



## 1 Review: Structural Congruence

Definition of Structural Congruence [ $\equiv$ ]:

1.  $\alpha$ -conversion
2. Re-order sums
3.  $P|0 \equiv P, P|Q \equiv Q|P, P|(Q|R) \equiv (P|Q)|R$
4.  $\text{new } a (P|Q) \equiv (\text{new } a Q)|P$  if  $a \notin \text{fv}(P)$ ,  $\text{new } a 0 \equiv 0$ ,  $\text{new } a, b P \equiv \text{new } b, a P$
5.  $A(\vec{b}) \equiv \{\vec{b}/\vec{a}\}P_A$  where  $A(\vec{a}) = P_A$

## 2 CCS

### 2.1 Definitions

$$\begin{array}{lll}
 \mathcal{L} ::= \mathcal{N} \cup \overline{\mathcal{N}} & \lambda, \mu, \dots & \text{Labels} \\
 \text{Act} ::= \mathcal{L} \cup \{\tau\} & \alpha, \beta, \dots & \text{Actions} \\
 P ::= A\langle a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle \left| \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i.P_i \right| P_1|P_2 \left| \text{new } a P & P, Q, \dots & \text{Processes}
 \end{array}$$

### 2.2 Operational Semantics Rules

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{(a.P + M)|(\bar{a}.Q + N) \rightarrow P|Q} \text{React} \quad \frac{P \rightarrow P'}{P|Q \rightarrow P'|Q} \text{Par} \quad \frac{P \rightarrow P'}{\text{new } a P \rightarrow \text{new } a P'} \text{Res} \\
 \frac{}{\tau.P + M \rightarrow P} \text{Tau} \quad \frac{Q \equiv P \quad P \rightarrow P' \quad P' \equiv Q'}{Q \rightarrow Q'} \text{Struct}
 \end{array}$$

### 2.3 Example: Lottery

Suppose we wish to model a lottery. There is a set of  $N$  balls with outcomes written on them, and we want to non-deterministically choose a ball, output its outcome, and reset to the initial state. We can use the following definitions:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Lottery} &= \tau.b_1.\text{Lottery} + \dots + \tau.b_n.\text{Lottery} \\
 \text{Main} &= (\text{Lottery}|\bar{b}_1.P_1|\dots|\bar{b}_n.P_n)
 \end{aligned}$$

This definition simulates a one-ball lottery. The process Lottery picks a ball  $i$  and sends the corresponding action  $b_i$ , which reacts with the corresponding parallel observer process  $\bar{b}_i.P_i$ , triggering the appropriate reward process  $P_i$ . We could also extend this to a multi-ball lottery by adding more actions to the observer processes:  $\bar{b}_i.\bar{b}_j.\bar{b}_k.P_{ijk}$ . However, we must take care to avoid having a  $b_i$  possibly interact with the wrong  $\bar{b}_i$  in a process; i.e., if the second ball drawn is  $b_i$ , we don't want that action to react with a process that has  $\bar{b}_i$  as its first action.

We can also use the following alternative definitions:

$$\begin{aligned}
A(a, b, c) &= \bar{a}.C\langle a, b, c \rangle \\
B(a, b, c) &= \bar{b}.C\langle a, b, c \rangle \\
C(a, b, c) &= \tau.B\langle a, b, c \rangle + c.A\langle a, b, c \rangle \\
A_i &= A\langle a_i, b_i, a_{i+1} \rangle && \text{for } i \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \text{ with } 3 + 1 = 1 \\
B_i &= B\langle a_i, b_i, a_{i+1} \rangle \\
C_i &= C\langle a_i, b_i, a_{i+1} \rangle \\
L_1 &= \text{new } a_1, a_2, a_3 (C_1|A_2|A_3) \\
L_2 &= \text{new } a_1, a_2, a_3 (A_1|C_2|A_3) \\
L_3 &= \text{new } a_1, a_2, a_3 (A_1|A_2|C_3)
\end{aligned}$$

To see how this works, we start by expanding the definition of  $L_1$ :

$$L_1 = \text{new } a_1, a_2, a_3 (C_1|A_2|A_3) \equiv \text{new } a_1, a_2, a_3 (\tau.B\langle a_1, b_1, a_2 \rangle + a_2.A\langle a_1, b_1, a_2 \rangle|A_2|A_3)$$

Thus from  $L_1$ , we can take one of two actions: either  $\tau$ , or  $a_2$ . In the latter case, we get (after  $a_2$  reacts with  $\bar{a}_2$  in  $A_2$ ):

$$\text{new } a_1, a_2, a_3 (A\langle a_1, b_1, a_2 \rangle|C\langle a_2, b_2, a_3 \rangle|A_3) \equiv L_2$$

In the former case, we get:

$$\text{new } a_1, a_2, a_3 (b_1.C\langle a_1, b_1, a_2 \rangle|A_2|A_3) \equiv \text{new } a_1, a_2, a_3 (b_1.C_1|A_2|A_3)$$

Once the  $b_1$  reacts with an external observer process, we are left with  $L_1$ . Thus at each of the  $L_i$ , we can either draw a ball  $b_i$  or transition to  $L_{i+1}$ .

### 3 CCS as an LTS

#### 3.1 Operational Semantics Rules

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{M + \alpha.P + N \xrightarrow{\alpha} P} \text{L-Sum} \quad \frac{P \xrightarrow{\lambda} P' \quad Q \xrightarrow{\bar{\lambda}} Q'}{P|Q \xrightarrow{\tau} P'|Q'} \text{L-React} \quad \frac{P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P' \quad \alpha \notin \{a, \bar{a}\}}{\text{new } a P \xrightarrow{\alpha} \text{new } a P'} \text{L-Res} \\
\frac{P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'}{P|Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'|Q} \text{L-Par L} \quad \frac{Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q'}{P|Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} P|Q'} \text{L-Par R} \quad \frac{\{\vec{b}/\vec{a}\}P_A \xrightarrow{\alpha} P' \quad A(\vec{a}) = P_A}{A\langle \vec{b} \rangle \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'} \text{L-Ident}
\end{array}$$

There are two important things to notice. The first is that we no longer make use of structural congruence; consequently, we now require separate rules for left- and right-parallel composition, and we need summands on both sides for the L-Sum rule. The second thing to notice is that in the L-React rule, since  $\lambda$  is internal to the process, we label the transition with  $\tau$  so that  $\lambda$  is hidden from any external processes. Also, we still have  $\alpha$ -equivalence for  $\text{new } a P$  expressions:  $\text{new } a P = \text{new } b P\{b/a\}$  for any other label  $b$ .

### 3.2 Theorems

First, we want to show that even though we no longer have a structural congruence rule, structural congruence in fact still holds. We therefore have the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.** *If  $P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'$  and  $P \equiv Q$ , then  $\exists Q'$  such that  $Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q'$  and  $Q' \equiv P'$ .*

*Proof.* Here is a partial proof, containing only a few subcases. Proof by induction on  $P \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'$ . Case L-Par L:  $P = P_1|P_2$ ,  $P_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} P'_1$ ,  $P' = P'_1|P_2$ . Consider  $P \equiv Q$ . We now look at all of the ways  $Q$  could be structurally congruent to  $P$ :

Subcase  $Q = P_2|P_1$ . Then let  $Q' = P_2|P'_1$ . By L-Par R,  $Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q'$ . ✓

Subcase  $Q = Q_1|P_2$ ,  $Q_1 \equiv P_1$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $\exists Q'_1$  such that  $Q_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q'_1$ ,  $Q'_1 \equiv P_1$ . By L-Par L,  $Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} Q'_1|P_2 \equiv P'$ . Then let  $Q' = Q'_1|P_2$ . ✓ □

We would also like to show that the transitions in this system correspond to those in the original CCS:

**Theorem 2.**  *$P \rightarrow P'$  iff  $P \xrightarrow{\tau} \equiv P'$  (where  $\xrightarrow{\tau} \equiv$  indicates relational composition of  $\xrightarrow{\tau}$  and  $\equiv$ ).*