



# Smart digital contracts: Contract analysis and some open problems

Fritz Henglein

Email: [henglein@diku.dk](mailto:henglein@diku.dk), [henglein@deondigital.com](mailto:henglein@deondigital.com)

OPLSS 2019, 2019-06-27



# Recall

**Agents:** Persons, companies, robots, devices that sign events and their evidence.

**Events:** Significant real-world events that update the state of the (business) world.

**Resources:** Physical (goods, services) and digital (money, rights) resources, represented by free vector space over resource types.

**Ownership states:** Map of which owner owns which (compound) resource, represented by coproduct of resource space indexed by agents.

**Resource transfers:** Changes to ownership states that sum to 0.

**Resource manager:** System that maintains ownership states subject to credit limit policy (admissible ownership states), admitting only updates by resource transfers.

**Contract:** Set of happy paths (acceptable event sequences).

**Contract specification:** A syntactic object denoting a contract.

**Contract specification language:** Language for contract specifications.

**Contract (life-cycle) management:** Program that receives a contract specification and then processes a stream of events in accordance with the semantics of the contract specification.



# Today

- Contract analysis
- Some exercises and open problems



# Contract properties

## Definition

A *contract property* is a predicate (Boolean function)  $P$  on contract specifications.

It is *extensional* if  $\mathcal{C}[[C_1]] = \mathcal{C}[[C_2]] \implies (P(C_1) \Leftrightarrow P(C_2))$ .

It is *universal* if  $P(C) \Leftrightarrow \forall s \in \mathcal{C}[[C]]. P'(s)$  for some predicate  $P'$  on event sequences.



# Contract verification and contract analysis

- Contract verification: Given  $C$  and  $P$ , decide whether  $P(C)$  holds. If possible, provide a proof of  $\vdash P(C)$ , respectively  $\vdash \neg P(C)$ .
- Contract analysis: Given  $C$  and  $P$ , compute a "good" witness  $W$  such that  $P(W)(c)$  holds.



## Contract analysis: First events

### Definition

$$\text{First}(c) = \{e \in E \mid \exists s \in E^*. es \in c\}$$

Analysis problem: Given contract specification  $C$  compute a (useful representation of) set  $F$  such that  $\text{First}(\llbracket C \rrbracket) \subseteq F$ .

Exercise: How would you do this for CSL contract specifications?



## Contract analysis: Fair consideration

### Definition

Let transfer effect function  $\text{eff}$  be given.

Given *valuation* function  $\text{Price} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the *value* of a sequence of events  $s \in E^*$  is

$$\text{Value}(s) = \text{Price}^*(\text{eff}(s)) \in \sum_A \mathbb{R}.$$

A contract  $c$  is  *$\epsilon$ -fair under Price* if

$$\forall s \in c, a \in A. |\text{Value}(s)(a)| \leq \epsilon.$$

A contract specification  $C$  is  *$\epsilon$ -fair under Price* if  $\mathcal{C}[[C]]$  is so.



## Contract analysis: Fair consideration

- Why important?
- An  $\epsilon$ -fair contract, where Price reflects market prices, guarantees that *no* happy path leads to a state where an agent has paid or received significantly more than any other in terms of the market value of exchanged goods, services and money.
- Combined with transactional (escrowed) contract execution, this guarantees that neither happy paths nor unhappy paths lead to disproportionate benefits/losses for any agent.
- Cannot be a built-in property of contracts since it depends on Price, which reflects context-dependent assumptions (market prices) about unit values of resource types.



## Linear resources and linear logic

- Linear logic is called a resource logic: Assumptions are “used up” by applications of modus ponens
- Transfers guarantee that no resources are lost or duplicated; they are treated “linearly”.

Intuitively, there is a connection between these “linearities”. What is it?

- Can sequents be interpreted as transfers and linear logic inference rules as (particular) linear maps on transfers?
- Linear logic has no scalar multiplication. Can linear logic be extended to admit meaningful “counting” operations; e.g. add  $k \cdot P$  instead of  $!P$ . For  $k \in \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ , any field  $K$ ?



# Linear logic: Structural rules

EXCHANGE

$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma, B, A, \Delta}{\vdash \Gamma, A, B, \Delta}$$

INIT

$$\vdash A, A^\perp$$

CUT

$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A \quad A^\perp, \Delta}{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta}$$


# Linear logic: Multiplicative rules

$$\frac{\text{TENSOR} \quad \vdash \Gamma, A \quad \vdash \Delta, B}{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta, A \otimes B}$$

TENSORUNIT

$$\vdash 1$$

PAR

$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A \wp B}$$

PARUNIT

$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma}{\vdash \Gamma, \perp}$$



## Linear logic: Additive rules

$$\text{WITH}$$
$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A \quad \vdash \Gamma, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A \& B}$$

$$\text{PLUS1}$$
$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A}{\vdash \Gamma, A \oplus B}$$

$$\text{PLUS2}$$
$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A \oplus B}$$

$$\text{TOP}$$
$$\vdash \Gamma, \top$$



## Wrap-up



# Smart contracts

- Ethereum-style smart contracts:
  - ▶ Current standard understanding of term “smart contract” .
  - ▶ Contract specification, contract management and resource management combined and expressed in single-threaded program expressed in general-purpose programming language (EVM).
  - ▶ Implementation as decentralized replicated state machine, where each replica stores full state.
  - ▶ Distributed consensus on total event order of all events across all contracts is required and computed.



## Smart digital contracts: Concepts

- Contract: A set of event sequences (“happy paths”).
- Contract specification: Syntactic object that denotes a contract (reified contract).
- CSL: Compositional contract specification language with multiple induction principles and supporting equational reasoning.
- Contract manager: System/service (“generic smart contract”) that manages a set of contracts passed to it for management.
- Resource: Finite map from arbitrary resource types to number of units of each type.
- Resource manager: System that manages ownership of resources by agents, admits only resource transfers.
- Resource transfer: Ownership changes that guarantee that no resources are duplicated or lost.



# Smart digital contracts: Separation of concerns

- Separation of contract and contract manager:
  - ▶ Separation of concerns: reified contracts (“digital contracts”) and their flexible, intelligent management (“smart”).
  - ▶ Change contracts and contract managers independent of each other.
  - ▶ Analyze contracts (written in DSL with mathematical semantics supporting compositional, equational reasoning and having multiple, useful induction principles) independent of their managers (written in any arbitrarily expressive and complex general-purpose languages).
  - ▶ Transparently port running contracts among contract managers.
- Separation of resource managers and contract managers: Facilitates
  - ▶ privacy and scalability of contract management (each contract managed independently; synchronize only through resource managers; consensus on total event order neither required nor computed);
  - ▶ transactional use on multiple resource managers, both decentralized (blockchain/distributed ledger) and centralized (server-based, cloud-hosted) systems;
  - ▶ scalable, distributed resource managers by additive (de)composition



# Finis

Thank you!

Fritz Henglein  
henglein@diku.dk  
henglein@deondigital.com

