Proving the Correctness of Fractional Permissions for a Java-like Kernel Language

John Boyland, <u>Chao Sun</u> University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee

FOOL 2011

Summary

- Soundness proof for permission type system
 - I. Based on a Java-like kernel language;
 - 2. Machine-checked using <u>Twelf</u>.
- Soundness proof for a non-null type system
 - I. Reducing to fractional permissions;
 - 2. Reusing the existing proof for the first.

Fractional Permissions

- A system for managing access to <u>mutable</u> states;
- Each field is associated with a permission, represents its accessibility to the object;
- <u>Nesting</u> is used to model object invariants and ownership.

Basic Permission

- Basic permission : $o.f \rightarrow o'$
 - Represents full access (read and write) to the field f of object o;
 - Gives additional information that points to another object o';
 - Linear: cannot be duplicated.

Formula

- Represents facts that remain true;
- Non-linear;
 - can be duplicated and discarded.
- Most noticeable one: $\Pi \prec o.f$

 $\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Node}(r) &= (\exists i \cdot r. \operatorname{data} \to i) \prec r. \operatorname{All} \land \\ (\exists n \cdot r. \operatorname{next} \to n + \\ n &= 0 ? \emptyset : n. \operatorname{All} \to 0 + \operatorname{Node}(n)) \prec r. \operatorname{All} \end{aligned}$



Other Permissions existential $Node(r) = (\exists i \cdot r. data \rightarrow i) \prec r. All \land$ $(\exists n \cdot r.\text{next} \rightarrow n +$ $n = 0? \emptyset : n.All \to 0 + Node(n)) \prec r.All$



Sunday, October 23, 2011



Node $(r) = (\exists i \cdot r. \text{data} \rightarrow i) \prec r. \text{All} \land$ $(\exists n \cdot r. \text{next} \rightarrow n +$ $n = 0 ? \emptyset : n. \text{All} \rightarrow 0 + \text{Node}(n)) \checkmark r. \text{All}$ nesting

Node $(r) = (\exists i \cdot r. \text{data} \rightarrow i) \prec r. \text{All}$ $(\exists n \cdot r. \text{next} \rightarrow n + n = 0? \emptyset : n. \text{All} \rightarrow 0 + \text{Node}(n)) \prec r. \text{All}$

Node
$$(r) = (\exists i \cdot r. \text{data} \rightarrow i) \prec r. \text{All}$$

 $(\exists n \cdot r. \text{next} \rightarrow n + n = 0? \emptyset : (n. \text{All} \rightarrow 0) + \text{Node}(n)) \prec r. \text{All}$

Node
$$(r) = (\exists i \cdot r. \text{data} \rightarrow i) \prec r. \text{All} \land$$

 $(\exists n \cdot r. \text{next} \rightarrow n + n + n = 0? \emptyset : n. \text{All} \rightarrow 0 + \text{Node}(n)) \prec r. \text{All}$

 $(\exists r \cdot (o.f \rightarrow r + (r = 0? \emptyset : r.All))) \prec o.All$ + $o.All \rightarrow 0$



$(\exists r \cdot (o.f \rightarrow r + (r = 0? \emptyset : r.All))) \prec o.All + o.All \rightarrow 0$







Sunday, October 23, 2011





Kernel Language

$$e :::= o | x | new C(\overline{f}) | e.f | e.f:=e$$

| let x=e in e | while c do e
| if c then e else e | m(\overline{e})
c :::= true | not c | c and c | e == e
d ::= m(\overline{x}) = e
g ::= d;...;d

$$(e;\mu) \rightarrow_g (e';\mu')$$

concurrency is omitted here

Permission Type

Procedure type $\alpha ::= \forall_{\Delta} \Pi \to \exists_{\Delta'} \Pi'$ Program type $\omega ::= \{\overline{m \mapsto \alpha}\}$ Type Judgment $\Delta; \Pi \vdash_{\omega} e \Downarrow \rho \dashv \Delta'; \Pi'$

P-Write writable **P-WRITE** $\Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1 \Downarrow \rho_1 \dashv \Delta_2; \Pi_2 /$ $\Delta_2; \Pi_2 \vdash_{\omega} e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi'$ $\Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1.f = e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \to \rho_2 + \Pi'$ value updated

Consistency

- Between Fractional Permissions and Memory
 - I. Evaluation depends on memory;
 - 2. Type checking depends on permission;
 - 3. Fractional heaps connect the two.

 $h: (O \times F) \to (\mathbb{Q}^+ \times O)$

Consistency

$$\forall_{(o,f)\mapsto(q,o')\in h} \ \mu \ o \ f = o'$$
$$\Pi' = \sum \{ \Pi_{o,f} \mid (o,f) \mapsto \Pi_{o,f} \in N, \mu \ o \ f \ \text{undefined} \}$$
$$h \models_N \Pi + \Pi'$$

 Π consistent with μ using N

How to Prove?

- Standard approach:
 - I. Define syntax and semantics;
 - 2. Define type system;
 - 3. Define consistency;
 - 4. Prove progress/preservation.
- All checked in Twelf

Piggy-backing Proof

- Prove soundness of one type system by reducing to another (more powerful) one;
- Reuse machine-checked proof.
- No dynamic semantics;
- No progress/preservation needed.

Non-null Type

- Same kernel language;
- Reference type is augmented to be either not-null or possibly-null;
- No restriction on reference access
 - i.e., every reference is owned by "world"
- Constructor is restricted to avoid leakage of this reference.

Not-Null

NOTNULL $E(x) = c^+$ $C; M; E, x: c^- \vdash e_1: c'$ $C; M; E \vdash e_2: c'$ $\overline{C; M; E \vdash if not x == 0 then e_1 else e_2: c'}$

Not-Null



Not-Null

NOTNULL

$$E(x) = c^+$$

 $C; M; E x : c^- \vdash e_1 : c' \quad C; M; E \vdash e_2 : c'$
 $C; M; E \vdash \text{if not } x ==0 \text{ then } e_1 \text{ else } e_2 : c'$

$$\begin{array}{l} C::=\epsilon \mid C,c:F\\ M::=\epsilon \mid M,m:(c_1,\ldots,c_n) \rightarrow c\\ F::=\epsilon \mid F,f:c\\ E::=\epsilon \mid E,x:c \end{array}$$

Not-Null possibly null NOTNULL $E(x) = c^+$ $C; M; E, x : c^{-} \vdash e_{1} : c'$ $C; M; E \vdash e_{2} : c'$ $C; M; E \vdash \text{if not } x == 0 \text{ then } e_1 \text{ else } e_2 : c'$

$$\begin{array}{l} C::=\epsilon \mid C,c:F\\ M:=\epsilon \mid M,m:(c_1,\ldots,c_n) \rightarrow c\\ F::=\epsilon \mid F,f:c\\ E::=\epsilon \mid E,x:c \end{array}$$



$$\begin{array}{l} C::=\epsilon \mid C,c:F\\ M::=\epsilon \mid M,m:(c_1,\ldots,c_n) \rightarrow c\\ F::=\epsilon \mid F,f:c\\ E::=\epsilon \mid E,x:c \end{array}$$

Converting Class

For a class c with with fields f_1, \ldots, f_n : $p(o) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\exists r_1 \cdot (o.f_1 \rightarrow r_1 + \Pi_1) + \dots + \exists r_n \cdot (o.f_n \rightarrow r_n + \Pi_n)) \prec 0.0 \text{ wned}$ $\dots + \exists r_n \cdot (o.f_n \rightarrow r_n + \Pi_n)) \prec 0.0 \text{ wned}$ where

$$\Pi_i = \begin{cases} \neg(r_i = 0) + p_i(r_i) & r_i \text{ not null} \\ \neg(r_i = 0) ? p_i(r_i) : \emptyset & r_i \text{ possibly null} \end{cases}$$

Converting Method

Lemma

For every e in the kernel language, if it has type t in non-null system under C, M, and E, then after converting these to ω and Π , e is also well-typed under permission system. In addition, the output permission is $\Pi + \Pi_t$, where Π_t is the permission converted from t.

 $\begin{array}{l} \text{NN-WRITE} \\ C; M; E \vdash e_1 : c_1^- \\ \hline C; M; E \vdash e_2 : c_2 \qquad C(c_1)(f) = c_2 \\ \hline C; M; E \vdash e_1 . f = e_2 : c_2 \end{array}$

P-WRITE $\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1} \Downarrow \rho_{1} \dashv \Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2}$ $\Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2} \vdash_{\omega} e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi'$ $\overline{\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1}.f = e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho_{2} + \Pi'}$

NN-WRITE $C; M; E \vdash e_1 : c_1^ C; M; E \vdash e_2 : c_2 \qquad C(c_1)(f) = c_2$ $C; M; E \vdash e_1 \cdot f = e_2 : c_2$ **P-WRITE** $\Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1 \Downarrow \rho_1 \dashv \Delta_2; \Pi_2$ $\Delta_2; \Pi_2 \vdash_{\omega} e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi'$ $\Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash \omega e_1 \cdot f = e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1 \cdot f \to \rho_2 + \Pi'$





 $\begin{array}{l} \text{WRITE} \\ C; M; E \vdash e_1 : c_1^- & C; M; E \vdash e_2 : c_2 \\ \hline C(c_1)(f) = c_2 \\ \hline C; M; E \vdash e_1 . f = e_2 : c_2 \\ & \text{assuming } e_2 \text{ is} \\ & \text{not null and } f \\ \hline \text{is annotated as not null} \end{array}$

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{WRITE} \\ C; M; E \vdash e_1: c_1^- \\ C(c_1)(f) = c_2 \\ \hline \\ C; M; E \vdash e_1. f = e_2: c_2 \\ assuming e_2 \text{ is} \\ not null and f \\ f \\ n(\rho_1 = 0) + p_1(\rho_1) + \Pi_1 \end{array}$



$$\begin{array}{c} \neg(\rho_{1}=0) + p_{1}(\rho_{1}) + \neg(\rho_{2}=0) + p_{2}(\rho_{2}) + \Pi_{1} \\ \\ & \Pi_{1} = \Pi_{1}' + 0. \text{Owned} \rightarrow 0 \\ \\ \hline \exists \rho' \cdot (\rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi_{f}) + \\ \exists \rho' \cdot (\rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi_{f}) \rightarrow 0. \text{Owned} + \\ \neg(\rho_{1}=0) + p_{1}(\rho_{1}) + \neg(\rho_{2}=0) + p_{2}(\rho_{2}) + \Pi_{1}' \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{P-WRITE} \\ \Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1 \Downarrow \rho_1 \dashv \Delta_2; \Pi_2 \\ \Delta_2; \Pi_2 \vdash_{\omega} e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi' \\ \hline \Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1.f = e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \rightarrow \rho_2 + \Pi' \end{array}$$

$$\exists \rho' \cdot (\rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi_f) + \\ \exists \rho' \cdot (\rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi_f) \longrightarrow 0. \text{Owned} + \\ \neg (\rho_1 = 0) + p_1(\rho_1) + \neg (\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \Pi'_1$$

P-WRITE

$$\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1} \Downarrow \rho_{1} \dashv \Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2}$$

$$\Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2} \vdash_{\omega} e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi'$$

$$\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1}.f = e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho_{2} + \Pi'$$

$$\rho_{1}.f \to \rho_{r} + \Pi_{r} + \\ \exists \rho' \cdot (\rho_{1}.f \to \rho' + \Pi_{f}) \longrightarrow 0. \text{Owned} + \\ \neg (\rho_{1} = 0) + p_{1}(\rho_{1}) + \neg (\rho_{2} = 0) + p_{2}(\rho_{2}) + \Pi'_{1}$$

P-WRITE

$$\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1} \Downarrow \rho_{1} \dashv \Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2}$$

$$\Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2} \vdash_{\omega} e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi'$$

$$\overline{\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1}.f = e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho_{2} + \Pi'}$$

$$\rho_{1}.f \to \rho_{2} + \Pi_{\rho} + \\ \exists \rho' \cdot (\rho_{1}.f \to \rho' + \Pi_{f}) \longrightarrow 0. \text{Owned} + \\ \neg (\rho_{1} = 0) + p_{1}(\rho_{1}) + \neg (\rho_{2} = 0) + p_{2}(\rho_{2}) + \Pi_{1}'$$

P-WRITE

$$\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1} \Downarrow \rho_{1} \dashv \Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2}$$

$$\Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2} \vdash_{\omega} e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi'$$

$$\overline{\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1}.f = e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho_{2} + \Pi'}$$

$$\begin{split} \rho_1.f &\to \rho_2 + \Pi_\rho + \\ \exists \rho' \cdot (\rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi_f) \longrightarrow 0. \text{Owned} + \\ \neg(\rho_1 = 0) + p_1(\rho_1) + \neg(\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \Pi_1' \end{split}$$

$$\end{split}$$

P-WRITE

$$\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1} \Downarrow \rho_{1} \dashv \Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2}$$

$$\Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2} \vdash_{\omega} e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi'$$

$$\overline{\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1}.f = e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho_{2} + \Pi'}$$

$$\begin{split} \rho_1.f \to \rho_2 + \Pi_\rho + \neg(\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \\ \exists \rho' \cdot (\rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi_f) \longrightarrow 0. \\ \text{Owned} + \\ \neg(\rho_1 = 0) + p_1(\rho_1) + \neg(\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \Pi_1' \\ \end{split}$$

P-WRITE

$$\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1} \Downarrow \rho_{1} \dashv \Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2}$$

$$\Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2} \vdash_{\omega} e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi'$$

$$\overline{\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1}.f = e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho_{2} + \Pi'}$$

$$\begin{split} \rho_1.f \to \rho_2 + \Pi_\rho + \neg(\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \\ \exists \rho' \cdot (\rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi_f) &\longrightarrow 0. \text{Owned} + \\ \neg(\rho_1 = 0) + p_1(\rho_1) + \neg(\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \Pi'_1 \end{split}$$

discarded

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{P-WRITE} \\ \Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1 \Downarrow \rho_1 \dashv \Delta_2; \Pi_2 \\ \Delta_2; \Pi_2 \vdash_{\omega} e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi' \\ \hline \Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1.f = e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \rightarrow \rho_2 + \Pi' \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c|c} \rho_1.f \to \rho_2 + \Pi_{\rho} + \neg(\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + & & \\ \exists \rho' \cdot (\rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi_f) \longrightarrow 0. \\ & & \neg(\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \Pi'_1 \end{array}$$

P-WRITE $\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1} \Downarrow \rho_{1} \dashv \Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2}$ $\Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2} \vdash_{\omega} e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi'$ $\overline{\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1}.f = e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho_{2} + \Pi'}$

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \rho' \cdot (\rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi_f) + \\ \exists \rho' \cdot (\rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi_f) &\longrightarrow 0. \text{Owned } + \\ \neg (\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \Pi_1' \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{P-WRITE} \\ \Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1 \Downarrow \rho_1 \dashv \Delta_2; \Pi_2 \\ \Delta_2; \Pi_2 \vdash_{\omega} e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi' \\ \hline \Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1.f = e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \rightarrow \rho_2 + \Pi' \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \rho' \cdot (\rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi_f) + \\ \exists \rho' \cdot (\rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi_f) & \rightarrow 0. \\ \neg(\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \Pi'_1 \end{aligned} \\ \end{aligned}$$

P-WRITE $\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1} \Downarrow \rho_{1} \dashv \Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2}$ $\Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2} \vdash_{\omega} e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi'$ $\overline{\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1}.f = e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho_{2} + \Pi'}$

> 0.0wned $\to 0 +$ $\neg(\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \Pi'_1$

P-WRITE $\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1} \Downarrow \rho_{1} \dashv \Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2}$ $\Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2} \vdash_{\omega} e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi'$ $\overline{\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1}.f = e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho_{2} + \Pi'}$

$$0.0 \text{wned} \to 0 +$$

 $\neg(\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \Pi'_1$

P-WRITE $\Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1 \Downarrow \rho_1 \dashv \Delta_2; \Pi_2$ $\Delta_2; \Pi_2 \vdash_{\omega} e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi'$ $\Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1.f = e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \to \rho_2 + \Pi'$ $0.0 \text{wned} \rightarrow 0$ $\neg(\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \Pi_1'$

P-WRITE $\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1} \Downarrow \rho_{1} \dashv \Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2}$ $\Delta_{2}; \Pi_{2} \vdash_{\omega} e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho' + \Pi'$ $\overline{\Delta_{1}; \Pi_{1} \vdash_{\omega} e_{1}.f = e_{2} \Downarrow \rho_{2} \dashv \Delta'; \rho_{1}.f \rightarrow \rho_{2} + \Pi'}$

$$\neg(\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \Pi_1$$

P-WRITE $\Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1 \Downarrow \rho_1 \dashv \Delta_2; \Pi_2$ $\Delta_2; \Pi_2 \vdash_{\omega} e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi'$ $\Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1.f = e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \to \rho_2 + \Pi'$ NN-WRITE $C; M; E \vdash e_1 : c_1^ C; M; E \vdash e_2 : c_2 \qquad C(c_1)(f) = c_2$ $C; M; E \vdash e_1 \cdot f = e_2 : c_2$ $\neg(\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \Pi_1$

P-WRITE $\Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1 \Downarrow \rho_1 \dashv \Delta_2; \Pi_2$ $\Delta_2; \Pi_2 \vdash_{\omega} e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \to \rho' + \Pi'$ $\Delta_1; \Pi_1 \vdash_{\omega} e_1.f = e_2 \Downarrow \rho_2 \dashv \Delta'; \rho_1.f \to \rho_2 + \Pi'$ NN-WRITE $C; M; E \vdash e_1 : c_1^ C; M; E \vdash e_2 : c_2 \qquad C(c_1)(f) = c_2$ $C; M; E \vdash e_1 \cdot f = e_2 : c_2$ $\neg(\rho_2 = 0) + p_2(\rho_2) + \Pi_1$



Soundness

For every program g in kernel language, if g can be type checked under the non-null system, with consistent environments C and M, then with converted program type ω , g can also be type checked under the permission system.

How to Prove?

• Piggy-back approach:

- I. Define type system;
- 2. Convert classes and methods;
- 3. Prove the lemma and theorem.
- All checked in Twelf.

Conclusion

- I. Fractional permissions with nesting is sound for a Java-like kernel language;
- 2. Fractional permissions can serve as a basis to prove soundness of other type systems;
- 3. Machine-checked proof has its benefits.

Thanks!