



# The MetaCoq Project

Matthieu Sozeau,  $\pi.r^2$ , Inria Paris & IRIF

j.w.w. A. Anand (Cornell), S. Boulier, N. Tabareau and T.  
Winterhalter (Gallinette) and C. Cohen (Marelle)

VALS Seminar

October 26th 2018

LRI, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

# The MetaCoq Project Goals

Meta-programming support for Coq ([Anand et al., 2018](#)):

- 1 **Reification and denotation** of terms (Template-Coq)
- 2 **Monadic** interpreter for scripting vernacular commands
- 3 **Specification** of Coq's typing and operational semantics
- 4 **Correctness proof** of a functional type-checker for Coq

This is all work-in-progress!

Hopefully tractable enough to eventually prove:

- ▶ A verified unification algorithm
- ▶ A verified refiner
- ▶ A verified tactic language

It already provides enough expressivity **inside Coq** for correctness proofs of metaprograms such as:

- ▶ The CertiCoq compiler ([Anand et al., 2017](#))
- ▶ Parametricity, forcing translations ([Boulier et al., 2017](#))
- ▶ An extensional-to-intensional type theory translation ([Winterhalter et al., 2018](#))

- ▶ Started as an extension of Template-Coq by Malecha.  
Malecha and Bengtson (2016) studied fully reflective tactics in Coq for the System F fragment.

- ▶ Started as an extension of Template-Coq by Malecha. Malecha and Bengtson (2016) studied fully reflective tactics in Coq for the System F fragment.
- ▶ MTac/MTac2 (Ziliani et al., 2015):  
A **typed** metaprogramming environment geared towards writing typed **tactics**.

- ▶ Started as an extension of Template-Coq by Malecha.  
Malecha and Bengtson (2016) studied fully reflective tactics in Coq for the System F fragment.
- ▶ MTac/MTac2 (Ziliani et al., 2015):  
A **typed** metaprogramming environment geared towards writing typed **tactics**.
- ▶ Coq in Coq (Barras, 1999):  
Metatheoretical proofs for a **model** of Coq, rather than the current **implementation**.  
⇒ Hope for reuse

- ▶ Started as an extension of Template-Coq by Malecha. Malecha and Bengtson (2016) studied fully reflective tactics in Coq for the System F fragment.
- ▶ MTac/MTac2 (Ziliani et al., 2015): A typed metaprogramming environment geared towards writing typed tactics.
- ▶ Coq in Coq (Barras, 1999): Metatheoretical proofs for a model of Coq, rather than the current implementation.  
⇒ Hope for reuse
- ▶ Idris, Agda and Lean have similar meta-programming frameworks.

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Reification and denotation: Template-Coq
  - Core language reification
  - Reifying commands: The Template Monad
- 3 Specifying Coq: Typing and the Checker
- 4 The calculus behind Coq: PCUIC
  - Formalizing an Extraction procedure
- 5 Applications
  - CertiCoq
  - Extensional to Intensional Type Theory revisited
- 6 Conclusion



- ▶ Initially developed by G. Malecha
- ▶ Quoting and unquoting of terms and declarations:  
Quote Definition `quoted_t : Ast.t := t.`  
Make Definition `denoted_t := quoted_t.`
- ▶ Ideally **faithful** representation of COQ terms
- ▶ Differences: Strings for `global_reference` and lists instead of arrays. But native integers and arrays are coming soon to Coq.

- ▶ Coq data structures: [Ast](#)
- ▶ [Demonstration](#)

- ▶ Terms using de Bruijn indices, with all constructors including Case, Fix, CoFix and polymorphic universes.
- ▶ Data structures to push definitions and inductive declarations to the kernel and retrieve information about constants and inductives from the kernel.
- ▶ **Missing:** the module system.

We need a way to communicate with the kernel, e.g. to add new definitions etc. Instead of special purpose commands we use a general monad.

- ▶ Coq data structures: [TemplateMonad](#)
- ▶ **Demonstration**

# The Template Monad

- ▶ Allows to crawl the environment and modify it.
- ▶ Different from MTac's monad (shallow vs. deep embedding)
- ▶ **WIP**: extracted version for compilation of plugins to OCaml
- ▶ Could be used to justify MTac2 programs and run them without oracles.

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Reification and denotation: Template-Coq
- 3 Specifying Coq: Typing and the Checker**
- 4 The calculus behind Coq: PCUIC
- 5 Applications
- 6 Conclusion

## Typing

- ▶ Inductive specifications of typing, conversion and reduction on terms.
- ▶ Includes global environments and universes. An enhanced elimination principle transfers properties to local and global environments, defined using a measure on derivations.
- ▶ WIP: strict positivity and guard condition.
- ▶ Missing: existential variables and local named variables.
- ▶ Modules: PMP, Derek Dreyer, Joshua Yanovski and I have a plan for elaborating them (involving  $\omega$ -universes)

- ▶ Reduction is specified as the reflexive, symmetric transitive closure of 1-step reduction.
- ▶ Cumulativity just compares the normal forms up-to the subtyping relation on universes.



# Cumulativity

- ▶ Reduction is specified as the reflexive, symmetric transitive closure of 1-step reduction.
- ▶ Cumulativity just compares the normal forms up-to the subtyping relation on universes.
- ▶ Standard proof of Church-Rosser (defining 1-step parallel reduction first) would be a nightmare in the implemented representation.

- ▶ Reduction is specified as the reflexive, symmetric transitive closure of 1-step reduction.
- ▶ Cumulativity just compares the normal forms up-to the subtyping relation on universes.
- ▶ Standard proof of Church-Rosser (defining 1-step parallel reduction first) would be a nightmare in the implemented representation.
  - ▶ Need a well-formedness predicate to be maintained everywhere for applications:  $\text{tApp} : \text{term} \rightarrow \text{list term} \rightarrow \text{term}$ . Invariant: no nested applications and no empty list of arguments. Coq's ML code uses a smart constructor to ensure that.
  - ▶ Interaction with  $\text{tCast}$  is non-trivial: e.g. term equality must be up-to casts, which might appear at heads of applications. It is **not** structurally recursive.

- ▶ Reduction is specified as the reflexive, symmetric transitive closure of 1-step reduction.
- ▶ Cumulativity just compares the normal forms up-to the subtyping relation on universes.
- ▶ Standard proof of Church-Rosser (defining 1-step parallel reduction first) would be a nightmare in the implemented representation.
  - ▶ Need a well-formedness predicate to be maintained everywhere for applications:  $\text{tApp} : \text{term} \rightarrow \text{list term} \rightarrow \text{term}$ . Invariant: no nested applications and no empty list of arguments. Coq's ML code uses a smart constructor to ensure that.
  - ▶ Interaction with  $\text{tCast}$  is non-trivial: e.g. term equality must be up-to casts, which might appear at heads of applications. It is **not** structurally recursive.

**Solution:** transfer metatheoretical proofs from a cleaned-up representation: PCUIC.

Weak head call-by-name reduction, conversion and type inference are implemented.

- ▶ Using a stack machine (without sharing) for head reduction.
- ▶ Uses fuel to run inside Coq.
- ▶ Partial **correctness** proof w.r.t. the typing specification.

Showing that the reduction/conversion implementation is correct w.r.t. small or big step operational semantics requires a few refinement steps ([Kunze et al., 2018](#)).

- ▶ Using extraction, we can get an alternative checker for Coq definitions.
- ▶ Runs in reasonable time on medium sized definitions (e.g. recursive definitions by well-founded recursion).

- 1 Refinements to efficient implementations closer to Coq 's implementation
  - ▶ Verifying the universe constraint algorithm (A. Guéneau and J.H. Jourdan).
  - ▶ Link to a Rust checker developed at MPI-SWS, implementing sharing in reduction.
- 2 Link to more ideal type theories like the calculus used in Coq in Coq for which SN is proved:
  - ▶ Simpler presentations of inductive types (W-types, containers)
  - ▶ Removing the global environment/delta reduction
  - ▶ Simpler universe systems without polymorphism or cumulative inductive types.

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Reification and denotation: Template-Coq
  - Core language reification
  - Reifying commands: The Template Monad
- 3 Specifying Coq: Typing and the Checker
- 4 The calculus behind Coq: PCUIC
  - Formalizing an Extraction procedure
- 5 Applications
  - CertiCoq
  - Extensional to Intensional Type Theory revisited
- 6 Conclusion

We need a cleaner version of the calculus for metatheoretical proofs. PCUIC has the same features except:

- ▶ Applications are binary and all terms are well-formed (for substitution and lifting for example)



We need a cleaner version of the calculus for metatheoretical proofs. PCUIC has the same features except:

- ▶ Applications are binary and all terms are well-formed (for substitution and lifting for example)
- ▶ Casts are removed: replaced by identity function applications to preserve reductions.
- ▶ Typing derivations can be transferred from TemplateCoq to PCUIC.

We need a cleaner version of the calculus for metatheoretical proofs. PCUIC has the same features except:

- ▶ Applications are binary and all terms are well-formed (for substitution and lifting for example)
- ▶ Casts are removed: replaced by identity function applications to preserve reductions.
- ▶ Typing derivations can be transferred from TemplateCoq to PCUIC.
- ▶ PCUIC's typing and reduction relations are simpler and enjoy weakening (for global and local environments) and substitution.
- ▶ WIP: confluence and subject reduction (standard except for cofixpoints)

PCUIC is close to the calculi we have shown consistency for in [Timany and Sozeau \(2018\)](#), except for the presentation of eliminators of inductives.

- ▶ Can we formally show an equivalence of presentation between `fix+match` and eliminators?
- ▶ Working idea: use a translation to well-founded definitions on the subterm relation (e.g. as done in Paulin-Mohring's HDR).

Extraction removes proofs and types.

- ▶ Easy to formalize as a translation from PCUIC to a call-by-value lambda-calculus.
- ▶ Goal: prove it preserves observational equivalence, for extraction of closed terms of informative inductive types.

```
∀ sigma t T v : Ast.term,  
  sigma ;; [] |- t : T -> axiom_free sigma ->  
  t ~>_wcbv v →  
  ∃ v' : ErasedAst.term,  
    extract sigma t ~>_wcbv v' ∧ v ~_T v'
```

We assume canonicity. Observational equivalence at:

- ▶ propositional types is the full relation
- ▶ inductive types relates the same constructors applied to related arguments.
- ▶ functions types preserves relatedness from arguments to applications.

Formalization of the proof of [Letouzey \(2004\)](#), without the  $\text{Prop} \leq \text{Type}$  rule.

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Reification and denotation: Template-Coq
  - Core language reification
  - Reifying commands: The Template Monad
- 3 Specifying Coq: Typing and the Checker
- 4 The calculus behind Coq: PCUIC
  - Formalizing an Extraction procedure
- 5 Applications
  - CertiCoq
  - Extensional to Intensional Type Theory revisited
- 6 Conclusion

CertiCoq is a certified compiler from extracted terms to CompCert's C-light. The verified compiler phases include:

- ▶ Eta-expansion of constructors
- ▶ Removal of constructor parameters
- ▶ Transformation of the global environment to local let-ins.
- ▶ CPS conversion
- ▶ Closure conversion, defunctionalization.
- ▶ Shrink reduction (removes administrative redexes)
- ▶ Link to a verified garbage collector.
- ▶ Resulting code can be compiled to assembly via CompCert or gcc.

The compiler is shown to preserve observational equivalence for weak call-by-value reduction.

$$\forall G \ t \ T \ v : \text{Ast.term},$$

$$G \ ;; \ [] \ |- \ t : T \ \rightarrow \ \text{axiom\_free } G \ \rightarrow$$

$$t \ \sim\>\_wcbv \ v \ \rightarrow$$

$$\exists v' : \text{CLight.syntax}, \ \text{extract } t \ \sim\>\_wcbv \ v' \ \wedge \ v \ \sim\_T \ v'$$

- ▶ Proofs are relatively straightforward thanks to forward simulations only, starting from a strongly normalizing calculus.
- ▶ We moved extraction at the start of the compilation pipeline to avoid size explosions.
- ▶ Issues with Coq's representation: mutual fixpoints as blocks (duplication), lambdas in match branches.
- ▶ The **extracted** version of the compiler is reasonably fast otherwise. Impractical inside Coq mainly due to string representation of references.



$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p : t = u}{\Gamma \vdash t \equiv u}$$

- ▶ Idea: take a derivation in ETT (with the reflection rule) and translate it to a decorated derivation in ITT.
- ▶ We verified a variant of Oury's translation, using ideas from the parametricity translation. It assumes uniqueness of identity proofs and functional extensionality in the target theory.
- ▶ Template-Coq is used to produce derivations in ETT, by quoting a partially typed term defined in Coq.
- ▶ The ITT theory can be interpreted in Template-Coq. We denote the result of the translation + obligations corresponding to uses of the reflection rule.

# ETT to ITT Example

```
Definition vrev {A n m} (v : vec A n) (acc : vec A m) : vec A (n + m) :=
vec_rect A (fun n _ => forall m, vec A m -> vec A (n + m))
  (fun m acc => acc)
  (fun a n _ rv m acc => {!rv _ (vcons a m acc)!})
  n v m acc.
```

- 1 Quote to Template-Coq
- 2 Translate to ETT adding type annotations using a retyping algorithm. ETT supports eliminators only (no fix+match).
- 3 Apply translation to ITT, generating obligations for conversions
- 4 Extract to Template-Coq a Coq term to denote along with obligations.
- 5 Run a template program asking the user to prove the obligations and defining the completed term.

```
Definition vrev {A n m} (v : vec A n) (acc : vec A m)
  : vec A (n + m) :=
vec_rect A (fun n _ => forall m, vec A m -> vec A (n + m))
  (fun m acc => acc)
  (fun a n _ rv m acc =>
    transport
      (vrev_obligation3 A n m v acc a n0 v0 rv m0 acc0)
      (rv (S m0) (vcons a m0 acc0)))
  n v m acc.
```

- ▶ Programmed and evaluated entirely in Coq!
- ▶ ETT to ITT is a translation of **derivations** and not only **terms**: computationally intensive.

- ▶ Extraction to a CBV lambda-calculus with translation validation of extracts ([Forster and Smolka, 2017](#)).
- ▶ Parametricity translation with stronger free theorems for Prop ([Anand and Morrisett, 2017](#)).
- ▶ Formalization of syntactic models ([Boulier et al., 2017](#)).
- ▶ ...

- ▶ MetaCoq provides meta-programming features on top of Coq
- ▶ It allows implementation, verification of those meta-programs w.r.t. operational or typing semantics, and their evaluation inside Coq or through extraction to ML.
- ▶ It includes a (partially verified) checker and extraction.
- ▶ It has interesting applications!

We are working on completing the formalization of the metatheory and existing translations.

Research problems:

- ▶ Proper support of meta-programming constructs like splicing, staging?
- ▶ Treatment of inductive types and recursion.

Write your plugins in Coq!

Certify them in Coq!

Run them natively using a certified compiler!

<http://template-coq.github.io/template-coq>

- A. Anand and G. Morrisett. Revisiting Parametricity: Inductives and Uniformity of Propositions. *ArXiv e-prints*, May 2017.
- Abhishek Anand, Andrew Appel, Greg Morrisett, Zoe Paraskevopoulou, Randy Pollack, Olivier Savary Belanger, Matthieu Sozeau, and Matthew Weaver. [CertiCoq: A verified compiler for Coq](#). In *CoqPL*, Paris, France, 2017.
- Abhishek Anand, Simon Boulrier, Cyril Cohen, Matthieu Sozeau, and Nicolas Tabareau. [Towards Certified Meta-Programming with Typed Template-Coq](#). In Jeremy Avigad and Assia Mahboubi, editors, *ITP 2018*, volume 10895 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 20–39. Springer, 2018.
- Bruno Barras. [Auto-validation d'un système de preuves avec familles inductives](#). Thèse de doctorat, Université Paris 7, November 1999.
- Simon Boulrier, Pierre-Marie Pédro, and Nicolas Tabareau. [The next 700 syntactical models of type theory](#). In *Certified Programs and Proofs (CPP 2017)*, pages 182 – 194, Paris, France, January 2017.
- Yannick Forster and Gert Smolka. [Weak Call-by-Value Lambda Calculus as a Model of Computation in Coq](#). In Mauricio Ayala-Rincón and César A. Muñoz, editors, *Interactive Theorem Proving - 8th International Conference, ITP 2017, Brasília, Brazil, September 26-29, 2017, Proceedings*, volume 10499 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 189–206. Springer, 2017.
- Fabian Kunze, Gert Smolka, and Yannick Forster. [Formal Small-step Verification of a Call-by-value Lambda Calculus Machine](#). *CoRR*, abs/1806.03205, 2018.
- Pierre Letouzey. [Programmation fonctionnelle certifiée: l'extraction de programmes dans l'assistant Coq](#). Thèse de doctorat, Université Paris-Sud, July 2004.
- Gregory Malecha and Jesper Bengtson. [Extensible and Efficient Automation Through Reflective Tactics](#). In Peter Thiemann, editor, *ESOP*, pages 532–559, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2016. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Amin Timany and Matthieu Sozeau. [Cumulative Inductive Types In Coq](#). In Hélène Kirchner, editor, *3rd International Conference on Formal Structures for Computation and Deduction, FSCD 2018, July 9-12, 2018, Oxford, UK*, volume 108 of *LIPICs*, pages 29:1–29:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018.
- Théo Winterhalter, Matthieu Sozeau, and Nicolas Tabareau. [Eliminating Reflection from Type Theory](#). 2018. Submitted.
- Beta Ziliani, Derek Dreyer, Neelakantan R. Krishnaswami, Aleksandar Nanevski, and Viktor Vafeiadis. [Mtac: A monad for typed tactic programming in Coq](#). *J. Funct. Program.*, 25, 2015.