

# Trocq parametricity translations for inductive types

---

Tomás Vallejos Parada

Team Gallinette, Inria, LS2N

2026-01-17

talk soon @ [tvallejos.cl](mailto:tvallejos.cl)

# Motivation

---

# Proof transfer examples

Inductive  $\text{nat} := \text{O} \mid \text{S} : \text{nat} \rightarrow \text{nat}$ .

Inductive  $\text{Z} := \text{Pz} : \text{nat} \rightarrow \text{Z} \mid \text{Nz} : \text{nat} \rightarrow \text{Z}$ .

Inductive  $\text{binnat} := \text{Obin} \mid \text{NPos} : \text{positive} \rightarrow \text{binnat}$ .

You have:

$(x + y = y + x)$  %Z

$(\text{foldl} + [2; 3; 5] = 10)$  %list nat

$\text{ind\_nat}$  nat

You need:

$(n + m = m + n)$  %N

$(\text{foldl} + [2; 3; 5] = 10)$  %list Z

$\text{ind\_nat}$  %binnat

One would like to discharge them by pressing a button

# Proof transfer frameworks via parametricity translations

- **“Raw” parametricity translation** (J.-P. Bernardy, P. Jansson, and R. Paterson)
- **Univalent parametricity translation** (N. Tabareau, É. Tanter, and M. Sozeau)
- **CoqEAL** (M. Dénès, A. Mörtberg, and V. Siles)

Latest: **Troq** (C. Cohen, E. Crance, and A. Mahboubi)

Generalizes previous parametricity translations

# Proof transfer requirements

In	User provides	Trocq translates
1. $5\%N$ into $5\%Z$	a <i>relation</i> between A and B	type A into type B
2. list nat into list Z	a <i>proof</i> the container preserves the relation	through a <i>type parametric</i> container
3. vec nat into vec Z	a relation between A and A	type A into type A

For inductive types with *type parameters* and *recursion*, *no indices*

This work generates 2. and 3. **automatically**

# Context

---

# Trocq's hierarchy

$\text{Param}_{n,k} AB := \Sigma R : A \rightarrow B \rightarrow \square. (M_n R) \times (M_k R^{\text{op}})$

$M_4 \quad \Pi a, b. (mR(a, b)) \circ (Rm(a, b)) \doteq \text{id}$

$M_3 \quad mR \wedge Rm$

$M_{2_a} \quad mR : \Pi a, b. m(a) = b \rightarrow R(a, b)$

$M_{2_b} \quad Rm : \Pi a, b. R(a, b) \rightarrow m(a) = b$

$M_1 \quad m : A \rightarrow B$

$M_0 \quad R : A \rightarrow B \rightarrow \square$

# Pros/cons of supporting weaker relations

## Pros

- Supports weaker relations
- Enables avoiding the univalence axiom when possible

## Cons

- Preserving relation across a container requires to prove

$$\Pi(A B : \square) (R : \text{Param}_{n,k} AB), \text{Param}_{n,k}(\text{list } A)(\text{list } B)$$

- Not translating a type requires to prove

$$\text{Param}_{n,k} AA$$

# Derivation

---

# A parametricity translation for inductive types

- Bottom-up derivation of the lattice
- Careful implementation of intermediate data requirements so coherence can be proven
- Strategy: postponing the elimination of identities

Implementation in ELPI built upon param2 (C. Cohen) and derive (E. Tassi) plugins, currently **automatically** generating:

1.  $\text{Param}_{n,0}AB$  preservation for parametric containers
2.  $\text{Param}_{n,0}AA$

For inductive types with type parameters and recursion, no indices

Find it at <https://github.com/Tvallejos/trocq/tree/rocqpl-26/std/algo>

## An example derivation: nat

Inductive  $nR : \text{nat} \rightarrow \text{nat} \rightarrow \text{Type} :=$   
 |  $OR : nR \ O \ O$   
 |  $SR : \forall n \ m, nR \ n \ m \rightarrow nR \ (S \ n) \ (S \ m).$

Fixpoint  $nM \ n := \text{match } n \text{ with}$   
 |  $O \Rightarrow O$   
 |  $S \ n' \Rightarrow S \ (nM \ n')$  end.

generate  $\text{projS} : \text{nat} \rightarrow \text{nat}$  and  $\text{Sproj} : \forall n1 \ n2, S \ n1 = S \ n2 \rightarrow \text{projS} \ n1 \ (S \ n1) = \text{projS} \ n1 \ (S \ n2)$

**Definition**  $nmR \ n1 \ n2 :$

$\text{natM} \ n1 = n2 \rightarrow nR \ n1 \ n2 :=$  by induction on  $n1$  and  $n2$ . On the diagonal, use  $nR \ Kth$  constructor,  $\text{Sproj}$  and **IH**. Discriminate outside it.

**Definition**  $nRm \ n1 \ n2 :$

$nR \ n1 \ n2 \rightarrow \text{natM} \ n1 = n2 :=$  by induction on  $nR$ ,  $f\_equal$  and **IH**.

generate  $\text{SprojSK}$ : constructor cancels with the projection

**Definition**  $\text{nat\_coh} \ n1 \ n2 \ (nR : nR \ n1 \ n2) :$

$nmR \ \_ \_ \ (nRm \ n1 \ n2 \ nR) = nR :=$  by induction on  $nR$ , rewrite under  $\text{SprojSK}$  and **IH**

## Another example generation: list

Inductive listR (A B : Type) (R : A → B → Type) : list A → list B → Type :=  
 | nilR : listR A B R (listR A B R nil nil)  
 | consR : ∀ a b, R a b  
 → ∀ la lb, listR A B R la lb  
 → (listR A B R (cons a la) (cons b lb)).

Definition list\_mR (A B : Type) (R : Param2a0.Rel A B) : ∀ la lb, listM A B R la = lb  
 → List\_R A B R la lb.

Definition List\_mRRmK (A B : Type) (R : Param40.Rel A B) la lb (IR : List\_R A B R la lb),  
 List\_mR A B R la lb (List\_Rm A B R la lb IR) = IR.

Fixpoint listM (A B : Type)  
 (R: Param10.Rel A B) l : list B :=  
 match l with  
 | nil => nil  
 | cons a l' => cons (map R a) (listM \_\_ R l')  
 end.

Definition List\_Rm (A B : Type) (R : Param2b0.Rel A B) :  
 ∀ la lb, List\_R A B R la lb → List\_mymap A B  
 R la = lb.

# Trocq parametricity translations for inductive types

---

Tomás Vallejos Parada

Team Gallinette, Inria, LS2N

2026-01-17

talk soon @ [tvallejos.cl](mailto:tvallejos.cl)

# Bibliography

- [1] J.-P. Bernardy, P. Jansson, and R. Paterson, “Parametricity and dependent types,” in *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming, ICFP 2010, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, September 27-29, 2010*, P. Hudak and S. Weirich, Eds., ACM, 2010, pp. 345–356. doi: [10.1145/1863543.1863592](https://doi.org/10.1145/1863543.1863592).
- [2] N. Tabareau, É. Tanter, and M. Sozeau, “The Marriage of Univalence and Parametricity,” *J. ACM*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 5:1–5:44, 2021, doi: [10.1145/3429979](https://doi.org/10.1145/3429979).
- [3] M. Dénès, A. Mörtberg, and V. Siles, “A Refinement-Based Approach to Computational Algebra in Coq,” in *Interactive Theorem Proving - Third International Conference, ITP 2012, Princeton, NJ, USA, August 13-15, 2012. Proceedings*, L. Beringer and A. P. Felty, Eds., in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7406. Springer, 2012, pp. 83–98. doi: [10.1007/978-3-642-32347-8\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-32347-8_7).
- [4] C. Cohen, E. Crance, and A. Mahboubi, “Trocq: Proof Transfer for Free, Beyond Equivalence and Univalence,” *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, vol. 47, no. 3, Sept. 2025, doi: [10.1145/3737283](https://doi.org/10.1145/3737283).
- [5] E. Tassi, “Deriving Proved Equality Tests in Coq-Elpi: Stronger Induction Principles for Containers in Coq,” in *10th International Conference on Interactive Theorem Proving, ITP 2019, Portland, OR, USA, September 9-12, 2019*, J. Harrison, J. O’Leary, and A. Tolmach, Eds., in LIPIcs, vol. 141. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019, pp. 29:1–29:18. doi: [10.4230/LIPICS.ITP.2019.29](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.ITP.2019.29).