Developing the infrastructure for formal proofs

With computer systems playing an ever greater role in modern society, there is a growing need to establish their ‘correctness’ and their formal properties. We spoke to Dr Dale Miller about the ProofCert project’s work in developing the foundations of a more accessible standard for formal proof, which could have significant implications in terms of software security.

A vulnerability in a software system can be rapidly exploited, compromising the security of the computer systems we all rely on in everyday life, so it’s increasingly important to establish their ‘correctness’. However, the methods currently used to verify the formal properties of computer systems are splintered, says Dr Dale Miller. “Currently the world of formal methods is very fragmented. We use proof assistants to develop formal proofs – there are seven or eight major proof assistants,” he explains. Based at the Inria Research Centre near Paris, Dr Miller is the Principal Investigator of the ProofCert project, an EC-backed initiative which aims to strengthen the foundations on which scientists can both prove mathematical theorems and establish the formal properties of computer systems. “The way it works today is that if you want to do a big proof you have to commit to using one of these proof assistants,” he continues. “It may be very hard – if not impossible – to make use of results or tools from another community, another group of researchers.”

Formal proofs
This fragmentation has consequences in terms of the way mathematicians prove theorems and establish the specific properties of computer systems. While established methods are still relevant in some situations, mathematics and computing has of course developed significantly over the last century or so. “Today we want to do formal proofs of very complex mathematical concepts and very complicated software systems, so it’s really now a matter of scale. What worked long ago on much smaller systems doesn’t always work so well today,” explains Dr Miller. The project aims to develop standardised methods of defining a formal proof in the form of proof certificates; this holds interest in terms of both software development and more abstract mathematical research. “Some researchers have done a formal proof in a theorem prover called Coq of the famous mathematical theorem called the four-colour theorem. This is a theorem about how many colours are required to colour a geographic map,” says Dr Miller. “The formal proof of that theorem was hard to achieve – a computer assisted proof was first achieved 40 years ago but some mathematicians weren’t convinced they could trust it. The more recent Coq proof is far more convincing.”

There is a long history of research into these kinds of abstract questions, with mathematicians, logicians and philosophers all contributing to the development of the proof theory field, the study of the structure of mathematical proofs. While mathematicians like Gentzen, Church and Turing could not have anticipated the pace of future technological development, their papers...
and ideas remain relevant in research; now Dr Miller and his colleagues are looking at them again. “We’ve been taking this old literature, dating back 70-80 years, and improving it. In a way, we’ve been trying to make it more computer science friendly,” he explains. Researchers aim to build on this earlier work by using the core elements of existing inferences to develop bigger inferences, which could help put in place the building blocks of enhanced software and hardware security. “It would be very interesting to eventually develop tools that could help us tackle security problems and assess whether a programme is correct. This could help prevent the emergence of bugs and problems in programmes that people could then exploit later,” continues Dr Miller.

This is not an immediate objective for the project however, and the current focus is more on laying the foundations for the next stage of development in formal methods. Within the project, researchers are concentrating on the fact that nowadays it is machines that build proofs, then communicate it to another machine that will check it. “ProofCert is a completely machine-to-machine project. These proofs are usually very complicated, and it’s inconceivable that a single person would be able to fully check it or that we would trust a human checker. But we still want to be able to check a proof now, and if doubts are raised at some point in the future, then they’d like to be able to re-check it again,” says Dr Miller. Many mathematical ideas are subject to re-examination; while abstract questions remain an important part of the wider agenda, Dr Miller says he often draws inspiration in research from issues around the ‘correctness’ of computer programmes. “To prove the correctness of a programme, you need to have a statement that says; ‘this programme should do the following...’ Then you state that as a proposed theorem, and look to prove that this programme does what it’s supposed to,” he outlines. This programme might be the computer’s operating system for example, or a search engine. Establishing whether a programme is correct depends to a large degree on understanding and describing its purpose, yet Dr Miller says it can be difficult to state this formally. “Take the google search bar for example. It’s very difficult to state its purpose formally – it’s supposed to be useful of course, but defining that in a mathematical sense is a complex challenge,” he points out. A well-considered, systematic way of thinking about what a specific programme should be doing and its formal purpose is essential to verifying whether it’s correct; this starts right from the early stages of development. “When a programmer is asked to perform a task they’re typically given a specification. Usually, that’s in a natural language, not all of the details are fully filled in, and also it usually relies on other programmes that aren’t fully mathematically defined either,” explains Dr Miller. “Today it is a major challenge to formally show that a program satisfies all or even some of the properties expected of it.”

**Formal proof**

The wider goal in this research is to make proof universal, to standardise proof systems through proof certificates, an

---

**It would be interesting to see if establishing a new standard for defining proof languages can allow thousands of new theorem provers to emerge, each tackling specialized domains or employing specialized search strategies. To be accepted, they only need to output checkable certificates of their own design**
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