

An abstraction is of form $(x_1, \dots, x_n)P$; it represents the process P rendered parametric on the names x_1, \dots, x_n . A concretisation is $(\vec{V}\vec{x})(\vec{y}, P)$ where $\vec{x} \subseteq \vec{y}$; it represents an output datum \vec{y} paired with a continuation process P . A commitment has three forms:

$P \xrightarrow{\tau} P'$ representing a communication within P

$P \xrightarrow{z} (\vec{x})P'$ represents the input of a datum (which will replace \vec{x}) along channel z .

$P \xrightarrow{\bar{z}} \vec{V}\vec{x}(\vec{y}, P')$ representing the output of datum \vec{y} along z .

Strong bisimulation \mathcal{S} : a relation such that if $P \xrightarrow{\alpha} A$ and $(P, Q) \in \mathcal{S}$ then $Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} B$ with $(A, B) \in \mathcal{S}$, and the same condition for \mathcal{S}^{-1} .

(SEE NEXT PAGE FOR SECOND PART)

[5 MARKS]

$$P \sim \text{in}(y). (\forall \text{mid } m) (C\langle y, \text{in}, \text{mid}, \ell, m \rangle \mid C\langle x, \text{mid}, \text{out}, m, r \rangle) \\ + \text{out}(x). (\forall \text{mid } m) (B\langle \text{in}, \text{mid}, \ell, m \rangle \mid B\langle \text{mid}, \text{out}, m, r \rangle)$$

$+ \tau. C\langle x, \text{in}, \text{out}, \ell, r \rangle$. The justification is in terms of the three commitments which P can make, justified by the rules of commitment.

[6 MARKS]

If P is changed by making $\text{in} = \text{out}$, then there is an extra commitment due to a communication between C outputting on in and B inputting on in :

$$P = \text{new mid}, m ((\text{in}(y). C\langle y, \text{in}, \text{mid}, \ell, m \rangle + \dots) \mid \text{in}(x). B\langle \text{mid}, \text{in}, m, r \rangle + \dots) \\ \xrightarrow{\tau} \text{new mid}, m (C\langle x, \text{in}, \text{mid}, \ell, m \rangle \mid B\langle \text{mid}, \text{in}, m, r \rangle) \\ \xrightarrow{\tau} P \text{ again}$$

Thus the datum x can cycle indefinitely between the pair of cells.

[5 MARKS]

(ii)

Let $P = (\forall x)\bar{x}(y)$, $Q = (\forall x)\bar{y}(x)$.

Then (a) $Q \neq P$, $Q \neq \textcircled{1}$, $Q \not\sim P$, $Q \not\sim \textcircled{1}$ since

Q has the commitment $Q \xrightarrow{\bar{y}} \forall x(x, \textcircled{1})$ and the other two have no commitments.

(b) $P \sim \textcircled{1}$, since neither has any commitment.

(c) $P \neq \textcircled{1}$, since none of the rules of structural equivalence allow any preactions $x(z)$ or $\bar{x}(y)$ to be added or eliminated.

[4 MARKS]