Programming language developed at Carnegie Mellon

Nomos: Resource-Aware Session Types for Programming Digital Contracts

Stephanie Balzer, Ankush Das, Jan Hoffmann, and Frank Pfenning

With some slides from Ankush.

Carnegie Mellon University

Inria Paris

Digital Contracts (or Smart Contracts)

Smart contracts (Ethereum): programs stored on a blockchain

- Carry out (financial) transactions between (untrusted) agents
- Cannot be modified but have state
- Community needs to reach consensus on the result of execution
- Users need to pay for the execution cost upfront

Digital Contracts (or Smart Contracts)

Smart contracts (Ethereum): programs stored on a blockchain

- Carry out (financial) transactions between (untrusted) agents
- Cannot be modified but have state
- Community needs to reach consensus on the result of execution
- Users need to pay for the execution cost upfront



Bugs in Digital Contracts are Expensive

- Bugs result in financial disasters (DAO, Parity Wallet, King of Ether, ...)
- Bugs are difficult to fix because they alter the contract



'\$300m in cryptocurrency' accidentally lost forever due to bug

User mistakenly takes control of hundreds of wallets containing cryptocurrency Ether, destroying them in a panic while trying to give

CRYTPO ENTOMOLOGY

A coding error led to \$30 million in ethereum being stolen

Yes!

Yes!

Example: memory safety

- Most security vulnerabilities are based on memory safety issues (Microsoft: 70% over past in the past 12 years in MS products)
- Why stick with unsafe languages? Legacy code, developers (training, social factors, ...)

Yes!

Example: memory safety

- Most security vulnerabilities are based on memory safety issues (Microsoft: 70% over past in the past 12 years in MS products)
- Why stick with unsafe languages? Legacy code, developers (training, social factors, ...)

Languages for Digital Contracts

- Great opportunity to start from a clean slate
- Correctness and readability of contracts are priorities

Yes!

Example: memory safety

- Most security vulnerabilities are based on memory safety issues (Microsoft: 70% over past in the past 12 years in MS products)
- Why stick with unsafe languages? Legacy code, developers (training, social factors, ...)

Languages for Digital Contracts

- Great opportunity to start from a clean slate
- Correctness and readability of contracts are priorities

Nomos

- Build on state-of-the art: statically-typed, strict, functional language
- Address domain-specific issues



status: running



status: running



status: running



status: ended





Auction Contract in Solidity

```
function bid() public payable {
   bid = msg.value;
   bidder = msg.sender;
   pendingReturns[bidder] = bid;
   if (bid > highestBid) {
      highestBidder = bidder;
      highestBid = bid;
   }
}
```

```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
    require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
    uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
    msg.sender.send(amount);
    return true;
```

```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
   require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
   uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
   msg.sender.send(amount);
   return true;
}
```

```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
    require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
    uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
    msg.sender.send(amount);
    return true;
}
```



```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
    require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
    uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
    msg.sender.send(amount);
    return true;
}
```

What happens if collect is called when auction is running?



```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
   require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
   uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
   msg.sender.send(amount);
   return true;
}
```

What happens if collect is called when auction is running?





function collect() public returns (bool) {
 require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
 uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
 msg.sender.send(amount);
 return true;
}

What happens if collect is called when auction is running? Protocol is not statically enforced!



add require (status == ended);

```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
    require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
    require (status == ended);
    uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
    msg.sender.send(amount);
    return true;
}
```

```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
  require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
  require (status == ended);
  uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
  msg.sender.send(amount);
  return true;
}
```



```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
    require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
    require (status == ended);
    uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
    msg.sender.send(amount);
    return true;
}
```

What happens if collect is called twice?



```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
    require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
    require (status == ended);
    uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
    msg.sender.send(amount);
    return true;
}
```

What happens if collect is called twice?



set pendingReturns[msg.sender] = 0

function collect() public returns (bool) {
 require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
 require (status == ended);
 uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
 msg.sender.send(amount);
 return true;

What happens if collect is called twice?

Linearity is not enforced!



set pendingReturns[msg.sender] = 0

```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
  require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
  require (status == ended);
  uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
  msg.sender.send(amount);
  pendingReturns[msg.sender] = 0;
  return true;
}
```

function collect() public returns (bool) {
 require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
 require (status == ended);
 uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
 msg.sender.send(amount);
 pendingReturns[msg.sender] = 0;
 return true;
}



function collect() public returns (bool) {
 require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
 require (status == ended);
 uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
 msg.sender.send(amount);
 pendingReturns[msg.sender] = 0;
 return true;
}

Method 'send' potentially transfers control to other contract.



function collect() public returns (bool) {
 require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
 require (status == ended);
 uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
 msg.sender.send(amount);
 pendingReturns[msg.sender] = 0;
 return true;
}

Method 'send' potentially transfers control to other contract.



'send' should be the last instruction.

function collect() public returns (bool) {
 require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
 require (status == ended);
 uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
 msg.sender.send(amount);
 pendingReturns[msg.sender] = 0;
 return true;

Method 'send' potentially transfers control to other contract.

Re-entrancy attack



'send' should be the last instruction.

```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
  require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
  require (status == ended);
  uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
  pendingReturns[msg.sender] = 0;
  msg.sender.send(amount);
  return true;
}
```

```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
  require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
  require (status == ended);
  uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
  pendingReturns[msg.sender] = 0;
  msg.sender.send(amount);
  return true;
```



```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
  require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
  require (status == ended);
  uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
  pendingReturns[msg.sender] = 0;
  msg.sender.send(amount);
  return true;
}
```

Method 'send' potentially transfers control to other contract.



```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
  require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
  require (status == ended);
  uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
  pendingReturns[msg.sender] = 0;
  msg.sender.send(amount);
  return true;
```

Method 'send' potentially transfers control to other contract.



Need to check return value of 'send'.

```
function collect() public returns (bool) {
  require (msg.sender != highestBidder);
  require (status == ended);
  uint amount = pendingReturns[msg.sender];
  pendingReturns[msg.sender] = 0;
  msg.sender.send(amount);
  return true;
}
```

Method 'send' potentially transfers control to other contract.

Out-of-gas exception.



Need to check return value of 'send'.
Bugs in Digital Contracts are Expensive

- Bugs result in financial disasters (DAO, Parity Wallet, King of Ether, ...)
- Bugs are difficult to fix because they alter the contract



'\$300m in cryptocurrency' accidentally lost forever due to bug

User mistakenly takes control of hundreds of wallets containing cryptocurrency Ether, destroying them in a panic while trying to give

CRYTPO ENTOMOLOGY

A coding error led to \$30 million in ethereum being stolen

Bug: Initialization function could be called by unauthorized user

- Ownership of the wallet could be changed after initialization
- Funds can be extracted by owner
- Damage: ~\$280 million

Problem: Interaction protocol with contracts

- Protocols of interaction not explicit in the language
- Protocols of interaction not enforced

The DAO: Reentrancy

Bug: Function can be called again during its ongoing execution

- A money transfer to a contract triggers a function call
- The called function can call the function that initiated the transfer
- ➡ DAO: money gets transferred without updating the balance

Problem 1: Unnecessary permissiveness in communication

Violation of function invariants

Problem 2: Failure to keep track of assets

Incorrect book-keeping of stored founds (returned payment)

Domain-Specific Issues with Digital Contracts

1. Resource consumption (gas cost)

- Participants have to agree on the result of a computation
- Denial of service attacks
- Would like to have static gas bounds

Domain-Specific Issues with Digital Contracts

1. Resource consumption (gas cost)

- Participants have to agree on the result of a computation
- Denial of service attacks
- Would like to have static gas bounds

2. Contract protocols and interfaces

- Contract protocols should be described and enforced
- Prevent issues like reentrancy bugs (DAO)

Domain-Specific Issues with Digital Contracts

1. Resource consumption (gas cost)

- Participants have to agree on the result of a computation
- Denial of service attacks
- Would like to have static gas bounds

2. Contract protocols and interfaces

- Contract protocols should be described and enforced
- Prevent issues like reentrancy bugs (DAO)

3. Keeping track of assets (crypto coins)

- Assets should not be duplicated
- Assets should not be lost

Nomos: A Type-Based Approach

A statically-typed, strict, functional language

• Functional fragment of ML

Additional features for domain-specific requirements

Language featureExpertiseGas boundsAutomatic amortized resource analysisJan HoffmannTracking assetsLinear type systemFrank PfenningContract interfacesShared binary session typesStephanie Balzer
Frank Pfenning

Lead developer: Ankush Das

Nomos: A Type-Based Approach

A statically-typed, strict, functional language

• Functional fragment of ML

Additional features for domain-specific requirements

	Language feature	Expertise
Gas bounds	Automatic amortized resource analysis	Jan Hoffmann
Tracking assets	Linear type system	Frank Pfenning
Contract interfaces	Shared binary session types	Stephanie Balzer Frank Pfenning

Based on a linear type system

Lead developer: Ankush Das 1. Automatic amortized resource analysis (AARA)

Resource Bound Analysis

Given: A (functional) program P

Question: What is the (worst-case) resource consumption of P as a function of the size of its inputs?

Resource Bound Analysis

Given: A (functional) program P

Clock cycles, heap space, gas, ...

Question: What is the (worst-case) resource consumption of P as a function of the size of its inputs?

Resource Bound Analysis

Given: A (functional) program P

Clock cycles, heap space, gas, ...

Question: What is the (worst-case) resource consumption of P as a function of the size of its inputs?



Not only asymptotic bounds but concrete constant factors.



Given: A (functional) program P

Clock cycles, heap space, gas, ...

Question: What is the (worst-case) resource consumption of P as a function of the size of its inputs?



Not only asymptotic bounds but concrete constant factors.



Given: A (functional) program P

Clock cycles, heap space, gas, ...

Question: What is the (worst-case) resource consumption of P as a function of the size of its inputs?



Not only asymptotic bounds but concrete constant factors. Goal: produce proofs (easily checkable)

AARA: Use Potential Method

- Assign potential functions to data structures
 - States are mapped to non-negative numbers
- Potential pays the resource consumption and the potential at the following program point
- Initial potential is an upper bound

 $\Phi(before) \ge \Phi(after) + cost$ $\oint telescoping \oint$ $\Phi(initial \ state) \ge \sum cost$

 $\Phi(state) \geq 0$

AARA: Use Potential Method

- Assign potential functions to data structures
 - States are mapped to non-negative numbers
- Potential pays the resource consumption and the potential at the following program point
- Initial potential is an upper bound

Type systems for automatic analysis

- Fix a format of potential functions (basis like in linear algebra)
- Type rules introduce linear constraint on coefficients

 $\Phi(before) \ge \Phi(after) + cost$ $\oint telescoping \oint$ $\Phi(initial \ state) \ge \sum cost$

 $\Phi(state) \geq 0$

AARA: Use Potential Method

- Assign potential functions to data structures
 - States are mapped to non-negative numbers
- Potential pays the resource consumption and the potential at the following program point
- Initial potential is an upper bound

Type systems for automatic analysis

Clear soundness theorem. Compositional. Efficient inference.

- Fix a format of potential functions (basis like in linear algebra)
- Type rules introduce linear constraint on coefficients



append(x,y)

Heap-space usage is 2n if

- n is the length of list x
- One list element requires two heap cells (data and pointer)

append(x,y)

Heap-space usage is 2n if

- n is the length of list x
- One list element requires two heap cells (data and pointer)

append(x,y)

Heap-space usage is 2n if

- n is the length of list x
- One list element requires two heap cells (data and pointer)



append(x,y)

Heap-space usage is 2n if

- n is the length of list x
- One list element requires two heap cells (data and pointer)



append(x,y)

Heap-space usage is 2n if

- n is the length of list x
- One list element requires two heap cells (data and pointer)



append(x,y)

Heap-space usage is 2n if

- n is the length of list x
- One list element requires two heap cells (data and pointer)



append(x,y)

Heap-space usage is 2n if

- n is the length of list x
- One list element requires two heap cells (data and pointer)



append(x,y)

Heap-space usage is 2n if

- n is the length of list x
- One list element requires two heap cells (data and pointer)



f(x,y,z) =
let t = append(x,y) in
append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y

f(x,y,z) =
let t = append(x,y) in
append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y



f(x,y,z) =
let t = append(x,y) in
append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

append(x,y)

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y



f(x,y,z) =
let t = append(x,y) in
append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y



append(x,y)

f(x,y,z) =
let t = append(x,y) in
append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y





f(x,y,z) =
let t = append(x,y) in
append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y



append(x,y)

f(x,y,z) =
let t = append(x,y) in
append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y



f(x,y,z) =
let t = append(x,y) in
append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y



append(t,z)

f(x,y,z) =
let t = append(x,y) in
append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y



append(t,z)

f(x,y,z) =
let t = append(x,y) in
append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y



append(t,z)

f(x,y,z) =
let t = append(x,y) in
append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y


f(x,y,z) =
 let t = append(x,y) in
 append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y



f(x,y,z) =
 let t = append(x,y) in
 append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y



f(x,y,z) =
 let t = append(x,y) in
 append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y



f(x,y,z) =
 let t = append(x,y) in
 append(t,z)

Heap usage of f(x,y,z) is 2n + 2(n+m) if

- n is the length of list x
- m is the length of list y



$$f(x,y,z) = \{ append: (l^{4}(int), l^{2}(int)) \xrightarrow{0/0} l^{2}(int) \}$$

$$let t = append(x,y) in$$

$$append(t,z)$$

$$append: (l^{2}(int), l^{0}(int)) \xrightarrow{0/0} l^{0}(int)$$

The most general type of append is specialized at call-sites:

append:
$$(L^{q}(int), L^{p}(int)) \xrightarrow{s/t}{} L^{r}(int) | \phi$$
 Linear constraints.

	Linear Potential Functions
User-defined resource metrics (i.e., by tick(q) in the code)	
Naturally compositional : tracks size changes, types are specifications	
Bound inference by reduction to efficient LP solving	
Type derivations prove bounds with respect to the cost semantics	

Polynomial Potential Functions

	Linear Potential Functions			
User-defined resource metrics (i.e., by tick(q) in the code)				
Naturally compositional : tracks size changes, types are specifications				
Bound inference by reduction to efficient LP solving				
Type derivations prove bounds with respect to the cost semantics				
Strong soundness theorem.				
Polynomial Potential				
Functions				

	Linear Potential Functions	Multivariate Polynomial Potential Functions
User-defined resource metrics (i.e., by tick(q) in the code)		
Naturally compositional : tracks size changes, types are specifications		
Bound inference by reduction to efficient LP solving		
Type derivations prove bounds with respect to the cost semantics		
Strong soundness theorem.		
Polynomial Potential Functions		

		For example m*n ² .
	Linear Potential Functions	Multivariate Polynomial Potential Functions
User-defined resource metrics (i.e., by tick(q) in the code)		
Naturally compositional : tracks size changes, types are specifications		
Bound inference by reduction to efficient LP solving		
Type derivations prove bounds with respect to the cost semantics		
Strong soundness theorem.		
Polynomial Potential Functions		

Implementations: RaML and Absynth

Resource Aware ML (RaML)

- Based on Inria's OCaml compiler
- Polymorphic and higher-order functions
- User-defined data types
- Side effects (arrays and references)

Absynth

- Based on control-flow graph IR
- Different front ends
- Bounds are integer expressions
- Supports probabilistic programs

 Resource Awa A i raml.com 	re ML	×		
RESOURCE AWARE ML				
	ABOUT	WEB INTERFACE	SOURCE CODE	PUBLICATIONS
	Conter	interface	_	
	WebHowKnow	interface to use the interface in issues		
	Web Ir	iterface		
	1 (* * * * * * 2 * Resource 3 * * * * * 4 *) 5 6 7 lot rog of	* * * * * * * e Aware ML * * * * * * * *		Hello Wa
	8 match li 9 [] 10 x::: 11 let 12 x::: 13	<pre>period if 12 = 1 with >> 12 vs => _ = Raml.tick(1.2) in append xs 12)</pre>		
	14 let hello 15 let world 16 17 ;; 18 19 20	= [72;101;108;108;111] = [87;111;114;108;100]		
	20			

http://raml.	CO
--------------	----

	Computed Bound	Actual Behavior	Analysis Runtime	Constraints
Sorting A-nodes (asort)	11+22kn +13k ² nv+13m +15n	O(k ² n+m)	0.14 s	5656
Quick sort (lists of lists)	3 -7.5nm +7.5nm ² +19.5m +16.5m ²	O(nm ²)	0.27 s	8712
Merge sort (list.ml)	43 + 30.5n + 8.5n ²	O(n log n)	0.11 s	3066
Split and sort	11 + 47n + 29n ²	O(n ²)	0.69 s	3793
Longest common subsequence	23 + 10n + 52nm + 25m	O(nm)	0.16 s	901
Matrix multiplication	3 + 2nm +18m + 22mxy +16my	O(mxy)	1.11 s	3901
Evaluator for boolean expressions (tutorial)	10+11n+16m+16mx+16my+20x+20y	O(mx+my)	0.33 s	1864
Dijkstra's shortest-path algorithm	46 + 33n +111n ²	O(n ²)	0.11 s	2808
Echelon form	8 + 43m ² n + 59m + 63m ²	O(nm ²)	1.81 s	8838
Binary multiplication (CompCert)	2+17kr+10ks+25k +8l+2+7r+8	O(kr+ks)	14.04 s	89,507
Square root (CompCert)	13+66m+16mn +4m ² +59n +4n ²	O(n ²)	18.25 s	135,529

Micro Benchmarks

Evaluation-Step Bounds

Quick Sort for Integers

Evaluation-step bound vs. measured behavior

Longest Common Subsequence

Evaluation-step bound vs. measured behavior

Longest Common Subsequence

Evaluation-step bound vs. measured behavior

Automatic Amortized Resource Analysis (AARA)

Type system for deriving symbolic resource bounds

- Compositional: Integrated with type systems or program logics
- Expressive: Bounds are multivariate resource polynomials
- Reliable: Formal soundness proof wrt. cost semantics
- Verifiable: Produces easily-checkable certificates
- Automatic: No user interaction required

Applicable in practice

- Implemented: Resource Aware ML and Absynth
- Effective: Works for many typical programs
- Efficient: Inference via linear programming

Automatic Amortized Resource Analysis (AARA)

Type system for deriving symbolic resource bounds

- Compositional: Integrated with type systems or program logics
- Expressive: Bounds are multivariate resource polynomials
- Reliable: Formal soundness proof wrt. cost semantics
- Verifiable: Produces easily-checkable certificates
- Automatic: No user interaction required

Applicable in practice

- Implemented: Resource Aware ML and Absynth
- Effective: Works for many typical programs
- Efficient: Inference via linear programming

Type checking in linear time!

2. Shared (resource-aware) binary session types

- Implement message-passing concurrent programs
- Communication via typed bidirectional channels
- Curry-Howard correspondence with intuitionistic linear logic
- Client and provider have dual types

- Implement message-passing concurrent programs
- Communication via typed bidirectional channels
- Curry-Howard correspondence with intuitionistic linear logic
- Client and provider have dual types

External choiceExample type:queue_A = &{ins : A --> queue_A,
del :
$$\oplus$$
{none : 1,
some : A \otimes queue_A}}

- Implement message-passing concurrent programs
- Communication via typed bidirectional channels
- Curry-Howard correspondence with intuitionistic linear logic
- Client and provider have dual types

- Implement message-passing concurrent programs
- Communication via typed bidirectional channels
- Curry-Howard correspondence with intuitionistic linear logic
- Client and provider have dual types

Type soundness (progress and preservation) implies deadlock freedom

$$\begin{array}{l} (x:A) \ (t: \mathsf{queue}_A) \vdash elem :: (s: \mathsf{queue}_A) \\ s \leftarrow elem \leftarrow x \ t = \\ & \mathsf{case} \ s \ (\mathsf{ins} \Rightarrow y \leftarrow \mathsf{recv} \ s \ ; \\ & t.\mathsf{ins} \ ; \\ & s \mathsf{end} \ t \ y \ ; \\ & s \leftarrow elem \leftarrow x \ t \\ | \ \mathsf{del} \Rightarrow s.\mathsf{some} \ ; \\ & s \leftarrow t) \end{array}$$

$$queue_{\mathbf{A}} = \&\{ins : \mathbf{A} \multimap queue_{\mathbf{A}}, \\ del : \oplus\{none : \mathbf{1}, \\ some : \mathbf{A} \otimes queue_{\mathbf{A}}\}\}$$

 $\begin{aligned} \text{auction} &= \bigoplus \{\text{running} : \& \{\text{bid} : \text{id} \supset \text{money} \multimap \text{auction} \}, \\ &\quad \text{ended} : \& \{\text{collect} : \text{id} \supset \bigoplus \{\text{won} : \text{monalisa} \otimes \text{auction}, \\ &\quad \text{lost} : \text{money} \otimes \text{auction} \} \} \end{aligned}$

Example: Auction



Type Rules

$$\frac{(k \in L) \quad \Omega \vdash P :: (x : A_k)}{\Omega \vdash (x.k ; P) :: (x : \oplus \{\ell : A_\ell\}_{\ell \in L})} \oplus R$$

$$\frac{(\forall \ell \in L) \quad \Omega, x: A_{\ell} \vdash Q_{\ell} :: (z:C)}{\Omega, x: \oplus \{\ell : A_{\ell}\}_{\ell \in L} \vdash \text{case } x \ (\ell \Rightarrow Q_{\ell})_{\ell \in L} :: (z:C)} \oplus L$$

$$\frac{(\forall \ell \in L) \quad \Omega \vdash P_{\ell} :: (x : A_{\ell})}{\Omega \vdash \text{case } x \ (\ell \Rightarrow P_{\ell})_{\ell \in L} :: (x : \&\{\ell : A_{\ell}\}_{\ell \in L})} \&R$$

$$\frac{\Omega, x:A_k \vdash Q :: (z:C)}{\Omega, x:\&\{\ell:A_\ell\}_{\ell \in L} \vdash (x.k;Q) :: (z:C)} \&L$$

- Each *process stores potential* in functional data
- Potential can be transferred via messages
- Potential is used to pay for performed work

- Each process stores potential in functional data
- Potential can be transferred via messages
- Potential is used to pay for performed work

Potential transfer only at the type level, not at runtime.

- Each process stores potential in functional data
- Potential can be *transferred via messages*
- Potential is used to pay for performed work

Potential transfer only at the type level, not at runtime.

User-defined cost metric.

- Each process stores potential in functional data
- Potential can be *transferred via messages*
- Potential is used to pay for performed work

Potential transfer only at the type level, not at runtime.

User-defined cost metric.

Message potential is a function of (functional) payload

 $A, B, C ::= \tau \supset A$ $\downarrow \tau \land A$ $\begin{matrix} 2 \\ \downarrow 2 \\ \downarrow b \\ \downarrow a \end{matrix}$

input value of type τ and continue as A output value of type τ and continue as A

- Each process stores potential in functional data
- Potential can be *transferred via messages*
- Potential is used to pay for performed work

Potential transfer only at the type level, not at runtime.

User-defined cost metric.

Message potential is a function of (functional) payload

 $A, B, C ::= \tau \supset A$ $\downarrow \tau \land A$ $L^{2}(int)$ $\downarrow 2 2$ $\downarrow 2$

Syntactic sugar (no payload)

$$A ::= \dots | \triangleright^r A | \triangleleft^r A$$

input value of type τ and continue as A output value of type τ and continue as A

• Only in intermediate language:

get $x_m \{r\}$; *P* pay $x_m \{r\}$; *P*

Resource-Aware Session Types via • Each process stores potential in functional data Potential only

- Potential can be transferred via messages
- Potential is used to pay for performed work
- Message potential is a function of (functional) payload



• Syntactic sugar (no payload)

$$A ::= \dots | \triangleright^r A | \triangleleft^r A$$

- Only in intermediate language:
 - get $x_m \{r\}$; *P* pay $x_m \{r\}$; *P*

Potential transfer only at the type level, not at runtime.

User-defined cost metric.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{auction} &= \bigwedge_{L}^{S} \blacktriangleleft^{11} \oplus \{\text{running} : \&\{\text{bid} : \text{id} \supset \text{money} \multimap \triangleright^{1} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction}, \\ & \text{cancel} : \triangleright^{8} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction} \}, \\ & \text{ended} : \&\{\text{collect} : \text{id} \supset \\ & \oplus\{\text{won} : \text{lot} \otimes \triangleright^{3} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction}, \\ & \text{lost} : \text{money} \otimes \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction} \}, \\ & \text{cancel} : \triangleright^{8} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction} \} \end{aligned}$$

Sharing: Need to acquire contract before use.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{auction} &= \uparrow^S_L \blacktriangleleft^{11} \oplus \{\text{running} : \&\{\text{bid} : \text{id} \supset \text{money} \multimap \triangleright^1 \downarrow^S_L \text{ auction}, \\ & \text{cancel} : \triangleright^8 \downarrow^S_L \text{ auction}\}, \\ & \text{ended} : \&\{\text{collect} : \text{id} \supset \\ & \oplus\{\text{won} : \text{lot} \otimes \triangleright^3 \downarrow^S_L \text{ auction}, \\ & \text{lost} : \text{money} \otimes \downarrow^S_L \text{ auction}\}, \\ & \text{cancel} : \triangleright^8 \downarrow^S_L \text{ auction}\} \end{aligned}$$

Sharing: Need to acquire contract before use.

Equi-synchronizing: Release contract at the same type.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{auction} &= \bigwedge_{L}^{S} \blacktriangleleft^{11} \oplus \{\text{running} : \&\{\text{bid} : \text{id} \supset \text{money} \multimap \triangleright^{1} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction}, \\ & \text{cancel} : \triangleright^{8} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction}\}, \\ & \text{ended} : \&\{\text{collect} : \text{id} \supset \\ & \oplus\{\text{won} : \text{lot} \otimes \triangleright^{3} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction}, \\ & \text{lost} : \text{money} \otimes \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction}\}, \\ & \text{cancel} : \triangleright^{8} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction}\} \end{aligned}$$









$$\begin{aligned} \text{auction} &= \bigwedge_{L}^{S} \blacktriangleleft^{11} \oplus \{\text{running} : \&\{\text{bid} : \text{id} \supset \text{money} \multimap \triangleright^{1} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction}, \\ & \text{cancel} : \triangleright^{8} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction} \}, \\ & \text{ended} : \&\{\text{collect} : \text{id} \supset \\ & \oplus\{\text{won} : \text{lot} \otimes \triangleright^{3} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction}, \\ & \text{lost} : \text{money} \otimes \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction} \}, \\ & \text{cancel} : \triangleright^{8} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction} \} \end{aligned}$$

 $\begin{aligned} \text{auction} &= \bigwedge_{L}^{S} \blacktriangleleft^{11} \oplus \{\text{running} : \&\{\text{bid} : \text{id} \supset \text{money} \multimap \triangleright^{1} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction}, \\ & \text{cancel} : \triangleright^{8} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction} \}, \\ & \text{ended} : \&\{\text{collect} : \text{id} \supset \\ & \oplus\{\text{won} : \text{lot} \otimes \triangleright^{3} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction}, \\ & \text{lost} : \text{money} \otimes \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction} \}, \\ & \text{cancel} : \triangleright^{8} \downarrow_{L}^{S} \text{ auction} \} \end{aligned}$

Gas cost is given by a cost semantics and the type system ensures 11 is the worst-case.

auction = $\uparrow^{S}_{L} \triangleleft^{11} \oplus \{\text{running} : \&\{\text{bid} : \text{id} \supset \text{money} \multimap \triangleright^{1} \downarrow^{S}_{L} \text{ auction}, \\ \text{cancel} : \triangleright^{8} \downarrow^{S}_{L} \text{ auction}\}, \\ \text{ended} : \&\{\text{collect} : \text{id} \supset \\ \oplus\{\text{won} : \text{lot} \otimes \triangleright^{3} \downarrow^{S}_{L} \text{ auction}, \\ \text{lost} : \text{money} \otimes \downarrow^{S}_{L} \text{ auction}\}, \\ \text{cancel} : \triangleright^{8} \downarrow^{S}_{L} \text{ auction}\}\}$

Gas cost is given by a cost semantics and the type system ensures 11 is the worst-case.

auction = $\uparrow^{S}_{L} \triangleleft^{11} \oplus \{\text{running} : \& \{\text{bid} : \text{id} \supset \text{money} \multimap \triangleright^{1} \downarrow^{S}_{L} \text{ auction}, \\ \text{cancel} : \triangleright^{8} \downarrow^{S}_{L} \text{ auction} \}, \\ \text{ended} : \& \{\text{collect} : \text{id} \supset \\ \oplus \{\text{won} : \text{lot} \otimes \triangleright^{3} \downarrow^{S}_{L} \text{ auction}, \\ \text{lost} : \text{money} \otimes \downarrow^{S}_{L} \text{ auction} \}, \\ \text{cancel} : \triangleright^{8} \downarrow^{S}_{L} \text{ auction} \} \}$ If the worst-case path is not taken then the leftover is returned.

Gas cost is given by a cost semantics and the type system ensures 11 is the worst-case.

 $auction = \bigwedge_{L}^{S} \checkmark^{11} \oplus \{running : \& \{bid : id \supset money \multimap \triangleright^{1} \downarrow_{L}^{S} auction, \\ cancel : \triangleright^{8} \downarrow_{L}^{S} auction \}, \\ ended : \& \{collect : id \supset \\ \oplus \{won : lot \otimes \triangleright^{3} \downarrow_{L}^{S} auction, \\ lost : money \otimes \downarrow_{L}^{S} auction \}, \\ cancel : \triangleright^{8} \downarrow_{L}^{S} auction \} \}$ If the worst-case path is not taken then the leftover is returned.

```
(b: bids); (M: money), (ml: monalisa) \vdash run :: (sa: auction)
  sa \leftarrow run \ b \leftarrow M \ l =
      la \leftarrow \text{accept } sa;
      la.running;
      case la
          (bid \Rightarrow r \leftarrow recv la ;
                      m \leftarrow \operatorname{recv} la;
                      sa \leftarrow \mathsf{detach} \ la;
                      m.value;
                      v \leftarrow \operatorname{recv} m;
                      b' = addbid b (r, v);
                      M' \leftarrow add \leftarrow M m;
                      sa \leftarrow run \ b' \leftarrow M' \ ml)
```

auction = $\uparrow^{S}_{L} \triangleleft^{11} \oplus \{\text{running} : \&\{\text{bid} : \text{id} \supset \text{money} \multimap \rhd^{1} \downarrow^{S}_{L} \text{auction}\},\$

 $(b: bids); (M: money), (ml: monalisa) \vdash run :: (sa: auction)$ $sa \leftarrow run \ b \leftarrow M \ l =$ accept 'acquire' (\uparrow_{\perp}^{S}) $la \leftarrow \text{accept } sa :$ *la*.running; case la(bid \Rightarrow *r* \leftarrow recv *la* ; $m \leftarrow \operatorname{recv} la;$ $sa \leftarrow \text{detach } la;$ m.value; $v \leftarrow \operatorname{recv} m$; b' = addbid b (r, v); $M' \leftarrow add \leftarrow M m;$ $sa \leftarrow run \ b' \leftarrow M' \ ml)$

Implementation of a Running Auction auction = $\bigwedge_{L}^{S} \triangleleft^{11} \oplus \{\text{running} : \&\{\text{bid} : \text{id} \supset \text{money} \longrightarrow \bigvee_{L}^{S} \text{auction}\},\$ $(b: bids); (M: money), (ml: monalisa) \vdash run :: (sa: auction)$ $sa \leftarrow run \ b \leftarrow M \ l =$ $la \leftarrow \text{accept } sa :$ accept 'acquire' (\uparrow_{\perp}^{S}) la.running :case lasend status 'running' (bid \Rightarrow *r* \leftarrow recv *la* ; $m \leftarrow \operatorname{recv} la;$ $sa \leftarrow \text{detach } la;$ m.value; $v \leftarrow \operatorname{recv} m$; b' = addbid b (r, v); $M' \leftarrow add \leftarrow M m;$ $sa \leftarrow run \ b' \leftarrow M' \ ml)$









How to Use the Potential

Payment schemes (amortized cost)

- Ensure constant gas cost in the presence of costly operations
- Overcharge for cheap operations and store gas in contract
- Similar to storing ether in memory in EVM but part of contract

Explicit gas bounds

- Add an additional argument that carries potential
- User arg $N \sim$ maximal number of players => gas bound is 81*N + 28

Enforce constant gas cost

- Simply disable potential in contract state
- Require messages to only carry constant potential

Blockchain state: shared processes waiting to be acquired

$$\underbrace{\operatorname{contr}_1(\vec{u}_1, \vec{v}_1)}_{\bullet \mathbf{C}_1} \underbrace{\operatorname{contr}_2(\vec{u}_2, \vec{v}_2)}_{\bullet \mathbf{C}_2} \cdots \underbrace{\operatorname{contr}_n(\vec{u}_n, \vec{v}_n)}_{\bullet \mathbf{C}_n}$$







Transaction: client submits code of a linear process





Transaction: client submits code of a linear process

$$\underbrace{\operatorname{contr}_1(\vec{u}_1, \vec{v}_1)}_{\bullet \mathbf{C}_1} \underbrace{\operatorname{contr}_2(\vec{u}_2, \vec{v}_2)}_{\bullet \mathbf{C}_2} \cdots \underbrace{\operatorname{contr}_n(\vec{u}_n, \vec{v}_n)}_{\bullet \mathbf{C}_n} \underbrace{\operatorname{client}}_{\bullet}$$

- Client process can acquire existing contracts
- Client process can spawn new (shared) processes -> new contracts
- Client process needs to terminates in a new valid state



Transaction: client submits code of a linear process



- Client process can spawn new (shared) processes -> new contracts
- Client process needs to terminates in a new valid state

Blockchain, Type Checking, and Verification

Type checking is part of the attack surface

- Contract code can checked at publication time
- User code needs to be checked for each transaction
- Denial of service attacks are possible
- Nomos type checking is linear in the size of the program

Verification of Nomos program is possible

- Dynamic semantics specifies runtime behavior
- Directly applicable to verification in Coq
- Nomos' type system guaranties some important properties

Nomos

A statically-typed, strict, functional language for digital contracts

- Automatic amortized resource analysis for static gas bounds
- Shared binary session types for transparent & safe contract interfaces
- Linear type system for accurately reflecting assets

References

• POPL '17: AARA for OCaml (RaML)

arXiv '19: Nomos

LICS '18: Resource-Aware Session Types

Ongoing work: implementation

Parser
 ·
 Type checker
 ·
 Interpreter
 ·
 Compiler
Nomos

A statically-typed, strict, functional language for digital contracts

- Automatic amortized resource analysis for static gas bounds
- Shared binary session types for transparent & safe contract interfaces
- Linear type system for accurately reflecting assets

References

• POPL '17: AARA for OCaml (RaML)

arXiv '19: Nomos

LICS '18: Resource-Aware Session Types

Ongoing work: implementation



- Parser
 ·
 Type checker
 ·
 Interpreter
 ·
 Compiler