, x);
  return r;
}</pre>
```



CAMLparam1(p) registers &p as a GC root.

The GC will avoid collecting the block, and will update p if the block moves.


```
value caml_swap_pair(value p)
{
    CAMLparam1(p); <--
    value r = caml_alloc(0, 2);
    value x = Field(p, 0);
    value y = Field(p, 1);
    Store_field(r, 0, y);
    Store_field(r, 1, x);
    return r;
}</pre>
```



```
value caml_swap_pair(value p)
{
    CAMLparam1(p);
    value r = caml_alloc(0, 2); <--
    value x = Field(p, 0);
    value y = Field(p, 1);
    Store_field(r, 0, y);
    Store_field(r, 1, x);
    return r;
}</pre>
```



```
value caml_swap_pair(value p)
{
    CAMLparam1(p);
    value r = caml_alloc(0, 2);
    value x = Field(p, 0); <--
    value y = Field(p, 1);
    Store_field(r, 0, y);
    Store_field(r, 1, x);
    return r;
}</pre>
```



```
value caml_swap_pair(value p)
{
    CAMLparam1(p);
    value r = caml_alloc(0, 2);
    value x = Field(p, 0);
    value y = Field(p, 1); <---
    Store_field(r, 0, y);
    Store_field(r, 1, x);
    return r;
}</pre>
```



```
value caml_swap_pair(value p)
{
    CAMLparam1(p);
    value r = caml_alloc(0, 2);
    value x = Field(p, 0);
    value y = Field(p, 1);
    Store_field(r, 0, y); <---
    Store_field(r, 1, x);
    return r;
}</pre>
```



```
value caml_swap_pair(value p)
{
    CAMLparam1(p);
    value r = caml_alloc(0, 2);
    value x = Field(p, 0);
    value y = Field(p, 1);
    Store_field(r, 0, y);
    Store_field(r, 1, x); <---
    return r;
}</pre>
```



Unregistering roots

One subtle **bug** remains!

```
value caml_swap_pair(value p)
{
    CAMLparam1(p);
    value r = caml_alloc(0, 2);
    value x = Field(p, 0);
    value y = Field(p, 1);
    Store_field(r, 0, y);
    Store_field(r, 1, x);
    return r;
}
```

Unregistering roots

One subtle **bug** remains!

```
value caml_swap_pair(value p)
{
    CAMLparam1(p);
    value r = caml_alloc(0, 2);
    value x = Field(p, 0);
    value y = Field(p, 1);
    Store_field(r, 0, y);
    Store_field(r, 1, x);
    return r;
}
```

The GC will *continue to update* &p after the function returns, corrupting the stack...! We must use **CAMLreturn()** to unregister local roots when returning.

Our final implementation for swap_pair

external swap_pair : 'a * 'b -> 'b * 'a = "caml_swap_pair"

```
value caml_swap_pair(value p)
{
    CAMLparam1(p);
    value r = caml_alloc(0, 2);
    value x = Field(p, 0);
    value y = Field(p, 1);
    Store_field(r, 0, y);
    Store_field(r, 1, x);
    CAMLreturn(r);
}
```

Outline: Language-local reasoning

1. Language-local program logics with external calls



Language-local reasoning

We reuse:



The one change: a minimal extension allowing external calls.

Modeling External Calls

```
external update_ref : int ref -> unit = "caml_update_ref"
let main () :=
    let r = ref 0 in
    update_ref r;
    print_int !r
```

Modeling External Calls

```
external update_ref : int ref -> unit = "caml_update_ref"
let main () :=
    let r = ref 0 in
    update_ref r;
    print_int !r
```

We model external calls as a new syntactic construct (inlining the declaration):

 $e \in Expr ::= \cdots \mid call fn \vec{e}$

Modeling External Calls

external update_ref : int ref -> unit = "caml_update_ref"
let main () :=
 let r = ref 0 in
 update_ref r;
 print_int !r

We model external calls as a new syntactic construct (inlining the declaration):

 $e \in Expr ::= \cdots \mid call fn \vec{e}$

We assign no semantics to external calls: they are simply stuck!

 $\forall \ell \; n. \; \{\ell \mapsto_{\scriptscriptstyle \mathrm{ML}} n\} \; \texttt{call caml_update_ref} \; [\ell] \; \{ \; V'. \; \exists m. \; V' = \langle \rangle * \ell \mapsto_{\scriptscriptstyle \mathrm{ML}} m \}_{\mathrm{ML}}$

 $\forall \ell \ n. \ \{\ell \mapsto_{\mathrm{ML}} n\} \texttt{ call caml_update_ref} \ [\ell] \ \{ \ V'. \ \exists m. \ V' = \langle \rangle \ast \ell \mapsto_{\mathrm{ML}} m \}_{\mathrm{ML}}$

" $\ell \mapsto_{\mathrm{ML}} V$ " is a Separation Logic assertion

- asserts that the memory location ℓ stores the value V
- grants the **permission** to access the location (read/write)

 $\forall \ell \ n. \ \{\ell \mapsto_{\scriptscriptstyle \mathrm{ML}} n\} \texttt{ call caml_update_ref} \ [\ell] \ \{ \ V'. \ \exists m. \ V' = \langle \rangle * \ell \mapsto_{\scriptscriptstyle \mathrm{ML}} m \}_{\mathrm{ML}}$

To do so, we introduce **interfaces** Ψ and Hoare triples $\{P\} e @ \Psi\{v, Q\}$ that verify programs against them. For example, for caml_update_ref, we assume:

 $\forall \ell \; n. \; \langle \ell \mapsto_{\scriptscriptstyle \mathrm{ML}} n \rangle \; \texttt{caml_update_ref} \; [\ell] \; \langle \mathit{V}'. \; \exists m. \; \mathit{V}' = \langle \rangle \ast \ell \mapsto_{\scriptscriptstyle \mathrm{ML}} m \rangle \quad \sqsubseteq \Psi$

 $\forall \ell \ n. \ \{\ell \mapsto_{\scriptscriptstyle \mathrm{ML}} n\} \texttt{ call caml_update_ref} \ [\ell] \ \{ \ V'. \ \exists m. \ V' = \langle \rangle * \ell \mapsto_{\scriptscriptstyle \mathrm{ML}} m \}_{\mathrm{ML}}$

To do so, we introduce **interfaces** Ψ and Hoare triples $\{P\} e @ \Psi\{v, Q\}$ that verify programs against them. For example, for caml_update_ref, we assume:

 $\forall \ell \ n. \ \langle \ell \mapsto_{\scriptscriptstyle \mathrm{ML}} n \rangle \ \texttt{caml_update_ref} \ [\ell] \ \langle V'. \ \exists m. \ V' = \langle \rangle \ast \ell \mapsto_{\scriptscriptstyle \mathrm{ML}} m \rangle \quad \sqsubseteq \Psi$

🕂 This is an assumption, not a Hoare triple 🕂

Desugaring To Predicate Transformers

Implement interface triples as a predicate transformer Ψ :



Implement interface triples as a predicate transformer $\Psi\colon$

 $\Psi: FnName \to [Val] \to (Val \to iProp) \to iProp$

"*iProp*" is the type of *Iris propositions*, which includes:

- quantifiers \forall, \exists, \dots and pure propositions
- Separation Logic modalities
- memory assertions of both languages $(\ell \mapsto_{ML} V, a \mapsto_{C} w)$
- specifications $\{P\} e @ \Psi \{Q\}$ of both languages

Desugaring To Predicate Transformers

Implement interface triples as a predicate transformer Ψ :



We desugar

Desugaring To Predicate Transformers

Implement interface triples as a predicate transformer Ψ :



We desugar

as follows:

$$egin{aligned} \Psi_{upd} \ fn \ ec{V} \ \Phi := \exists \ell n. \ \ell \mapsto_{ ext{ML}} n * fn = \texttt{caml_update_ref} * ec{V} = [\ell] \ & * (orall V'm. \ V' = \langle
angle * \ell \mapsto_{ ext{ML}} m - * \Phi(V')) \end{aligned}$$



We parameterize Hoare triples by Ψ (inspired by de Vilhena and Pottier [2021]):

" $\{P\}\,e\,@\,\Psi\,\{Q\}$ " means:

"Starting from a state satisfying P, e reduces to a value arriving in a state satisfying Q— either by normal reductions, or by making external calls that satisfy Ψ "



We parameterize Hoare triples by Ψ (inspired by de Vilhena and Pottier [2021]):

" $\{P\}\,e\,@\,\Psi\,\{Q\}$ " means:

"Starting from a state satisfying P, e reduces to a value arriving in a state satisfying Q— either by normal reductions, or by making external calls that satisfy Ψ "

Note: In a OCaml-and-C program (after linking), adequacy holds for $\Psi fn \ \vec{V} \Phi := \bot$

In Iris, we then define Hoare triples in terms of the operational semantics:

$$\begin{split} \{P\} e @ \Psi \{Q\} &:= & \Box \left(P \longrightarrow \mathsf{wp} e @ \Psi \{Q\}\right) \\ \mathsf{wp} e @ \Psi \{Q\} &:= & \begin{cases} Q(v) & e = v \\ \forall e', (e \rightarrow e') \Rightarrow \mathsf{wp} e' @ \Psi \{Q\} & e \text{ reducible} \\ \Psi fn \ \vec{V} \underbrace{\left(\lambda \ V'. \ \mathsf{wp} \ K[V'] @ \Psi \{Q\}\right)}_{\mathsf{Postcondition}} & e = K[\mathsf{call} fn \ \vec{V}] \end{split}$$

Outline: The OCaml FFI

- 1. Language-local program logics with external calls
- 2. Glue code and program logic for FFI



External Calls in Glue Code

In glue code we treat operations of the OCaml FFI as external functions.

```
value caml_update_ref(value r) {
    int x = Int_val (Field(r, 0));
    int y = rand(x);
    Store_field(r, 0, Val_int(y));
    return Val_int(0);
}
```

Glue code is verified using the program logic for C, but additionally **assuming an interface** Ψ_{FFI} for the OCaml FFI primitives, with resources e.g. $\gamma \mapsto_{\text{blk}[t|m]} \vec{v}$.

External Calls in Glue Code

In glue code we treat operations of the OCaml FFI as external functions.

```
value caml_update_ref(value r) {
    int x = Int_val (Field(r, 0));
    int y = rand(x);
    Store_field(r, 0, Val_int(y));
    return Val_int(0);
}
```

Glue code is verified using the program logic for C, but additionally **assuming an** interface Ψ_{FFI} for the OCaml FFI primitives, with resources e.g. $\gamma \mapsto_{\text{blk}[t|m]} \vec{v}$.

$$\begin{array}{l} \left\langle \mathsf{GC}(\theta) * \gamma \mapsto_{\mathsf{blk}[0|\mathsf{mut}]} \vec{v} * \gamma \sim^{\theta}_{\mathsf{C}} w * v' \sim^{\theta}_{\mathsf{C}} w' \right\rangle \\ \mathbf{Store_field}(w, i, w') & \sqsubseteq \Psi_{\mathrm{FFI}} \\ \left\langle \mathsf{GC}(\theta) * \gamma \mapsto_{\mathsf{blk}[0|\mathsf{mut}]} \vec{v}[i := v'] \right\rangle \end{array}$$

External Calls in Glue Code

In glue code we treat operations of the OCaml FFI as external functions.

```
value caml_update_ref(value r) {
    int x = Int_val (Field(r, 0));
    int y = rand(x);
    Store_field(r, 0, Val_int(y));
    return Val_int(0);
}
```

$$\begin{split} \big\{ \mathsf{GC}(\theta) * \gamma &\mapsto_{\mathsf{blk}[0|\mathsf{mut}]} [n] * \gamma \sim^{\theta}_{\mathsf{C}} w \big\} \\ \texttt{call caml_update_ref} [w] @ \Psi_{\mathsf{FFI}} \\ \big\{ w'. \exists m. \ \mathsf{GC}(\theta) * \gamma &\mapsto_{\mathsf{blk}[0|\mathsf{mut}]} [m] * w' \sim^{\theta}_{\mathsf{C}} 0 \big\} \end{split}$$

Glue code is verified using the program logic for C, but additionally **assuming an** interface Ψ_{FFI} for the OCaml FFI primitives, with resources e.g. $\gamma \mapsto_{\text{blk}[t|m]} \vec{v}$.

$$\begin{array}{l} \left\langle \mathsf{GC}(\theta) * \gamma \mapsto_{\mathsf{blk}[0|\mathsf{mut}]} \vec{v} * \gamma \sim^{\theta}_{\mathsf{C}} w * v' \sim^{\theta}_{\mathsf{C}} w' \right\rangle \\ \mathbf{Store_field}(w, i, w') & \sqsubseteq \Psi_{\mathrm{FFI}} \\ \left\langle \mathsf{GC}(\theta) * \gamma \mapsto_{\mathsf{blk}[0|\mathsf{mut}]} \vec{v}[i := v'] \right\rangle \end{array}$$

Outline: The OCaml-FFI boundary

- 1. Language-local program logics with external calls
- 2. Glue code and program logic for FFI
- 3. Focus: the OCaml-FFI boundary



We assumed an interface for caml_update_ref that uses ML points-tos:

$$\forall \ell n. \ \langle \ell \mapsto_{\mathrm{ML}} n \rangle \ \mathtt{caml_update_ref} \ [\ell] \ \langle \textit{V'}. \ \exists m. \ \textit{V'} = \langle \rangle \ast \ell \mapsto_{\mathrm{ML}} m \rangle$$

Meanwhile, we proved the following specification for caml_update_ref using $\Psi_{\rm FFI}$:

$$\begin{split} \left\{ \mathsf{GC}(\theta) * \gamma \mapsto_{\mathsf{blk}[0|\mathsf{mut}]} [n] * \gamma \sim^{\theta}_{\mathsf{C}} w \right\} \\ \texttt{call caml_update_ref} [w] @ \Psi_{\mathrm{FFI}} \\ \left\{ w'. \exists m. \ \mathsf{GC}(\theta) * w' \sim^{\theta}_{\mathsf{C}} 0 * \gamma \mapsto_{\mathsf{blk}[0|\mathsf{mut}]} [m] \right\} \end{split}$$

These express two different views about the same piece of state!

Idea:

- make $\ell \mapsto_{ML} \vec{V}$ and $\gamma \mapsto_{blk[0|mut]} \vec{v}$ mutually exclusive (for related ℓ and γ)
- have view reconciliation rules to switch between the two representations

$$\mathsf{GC}(\theta) * \boldsymbol{\ell} \mapsto_{\mathsf{ML}} \vec{\boldsymbol{V}} \cong \exists \vec{v}, \gamma, \mathsf{GC}(\theta) * \gamma \mapsto_{\mathsf{blk}[0|\mathsf{mut}]} \vec{v} * \boldsymbol{\ell} \sim_{\mathsf{ML}} \gamma * \vec{\boldsymbol{V}} \sim_{\mathsf{ML}} \vec{v}$$
(ML-TO-FFI)
$$\mathsf{GC}(\theta) * \gamma \mapsto_{\mathsf{blk}[0|\mathsf{mut}]} \vec{v} * \vec{\boldsymbol{V}} \sim_{\mathsf{ML}} \vec{v} \cong \exists \boldsymbol{\ell}, \mathsf{GC}(\theta) * \boldsymbol{\ell} \mapsto_{\mathsf{ML}} \vec{\boldsymbol{V}} * \boldsymbol{\ell} \sim_{\mathsf{ML}} \gamma$$
(FFI-TO-ML)

Challenge: proving that the view reconciliation rules are sound is hard!

Challenge: **proving** that the view reconciliation rules are sound is hard!

The standard workflow in Iris:

- have Separation Logic memory assertions $(\ell \mapsto_{\text{ML}} V)$
- have the state of the operational semantics (finite map: Location \rightarrow Value)
- relate the two ("state interpretation"). Often straightforward...

Challenge: proving that the view reconciliation rules are sound is hard!

- in the **program logic**, we can hold a mix of $\ell \mapsto_{ML} \vec{V}$ and $\gamma \mapsto_{blk[0|mut]} \vec{v}$
- the operational semantics has only one simultaneous view of the OCaml state

How can we relate the assertions and the operational semantics state?

View Reconciliation: Challenge (2)

In the operational semantics, there is only one simultaneous view of the OCaml state.


View Reconciliation: Challenge (2) and Solution

In the program logic: what happens to OCaml points-to?



View Reconciliation: Challenge (2) and Solution

In the program logic: what happens to OCaml points-to?

Solution: track both views of the state in the program logic





Quiz Time: What are the OCaml values of x, b, and y?

let x	=	1
let b	=	true
let y	=	(1, 2)

x b y





High-level representation is not unique!



High-level representation is not unique!

How does Operational Semantics choose the right value when switching to ML values?

We use angelic nondeterminism, based on multi-relations (see DimSum, CCR)!

We use angelic nondeterminism, based on multi-relations (see DimSum, CCR)!

$$\begin{split} & \text{wp } e \{\Phi\} : = \cdots \lor \left(e \text{ reducible } * \forall e'. e \to e' \longrightarrow \text{wp } e' \{\Phi\}\right) & \text{usual Iris} \\ & \text{wp } e \{\Phi\} : = \cdots \lor \left(\exists X. e \twoheadrightarrow X * \forall e'. e' \in X \longrightarrow \text{wp } e' \{\Phi\}\right) & \text{multi-relations} \end{split}$$

Regular C and ML, not having angelic non-determinism, retain usual SOS

We use angelic nondeterminism, based on multi-relations (see DimSum, CCR)!

$$\begin{split} & \text{wp } e \{\Phi\} : = \cdots \lor \left(e \text{ reducible } * \forall e'. e \to e' \longrightarrow \text{wp } e' \{\Phi\}\right) & \text{usual Iris} \\ & \text{wp } e \{\Phi\} : = \cdots \lor \left(\exists X. e \twoheadrightarrow X * \forall e'. e' \in X \longrightarrow \text{wp } e' \{\Phi\}\right) & \text{multi-relations} \end{split}$$

Regular C and ML, not having angelic non-determinism, retain usual SOS

For adequacy, existential needs to be extracted \Rightarrow transfinite Iris

Contribution: An Iris for toy C+ML+FFI, emphasizing language-local reasoning.

Contribution: An Iris for toy C+ML+FFI, emphasizing language-local reasoning.

We give a **general recipe** for merging two languages:

- 1. Abstract over "the other side" using interfaces and external calls
- 2. Formalize the semantics of the FFI (memory model and primitives)
- 3. Bridge between memory models using view reconciliation

Contribution: An Iris for toy C+ML+FFI, emphasizing language-local reasoning.

We give a **general recipe** for merging two languages:

- 1. Abstract over "the other side" using interfaces and external calls
- 2. Formalize the semantics of the FFI (memory model and primitives)
- 3. Bridge between memory models using view reconciliation

More in the paper: https://melocoton-project.github.io

- more detailed FFI: callbacks, custom blocks, GC interaction
- logical relation for semantic typing of external functions

bonus slides



The FFI wrapper

The Linker

- Convert ML values to block-level
- Provide FFI: a C calling convention for ML
- Link programs using the same calling convention
- Resolve external calls



A *permission* describes the right to access some resources or memory:

 $GC(\alpha)$: permission to use C functions of the FFI $\rightarrow \alpha$: an abstract name that identifies **a specific layout** of the GC memory.

(α changes when the GC moves or deallocates block)

 $\gamma \mapsto_{blk[0|imm]} [x; y; ...]$: permission to access a block in the GC memory $\rightarrow \gamma$: abstract **label** of the block

 \rightarrow [x; y; ...]: contents of the block

 $\&p \mapsto_{C} p0$: permission to access the C variable p $\rightarrow p0$: current value of the variable









 $\begin{array}{l} \langle \mathsf{GC}(\alpha) \ast \& p \mapsto_{\mathrm{C}} \mathsf{p0} \ast \mathrm{blkaddr}(\alpha, \gamma) = \mathsf{p0} \rangle \\ \\ \mathsf{CAMLparam1}(p) \\ \langle \mathsf{GC}(\alpha) \ast \& p \mapsto_{\mathrm{root}} \gamma \rangle \end{array}$



$$\begin{split} & \langle \mathsf{GC}(\alpha) \ast \& p \mapsto_{\mathbf{C}} \mathtt{p0} \ast \mathrm{blkaddr}(\alpha, \gamma) = \mathtt{p0} \rangle \\ & \mathsf{CAMLparam1}(p) \\ & \langle \mathsf{GC}(\alpha) \ast \& p \mapsto_{\mathrm{root}} \gamma \rangle \end{split}$$



 $\begin{aligned} \langle \mathsf{GC}(\alpha) \rangle \\ & \mathsf{caml_alloc}(0, n) \\ \langle \mathtt{r}. \exists \beta. \operatorname{blkaddr}(\beta, \delta) = \mathtt{r} * \mathsf{GC}(\beta) * \delta \mapsto_{\operatorname{blk}[0|\mathsf{imm}]} [?; ...; ?] \rangle \end{aligned}$



$$\begin{split} \langle \mathsf{GC}(\alpha) \rangle \\ & \mathsf{caml_alloc}(0,n) \\ \big\langle \mathbf{r}. \ \exists \beta. \ \mathrm{blkaddr}(\beta,\delta) = \mathbf{r} * \mathsf{GC}(\beta) * \delta \mapsto_{\mathrm{blk}[0|\mathsf{imm}]} [?;...;?] \big\rangle \end{split}$$



Rule for reading a root &p

 $\begin{array}{l} \langle \mathsf{GC}(\beta) \ast \& p \mapsto_{\mathrm{root}} \gamma \rangle & \ast(\& p) \\ \langle \mathtt{p1}. \, \mathrm{blkaddr}(\beta, \gamma) = \mathtt{p1} \ast \mathsf{GC}(\beta), \& p \mapsto_{\mathrm{root}} \gamma \rangle \end{array}$



$$\begin{array}{l} \left\langle \mathsf{GC}(\beta) * \gamma \mapsto_{\mathsf{blk}[0|\mathsf{imm}]} [..; v_i; ...] * \mathsf{blkaddr}(\beta, \gamma) = \mathsf{p} \right\rangle \\ \\ \mathsf{Field}(\mathsf{p}, i) \\ \left\langle v_i. \ \mathsf{GC}(\beta), \gamma \mapsto_{\mathsf{blk}[0|\mathsf{imm}]} [..; v_i; ...] \right\rangle \end{array}$$



$$\begin{split} &\left\langle \mathsf{GC}(\beta) * \gamma \mapsto_{\mathrm{blk}[0|\mathrm{imm}]} [..; v_i; ...] * \mathrm{blkaddr}(\beta, \gamma) = \mathsf{p} \\ & \mathsf{Field}(\mathsf{p}, i) \\ &\left\langle v_i. \ \mathsf{GC}(\beta), \gamma \mapsto_{\mathrm{blk}[0|\mathrm{imm}]} [..; v_i; ...] \right\rangle \end{split}$$



$$\begin{array}{l} \left\langle \mathsf{GC}(\beta) \ast \delta \mapsto_{\mathrm{blk}[0|\mathrm{imm}]} [..;v_i;...] \ast \mathrm{blkaddr}(\beta,\delta) = \mathtt{r} \right\rangle \\ & \mathsf{Store_field}(\mathtt{r},i,v) \\ \left\langle \mathsf{GC}(\beta) \ast \delta \mapsto_{\mathrm{blk}[0|\mathrm{imm}]} [..;v;...] \right\rangle \end{array}$$



$$\begin{split} &\left\langle \mathsf{GC}(\beta) \ast \delta \mapsto_{\mathrm{blk}[0|\mathrm{imm}]} [..;v_i;...] \ast \mathrm{blkaddr}(\beta,\delta) = \mathbf{r} \right\rangle \\ & \operatorname{Store_field}(\mathbf{r},i,v) \\ &\left\langle \mathsf{GC}(\beta) \ast \delta \mapsto_{\mathrm{blk}[0|\mathrm{imm}]} [..;v;...] \right\rangle \end{split}$$



 $\begin{array}{l} \langle \mathsf{GC}(\beta) \ast \& p \mapsto_{\mathrm{root}} \gamma \rangle \\ \\ \mathsf{CAMLreturn}(\mathbf{r}) \\ \langle \mathsf{GC}(\beta) \ast \& p \mapsto_{\mathrm{C}} \mathrm{blkaddr}(\beta, \gamma) \rangle \end{array}$