

Process Composition

Filip Smola

March 17, 2025

Contents

1	Utility Theorems	2
2	Resource Terms	4
2.1	Resource Term Equivalence	5
2.2	Parallel Parts	8
2.3	Parallellisation	9
2.4	Refinement	11
2.5	Removing <i>Empty</i> Terms From a List	12
2.6	Merging Nested <i>Parallel</i> Terms in a List	13
3	Resource Term Normal Form	15
4	Rewriting Resource Term Normalisation	16
4.1	Rewriting Relation	17
4.2	Rewriting Bound	18
4.3	Step	19
4.3.1	Removing One Empty	19
4.3.2	Merging One Parallel	20
4.3.3	Rewriting Step Function	21
4.4	Normalisation Procedure	26
4.5	As Abstract Rewriting System	28
4.5.1	Rewriting System Properties	28
4.5.2	<i>NonD</i> Joinability	30
4.5.3	<i>Executable</i> and <i>Repeatable</i> Joinability	30
4.5.4	<i>Parallel</i> Joinability	30
4.5.5	Other Helpful Lemmas	33
4.5.6	Equivalent Term Joinability	34
4.6	Term Equivalence as Rewriting Closure	35
5	Direct Resource Term Normalisation	36
6	Comparison of Resource Term Normalisation	38

7	Resources	39
7.1	Quotient Type	39
7.2	Lifting Bounded Natural Functor Structure	40
7.3	Lifting Constructors	41
7.4	Parallel Product	44
7.5	Lifting Parallel Parts	45
7.6	Lifting Parallelisation	46
7.7	Representative of Parallel Resource	46
7.8	Replicated Resources	47
7.9	Lifting Resource Refinement	47
8	Process Compositions	48
8.1	Datatype, Input, Output and Validity	48
8.2	Gathering Primitive Actions	52
8.3	Resource Refinement in Processes	53
9	List-based Composition Actions	54
9.1	Progressing Both Non-deterministic Branches	56
10	Primitive Action Substitution	56
11	Useful Notation	58
12	Copyable Resource Elimination	59
12.1	Replacing Copyable Resource Actions	60
12.2	Making Copyable Resource Terms Linear	60
12.3	Final Properties	64

```

theory Util
  imports Main
begin

```

1 Utility Theorems

This theory contains general facts that we use in our proof but which do not depend on our development.

list-all and *list-ex* are dual

lemma *not-list-all*:

$$(\neg \text{list-all } P \text{ } xs) = \text{list-ex } (\lambda x. \neg P \ x) \ xs$$

<proof>

lemma *not-list-ex*:

$$(\neg \text{list-ex } P \text{ } xs) = \text{list-all } (\lambda x. \neg P \ x) \ xs$$

<proof>

A list of length more than one starts with two elements

lemma *list-obtain-2*:
assumes $1 < \text{length } xs$
obtains $v \ vb \ vc$ **where** $xs = v \# \ vb \# \ vc$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Generalise the theorem $\llbracket ?k < ?l; ?m + ?l = ?k + ?n \rrbracket \implies ?m < ?n$

lemma *less-add-eq-less-general*:
fixes $k \ l \ m \ n :: 'a :: \{\text{comm-monoid-add}, \text{ordered-cancel-ab-semigroup-add}, \text{linorder}\}$
assumes $k < l$
and $m + l = k + n$
shows $m < n$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Consider a list of elements and two functions, one of which is always at less-than or equal to the other on elements of that list. If for one element of that list the first function is strictly less than the other, then summing the list with the first function is also strictly less summing it with the second function.

lemma *sum-list-mono-one-strict*:
fixes $f \ g :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b :: \{\text{comm-monoid-add}, \text{ordered-cancel-ab-semigroup-add}, \text{linorder}\}$
assumes $\bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } xs \implies f \ x \leq g \ x$
and $x \in \text{set } xs$
and $f \ x < g \ x$
shows $\text{sum-list } (\text{map } f \ xs) < \text{sum-list } (\text{map } g \ xs)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Generalise $(\bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } ?xs \implies ?f \ x \leq ?g \ x) \implies \text{sum-list } (\text{map } ?f \ ?xs) \leq \text{sum-list } (\text{map } ?g \ ?xs)$ to allow for different lists

lemma *sum-list-mono-list-all2*:
fixes $f \ g :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b :: \{\text{monoid-add}, \text{ordered-ab-semigroup-add}\}$
assumes *list-all2* $(\lambda x \ y. f \ x \leq g \ y) \ xs \ ys$
shows $(\sum x \leftarrow xs. f \ x) \leq (\sum x \leftarrow ys. g \ x)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Generalise $\llbracket \bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } ?xs \implies ?f \ x \leq ?g \ x; ?x \in \text{set } ?xs; ?f \ ?x < ?g \ ?x \rrbracket \implies \text{sum-list } (\text{map } ?f \ ?xs) < \text{sum-list } (\text{map } ?g \ ?xs)$ to allow for different lists

lemma *sum-list-mono-one-strict-list-all2*:
fixes $f \ g :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b :: \{\text{comm-monoid-add}, \text{ordered-cancel-ab-semigroup-add}, \text{linorder}\}$
assumes *list-all2* $(\lambda x \ y. f \ x \leq g \ y) \ xs \ ys$
and $(x, y) \in \text{set } (\text{zip } xs \ ys)$
and $f \ x < g \ y$
shows $\text{sum-list } (\text{map } f \ xs) < \text{sum-list } (\text{map } g \ ys)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Define a function to count the number of list elements satisfying a predicate

primrec *count-if* :: ('a \Rightarrow bool) \Rightarrow 'a list \Rightarrow nat

where

count-if P [] = 0

| *count-if* P (x#xs) = (if P x then Suc (count-if P xs) else count-if P xs)

lemma *count-if-append* [simp]:

count-if P (xs @ ys) = *count-if* P xs + *count-if* P ys

<proof>

lemma *count-if-0-conv*:

(*count-if* P xs = 0) = (\neg list-ex P xs)

<proof>

Intersection of sets that are the same is any of those sets

lemma *Inter-all-same*:

assumes $\bigwedge x y. [x \in A; y \in A] \Longrightarrow f x = f y$

and $x \in A$

shows $(\bigcap x \in A. f x) = f x$

<proof>

end

theory *ResTerm*

imports *Main*

begin

2 Resource Terms

Resource terms describe resources with atoms drawn from two types, linear and copyable, combined in a number of ways:

- Parallel resources represent their simultaneous presence,
- Non-deterministic resource represent exactly one of two options,
- Executable resources represent a single potential execution of a process transforming one resource into another,
- Repeatably executable resources represent an unlimited amount of such potential executions.

We define two distinguished resources on top of the atoms:

- Empty, to represent the absence of a resource and serve as the unit for parallel combination,
- Anything, to represent a resource about which we have no information.

datatype (*discs-sels*) ('a, 'b) *res-term* =
Res 'a
 — Linear resource atom
 | *Copyable* 'b
 — Copyable resource atom
 | *is-Empty: Empty*
 — The absence of a resource
 | *is-Anything: Anything*
 — Resource about which we know nothing
 | *Parallel* ('a, 'b) *res-term list*
 — Parallel combination
 | *NonD* ('a, 'b) *res-term* ('a, 'b) *res-term*
 — Non-deterministic combination
 | *Executable* ('a, 'b) *res-term* ('a, 'b) *res-term*
 — Executable resource
 | *Repeatable* ('a, 'b) *res-term* ('a, 'b) *res-term*
 — Repeatably executable resource

Every child of *Parallel* is smaller than it

lemma *parallel-child-smaller*:

$x \in \text{set } xs \implies \text{size-res-term } f \ g \ x < \text{size-res-term } f \ g \ (\text{Parallel } xs)$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

No singleton *Parallel* is equal to its own child, because the child has to be smaller

lemma *parallel-neq-single* [*simp*]:

$\text{Parallel } [a] \neq a$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

2.1 Resource Term Equivalence

Some resource terms are different descriptions of the same situation. We express this by relating resource terms as follows:

- *Parallel* [] with *Empty*
- *Parallel* [x] with *x*
- *Parallel* (xs @ [Parallel ys] @ zs) with *Parallel* (xs @ ys @ zs)

We extend this with the reflexive base cases, recursive cases and symmetric-transitive closure. As a result, we get an equivalence relation on resource terms, which we will later use to quotient the terms and form a type of resources.

inductive *res-term-equiv* :: ('a, 'b) *res-term* \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) *res-term* \Rightarrow *bool* (**infix** \sim 100)

where

nil: $\text{Parallel } [] \sim \text{Empty}$
singleton: $\text{Parallel } [a] \sim a$
merge: $\text{Parallel } (x @ [\text{Parallel } y] @ z) \sim \text{Parallel } (x @ y @ z)$
empty: $\text{Empty} \sim \text{Empty}$
anything: $\text{Anything} \sim \text{Anything}$
res: $\text{Res } x \sim \text{Res } x$
copyable: $\text{Copyable } x \sim \text{Copyable } x$
parallel: $\text{list-all2 } (\sim) \text{ } xs \text{ } ys \implies \text{Parallel } xs \sim \text{Parallel } ys$
nondet: $\llbracket x \sim y; u \sim v \rrbracket \implies \text{NonD } x \text{ } u \sim \text{NonD } y \text{ } v$
executable: $\llbracket x \sim y; u \sim v \rrbracket \implies \text{Executable } x \text{ } u \sim \text{Executable } y \text{ } v$
repeatable: $\llbracket x \sim y; u \sim v \rrbracket \implies \text{Repeatable } x \text{ } u \sim \text{Repeatable } y \text{ } v$
sym [*sym*]: $x \sim y \implies y \sim x$
trans [*trans*]: $\llbracket x \sim y; y \sim z \rrbracket \implies x \sim z$

Add some of the rules for the simplifier

lemmas [*simp*] =
nil nil[*symmetric*]
singleton singleton[*symmetric*]

Constrain all these rules to the resource term equivalence namespace

hide-fact (**open**) *empty anything res copyable nil singleton merge parallel nondet executable repeatable sym trans*

Next we derive a handful of rules for the equivalence, placing them in its namespace

$\langle ML \rangle$

It can be shown to be reflexive

lemma *refl* [*simp*]:
 $a \sim a$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *reflI*:
 $a = b \implies a \sim b$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *equivp* [*simp*]:
equivp res-term-equiv
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Parallel resource terms can be related by splitting them into parts

lemma *decompose*:
assumes $\text{Parallel } x1 \sim \text{Parallel } y1$
and $\text{Parallel } x2 \sim \text{Parallel } y2$
shows $\text{Parallel } (x1 @ x2) \sim \text{Parallel } (y1 @ y2)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

We can drop a unit from any parallel resource term

lemma *drop*:

$Parallel (x @ [Empty] @ y) \sim Parallel (x @ y)$
<proof>

Equivalent resource terms remain equivalent wrapped in a parallel

lemma *singleton-both*:

$x \sim y \implies Parallel [x] \sim Parallel [y]$
<proof>

We can reduce a resource term equivalence given equivalences for both sides

lemma *trans-both*:

$\llbracket a \sim x; y \sim b; x \sim y \rrbracket \implies a \sim b$
<proof>

<ML>

experiment begin

lemma $Parallel [Parallel [], Empty] \sim Empty$

<proof>

end

Inserting equivalent terms anywhere in equivalent parallel terms preserves the equivalence

lemma *res-term-parallel-insert*:

assumes $Parallel x \sim Parallel y$
and $Parallel u \sim Parallel v$
and $a \sim b$
shows $Parallel (x @ [a] @ u) \sim Parallel (y @ [b] @ v)$
<proof>

With inserting at the start being just a special case

lemma *res-term-parallel-cons*:

assumes $Parallel x \sim Parallel y$
and $a \sim b$
shows $Parallel (a \# x) \sim Parallel (b \# y)$
<proof>

Empty is a unit for binary *Parallel*

lemma *res-term-parallel-emptyR* [*simp*]: $Parallel [x, Empty] \sim x$
<proof>

lemma *res-term-parallel-emptyL* [*simp*]: $Parallel [Empty, x] \sim x$
<proof>

Term equivalence is preserved by parallel on either side

lemma *res-term-equiv-parallel* [*simp*]:

$x \sim y \implies x \sim Parallel [y]$
<proof>

lemmas [*simp*] = *res-term-equiv-parallel*[*symmetric*]

Resource term map preserves equivalence:

lemma *map-res-term-preserves-equiv* [simp]:

$x \sim y \implies \text{map-res-term } f \ g \ x \sim \text{map-res-term } f \ g \ y$
 ⟨proof⟩

The other direction is not true in general, because they may be new equivalences created by mapping different atoms to the same one. However, the counter-example proof requires a decision procedure for the equivalence to prove that two distinct atoms are not equivalent terms. As such, we delay it until normalisation for the terms is established.

2.2 Parallel Parts

Parallel resources often arise in processes, because they describe the frequent situation of having multiple resources be simultaneously present. With resource terms, the way this situation is expressed can get complex. To simplify it, we define a function to extract the list of parallel resource terms, traversing nested *Parallel* terms and dropping any *Empty* resources in them. We call these the parallel parts.

primrec *parallel-parts* :: ('a, 'b) res-term \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) res-term list

where

parallel-parts *Empty* = []
 | *parallel-parts* *Anything* = [*Anything*]
 | *parallel-parts* (*Res* *a*) = [*Res* *a*]
 | *parallel-parts* (*Copyable* *a*) = [*Copyable* *a*]
 | *parallel-parts* (*Parallel* *xs*) = *concat* (*map* *parallel-parts* *xs*)
 | *parallel-parts* (*NonD* *a* *b*) = [*NonD* *a* *b*]
 | *parallel-parts* (*Executable* *a* *b*) = [*Executable* *a* *b*]
 | *parallel-parts* (*Repeatable* *a* *b*) = [*Repeatable* *a* *b*]

Every resource is equivalent to combining its parallel parts in parallel

lemma *parallel-parts-eq*:

$x \sim \text{Parallel } (\text{parallel-parts } x)$
 ⟨proof⟩

Equivalent parallel parts is the same as equivalent resource terms

lemma *equiv-parallel-parts*:

list-all2 (\sim) (*parallel-parts* *a*) (*parallel-parts* *b*) = $a \sim b$
 ⟨proof⟩

Note that resource term equivalence does not imply parallel parts equality

lemma

obtains $x \ y$ **where** $x \sim y$ **and** *parallel-parts* $x \neq \text{parallel-parts } y$
 ⟨proof⟩

But it does imply that both have equal number of parallel parts

lemma *parallel-parts-length-eq*:

$$x \sim y \implies \text{length} (\text{parallel-parts } x) = \text{length} (\text{parallel-parts } y)$$

<proof>

Empty parallel parts, however, is the same as equivalence to the unit

lemma *parallel-parts-nil-equiv-empty*:

$$(\text{parallel-parts } a = []) = a \sim \text{Empty}$$

<proof>

Singleton parallel parts imply equivalence to the one element

lemma *parallel-parts-single-equiv-element*:

$$\text{parallel-parts } a = [x] \implies a \sim x$$

<proof>

No element of parallel parts is *Parallel* or *Empty*

lemma *parallel-parts-have-no-empty*:

$$x \in \text{set} (\text{parallel-parts } a) \implies \neg \text{is-Empty } x$$

<proof>

lemma *parallel-parts-have-no-par*:

$$x \in \text{set} (\text{parallel-parts } a) \implies \neg \text{is-Parallel } x$$

<proof>

Every parallel part of a resource is at most as big as it

lemma *parallel-parts-not-bigger*:

$$x \in \text{set} (\text{parallel-parts } a) \implies \text{size-res-term } f g x \leq (\text{size-res-term } f g a)$$

<proof>

Any resource that is not *Empty* or *Parallel* has itself as parallel part

lemma *parallel-parts-self* [*simp*]:

$$[\neg \text{is-Empty } x; \neg \text{is-Parallel } x] \implies \text{parallel-parts } x = [x]$$

<proof>

List of terms with no *Empty* or *Parallel* elements is the same as parallel parts of the *Parallel* term build from it

lemma *parallel-parts-no-empty-parallel*:

assumes $\neg \text{list-ex is-Empty } xs$

and $\neg \text{list-ex is-Parallel } xs$

shows $\text{parallel-parts } (\text{Parallel } xs) = xs$

<proof>

2.3 Parallelisation

In the opposite direction of parallel parts, we can take a list of resource terms and combine them in parallel in a way smarter than just using *Parallel*. This rests in checking the list length, using the *Empty* resource if it is empty and skipping the wrapping in *Parallel* if it has only a single element. We call this parallelisation.

fun *parallelise* :: ('a, 'b) res-term list \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) res-term
where
parallelise [] = *Empty*
| *parallelise* [x] = x
| *parallelise* xs = *Parallel* xs

This produces equivalent results to the *Parallel* constructor

lemma *parallelise-equiv*:
parallelise xs \sim *Parallel* xs
⟨proof⟩

Lists of equal length that parallelise to the same term must have been equal

lemma *parallelise-same-length*:
[[*parallelise* x = *parallelise* y; length x = length y]] \implies x = y
⟨proof⟩

Parallelisation and naive parallel combination have the same parallel parts

lemma *parallel-parts-parallelise-eq*:
parallel-parts (*parallelise* xs) = *parallel-parts* (*Parallel* xs)
⟨proof⟩

Parallelising to a *Parallel* term means the input is either:

- A singleton set containing just that resulting *Parallel* term, or
- Exactly the children of the output and with at least two elements.

lemma *parallelise-to-parallel-conv*:
(*parallelise* xs = *Parallel* ys) = (xs = [*Parallel* ys] \vee (1 < length xs \wedge xs = ys))
⟨proof⟩

So parallelising to a *Parallel* term with the same children is the same as the list having at least two elements

lemma *parallelise-to-parallel-same-length*:
(*parallelise* xs = *Parallel* xs) = (1 < length xs)
⟨proof⟩

If the output of parallelisation contains a nested *Parallel* term then so must have the input list

lemma *parallelise-to-parallel-has-parallel*:
assumes *parallelise* xs = *Parallel* ys
and list-ex is-*Parallel* ys
shows list-ex is-*Parallel* xs
⟨proof⟩

If the output of parallelisation contains *Empty* then so must have the input

lemma *parallelise-to-parallel-has-empty*:

assumes $parallelise\ xs = Parallel\ ys$
obtains $x\ s = [Parallel\ ys]$
 | $x\ s = ys$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Parallelising to *Empty* means the input list was either empty or contained just that

lemma *parallelise-to-empty-eq*:
assumes $parallelise\ xs = Empty$
obtains $x\ s = []$
 | $x\ s = [Empty]$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

If a list parallelises to anything but *Parallel* or *Empty*, then it must have been a singleton of that term

lemma *parallelise-to-single-eq*:
assumes $parallelise\ xs = a$
and $\neg is-Empty\ a$
and $\neg is-Parallel\ a$
shows $x\ s = [a]$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Sets of atoms after parallelisation are unions of those atoms sets for the inputs

lemma *set1-res-term-parallelise* [*simp*]:
 $set1-res-term\ (ResTerm.parallelise\ xs) = \bigcup (set1-res-term\ 'set\ xs)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *set2-res-term-parallelise* [*simp*]:
 $set2-res-term\ (ResTerm.parallelise\ xs) = \bigcup (set2-res-term\ 'set\ xs)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

2.4 Refinement

Resource term refinement applies two functions to the linear and copyable atoms in a term. Unlike *map-res-term*, the first function (applied to linear atoms) is allowed to produce full resource terms, not just other atoms. (The second function must still produce other atoms, because we cannot replace a copyable atom with an arbitrary, possibly not copyable, resource.) This allows us to refine atoms into potentially complex terms.

primrec *refine-res-term* ::
 $('a \Rightarrow ('x, 'y)\ res-term) \Rightarrow ('b \Rightarrow 'y) \Rightarrow ('a, 'b)\ res-term \Rightarrow ('x, 'y)\ res-term$

where

$refine-res-term\ f\ g\ Empty = Empty$
 | $refine-res-term\ f\ g\ Anything = Anything$
 | $refine-res-term\ f\ g\ (Res\ a) = f\ a$
 | $refine-res-term\ f\ g\ (Copyable\ x) = Copyable\ (g\ x)$
 | $refine-res-term\ f\ g\ (Parallel\ xs) = Parallel\ (map\ (refine-res-term\ f\ g)\ xs)$

$| \text{refine-res-term } f g (\text{NonD } x y) = \text{NonD } (\text{refine-res-term } f g x) (\text{refine-res-term } f g y)$
 $| \text{refine-res-term } f g (\text{Executable } x y) =$
 $\quad \text{Executable } (\text{refine-res-term } f g x) (\text{refine-res-term } f g y)$
 $| \text{refine-res-term } f g (\text{Repeatable } x y) =$
 $\quad \text{Repeatable } (\text{refine-res-term } f g x) (\text{refine-res-term } f g y)$

Two refined resources are equivalent if:

- the original resources were equivalent,
- the linear atom refinements produce equivalent terms and
- the copyable atom refinements produce identical atoms.

lemma *refine-res-term-eq*:

assumes $x \sim y$
and $\bigwedge x. f x \sim f' x$
and $\bigwedge x. g x = g' x$
shows $\text{refine-res-term } f g x \sim \text{refine-res-term } f' g' y$
<proof>

2.5 Removing *Empty* Terms From a List

As part of simplifying resource terms, it is sometimes useful to be able to take a list of terms and drop from it any empty resource.

primrec *remove-all-empty* :: $('a, 'b) \text{ res-term list} \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) \text{ res-term list}$

where
 $\text{remove-all-empty } [] = []$
 $| \text{remove-all-empty } (x\#xs) = (\text{if is-Empty } x \text{ then } \text{remove-all-empty } xs \text{ else } x\#\text{remove-all-empty } xs)$

The result of dropping *Empty* terms from a list of resource terms is a subset of the original list

lemma *remove-all-empty-subset*:

$x \in \text{set } (\text{remove-all-empty } xs) \implies x \in \text{set } xs$
<proof>

If there are no *Empty* terms then removing them is the same as not doing anything

lemma *remove-all-empty-none*:

$\neg \text{list-ex is-Empty } xs \implies \text{remove-all-empty } xs = xs$
<proof>

There are no *Empty* terms left after they are removed

lemma *remove-all-empty-result*:

$\neg \text{list-ex is-Empty } (\text{remove-all-empty } xs)$

<proof>

Removing *Empty* terms distributes over appending lists

lemma *remove-all-empty-append*:

$$\text{remove-all-empty } (xs @ ys) = \text{remove-all-empty } xs @ \text{remove-all-empty } ys$$

<proof>

Removing *Empty* terms distributes over constructing lists

lemma *remove-all-empty-Cons*:

$$\text{remove-all-empty } (x \# xs) = \text{remove-all-empty } [x] @ \text{remove-all-empty } xs$$

<proof>

Removing *Empty* terms from children of a parallel resource term results in an equivalent term

lemma *remove-all-empty-equiv*:

$$\text{Parallel } xs \sim \text{Parallel } (\text{remove-all-empty } xs)$$

<proof>

Removing *Empty* terms does not affect the atom sets

lemma *set1-res-term-remove-all-empty [simp]*:

$$\bigcup (\text{set1-res-term } ' \text{ set } (\text{remove-all-empty } xs)) = \bigcup (\text{set1-res-term } ' \text{ set } xs)$$

<proof>

lemma *set2-res-term-remove-all-empty [simp]*:

$$\bigcup (\text{set2-res-term } ' \text{ set } (\text{remove-all-empty } xs)) = \bigcup (\text{set2-res-term } ' \text{ set } xs)$$

<proof>

2.6 Merging Nested *Parallel* Terms in a List

Similarly, it is sometimes useful to be able to take a list of terms and merge the children of any *Parallel* term in it up into the list itself

primrec *merge-all-parallel* :: ('a, 'b) *res-term list* \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) *res-term list*

where

$$\text{merge-all-parallel } [] = []$$

$$| \text{merge-all-parallel } (x \# xs) =$$

$$(\text{case } x \text{ of } \text{Parallel } y \Rightarrow y @ \text{merge-all-parallel } xs \mid - \Rightarrow x \# \text{merge-all-parallel } xs)$$

If there are no *Parallel* terms then merging them is the same as not doing anything

lemma *merge-all-parallel-none*:

$$\neg \text{list-ex is-Parallel } xs \Longrightarrow \text{merge-all-parallel } xs = xs$$

<proof>

If no element of the input list has itself nested *Parallel* terms then there will be none left after merging *Parallel* terms in the list

lemma *merge-all-parallel-result*:

$$\text{assumes } \bigwedge ys. \text{Parallel } ys \in \text{set } xs \Longrightarrow \neg \text{list-ex is-Parallel } ys$$

shows $\neg \text{list-ex is-Parallel (merge-all-parallel xs)}$
 ⟨proof⟩

Merging nested *Parallel* terms distributes over appending lists

lemma *merge-all-parallel-append*:
 $\text{merge-all-parallel (xs @ ys)} = \text{merge-all-parallel xs @ merge-all-parallel ys}$
 ⟨proof⟩

Merging *Parallel* terms distributes over constructing lists

lemma *merge-all-parallel-Cons*:
 $\text{merge-all-parallel (x \# xs)} = \text{merge-all-parallel [x] @ merge-all-parallel xs}$
 ⟨proof⟩

Merging *Parallel* terms nested in another *Parallel* term results in an equivalent term

lemma *merge-all-parallel-equiv*:
 $\text{Parallel xs} \sim \text{Parallel (merge-all-parallel xs)}$
 ⟨proof⟩

If the output of *merge-all-parallel* contains *Empty* then:

- It was nested in one of the input elements, or
- It was in the input.

lemma *merge-all-parallel-has-empty*:
assumes *list-ex is-Empty (merge-all-parallel xs)*
obtains *ys where Parallel ys ∈ set xs and list-ex is-Empty ys*
 | *list-ex is-Empty xs*
 ⟨proof⟩

Merging *Parallel* terms does not affect the atom sets

lemma *set1-res-term-merge-all-parallel [simp]*:
 $\bigcup (\text{set1-res-term ' set (merge-all-parallel xs)}) = \bigcup (\text{set1-res-term ' set xs})$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *set2-res-term-merge-all-parallel [simp]*:
 $\bigcup (\text{set2-res-term ' set (merge-all-parallel xs)}) = \bigcup (\text{set2-res-term ' set xs})$
 ⟨proof⟩

end
theory *ResNormalForm*
imports
ResTerm
Util
begin

3 Resource Term Normal Form

A resource term is normalised when:

- It is a leaf node, or
- It is an internal node with all children normalised and additionally:
 - If it is a parallel resource then none of its children are *Empty* or *Parallel* and it has more than one child.

primrec *normalised* :: ('a, 'b) *res-term* ⇒ *bool*

where

```

  normalised Empty = True
| normalised Anything = True
| normalised (Res x) = True
| normalised (Copyable x) = True
| normalised (Parallel xs) =
  ( list-all normalised xs ∧
    list-all (λx. ¬ is-Empty x) xs ∧ list-all (λx. ¬ is-Parallel x) xs ∧
    1 < length xs)
| normalised (NonD x y) = (normalised x ∧ normalised y)
| normalised (Executable x y) = (normalised x ∧ normalised y)
| normalised (Repeatable x y) = (normalised x ∧ normalised y)

```

The fact that a term is not normalised can be split into cases

lemma *not-normalised-cases*:

assumes ¬ *normalised* *x*

obtains

```

  (Parallel-Child) xs where x = Parallel xs and list-ex (λx. ¬ normalised x) xs
| (Parallel-Empty) xs where x = Parallel xs and list-ex is-Empty xs
| (Parallel-Par) xs where x = Parallel xs and list-ex is-Parallel xs
| (Parallel-Nil) x = Parallel []
| (Parallel-Singleton) a where x = Parallel [a]
| (NonD-L) a b where x = NonD a b and ¬ normalised a
| (NonD-R) a b where x = NonD a b and ¬ normalised b
| (Executable-L) a b where x = Executable a b and ¬ normalised a
| (Executable-R) a b where x = Executable a b and ¬ normalised b
| (Repeatable-L) a b where x = Repeatable a b and ¬ normalised a
| (Repeatable-R) a b where x = Repeatable a b and ¬ normalised b
⟨proof⟩

```

When a *Parallel* term is not normalised then it can be useful to obtain the first term in it that is *Empty*, *Parallel* or not normalised.

lemma *obtain-first-parallel*:

assumes list-ex *is-Parallel* *xs*

obtains *a* *b* *c* **where** *xs* = *a* @ [*Parallel* *b*] @ *c* **and** list-all (λ*x*. ¬ *is-Parallel* *x*) *a*

⟨proof⟩
lemma *obtain-first-empty*:
 assumes *list-ex is-Empty xs*
 obtains *a b c* **where** $xs = a @ [Empty] @ c$ **and** *list-all* $(\lambda x. \neg is-Empty x) a$
 ⟨proof⟩
lemma *obtain-first-unnormalised*:
 assumes *list-ex* $(\lambda x. \neg normalised x) xs$
 obtains *a b c* **where** $xs = a @ [b] @ c$ **and** *list-all normalised a* **and** $\neg normalised b$
 ⟨proof⟩

Mapping functions over a resource term does not change whether it is normalised

lemma *normalised-map*:
 $normalised (map-res-term f g x) = normalised x$
 ⟨proof⟩

If a *Parallel* term is normalised then so are all its children

lemma *normalised-parallel-children*:
 $\llbracket normalised (Parallel xs); x \in set xs \rrbracket \implies normalised x$
 ⟨proof⟩

Normalised *Parallel* term has as parallel parts exactly its direct children

lemma *normalised-parallel-parts-eq*:
 $normalised (Parallel xs) \implies parallel-parts (Parallel xs) = xs$
 ⟨proof⟩

Parallelising a list of normalised terms with no nested *Empty* or *Parallel* terms gives normalised result.

lemma *normalised-parallelise*:
 assumes $\bigwedge x. x \in set xs \implies normalised x$
 and $\neg list-ex is-Empty xs$
 and $\neg list-ex is-Parallel xs$
 shows $normalised (parallelise xs)$
 ⟨proof⟩

end
theory *ResNormRewrite*
imports
ResNormalForm
Abstract-Rewriting.Abstract-Rewriting
Util
begin

4 Rewriting Resource Term Normalisation

This resource term normalisation procedure is based on the following rewrite rules:

- $Parallel [] \rightarrow Empty$
- $Parallel [a] \rightarrow a$
- $Parallel (x @ [Parallel y] @ z) \rightarrow Parallel (x @ y @ z)$
- $Parallel (x @ [Empty] @ y) \rightarrow Parallel (x @ y)$

This represents the one-directional, single-step version of resource term equivalence. Note that the last rule must be made explicit here, because its counterpart theorem $Parallel (?x @ [Empty] @ ?y) \sim Parallel (?x @ ?y)$ can only be derived thanks to symmetry.

4.1 Rewriting Relation

The rewriting relation contains a rewriting rule for each introduction rule of (\sim) except for symmetry and transitivity, and an explicit rule for $Parallel (?x @ [Empty] @ ?y) \sim Parallel (?x @ ?y)$.

inductive $res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite :: ('a, 'b) res\text{-}term \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) res\text{-}term \Rightarrow bool$ **where**

- $empty: res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ Empty\ Empty$
- $| anything: res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ Anything\ Anything$
- $| res: res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ (Res\ x)\ (Res\ x)$
- $| copyable: res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ (Copyable\ x)\ (Copyable\ x)$
- $| nil: res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ (Parallel\ [])\ Empty$
- $| singleton: res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ (Parallel\ [a])\ a$
- $| merge: res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ (Parallel\ (x\ @\ [Parallel\ y]\ @\ z))\ (Parallel\ (x\ @\ y\ @\ z))$
- $| drop: res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ (Parallel\ (x\ @\ [Empty]\ @\ z))\ (Parallel\ (x\ @\ z))$
- $| parallel: list\text{-}all2\ res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ xs\ ys \implies res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ (Parallel\ xs)\ (Parallel\ ys)$
- $| nondet: \llbracket res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ x\ y; res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ u\ v \rrbracket \implies res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ (NonD\ x\ u)\ (NonD\ y\ v)$
- $| executable: \llbracket res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ x\ y; res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ u\ v \rrbracket \implies res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ (Executable\ x\ u)\ (Executable\ y\ v)$
- $| repeatable: \llbracket res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ x\ y; res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ u\ v \rrbracket \implies res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ (Repeatable\ x\ u)\ (Repeatable\ y\ v)$

hide-fact (**open**) $empty\ anything\ res\ copyable\ nil\ singleton\ merge\ drop\ parallel\ nondet\ executable\ repeatable$

$\langle ML \rangle$

The rewrite relation is reflexive

lemma $refl\ [simp]:$
 $res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite\ x\ x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *parallel-one*:

$res\text{-term-rewrite } a \ b \implies res\text{-term-rewrite } (Parallel \ (xs \ @ \ [a] \ @ \ ys)) \ (Parallel \ (xs \ @ \ [b] \ @ \ ys))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

$\langle ML \rangle$

Every term rewrites to an equivalent term

lemma *res-term-rewrite-imp-equiv*:

$res\text{-term-rewrite } x \ y \implies x \sim y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

By transitivity of the equivalence this holds for transitive closure of the rewriting

lemma *res-term-rewrite-trancl-imp-equiv*:

$res\text{-term-rewrite}^{++} \ x \ y \implies x \sim y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Normalised terms have no distinct term to which they transition

lemma *res-term-rewrite-normalised*:

assumes *normalised x*
shows $\nexists y. res\text{-term-rewrite } x \ y \wedge x \neq y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *res-term-rewrite-normalisedD*:

$\llbracket res\text{-term-rewrite } x \ y; \text{ normalised } x \rrbracket \implies x = y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Whereas other terms have a distinct term to which they transition

lemma *res-term-rewrite-not-normalised*:

assumes $\neg \text{normalised } x$
shows $\exists y. res\text{-term-rewrite } x \ y \wedge x \neq y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Therefore a term is normalised iff it rewrites only back to itself

lemma *normalised-is-rewrite-refl*:

$\text{normalised } x = (\forall y. res\text{-term-rewrite } x \ y \longrightarrow x = y)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Every term rewrites to one of at most equal size

lemma *res-term-rewrite-not-increase-size*:

$res\text{-term-rewrite } x \ y \implies size\text{-res-term } f \ g \ y \leq size\text{-res-term } f \ g \ x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

4.2 Rewriting Bound

There is an upper bound to how many rewriting steps could be applied to a term. We find it by considering the worst (most un-normalised) possible case of each node.

primrec *res-term-rewrite-bound* :: ('a, 'b) *res-term* \Rightarrow *nat*

where

res-term-rewrite-bound Empty = 0
| *res-term-rewrite-bound Anything* = 0
| *res-term-rewrite-bound (Res a)* = 0
| *res-term-rewrite-bound (Copyable x)* = 0
| *res-term-rewrite-bound (Parallel xs)* =
sum-list (map res-term-rewrite-bound xs) + length xs + 1

— All the steps of the children, plus one for every child that could need to be merged/dropped and another if in the end there are less than two children.

| *res-term-rewrite-bound (NonD x y)* = *res-term-rewrite-bound x + res-term-rewrite-bound y*

| *res-term-rewrite-bound (Executable x y)* = *res-term-rewrite-bound x + res-term-rewrite-bound y*

| *res-term-rewrite-bound (Repeatable x y)* = *res-term-rewrite-bound x + res-term-rewrite-bound y*

For un-normalised terms the bound is non-zero

lemma *res-term-rewrite-bound-not-normalised*:

\neg *normalised x* \Longrightarrow *res-term-rewrite-bound x* \neq 0
<proof>

Rewriting relation does not increase this bound

lemma *res-term-rewrite-non-increase-bound*:

res-term-rewrite x y \Longrightarrow *res-term-rewrite-bound y* \leq *res-term-rewrite-bound x*
<proof>

4.3 Step

The rewriting step function implements a specific algorithm for the rewriting relation by picking one approach where the relation allows multiple rewriting paths. To help define its parallel resource case, we first define a function to remove one *Empty* term from a list and another to merge the children of one *Parallel* term up into the containing list of terms.

4.3.1 Removing One Empty

Remove the first *Empty* from a list of term

fun *remove-one-empty* :: ('a, 'b) *res-term list* \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) *res-term list*

where

remove-one-empty [] = []
| *remove-one-empty (Empty # xs)* = *xs*
| *remove-one-empty (x # xs)* = *x # remove-one-empty xs*

lemma *remove-one-empty-cons* [*simp*]:

is-Empty x \Longrightarrow *remove-one-empty (x # xs)* = *xs*
 \neg *is-Empty x* \Longrightarrow *remove-one-empty (x # xs)* = *x # remove-one-empty xs*

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *remove-one-empty-append:*

$list-all (\lambda x. \neg is-Empty\ x)\ a \implies remove-one-empty\ (a\ @\ d) = a\ @\ remove-one-empty\ d$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *remove-one-empty-distinct:*

$list-ex\ is-Empty\ xs \implies remove-one-empty\ xs \neq xs$

$\langle proof \rangle$

This is identity when there are no *Empty* terms

lemma *remove-one-empty-none [simp]:*

$\neg list-ex\ is-Empty\ xs \implies remove-one-empty\ xs = xs$

$\langle proof \rangle$

This decreases length by one when there are *Empty* terms

lemma *length-remove-one-empty [simp]:*

$list-ex\ is-Empty\ xs \implies length\ (remove-one-empty\ xs) + 1 = length\ xs$

$\langle proof \rangle$

Removing an *Empty* term does not increase the size

lemma *remove-one-empty-not-increase-size:*

$size-res-term\ f\ g\ (Parallel\ (remove-one-empty\ xs)) \leq size-res-term\ f\ g\ (Parallel\ xs)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

Any *Parallel* term is equivalent to itself with an *Empty* term removed

lemma *remove-one-empty-equiv:*

$Parallel\ xs \sim Parallel\ (remove-one-empty\ xs)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

Removing an *Empty* term commutes with the resource term map

lemma *remove-one-empty-map:*

$map\ (map-res-term\ f\ g)\ (remove-one-empty\ xs) = remove-one-empty\ (map\ (map-res-term\ f\ g)\ xs)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

The result of dropping an *Empty* from a list of resource terms is a subset of the original list

lemma *remove-one-empty-subset:*

$x \in set\ (remove-one-empty\ xs) \implies x \in set\ xs$

$\langle proof \rangle$

4.3.2 Merging One Parallel

Merge the first *Parallel* in a list of terms

fun *merge-one-parallel* :: ('a, 'b) *res-term list* ⇒ ('a, 'b) *res-term list*

where

merge-one-parallel [] = []
 | *merge-one-parallel* (Parallel *x # xs*) = *x @ xs*
 | *merge-one-parallel* (*x # xs*) = *x # merge-one-parallel xs*

lemma *merge-one-parallel-cons-not* [*simp*]:

¬ *is-Parallel x* ⇒ *merge-one-parallel (x # xs) = x # merge-one-parallel xs*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *merge-one-parallel-append*:

list-all (λ*x*. ¬ *is-Parallel x*) *a* ⇒ *merge-one-parallel (a @ d) = a @ merge-one-parallel d*

for *a d*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *merge-one-parallel-distinct*:

list-ex is-Parallel xs ⇒ *merge-one-parallel xs ≠ xs*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

This is identity when there are no *Parallel* terms

lemma *merge-one-parallel-none* [*simp*]:

¬ *list-ex is-Parallel xs* ⇒ *merge-one-parallel xs = xs*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Merging a *Parallel* term does not increase the size

lemma *merge-one-parallel-not-increase-size*:

size-res-term f g (Parallel (*merge-one-parallel xs*)) ≤ *size-res-term f g* (Parallel *xs*)

⟨*proof*⟩

Any *Parallel* term is equivalent to itself with a *Parallel* term merged

lemma *merge-one-parallel-equiv*:

Parallel *xs* ∼ Parallel (*merge-one-parallel xs*)
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Merging a *Parallel* term commutes with the resource term map

lemma *merge-one-parallel-map*:

map (*map-res-term f g*) (*merge-one-parallel xs*) = *merge-one-parallel* (*map* (*map-res-term f g*) *xs*)

⟨*proof*⟩

4.3.3 Rewriting Step Function

The rewriting step function itself performs one rewrite for any un-normalised input term. Where there are multiple choices, it proceeds as follows:

- For binary internal nodes (*NonD*, *Executable* and *Repeatable*), first fully rewrite the first child until normalised and only then start rewriting the second.
- For *Parallel* nodes proceed in phases:
 - If any child is not normalised, rewrite all children; otherwise
 - If there is some nested *Parallel* node in the children, merge one up; otherwise
 - If there is some *Empty* node in the children, remove one; otherwise
 - If there are no children, then return *Empty*; otherwise
 - If there is exactly one child, then return that term; otherwise
 - Do nothing and return the same term.

primrec *step* :: ('a, 'b) *res-term* \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) *res-term*

where

```

  step Empty = Empty
| step Anything = Anything
| step (Res x) = Res x
| step (Copyable x) = Copyable x
| step (NonD x y) =
  ( if  $\neg$  normalised x then NonD (step x) y
    else if  $\neg$  normalised y then NonD x (step y)
    else NonD x y)
| step (Executable x y) =
  ( if  $\neg$  normalised x then Executable (step x) y
    else if  $\neg$  normalised y then Executable x (step y)
    else Executable x y)
| step (Repeatable x y) =
  ( if  $\neg$  normalised x then Repeatable (step x) y
    else if  $\neg$  normalised y then Repeatable x (step y)
    else Repeatable x y)
| step (Parallel xs) =
  ( if list-ex ( $\lambda x. \neg$  normalised x) xs then Parallel (map step xs)
    else if list-ex is-Parallel xs then Parallel (merge-one-parallel xs)
    else if list-ex is-Empty xs then Parallel (remove-one-empty xs)
    else (case xs of
      []  $\Rightarrow$  Empty
    | [a]  $\Rightarrow$  a
    | -  $\Rightarrow$  Parallel xs))

```

Case split and induction for *step* fully expanded

lemma *step-cases*

[*case-names* *Empty Anything Res Copyable NonD-L NonD-R NonD Executable-L Executable-R Executable*

Repeatable-L Repeatable-R Repeatable Par-Norm Par-Par Par-Empty Par-Nil Par-Single

Par]:

assumes $x = \text{Empty} \implies P$
and $x = \text{Anything} \implies P$
and $\bigwedge a. x = \text{Res } a \implies P$
and $\bigwedge u. x = \text{Copyable } u \implies P$
and $\bigwedge u v. [\neg \text{normalised } u; x = \text{NonD } u v] \implies P$
and $\bigwedge u v. [\text{normalised } u; \neg \text{normalised } v; x = \text{NonD } u v] \implies P$
and $\bigwedge u v. [\text{normalised } u; \text{normalised } v; x = \text{NonD } u v] \implies P$
and $\bigwedge u v. [\neg \text{normalised } u; x = \text{Executable } u v] \implies P$
and $\bigwedge u v. [\text{normalised } u; \neg \text{normalised } v; x = \text{Executable } u v] \implies P$
and $\bigwedge u v. [\text{normalised } u; \text{normalised } v; x = \text{Executable } u v] \implies P$
and $\bigwedge u v. [\neg \text{normalised } u; x = \text{Repeatable } u v] \implies P$
and $\bigwedge u v. [\text{normalised } u; \neg \text{normalised } v; x = \text{Repeatable } u v] \implies P$
and $\bigwedge u v. [\text{normalised } u; \text{normalised } v; x = \text{Repeatable } u v] \implies P$
and $\bigwedge xs. [x = \text{Parallel } xs; \exists a. a \in \text{set } xs \wedge \neg \text{normalised } a] \implies P$
and $\bigwedge xs. [x = \text{Parallel } xs; \forall a. a \in \text{set } xs \longrightarrow \text{normalised } a; \text{list-ex is-Parallel } xs] \implies P$
and $\bigwedge xs. [x = \text{Parallel } xs; \forall a. a \in \text{set } xs \longrightarrow \text{normalised } a; \text{list-all } (\lambda x. \neg \text{is-Parallel } x) xs; \text{list-ex is-Empty } xs] \implies P$
and $x = \text{Parallel } [] \implies P$
and $\bigwedge u. [x = \text{Parallel } [u]; \text{normalised } u; \neg \text{is-Parallel } u; \neg \text{is-Empty } u] \implies P$
and $\bigwedge v vb vc. [x = \text{Parallel } (v \# vb \# vc); \forall a. a \in \text{set } (v \# vb \# vc) \longrightarrow \text{normalised } a; \text{list-all } (\lambda x. \neg \text{is-Parallel } x) (v \# vb \# vc); \text{list-all } (\lambda x. \neg \text{is-Empty } x) (v \# vb \# vc)] \implies P$
shows P
<proof>

lemma *step-induct*

[*case-names Empty Anything Res Copyable NonD-L NonD-R NonD Executable-L Executable-R Executable*

Repeatable-L Repeatable-R Repeatable Par-Norm Par-Par Par-Empty Par-Nil Par-Single

Par]:

assumes $P \text{ Empty}$
and $P \text{ Anything}$
and $\bigwedge a. P (\text{Res } a)$
and $\bigwedge x. P (\text{Copyable } x)$
and $\bigwedge x y. [P x; P y; \neg \text{normalised } x] \implies P (\text{NonD } x y)$
and $\bigwedge x y. [P x; P y; \text{normalised } x; \neg \text{normalised } y] \implies P (\text{NonD } x y)$
and $\bigwedge x y. [P x; P y; \text{normalised } x; \text{normalised } y] \implies P (\text{NonD } x y)$
and $\bigwedge x y. [P x; P y; \neg \text{normalised } x] \implies P (\text{Executable } x y)$
and $\bigwedge x y. [P x; P y; \text{normalised } x; \neg \text{normalised } y] \implies P (\text{Executable } x y)$
and $\bigwedge x y. [P x; P y; \text{normalised } x; \text{normalised } y] \implies P (\text{Executable } x y)$
and $\bigwedge x y. [P x; P y; \neg \text{normalised } x] \implies P (\text{Repeatable } x y)$
and $\bigwedge x y. [P x; P y; \text{normalised } x; \neg \text{normalised } y] \implies P (\text{Repeatable } x y)$
and $\bigwedge x y. [P x; P y; \text{normalised } x; \text{normalised } y] \implies P (\text{Repeatable } x y)$

and $\bigwedge xs. \llbracket \bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } xs \implies P x; \exists a. a \in \text{set } xs \wedge \neg \text{normalised } a \rrbracket \implies P$
(Parallel xs)
and $\bigwedge xs. \llbracket \bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } xs \implies P x; \forall a. a \in \text{set } xs \longrightarrow \text{normalised } a; \text{list-ex}$
is-Parallel xs \rrbracket
 $\implies P$ *(Parallel xs)*
and $\bigwedge xs. \llbracket \bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } xs \implies P x; \forall a. a \in \text{set } xs \longrightarrow \text{normalised } a$
 $\quad ; \text{list-all } (\lambda x. \neg \text{is-Parallel } x) \text{ } xs; \text{list-ex is-Empty } xs \rrbracket$
 $\implies P$ *(Parallel xs)*
and P *(Parallel [])*
and $\bigwedge u. \llbracket P u; \text{normalised } u; \neg \text{is-Parallel } u; \neg \text{is-Empty } u \rrbracket \implies P$ *(Parallel*
[u])
and $\bigwedge v \text{ } vb \text{ } vc.$
 $\quad \llbracket \bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } (v \# vb \# vc) \implies P x; \forall a. a \in \text{set } (v \# vb \# vc) \longrightarrow$
normalised } a
 $\quad ; \text{list-all } (\lambda x. \neg \text{is-Parallel } x) \text{ } (v \# vb \# vc)$
 $\quad ; \text{list-all } (\lambda x. \neg \text{is-Empty } x) \text{ } (v \# vb \# vc) \rrbracket$
 $\implies P$ *(Parallel (v # vb # vc))*
shows $P x$
<proof>

Variant of induction with some relevant step results is also useful

lemma *step-induct'*

[case-names Empty Anything Res Copyable NonD-L NonD-R NonD Executable-L
Executable-R Executable
Repeatable-L Repeatable-R Repeatable Par-Norm Par-Par Par-Empty
Par-Nil Par-Single
Par]:
assumes P *Empty*
and P *Anything*
and $\bigwedge a. P$ *(Res a)*
and $\bigwedge x. P$ *(Copyable x)*
and $\bigwedge x y. \llbracket P x; P y; \neg \text{normalised } x; \text{step } (\text{NonD } x y) = \text{NonD } (\text{step } x) y \rrbracket$
 $\implies P$ *(NonD x y)*
and $\bigwedge x y. \llbracket P x; P y; \text{normalised } x; \neg \text{normalised } y; \text{step } (\text{NonD } x y) = \text{NonD}$
 x *(step y)* \rrbracket
 $\implies P$ *(NonD x y)*
and $\bigwedge x y. \llbracket P x; P y; \text{normalised } x; \text{normalised } y; \text{step } (\text{NonD } x y) = \text{NonD}$
 x *y* \rrbracket
 $\implies P$ *(NonD x y)*
and $\bigwedge x y. \llbracket P x; P y; \neg \text{normalised } x; \text{step } (\text{Executable } x y) = \text{Executable } (\text{step}$
 $x)$ *y* \rrbracket
 $\implies P$ *(Executable x y)*
and $\bigwedge x y. \llbracket P x; P y; \text{normalised } x; \neg \text{normalised } y$
 $\quad ; \text{step } (\text{Executable } x y) = \text{Executable } x$ *(step y)* \rrbracket
 $\implies P$ *(Executable x y)*
and $\bigwedge x y. \llbracket P x; P y; \text{normalised } x; \text{normalised } y; \text{step } (\text{Executable } x y) =$
 $\text{Executable } x$ *y* \rrbracket
 $\implies P$ *(Executable x y)*
and $\bigwedge x y. \llbracket P x; P y; \neg \text{normalised } x; \text{step } (\text{Repeatable } x y) = \text{Repeatable } (\text{step}$

$x) y]$
 $\implies P (\text{Repeatable } x y)$
and $\bigwedge x y. \llbracket P x; P y; \text{normalised } x; \neg \text{normalised } y$
 $;\text{ step } (\text{Repeatable } x y) = \text{Repeatable } x (\text{step } y)\rrbracket$
 $\implies P (\text{Repeatable } x y)$
and $\bigwedge x y. \llbracket P x; P y; \text{normalised } x; \text{normalised } y; \text{step } (\text{Repeatable } x y) =$
 $\text{Repeatable } x y\rrbracket$
 $\implies P (\text{Repeatable } x y)$
and $\bigwedge xs. \llbracket \bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } xs \implies P x; \exists a. a \in \text{set } xs \wedge \neg \text{normalised } a$
 $;\text{ step } (\text{Parallel } xs) = \text{Parallel } (\text{map } \text{step } xs)\rrbracket$
 $\implies P (\text{Parallel } xs)$
and $\bigwedge xs. \llbracket \bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } xs \implies P x; \forall a. a \in \text{set } xs \longrightarrow \text{normalised } a; \text{list-ex}$
 $\text{is-Parallel } xs;$
 $\text{step } (\text{Parallel } xs) = \text{Parallel } (\text{merge-one-parallel } xs)\rrbracket$
 $\implies P (\text{Parallel } xs)$
and $\bigwedge xs. \llbracket \bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } xs \implies P x; \forall a. a \in \text{set } xs \longrightarrow \text{normalised } a$
 $;\text{ list-all } (\lambda x. \neg \text{is-Parallel } x) xs; \text{list-ex is-Empty } xs$
 $;\text{ step } (\text{Parallel } xs) = \text{Parallel } (\text{remove-one-empty } xs)\rrbracket$
 $\implies P (\text{Parallel } xs)$
and $P (\text{Parallel } [])$
and $\bigwedge u. \llbracket P u; \text{normalised } u; \neg \text{is-Parallel } u; \neg \text{is-Empty } u; \text{step } (\text{Parallel } [u])$
 $= u\rrbracket$
 $\implies P (\text{Parallel } [u])$
and $\bigwedge v vb vc.$
 $\llbracket \bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } (v \# vb \# vc) \implies P x; \forall a. a \in \text{set } (v \# vb \# vc) \longrightarrow$
 $\text{normalised } a$
 $;\text{ list-all } (\lambda x. \neg \text{is-Parallel } x) (v \# vb \# vc)$
 $;\text{ list-all } (\lambda x. \neg \text{is-Empty } x) (v \# vb \# vc)$
 $;\text{ step } (\text{Parallel } (v \# vb \# vc)) = \text{Parallel } (v \# vb \# vc)\rrbracket$
 $\implies P (\text{Parallel } (v \# vb \# vc))$
shows $P x$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Set of atoms remains unchanged by rewriting step

lemma *set1-res-term-step* [simp]:

set1-res-term (step x) = *set1-res-term* x

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *set2-res-term-step* [simp]:

set2-res-term (step x) = *set2-res-term* x

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Resource term rewriting relation contains the step function graph. In other words, the step function is a particular strategy implementing that rewriting.

lemma *res-term-rewrite-contains-step*:

res-term-rewrite x (step x)

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Resource term being normalised is the same as the step not changing it

lemma *normalised-is-step-id*:
 $normalised\ x = (step\ x = x)$
 ⟨proof⟩

So, for normalised terms we can drop any step applied to them

lemma *step-normalised [simp]*:
 $normalised\ x \implies step\ x = x$
 ⟨proof⟩

Rewriting step never increases the term size

lemma *step-not-increase-size*:
 $size-res-term\ f\ g\ (step\ x) \leq size-res-term\ f\ g\ x$
 ⟨proof⟩

Every resource is equivalent to itself after the step

lemma *res-term-equiv-step*:
 $x \sim step\ x$
 ⟨proof⟩

Normalisation step commutes with the resource term map

lemma *step-map*:
 $map-res-term\ f\ g\ (step\ x) = step\ (map-res-term\ f\ g\ x)$
 ⟨proof⟩

Because it implements the rewriting relation, the non-increasing of bound extends to the step

lemmas *res-term-rewrite-bound-step-non-increase =*
 $res-term-rewrite-non-increase-bound[OF\ res-term-rewrite-contains-step]$

On un-normalised terms, the step actually strictly decreases the bound. While this should also be true of the rewriting relation it implements, the stricter way the step proceeds makes this proof more tractable.

lemma *res-term-rewrite-bound-step-decrease*:
 $\neg\ normalised\ x \implies res-term-rewrite-bound\ (step\ x) < res-term-rewrite-bound\ x$
 ⟨proof⟩

4.4 Normalisation Procedure

Rewrite a resource term until normalised

function *normal-rewr* :: ('a, 'b) res-term \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) res-term
where *normal-rewr* x = (if normalised x then x else normal-rewr (step x))
 ⟨proof⟩

This terminates with the rewriting bound as measure, because the step keeps decreasing it

termination *normal-rewr*

<proof>

We remove the normalisation procedure definition from the simplifier, because it can loop

lemmas [*simp del*] = *normal-rewr.simps*

However, the terminal case can be safely used for simplification

lemma *normalised-normal-rewr* [*simp*]:

normalised x \implies *normal-rewr x = x*

<proof>

Normalisation produces actually normalised terms

lemma *normal-rewr-normalised*:

normalised (normal-rewr x)

<proof>

Normalisation is idempotent

lemma *normal-rewr-idempotent* [*simp*]:

normal-rewr (normal-rewr x) = normal-rewr x

<proof>

Normalisation absorbs rewriting step

lemma *normal-rewr-step*:

normal-rewr x = normal-rewr (step x)

<proof>

Normalisation leaves leaf terms unchanged

lemma *normal-rewr-leaf*:

normal-rewr Empty = Empty

normal-rewr Anything = Anything

normal-rewr (Res x) = Res x

normal-rewr (Copyable x) = Copyable x

<proof>

Normalisation passes through *NonD*, *Executable* and *Repeatable* constructors

lemma *normal-rewr-nondet*:

normal-rewr (NonD x y) = NonD (normal-rewr x) (normal-rewr y)

<proof>

lemma *normal-rewr-executable*:

normal-rewr (Executable x y) = Executable (normal-rewr x) (normal-rewr y)

<proof>

lemma *normal-rewr-repeatable*:

normal-rewr (Repeatable x y) = Repeatable (normal-rewr x) (normal-rewr y)

<proof>

Normalisation simplifies empty *Parallel* terms

lemma *normal-rewr-parallel-empty*:

$normal\text{-}rewr (Parallel []) = Empty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Every resource is equivalent to its normalisation

lemma *res-term-equiv-normal-rewr*:
 $x \sim normal\text{-}rewr x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

And, by transitivity, resource terms with equal normalisations are equivalent

lemma *normal-rewr-imp-equiv*:
 $normal\text{-}rewr x = normal\text{-}rewr y \implies x \sim y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Resource normalisation commutes with the resource map

lemma *normal-rewr-map*:
 $map\text{-}res\text{-}term f g (normal\text{-}rewr x) = normal\text{-}rewr (map\text{-}res\text{-}term f g x)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Normalisation is contained in transitive closure of the rewriting

lemma *res-term-rewrite-tranclp-normal-rewr*:
 $res\text{-}term\text{-}rewrite^{++} x (normal\text{-}rewr x)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

4.5 As Abstract Rewriting System

The normalisation procedure described above implements an abstract rewriting system. Their theory allows us to prove that equality of normal forms is the same as term equivalence by reasoning about how equivalent terms are joinable by the rewriting.

4.5.1 Rewriting System Properties

In the ARS mechanisation normal forms are terminal elements of the rewriting relation, while in our case they are fixpoints. To interface with that property, we use the irreflexive graph of *step*.

definition *step-irr* :: ('a, 'b) *res-term rel*
where $step\text{-}irr = \{(x,y). x \neq y \wedge step x = y\}$

lemma *step-irr-inI*:
 $x \neq step x \implies (x, step x) \in step\text{-}irr$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Graph of *normal-rewr* is in the transitive-reflexive closure of irreflexive *step*

lemma *normal-rewr-in-step-rtrancl*:
 $(x, normal\text{-}rewr x) \in step\text{-}irr^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Normal forms of irreflexive step are exactly the normalised terms

lemma *step-nf-is-normalised*:

$$NF \text{ step-irr} = \{x. \text{normalised } x\}$$

<proof>

As such, every value of *normal-rewr* is a normal form of irreflexive step

lemma *normal-rewr-NF [simp]*:

$$\text{normal-rewr } x \in NF \text{ step-irr}$$

<proof>

Terms related by reflexive-transitive step are equivalent

lemma *step-rtrancl-equivalent*:

$$(a, b) \in \text{step-irr}^* \implies a \sim b$$

<proof>

Irreflexive step is locally and strongly confluent because it's part of a function

lemma *step-irr-locally-confluent*:

$$WCR \text{ step-irr}$$

<proof>

lemma *step-irr-strongly-confluent*:

$$\text{strongly-confluent } \text{step-irr}$$

<proof>

Therefore it is Church-Rosser and has unique normal forms

lemma *step-CR: CR step-irr*

<proof>

lemma *step-UNC: UNC step-irr*

<proof>

lemma *step-UNF: UNF step-irr*

<proof>

Irreflexive step is strongly normalising because it decreases the well-founded rewriting bound

lemma *step-SN*:

$$SN \text{ step-irr}$$

<proof>

Normalisability relation of irreflexive step is exactly the graph of *normal-rewr*

lemma *step-normalizability-normal-rewr*:

$$\text{step-irr}^! = \{(x, y). y = \text{normal-rewr } x\}$$

<proof>

The unique normal form, *the-NF* in the ARS language, is *normal-rewr*

lemma *step-irr-the-NF [simp]*:

$$\text{the-NF } \text{step-irr } x = \text{normal-rewr } x$$

<proof>

Terms related by reflexive-transitive step have the same normal form

lemma *step-rtrancl-eq-normal*:

$$(x,y) \in \text{step-irr}^* \implies \text{normal-rewr } x = \text{normal-rewr } y$$

<proof>

4.5.2 *NonD Joinability*

Two *NonD* terms are joinable if their corresponding children are joinable

lemma *step-rtrancl-nondL*:

$$(x,u) \in \text{step-irr}^* \implies (\text{NonD } x \ y, \text{NonD } u \ y) \in \text{step-irr}^*$$

<proof>

lemma *step-rtrancl-nondR*:

$$[(y,v) \in \text{step-irr}^*; \text{normalised } x] \implies (\text{NonD } x \ y, \text{NonD } x \ v) \in \text{step-irr}^*$$

<proof>

lemma *step-rtrancl-nond*:

$$[(x,u) \in \text{step-irr}^*; \text{normalised } u; (y,v) \in \text{step-irr}^*] \implies (\text{NonD } x \ y, \text{NonD } u \ v) \in \text{step-irr}^*$$

<proof>

lemma *step-join-apply-nondet*:

$$\text{assumes } (x,u) \in \text{step-irr}^\downarrow \text{ and } (y,v) \in \text{step-irr}^\downarrow \text{ shows } (\text{NonD } x \ y, \text{NonD } u \ v) \in \text{step-irr}^\downarrow$$

<proof>

4.5.3 *Executable and Repeatable Joinability*

Two (repeatably) executable resource terms are joinable if their corresponding children are joinable

lemma *step-join-apply-executable*:

$$[(x,u) \in \text{step-irr}^\downarrow; (y,v) \in \text{step-irr}^\downarrow] \implies (\text{Executable } x \ y, \text{Executable } u \ v) \in \text{step-irr}^\downarrow$$

<proof>

lemma *step-join-apply-repeatable*:

$$[(x,u) \in \text{step-irr}^\downarrow; (y,v) \in \text{step-irr}^\downarrow] \implies (\text{Repeatable } x \ y, \text{Repeatable } u \ v) \in \text{step-irr}^\downarrow$$

<proof>

4.5.4 *Parallel Joinability*

From two lists of joinable terms we can obtain a list of common destination terms

lemma *list-all2-join*:

$$\text{assumes } \text{list-all2 } (\lambda x \ y. (x, y) \in R^\downarrow) \ xs \ ys$$

obtains *cs*

where $list\text{-}all2 (\lambda x c. (x, c) \in R^*) xs cs$
and $list\text{-}all2 (\lambda y c. (y, c) \in R^*) ys cs$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Every parallel resource term with at least two elements is related to a parallel resource term with the contents normalised

lemma $step\text{-}rtrancl\text{-}map\text{-}normal$:
 $(Parallel\ xs, Parallel\ (map\ normal\text{-}rewr\ xs)) \in step\text{-}irr^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Two lists of joinable terms have the same normal forms

lemma $list\text{-}all2\text{-}join\text{-}normal\text{-}eq$:
 $list\text{-}all2 (\lambda u v. (u, v) \in step\text{-}irr^\downarrow) xs ys \implies map\ normal\text{-}rewr\ xs = map\ normal\text{-}rewr\ ys$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Parallel resource terms whose contents are joinable are themselves joinable

lemma $step\text{-}join\text{-}apply\text{-}parallel$:
assumes $list\text{-}all2 (\lambda u v. (u, v) \in step\text{-}irr^\downarrow) xs ys$
shows $(Parallel\ xs, Parallel\ ys) \in step\text{-}irr^\downarrow$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Removing all *Empty* terms absorbs the removal of one

lemma $remove\text{-}all\text{-}empty\text{-}subsumes\text{-}remove\text{-}one$:
 $remove\text{-}all\text{-}empty\ (remove\text{-}one\text{-}empty\ xs) = remove\text{-}all\text{-}empty\ xs$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

For any list with an *Empty* term, removing one strictly decreases their count

lemma $remove\text{-}one\text{-}empty\text{-}count\text{-}if\text{-}decrease$:
 $list\text{-}ex\ is\text{-}Empty\ xs \implies count\text{-}if\ is\text{-}Empty\ (remove\text{-}one\text{-}empty\ xs) < count\text{-}if\ is\text{-}Empty\ xs$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Removing all *Empty* terms from children of a *Parallel* term, that are already all normalised and none of which are nested *Parallel* terms, is related by transitive and reflexive closure of irreflexive step.

lemma $step\text{-}rtrancl\text{-}remove\text{-}all\text{-}empty$:
assumes $\bigwedge x. x \in set\ xs \implies normalised\ x$
and $\neg list\text{-}ex\ is\text{-}Parallel\ xs$
shows $(Parallel\ xs, Parallel\ (remove\text{-}all\text{-}empty\ xs)) \in step\text{-}irr^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

After merging all *Parallel* elements of a list of normalised terms, there remain no more *Parallel* terms in it

lemma $merge\text{-}all\text{-}parallel\text{-}map\text{-}normal\text{-}result$:
assumes $\bigwedge x. x \in set\ xs \implies normalised\ x$
shows $\neg list\text{-}ex\ is\text{-}Parallel\ (merge\text{-}all\text{-}parallel\ xs)$

<proof>

For any list with a *Parallel* term, removing one strictly decreases their count if no element contains further nested *Parallel* terms within it

lemma *merge-one-parallel-count-if-decrease:*

assumes *list-ex is-Parallel xs*

and $\bigwedge y \ ys. \llbracket y \in \text{set } xs; y = \text{Parallel } ys \rrbracket \implies \neg \text{list-ex is-Parallel } ys$

shows $\text{count-if is-Parallel } (\text{merge-one-parallel } xs) < \text{count-if is-Parallel } xs$

<proof>

Merging all *Parallel* terms absorbs the merging of one if no element contains further nested *Parallel* terms within it

lemma *merge-all-parallel-subsumes-merge-one:*

assumes $\bigwedge y \ ys. \llbracket y \in \text{set } xs; y = \text{Parallel } ys \rrbracket \implies \neg \text{list-ex is-Parallel } ys$

shows $\text{merge-all-parallel } (\text{merge-one-parallel } xs) = \text{merge-all-parallel } xs$

<proof>

Merging one *Parallel* term in a list of normalised terms keeps them normalised

lemma *merge-one-parallel-preserve-normalised:*

$\llbracket \bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } xs \implies \text{normalised } x; a \in \text{set } (\text{merge-one-parallel } xs) \rrbracket \implies \text{normalised}$

a

<proof>

Merging all *Parallel* terms in a list of normalised terms keeps them normalised

lemma *merge-all-parallel-preserve-normalised:*

$\llbracket \bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } xs \implies \text{normalised } x; a \in \text{set } (\text{merge-all-parallel } xs) \rrbracket \implies \text{normalised}$

a

<proof>

Merging all *Parallel* terms from children of a *Parallel* term, that are already all normalised, is related by transitive and reflexive closure of irreflexive step.

lemma *step-rtrancl-merge-all-parallel:*

assumes $\bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } xs \implies \text{normalised } x$

shows $(\text{Parallel } xs, \text{Parallel } (\text{merge-all-parallel } xs)) \in \text{step-irr}^*$

<proof>

Thus, there is a general rewriting path that *Parallel* terms take

lemma *step-rtrancl-parallel:*

$(\text{Parallel } xs, \text{Parallel } (\text{remove-all-empty } (\text{merge-all-parallel } (\text{map normal-rewr } xs)))) \in \text{step-irr}^*$

<proof>

4.5.5 Other Helpful Lemmas

For Church-Rosser strongly normalising rewriting systems, joinability is transitive

lemma *CR-SN-join-trans*:

assumes *CR R*

and *SN R*

and $(x, y) \in R^\downarrow$

and $(y, z) \in R^\downarrow$

shows $(x, z) \in R^\downarrow$

<proof>

More generally, for such systems, two joinable pairs can be bridged by a third

lemma *CR-SN-join-both*:

$\llbracket CR R; SN R; (a, b) \in R^\downarrow; (x, y) \in R^\downarrow; (b, y) \in R^\downarrow \rrbracket \implies (a, x) \in R^\downarrow$

<proof>

With irreflexive step being one such rewriting system

lemmas *step-irr-join-trans* = *CR-SN-join-trans*[*OF step-CR step-SN*]

lemmas *step-irr-join-both* = *CR-SN-join-both*[*OF step-CR step-SN*]

Parallel term with no work left in children normalises in three possible ways

lemma *normal-rewr-parallel-cases*:

assumes $\forall x. x \in \text{set } xs \longrightarrow \text{normalised } x$

and $\neg \text{list-ex is-Empty } xs$

and $\neg \text{list-ex is-Parallel } xs$

obtains

$(\text{Parallel}) \text{ normalised } (\text{Parallel } xs) \text{ and } \text{normal-rewr } (\text{Parallel } xs) = \text{Parallel}$

xs

| $(\text{Empty}) \text{ } xs = [] \text{ and } \text{normal-rewr } (\text{Parallel } xs) = \text{Empty}$

| $(\text{Single}) \text{ } a \text{ where } xs = [a] \text{ and } \text{normal-rewr } (\text{Parallel } xs) = a$

<proof>

For a list of already normalised terms with no *Empty* or *Parallel* terms, the normalisation procedure acts like *parallel-parts* followed by *parallelise*. It only does simplifications related to the number of elements.

lemma *normal-rewr-parallelise*:

assumes $\forall x. x \in \text{set } xs \longrightarrow \text{normalised } x$

and $\neg \text{list-ex is-Empty } xs$

and $\neg \text{list-ex is-Parallel } xs$

shows $\text{normal-rewr } (\text{Parallel } xs) = \text{parallelise } (\text{parallel-parts } (\text{Parallel } xs))$

<proof>

Removing all *Empty* terms has no effect on number of *Parallel* terms

lemma *parallel-remove-all-empty*:

$\text{list-ex is-Parallel } (\text{remove-all-empty } xs) = \text{list-ex is-Parallel } xs$

$\langle proof \rangle$

Removing all *Empty* terms is idempotent because there are no *Empty* terms to remove on the second pass

lemma *remove-all-empty-idempotent:*

shows $remove\text{-all}\text{-empty} (remove\text{-all}\text{-empty} xs) = remove\text{-all}\text{-empty} xs$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Every *Parallel* term rewrites to the parallelisation of normalised children with all *Empty* terms removed and all *Parallel* terms merged

lemma *normal-rewr-to-parallelise:*

$normal\text{-rewr} (Parallel xs)$
 $= parallelise (remove\text{-all}\text{-empty} (merge\text{-all}\text{-parallel} (map normal\text{-rewr} xs)))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Parallel term that normalises to *Empty* must have had no children left after normalising them, merging *Parallel* terms and removing *Empty* terms

lemma *normal-rewr-to-empty:*

assumes $normal\text{-rewr} (Parallel xs) = Empty$
shows $remove\text{-all}\text{-empty} (merge\text{-all}\text{-parallel} (map normal\text{-rewr} xs)) = []$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Parallel term that normalises to another *Parallel* must have had those children left after normalising its own, merging *Parallel* terms and removing *Empty* terms

lemma *normal-rewr-to-parallel:*

assumes $normal\text{-rewr} (Parallel xs) = Parallel ys$
shows $remove\text{-all}\text{-empty} (merge\text{-all}\text{-parallel} (map normal\text{-rewr} xs)) = remove\text{-all}\text{-empty} ys$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Parallel that normalises to anything else must have had that as the only term left after normalising its own, merging *Parallel* terms and removing *Empty* terms

lemma *normal-rewr-to-other:*

assumes $normal\text{-rewr} (Parallel xs) = a$
and $\neg is\text{-Empty} a$
and $\neg is\text{-Parallel} a$
shows $remove\text{-all}\text{-empty} (merge\text{-all}\text{-parallel} (map normal\text{-rewr} xs)) = [a]$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

4.5.6 Equivalent Term Joinability

Equivalent resource terms are joinable by irreflexive step

lemma *res-term-equiv-joinable:*

$x \sim y \implies (x, y) \in step\text{-irr}^\downarrow$

<proof>

Therefore this rewriting-based normalisation brings equivalent terms to the same normal form

lemma *res-term-equiv-imp-normal-rewr:*

assumes $x \sim y$ **shows** $\text{normal-rewr } x = \text{normal-rewr } y$

<proof>

And resource term equivalence is equal to having equal normal forms

theorem *res-term-equiv-is-normal-rewr:*

$x \sim y = (\text{normal-rewr } x = \text{normal-rewr } y)$

<proof>

4.6 Term Equivalence as Rewriting Closure

We can now show that (\sim) is the equivalence closure of *res-term-rewrite*.

An equivalence closure is a reflexive, transitive and symmetric closure. In our case, the rewriting is already reflexive, so we only need to verify the symmetric and transitive closure.

As such, the core difficulty in this section is to prove the following equality:

$x \sim y = (\text{symclp res-term-rewrite})^{++} x y$

One direction is simpler, because rewriting implies equivalence

lemma *res-term-rewrite-equivclp-imp-equiv:*

$(\text{symclp res-term-rewrite})^{++} x y \implies x \sim y$

<proof>

Trying to prove the other direction purely through facts about the rewriting itself fails

lemma

$x \sim y \implies (\text{symclp res-term-rewrite})^{++} x y$

<proof>

But, we can take advantage of the normalisation procedure to prove it

lemma *res-term-rewrite-equiv-imp-equivclp:*

assumes $x \sim y$

shows $(\text{symclp res-term-rewrite})^{++} x y$

<proof>

Thus, we prove that resource term equivalence is the equivalence closure of the rewriting

lemma *res-term-equiv-is-rewrite-closure:*

$(\sim) = \text{equivclp res-term-rewrite}$

<proof>

```

end
theory ResNormDirect
  imports ResNormalForm
begin

```

5 Direct Resource Term Normalisation

In this section we define a normalisation procedure for resource terms that directly normalises a term in a single bottom-up pass. This could be considered normalisation by evaluation as opposed to by rewriting.

Note that, while this procedure is more computationally efficient, it is less useful in proofs. In this way it is complemented by rewriting-based normalisation that is less direct but more helpful in inductive proofs.

First, for a list of terms where no *Parallel* term contains an *Empty* term, the order of *merge-all-parallel* and *remove-all-empty* does not matter. This is specifically the case for a list of normalised terms. As such, our choice of order in the normalisation definition does not matter.

lemma *merge-all-parallel-remove-all-empty-comm*:

```

  assumes  $\bigwedge ys. \text{Parallel } ys \in \text{set } xs \implies \neg \text{list-ex is-Empty } ys$ 
  shows  $\text{merge-all-parallel } (\text{remove-all-empty } xs) = \text{remove-all-empty } (\text{merge-all-parallel } xs)$ 
  <proof>

```

Direct normalisation of resource terms proceeds in a single bottom-up pass. The interesting case is for *Parallel* terms, where any *Empty* and nested *Parallel* children are handled using *parallel-parts* and the resulting list is turned into the simplest term representing its parallel combination using *parallelise*.

primrec *normal-dir* :: ('a, 'b) *res-term* \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) *res-term*

where

```

  normal-dir Empty = Empty
| normal-dir Anything = Anything
| normal-dir (Res x) = Res x
| normal-dir (Copyable x) = Copyable x
| normal-dir (Parallel xs) =
  parallelise (merge-all-parallel (remove-all-empty (map normal-dir xs)))
| normal-dir (NonD x y) = NonD (normal-dir x) (normal-dir y)
| normal-dir (Executable x y) = Executable (normal-dir x) (normal-dir y)
| normal-dir (Repeatable x y) = Repeatable (normal-dir x) (normal-dir y)

```

Any resource term is equivalent to its direct normalisation

lemma *normal-dir-equiv*:

```

  a  $\sim$  normal-dir a
  <proof>

```

Thus terms with equal normalisation are equivalent

lemma *normal-dir-eq-imp-equiv*:
 $normal-dir\ a = normal-dir\ b \implies a \sim b$
(*proof*)

If the output of *merge-all-parallel* still contains a *Parallel* term then it must have been nested in one of the input elements

lemma *merge-all-parallel-has-Parallel*:
assumes $list-ex\ is-Parallel\ (merge-all-parallel\ xs)$
obtains ys
where $Parallel\ ys \in set\ xs$
and $list-ex\ is-Parallel\ ys$
(*proof*)

If the output of *remove-all-empty* contains a *Parallel* term then it must have been in the input

lemma *remove-all-empty-has-Parallel*:
assumes $Parallel\ ys \in set\ (remove-all-empty\ xs)$
shows $Parallel\ ys \in set\ xs$
(*proof*)

If a resource term normalises to a *Parallel* term then that does not contain any nested

lemma *normal-dir-no-nested-Parallel*:
 $normal-dir\ a = Parallel\ xs \implies \neg list-ex\ is-Parallel\ xs$
(*proof*)

If a resource term normalises to a *Parallel* term then it does not contain *Empty*

lemma *normal-dir-no-nested-Empty*:
 $normal-dir\ a = Parallel\ xs \implies \neg list-ex\ is-Empty\ xs$
(*proof*)

Merging *Parallel* terms in a list of normalised terms keeps all terms in the result normalised

lemma *normalised-merge-all-parallel*:
assumes $x \in set\ (merge-all-parallel\ xs)$
and $\bigwedge x. x \in set\ xs \implies normalised\ x$
shows $normalised\ x$
(*proof*)

Normalisation produces resources in normal form

lemma *normalised-normal-dir*:
 $normalised\ (normal-dir\ a)$
(*proof*)

Normalisation does nothing to resource terms in normal form

lemma *normal-dir-normalised*:

normalised $x \implies \text{normal-dir } x = x$
 ⟨proof⟩

Parallelising to anything but *Empty* or *Parallel* means the input list contained just that

lemma *parallelise-eq-Anything* [simp]: (*parallelise* $xs = \text{Anything}$) = ($xs = [\text{Anything}]$)
and *parallelise-eq-Res* [simp]: (*parallelise* $xs = \text{Res } a$) = ($xs = [\text{Res } a]$)
and *parallelise-eq-Copyable* [simp]: (*parallelise* $xs = \text{Copyable } b$) = ($xs = [\text{Copyable } b]$)
and *parallelise-eq-NonD* [simp]: (*parallelise* $xs = \text{NonD } x \ y$) = ($xs = [\text{NonD } x \ y]$)
and *parallelise-eq-Executable* [simp]:(*parallelise* $xs = \text{Executable } x \ y$) = ($xs = [\text{Executable } x \ y]$)
and *parallelise-eq-Repeatable* [simp]:(*parallelise* $xs = \text{Repeatable } x \ y$) = ($xs = [\text{Repeatable } x \ y]$)
 ⟨proof⟩

Equivalent resource terms normalise to equal results

lemma *res-term-equiv-normal-dir*:
 $a \sim b \implies \text{normal-dir } a = \text{normal-dir } b$
 ⟨proof⟩

Equivalence of resource term is equality of their normal forms

lemma *res-term-equiv-is-normal-dir*:
 $a \sim b = (\text{normal-dir } a = \text{normal-dir } b)$
 ⟨proof⟩

We use this fact to give a code equation for (\sim)

lemmas [*code*] = *res-term-equiv-is-normal-dir*

The normal form is unique in each resource term equivalence class

lemma *normal-dir-unique*:
 $[\text{normal-dir } x = x; \text{normal-dir } y = y; x \sim y] \implies x = y$
 ⟨proof⟩

end
theory *ResNormCompare*
imports
 ResNormDirect
 ResNormRewrite
begin

6 Comparison of Resource Term Normalisation

The two normalisation procedures have the same outcome, because they both normalise the term

lemma *normal-rewr-is-normal-dir*:

normal-rewr = normal-dir
 ⟨*proof*⟩

With resource term normalisation to decide the equivalence, we can prove that the resource term mapping may render terms equivalent.

lemma
fixes $a\ b :: 'a$ **and** $c :: 'b$
assumes $a \neq b$
obtains $f :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b$ **and** $x\ y$ **where** $\text{map-res-term } f\ g\ x \sim \text{map-res-term } f\ g\ y$
and $\neg x \sim y$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

end
theory *Resource*
imports
 ResTerm
 ResNormCompare
begin

7 Resources

We define resources as the quotient of resource terms by their equivalence. To decide the equivalence we use resource term normalisation procedures, primarily the one based on rewriting.

7.1 Quotient Type

Resource term mapper satisfies the functor assumptions: it commutes with function composition and mapping identities is itself identity

functor *map-res-term*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Resources are resource terms modulo their equivalence

quotient-type $('a, 'b)$ *resource* = $('a, 'b)$ *res-term* / *res-term-equiv*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *abs-resource-eqI* [*intro*]:
 $x \sim y \implies \text{abs-resource } x = \text{abs-resource } y$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *abs-resource-eqE* [*elim*]:
 $[\text{abs-resource } x = \text{abs-resource } y; x \sim y \implies P] \implies P$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Resource representation then abstraction is identity

lemmas *resource-abs-of-rep* [*simp*] = *Quotient3-abs-rep[OF Quotient3-resource]*

Lifted normalisation gives a normalised representative term for a resource

lift-definition *of-resource* :: ('a, 'b) resource \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) res-term **is** normal-rewr
 <proof>

lemma *of-resource-absorb-normal-rewr* [simp]:
 normal-rewr (of-resource x) = of-resource x
 <proof>

lemma *of-resource-absorb-normal-dir* [simp]:
 normal-dir (of-resource x) = of-resource x
 <proof>

Equality of resources can be characterised by equality of representative terms

instantiation *resource* :: (equal, equal) equal
begin

definition *equal-resource* :: ('a, 'b) resource \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) resource \Rightarrow bool
where *equal-resource* a b = (of-resource a = of-resource b)

instance
 <proof>
end

7.2 Lifting Bounded Natural Functor Structure

Equivalent terms have equal atom sets

lemma *res-term-equiv-set1* [simp]:
 $x \sim y \Longrightarrow \text{set1-res-term } x = \text{set1-res-term } y$
 <proof>

lemma *res-term-equiv-set2* [simp]:
 $x \sim y \Longrightarrow \text{set2-res-term } x = \text{set2-res-term } y$
 <proof>

BNF structure can be lifted. Proof inspired by Fürer et al. [1].

lift-bnf ('a, 'b) resource
 <proof>

Resource map can be given a code equation through the term map

lemma *map-resource-code* [code]:
 $\text{map-resource } f g (\text{abs-resource } x) = \text{abs-resource } (\text{map-res-term } f g x)$
 <proof>

Atom sets of a resource are those sets of its representative term

lemma *set1-resource*:
fixes $x :: ('a, 'b) \text{ resource}$
shows $\text{set1-resource } x = \text{set1-res-term } (\text{of-resource } x)$
 <proof>
lemma *set2-resource*:

```

fixes x :: ('a, 'b) resource
shows set2-resource x = set2-res-term (of-resource x)
⟨proof⟩

```

7.3 Lifting Constructors

All term constructors are easily lifted thanks to the term equivalence being a congruence

```

lift-definition Empty :: ('a, 'b) resource
is res-term.Empty ⟨proof⟩
lift-definition Anything :: ('a, 'b) resource
is res-term.Anything ⟨proof⟩
lift-definition Res :: 'a ⇒ ('a, 'b) resource
is res-term.Res ⟨proof⟩
lift-definition Copyable :: 'b ⇒ ('a, 'b) resource
is res-term.Copyable ⟨proof⟩
lift-definition Parallel :: ('a, 'b) resource list ⇒ ('a, 'b) resource
is res-term.Parallel ⟨proof⟩
lift-definition NonD :: ('a, 'b) resource ⇒ ('a, 'b) resource ⇒ ('a, 'b) resource
is res-term.NonD ⟨proof⟩
lift-definition Executable :: ('a, 'b) resource ⇒ ('a, 'b) resource ⇒ ('a, 'b) resource
is res-term.Executable ⟨proof⟩
lift-definition Repeatable :: ('a, 'b) resource ⇒ ('a, 'b) resource ⇒ ('a, 'b) resource
is res-term.Repeatable ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemmas resource-constr-abs-eq =
  Empty.abs-eq Anything.abs-eq Res.abs-eq Copyable.abs-eq Parallel.abs-eq NonD.abs-eq
  Executable.abs-eq Repeatable.abs-eq

```

Resources can be split into cases like terms

```

lemma resource-cases:
fixes r :: ('a, 'b) resource
obtains
  (Empty) r = Empty
| (Anything) r = Anything
| (Res) a where r = Res a
| (Copyable) x where r = Copyable x
| (Parallel) xs where r = Parallel xs
| (NonD) x y where r = NonD x y
| (Executable) x y where r = Executable x y
| (Repeatable) x y where r = Repeatable x y
⟨proof⟩

```

Resources can be inducted over like terms

```

lemma resource-induct [case-names Empty Anything Res Copyable Parallel NonD
  Executable Repeatable]:
assumes P Empty
and P Anything

```

and $\bigwedge a. P \text{ (Res } a)$
and $\bigwedge x. P \text{ (Copyable } x)$
and $\bigwedge xs. (\bigwedge x. x \in \text{set } xs \implies P x) \implies P \text{ (Parallel } xs)$
and $\bigwedge x y. \llbracket P x; P y \rrbracket \implies P \text{ (NonD } x y)$
and $\bigwedge x y. \llbracket P x; P y \rrbracket \implies P \text{ (Executable } x y)$
and $\bigwedge x y. \llbracket P x; P y \rrbracket \implies P \text{ (Repeatable } x y)$
shows $P x$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Representative terms of the lifted constructors apart from *Resource.Parallel* are known

lemma *of-resource-simps* [*simp*]:
of-resource *Empty* = *res-term.Empty*
of-resource *Anything* = *res-term.Anything*
of-resource *(Res a)* = *res-term.Res a*
of-resource *(Copyable b)* = *res-term.Copyable b*
of-resource *(NonD x y)* = *res-term.NonD (of-resource x) (of-resource y)*
of-resource *(Executable x y)* = *res-term.Executable (of-resource x) (of-resource y)*
of-resource *(Repeatable x y)* = *res-term.Repeatable (of-resource x) (of-resource y)*
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Basic resource term equivalences become resource equalities

lemma [*simp*]:
shows *resource-empty*: *Parallel []* = *Empty*
and *resource-singleton*: *Parallel [x]* = *x*
and *resource-merge*: *Parallel (xs @ [Parallel ys] @ zs)* = *Parallel (xs @ ys @ zs)*
and *resource-drop*: *Parallel (xs @ [Empty] @ zs)* = *Parallel (xs @ zs)*
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *resource-parallel-nested* [*simp*]:
Parallel (Parallel xs # ys) = *Parallel (xs @ ys)*
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *resource-decompose*:
assumes *Parallel xs* = *Parallel ys*
and *Parallel us* = *Parallel vs*
shows *Parallel (xs @ us)* = *Parallel (ys @ vs)*
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *resource-drop-list*:
 $(\bigwedge y. y \in \text{set } ys \implies y = \text{Empty}) \implies \text{Parallel } (xs @ ys @ zs) = \text{Parallel } (xs @ zs)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Equality of resources except *Resource.Parallel* implies equality of their children

lemma

shows *resource-res-eq*: $Res\ x = Res\ y \implies x = y$
and *resource-copyable-eq*: $Copyable\ x = Copyable\ y \implies x = y$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *resource-nondet-eq*:
 $NonD\ a\ b = NonD\ x\ y \implies a = x$
 $NonD\ a\ b = NonD\ x\ y \implies b = y$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *resource-executable-eq*:
 $Executable\ a\ b = Executable\ x\ y \implies a = x$
 $Executable\ a\ b = Executable\ x\ y \implies b = y$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *resource-repeatable-eq*:
 $Repeatable\ a\ b = Repeatable\ x\ y \implies a = x$
 $Repeatable\ a\ b = Repeatable\ x\ y \implies b = y$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Many resource inequalities not involving *Resource.Parallel* are simple to prove

lemma *resource-neq [simp]*:
 $Empty \neq Anything$
 $Empty \neq Res\ a$
 $Empty \neq Copyable\ b$
 $Empty \neq NonD\ x\ y$
 $Empty \neq Executable\ x\ y$
 $Empty \neq Repeatable\ x\ y$
 $Anything \neq Res\ a$
 $Anything \neq Copyable\ b$
 $Anything \neq NonD\ x\ y$
 $Anything \neq Executable\ x\ y$
 $Anything \neq Repeatable\ x\ y$
 $Res\ a \neq Copyable\ b$
 $Res\ a \neq NonD\ x\ y$
 $Res\ a \neq Executable\ x\ y$
 $Res\ a \neq Repeatable\ x\ y$
 $Copyable\ b \neq NonD\ x\ y$
 $Copyable\ b \neq Executable\ x\ y$
 $Copyable\ b \neq Repeatable\ x\ y$
 $NonD\ x\ y \neq Executable\ u\ v$
 $NonD\ x\ y \neq Repeatable\ u\ v$
 $Executable\ x\ y \neq Repeatable\ u\ v$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Resource map of lifted constructors can be simplified

lemma *map-resource-simps [simp]*:
 $map-resource\ f\ g\ Empty = Empty$
 $map-resource\ f\ g\ Anything = Anything$

```

map-resource f g (Res a) = Res (f a)
map-resource f g (Copyable b) = Copyable (g b)
map-resource f g (Parallel xs) = Parallel (map (map-resource f g) xs)
map-resource f g (NonD x y) = NonD (map-resource f g x) (map-resource f g y)
map-resource f g (Executable x y) = Executable (map-resource f g x) (map-resource
f g y)
map-resource f g (Repeatable x y) = Repeatable (map-resource f g x) (map-resource
f g y)
⟨proof⟩

```

Note that resource term size doesn't lift, because *res-term.Parallel* [*res-term.Empty*] is equivalent to *Resource.Empty* but their sizes are 2 and 1 respectively.

7.4 Parallel Product

We introduce infix syntax for binary *Resource.Parallel*, forming a resource product

```

definition resource-par :: ('a, 'b) resource ⇒ ('a, 'b) resource ⇒ ('a, 'b) resource
  (infixr ∘ 120)
  where x ∘ y = Parallel [x, y]

```

For the purposes of code generation we act as if we lifted it

```

lemma resource-par-code [code]:
  abs-resource x ∘ abs-resource y = abs-resource (ResTerm.Parallel [x, y])
  ⟨proof⟩

```

Parallel product can be merged with *Resource.Parallel* resources on either side or around it

```

lemma resource-par-is-parallel [simp]:
  x ∘ Parallel xs = Parallel (x # xs)
  Parallel xs ∘ x = Parallel (xs @ [x])
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma resource-par-nested-start [simp]:
  Parallel (x ∘ y # zs) = Parallel (x # y # zs)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma resource-par-nested [simp]:
  Parallel (xs @ a ∘ b # ys) = Parallel (xs @ a # b # ys)
  ⟨proof⟩

```

Lifted constructor *Resource.Parallel*, which does not have automatic code equations, can be given code equations using this resource product

```

lemmas [code] = resource-empty resource-par-is-parallel(1)[symmetric]

```

This resource product sometimes leads to overly long expressions when generating code for formalised models, but these can be limited by code unfolding

lemma *resource-par-res* [code-unfold]:

$$\mathit{Res} \ x \odot y = \mathit{Parallel} \ [\mathit{Res} \ x, \ y]$$

<proof>

lemma *resource-parallel-res* [code-unfold]:

$$\mathit{Parallel} \ [\mathit{Res} \ x, \ \mathit{Parallel} \ ys] = \mathit{Parallel} \ (\mathit{Res} \ x \ \# \ ys)$$

<proof>

We show that this resource product is a monoid, meaning it is unital and associative

lemma *resource-par-unitL* [simp]:

$$\mathit{Empty} \odot x = x$$

<proof>

lemma *resource-par-unitR* [simp]:

$$x \odot \mathit{Empty} = x$$

<proof>

lemma *resource-par-assoc* [simp]:

$$(a \odot b) \odot c = a \odot (b \odot c)$$

<proof>

Resource map passes through resource product

lemma *resource-par-map* [simp]:

$$\mathit{map-resource} \ f \ g \ (\mathit{resource-par} \ a \ b) = \mathit{resource-par} \ (\mathit{map-resource} \ f \ g \ a) \ (\mathit{map-resource} \ f \ g \ b)$$

<proof>

Representative of resource product is normalised *res-term.Parallel* term of the two children's representations

lemma *of-resource-par*:

$$\mathit{of-resource} \ (\mathit{resource-par} \ x \ y) = \mathit{normal-rewr} \ (\mathit{res-term.Parallel} \ [\mathit{of-resource} \ x, \ \mathit{of-resource} \ y])$$

<proof>

7.5 Lifting Parallel Parts

lift-definition *parallel-parts* :: ('a, 'b) resource ⇒ ('a, 'b) resource list

is *ResTerm.parallel-parts* *<proof>*

Parallel parts of the lifted constructors can be simplified like the term version

lemma *parallel-parts-simps*:

$$\mathit{parallel-parts} \ \mathit{Empty} = []$$

$$\mathit{parallel-parts} \ \mathit{Anything} = [\mathit{Anything}]$$

$$\mathit{parallel-parts} \ (\mathit{Res} \ a) = [\mathit{Res} \ a]$$

$$\mathit{parallel-parts} \ (\mathit{Copyable} \ b) = [\mathit{Copyable} \ b]$$

$$\mathit{parallel-parts} \ (\mathit{Parallel} \ xs) = \mathit{concat} \ (\mathit{map} \ \mathit{parallel-parts} \ xs)$$

$$\mathit{parallel-parts} \ (\mathit{NonD} \ x \ y) = [\mathit{NonD} \ x \ y]$$

$$\mathit{parallel-parts} \ (\mathit{Executable} \ x \ y) = [\mathit{Executable} \ x \ y]$$

parallel-parts (*Repeatable x y*) = [*Repeatable x y*]
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Every resource is the same as *Resource.Parallel* resource formed from its parallel parts

lemma *resource-eq-parallel-parts*:
 $x = \text{Parallel } (\text{parallel-parts } x)$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Resources with equal parallel parts are equal

lemma *parallel-parts-cong*:
 $\text{parallel-parts } x = \text{parallel-parts } y \implies x = y$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Parallel parts of the resource product are the two resources' parallel parts

lemma *parallel-parts-par*:
 $\text{parallel-parts } (a \odot b) = \text{parallel-parts } a \ @ \ \text{parallel-parts } b$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

7.6 Lifting Parallelisation

lift-definition *parallelise* :: (*'a, 'b*) *resource list* \Rightarrow (*'a, 'b*) *resource*
 is *ResTerm.parallelise*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Parallelisation of the lifted constructors can be simplified like the term version

lemma *parallelise-resource-simps* [*code*]:
 $\text{parallelise } [] = \text{Empty}$
 $\text{parallelise } [x] = x$
 $\text{parallelise } (x\#y\#zs) = \text{Parallel } (x\#y\#zs)$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

7.7 Representative of Parallel Resource

By relating to direct normalisation, representative term for *Resource.Parallel* is parallelisation of representatives of its parallel parts

lemma *of-resource-parallel*:
 $\text{of-resource } (\text{Parallel } xs)$
 $= \text{ResTerm.parallelise } (\text{merge-all-parallel } (\text{remove-all-empty } (\text{map of-resource } xs)))$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Equality of *Resource.Parallel* resources implies equality of their parallel parts

lemma *resource-parallel-eq*:

$Parallel\ xs = Parallel\ ys \implies concat\ (map\ parallel-parts\ xs) = concat\ (map\ parallel-parts\ ys)$
 ⟨proof⟩

With this, we can prove simplification equations for atom sets

lemma *set1-resource-simps* [simp]:

$set1-resource\ Empty = \{\}$
 $set1-resource\ Anything = \{\}$
 $set1-resource\ (Res\ a) = \{a\}$
 $set1-resource\ (Copyable\ b) = \{\}$
 $set1-resource\ (Parallel\ xs) = \bigcup (set1-resource\ 'set\ xs)$
 $set1-resource\ (NonD\ x\ y) = set1-resource\ x \cup set1-resource\ y$
 $set1-resource\ (Executable\ x\ y) = set1-resource\ x \cup set1-resource\ y$
 $set1-resource\ (Repeatable\ x\ y) = set1-resource\ x \cup set1-resource\ y$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *set2-resource-simps* [simp]:

$set2-resource\ Empty = \{\}$
 $set2-resource\ Anything = \{\}$
 $set2-resource\ (Res\ a) = \{\}$
 $set2-resource\ (Copyable\ b) = \{b\}$
 $set2-resource\ (Parallel\ xs) = \bigcup (set2-resource\ 'set\ xs)$
 $set2-resource\ (NonD\ x\ y) = set2-resource\ x \cup set2-resource\ y$
 $set2-resource\ (Executable\ x\ y) = set2-resource\ x \cup set2-resource\ y$
 $set2-resource\ (Repeatable\ x\ y) = set2-resource\ x \cup set2-resource\ y$
 ⟨proof⟩

7.8 Replicated Resources

Replicate a resource several times in a *Resource.Parallel*

fun *nres-term* :: $nat \Rightarrow ('a, 'b)\ res-term \Rightarrow ('a, 'b)\ res-term$
where *nres-term* $n\ x = ResTerm.Parallel\ (replicate\ n\ x)$

lift-definition *nresource* :: $nat \Rightarrow ('a, 'b)\ resource \Rightarrow ('a, 'b)\ resource$
is *nres-term* ⟨proof⟩

At the resource level this can be simplified just like at the term level

lemma *nresource-simp*:

$nresource\ n\ x = Parallel\ (replicate\ n\ x)$
 ⟨proof⟩

Parallel product of replications is a replication for the combined amount

lemma *nresource-par*:

$nresource\ x\ a \odot nresource\ y\ a = nresource\ (x+y)\ a$
 ⟨proof⟩

7.9 Lifting Resource Refinement

lift-definition *refine-resource*

$:: ('a \Rightarrow ('x, 'y) \text{ resource}) \Rightarrow ('b \Rightarrow 'y) \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) \text{ resource} \Rightarrow ('x, 'y) \text{ resource}$
is *refine-res-term* $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Refinement of lifted constructors can be simplified like the term version

lemma *refine-resource-simps* [*simp*]:
refine-resource f g *Empty* = *Empty*
refine-resource f g *Anything* = *Anything*
refine-resource f g (*Res* a) = f a
refine-resource f g (*Copyable* b) = *Copyable* (g b)
refine-resource f g (*Parallel* x s) = *Parallel* (*map* (*refine-resource* f g) x s)
refine-resource f g (*NonD* x y) = *NonD* (*refine-resource* f g x) (*refine-resource* f g y)
refine-resource f g (*Executable* x y) =
Executable (*refine-resource* f g x) (*refine-resource* f g y)
refine-resource f g (*Repeatable* x y) =
Repeatable (*refine-resource* f g x) (*refine-resource* f g y)
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Code for refinement performs the term-level refinement on the normalised representative

lemma *refine-resource-code* [*code*]:
refine-resource f g (*abs-resource* x) = *abs-resource* (*refine-res-term* (*of-resource* \circ f) g x)
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Refinement passes through resource product

lemma *refine-resource-par*:
refine-resource f g ($x \odot y$) = *refine-resource* f g $x \odot$ *refine-resource* f g y
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end
theory *Process*
imports *Resource*
begin

8 Process Compositions

We define process compositions to describe how larger processes are built from smaller ones from the perspective of how outputs of some actions serve as inputs for later actions. Our process compositions form a tree, with actions as leaves and composition operations as internal nodes. We use resources to represent the inputs and outputs of processes.

8.1 Datatype, Input, Output and Validity

Process composition datatype with primitive actions, composition operations and resource actions. We use the following type variables:

- *'a* for linear resource atoms,
- *'b* for copyable resource atoms,
- *'l* for primitive action labels, and
- *'m* for primitive action metadata.

datatype (*'a*, *'b*, *'l*, *'m*) *process* =

- Primitive* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource* *'l* *'m*
— Primitive action with given input, output, label and metadata
- | *Seq* (*'a*, *'b*, *'l*, *'m*) *process* (*'a*, *'b*, *'l*, *'m*) *process*
— Sequential composition
- | *Par* (*'a*, *'b*, *'l*, *'m*) *process* (*'a*, *'b*, *'l*, *'m*) *process*
— Parallel composition
- | *Opt* (*'a*, *'b*, *'l*, *'m*) *process* (*'a*, *'b*, *'l*, *'m*) *process*
— Optional composition
- | *Represent* (*'a*, *'b*, *'l*, *'m*) *process*
— Representation of a process composition as a repeatedly executable resource
- | *Identity* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource*
— Identity action
- | *Swap* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource*
— Swap action
- | *InjectL* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource*
— Left injection
- | *InjectR* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource*
— Right injection
- | *OptDistrIn* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource*
— Distribution into branches of a non-deterministic resource
- | *OptDistrOut* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource*
— Distribution out of branches of a non-deterministic resource
- | *Duplicate* *'b*
— Duplication of a copyable resource
- | *Erase* *'b*
— Discarding a copyable resource
- | *Apply* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource*
— Applying an executable resource
- | *Repeat* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource*
— Duplicating a repeatedly executable resource
- | *Close* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource*
— Discarding a repeatedly executable resource
- | *Once* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource*
— Converting a repeatedly executable resource into a plain executable resource
- | *Forget* (*'a*, *'b*) *resource*
— Forgetting all details about a resource

Each process composition has a well defined input and output resource, derived recursively from the individual actions that constitute it.

primrec *input* :: (*'a*, *'b*, *'l*, *'m*) *process* \Rightarrow (*'a*, *'b*) *resource*

where

$input (Primitive\ ins\ outs\ l\ m) = ins$
| $input (Seq\ p\ q) = input\ p$
| $input (Par\ p\ q) = input\ p \odot input\ q$
| $input (Opt\ p\ q) = NonD (input\ p) (input\ q)$
| $input (Represent\ p) = Empty$
| $input (Identity\ a) = a$
| $input (Swap\ a\ b) = a \odot b$
| $input (InjectL\ a\ b) = a$
| $input (InjectR\ a\ b) = b$
| $input (OptDistrIn\ a\ b\ c) = a \odot (NonD\ b\ c)$
| $input (OptDistrOut\ a\ b\ c) = NonD (a \odot b) (a \odot c)$
| $input (Duplicate\ a) = Copyable\ a$
| $input (Erase\ a) = Copyable\ a$
| $input (Apply\ a\ b) = a \odot (Executable\ a\ b)$
| $input (Repeat\ a\ b) = Repeatable\ a\ b$
| $input (Close\ a\ b) = Repeatable\ a\ b$
| $input (Once\ a\ b) = Repeatable\ a\ b$
| $input (Forget\ a) = a$

Input of mapped process is accordingly mapped input

lemma *map-process-input* [simp]:

$input (map\ process\ f\ g\ h\ i\ x) = map\ resource\ f\ g (input\ x)$
(proof)

primrec *output* :: ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) resource

where

$output (Primitive\ ins\ outs\ l\ m) = outs$
| $output (Seq\ p\ q) = output\ q$
| $output (Par\ p\ q) = output\ p \odot output\ q$
| $output (Opt\ p\ q) = output\ p$
| $output (Represent\ p) = Repeatable (input\ p) (output\ p)$
| $output (Identity\ a) = a$
| $output (Swap\ a\ b) = b \odot a$
| $output (InjectL\ a\ b) = NonD\ a\ b$
| $output (InjectR\ a\ b) = NonD\ a\ b$
| $output (OptDistrIn\ a\ b\ c) = NonD (a \odot b) (a \odot c)$
| $output (OptDistrOut\ a\ b\ c) = a \odot (NonD\ b\ c)$
| $output (Duplicate\ a) = Copyable\ a \odot Copyable\ a$
| $output (Erase\ a) = Empty$
| $output (Apply\ a\ b) = b$
| $output (Repeat\ a\ b) = (Repeatable\ a\ b) \odot (Repeatable\ a\ b)$
| $output (Close\ a\ b) = Empty$
| $output (Once\ a\ b) = Executable\ a\ b$
| $output (Forget\ a) = Anything$

Output of mapped process is accordingly mapped output

lemma *map-process-output* [simp]:

$output (map\ process\ f\ g\ h\ i\ x) = map\ resource\ f\ g (output\ x)$

<proof>

Not all process compositions are valid. While we consider all individual actions to be valid, we impose two conditions on composition operations beyond the validity of their children:

- Sequential composition requires that the output of the first process be the input of the second.
- Optional composition requires that the two processes arrive at the same output.

primrec *valid* :: ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process \Rightarrow bool

where

valid (Primitive ins outs l m) = True
| *valid* (Seq p q) = (output p = input q \wedge *valid* p \wedge *valid* q)
| *valid* (Par p q) = (*valid* p \wedge *valid* q)
| *valid* (Opt p q) = (*valid* p \wedge *valid* q \wedge output p = output q)
| *valid* (Represent p) = *valid* p
| *valid* (Identity a) = True
| *valid* (Swap a b) = True
| *valid* (InjectL a b) = True
| *valid* (InjectR a b) = True
| *valid* (OptDistrIn a b c) = True
| *valid* (OptDistrOut a b c) = True
| *valid* (Duplicate a) = True
| *valid* (Erase a) = True
| *valid* (Apply a b) = True
| *valid* (Repeat a b) = True
| *valid* (Close a b) = True
| *valid* (Once a b) = True
| *valid* (Forget a) = True

Process mapping preserves validity

lemma *map-process-valid* [simp]:

valid x \implies *valid* (map-process f g h i x)

<proof>

However, it does not necessarily preserve invalidity if there exist two distinct linear or copyable resource atoms

lemma

fixes g h i **and** a b :: 'a

assumes a \neq b

obtains f **and** x :: ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process

where \neg *valid* x **and** *valid* (map-process f g h i x)

<proof>

lemma

fixes f h i **and** a b :: 'b

```

assumes  $a \neq b$ 
obtains  $g$  and  $x :: ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm)$  process
where  $\neg \text{valid } x$  and  $\text{valid } (\text{map-process } f \ g \ h \ i \ x)$ 
<proof>

```

If the resource map is injective then mapping with it does not change validity

```

lemma map-process-valid-eq:
assumes inj f
and inj g
shows  $\text{valid } x = \text{valid } (\text{map-process } f \ g \ h \ i \ x)$ 
<proof>

```

8.2 Gathering Primitive Actions

As primitive actions represent assumptions about what we can do in the modelling domain, it is often useful to gather them.

When we want to talk about only primitive actions, we represent them with a quadruple of input, output, label and metadata, just as the parameters to the *Primitive* constructor.

```

type-synonym  $('a, 'b, 'l, 'm)$  prim-pars =  $('a, 'b)$  resource  $\times$   $('a, 'b)$  resource  $\times$ 
 $'l \times 'm$ 

```

Uncurried version of *Primitive* to use with *prim-pars*

```

fun Primitive-unc ::  $('a, 'b, 'l, 'm)$  prim-pars  $\Rightarrow$   $('a, 'b, 'l, 'm)$  process
where Primitive-unc  $(a, b, l, m) = \text{Primitive } a \ b \ l \ m$ 

```

Gather the primitives recursively from the composition, preserving their order

```

primrec primitives ::  $('a, 'b, 'l, 'm)$  process  $\Rightarrow$   $('a, 'b, 'l, 'm)$  prim-pars list
where
  primitives (Primitive ins outs l m) =  $[(\text{ins}, \text{outs}, l, m)]$ 
| primitives (Seq p q) = primitives p @ primitives q
| primitives (Par p q) = primitives p @ primitives q
| primitives (Opt p q) = primitives p @ primitives q
| primitives (Represent p) = primitives p
| primitives (Identity a) = []
| primitives (Swap a b) = []
| primitives (InjectL a b) = []
| primitives (InjectR a b) = []
| primitives (OptDistrIn a b c) = []
| primitives (OptDistrOut a b c) = []
| primitives (Duplicate a) = []
| primitives (Erase a) = []
| primitives (Apply a b) = []
| primitives (Repeat a b) = []
| primitives (Close a b) = []
| primitives (Once a b) = []

```

| *primitives* (*Forget a*) = []

Primitives of mapped process are accordingly mapped primitives

lemma *map-process-primitives* [*simp*]:

primitives (*map-process f g h i x*)
= *map* ($\lambda(a, b, l, m). (map-resource\ f\ g\ a, map-resource\ f\ g\ b, h\ l, i\ m)$) (*primitives*
x)
⟨*proof*⟩

8.3 Resource Refinement in Processes

We can apply *refine-resource* systematically throughout a process composition

primrec *process-refineRes* ::

(*'a* \Rightarrow (*'x, 'y*) *resource*) \Rightarrow (*'b* \Rightarrow *'y*) \Rightarrow (*'a, 'b, 'l, 'm*) *process* \Rightarrow (*'x, 'y, 'l, 'm*)
process

where

process-refineRes f g (*Primitive ins outs l m*) =
Primitive (*refine-resource f g ins*) (*refine-resource f g outs*) *l m*
| *process-refineRes f g* (*Identity a*) = *Identity* (*refine-resource f g a*)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*Swap a b*) = *Swap* (*refine-resource f g a*) (*refine-resource*
f g b)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*Seq p q*) = *Seq* (*process-refineRes f g p*) (*process-refineRes*
f g q)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*Par p q*) = *Par* (*process-refineRes f g p*) (*process-refineRes*
f g q)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*Opt p q*) = *Opt* (*process-refineRes f g p*) (*process-refineRes*
f g q)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*InjectL a b*) = *InjectL* (*refine-resource f g a*) (*refine-resource*
f g b)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*InjectR a b*) = *InjectR* (*refine-resource f g a*) (*refine-resource*
f g b)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*OptDistrIn a b c*) =
OptDistrIn (*refine-resource f g a*) (*refine-resource f g b*) (*refine-resource f g c*)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*OptDistrOut a b c*) =
OptDistrOut (*refine-resource f g a*) (*refine-resource f g b*) (*refine-resource f g*
c)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*Duplicate a*) = *Duplicate* (*g a*)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*Erase a*) = *Erase* (*g a*)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*Represent p*) = *Represent* (*process-refineRes f g p*)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*Apply a b*) = *Apply* (*refine-resource f g a*) (*refine-resource*
f g b)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*Repeat a b*) = *Repeat* (*refine-resource f g a*) (*refine-resource*
f g b)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*Close a b*) = *Close* (*refine-resource f g a*) (*refine-resource*
f g b)
| *process-refineRes f g* (*Once a b*) = *Once* (*refine-resource f g a*) (*refine-resource*
f g b)

$$| \text{process-refineRes } f \ g \ (\text{Forget } a) = \text{Forget } (\text{refine-resource } f \ g \ a)$$

This behaves well with the input, output and primitives, and preserves validity

lemma *process-refineRes-input* [simp]:

$$\text{input } (\text{process-refineRes } f \ g \ x) = \text{refine-resource } f \ g \ (\text{input } x)$$

<proof>

lemma *process-refineRes-output* [simp]:

$$\text{output } (\text{process-refineRes } f \ g \ x) = \text{refine-resource } f \ g \ (\text{output } x)$$

<proof>

lemma *process-refineRes-primitives*:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{primitives } (\text{process-refineRes } f \ g \ x) \\ &= \text{map } (\lambda(\text{ins}, \text{outs}, l, m). (\text{refine-resource } f \ g \ \text{ins}, \text{refine-resource } f \ g \ \text{outs}, l, m)) \\ & \quad (\text{primitives } x) \end{aligned}$$

<proof>

lemma *process-refineRes-valid* [simp]:

$$\text{valid } x \implies \text{valid } (\text{process-refineRes } f \ g \ x)$$

<proof>

9 List-based Composition Actions

We define functions to compose a list of processes in sequence or in parallel. In both cases these associate the binary operation to the right, and for the empty list they both use the identity process on the *Resource.Empty* resource.

Compose a list of processes in sequence

primrec *seq-process-list* :: ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process list \Rightarrow ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process

where

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{seq-process-list } [] = \text{Identity Empty} \\ & | \text{seq-process-list } (x \# xs) = (\text{if } xs = [] \text{ then } x \text{ else } \text{Seq } x \ (\text{seq-process-list } xs)) \end{aligned}$$

lemma *seq-process-list-input* [simp]:

$$xs \neq [] \implies \text{input } (\text{seq-process-list } xs) = \text{input } (\text{hd } xs)$$

<proof>

lemma *seq-process-list-output* [simp]:

$$xs \neq [] \implies \text{output } (\text{seq-process-list } xs) = \text{output } (\text{last } xs)$$

<proof>

lemma *seq-process-list-valid*:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{valid } (\text{seq-process-list } xs) \\ &= (\text{list-all valid } xs \\ & \quad \wedge (\forall i :: \text{nat}. i < \text{length } xs - 1 \longrightarrow \text{output } (xs ! i) = \text{input } (xs ! \text{Suc } i))) \end{aligned}$$

<proof>

lemma *seq-process-list-primitives* [simp]:

$$\text{primitives } (\text{seq-process-list } xs) = \text{concat } (\text{map primitives } xs)$$

<proof>

We use list-based sequential composition to make generated code more readable

lemma *seq-process-list-code-unfold* [*code-unfold*]:
Seq x (Seq y z) = seq-process-list $[x, y, z]$
Seq x (seq-process-list ($y \# ys$)) = seq-process-list ($x \# y \# ys$)
<proof>

Resource refinement can be distributed across the list being composed

lemma *seq-process-list-refine*:
process-refineRes f g (seq-process-list xs) = seq-process-list (map (process-refineRes f g) xs)
<proof>

Compose a list of processes in parallel

primrec *par-process-list* :: ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process list \Rightarrow ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process
where
par-process-list [] = Identity Empty
| par-process-list ($x \# xs$) = (if $xs = []$ then x else Par x (par-process-list xs))

lemma *par-process-list-input* [*simp*]:
input (par-process-list xs) = foldr (\odot) (map input xs) Empty
<proof>

lemma *par-process-list-output* [*simp*]:
output (par-process-list xs) = foldr (\odot) (map output xs) Empty
<proof>

lemma *par-process-list-valid* [*simp*]:
valid (par-process-list xs) = list-all valid xs
<proof>

lemma *par-process-list-primitives* [*simp*]:
primitives (par-process-list xs) = concat (map primitives xs)
<proof>

We use list-based parallel composition to make generated code more readable

lemma *par-process-list-code-unfold* [*code-unfold*]:
Par x (Par y z) = par-process-list $[x, y, z]$
Par x (par-process-list ($y \# ys$)) = par-process-list ($x \# y \# ys$)
<proof>

Resource refinement can be distributed across the list being composed

lemma *par-process-list-refine*:
process-refineRes f g (par-process-list xs) = par-process-list (map (process-refineRes f g) xs)
<proof>

9.1 Progressing Both Non-deterministic Branches

Note that validity of Opt requires that its children have equal outputs. However, we can define a composition template that allows us to optionally compose processes with different outputs, producing the non-deterministic combination of those outputs. This represents progressing both branches of a $Resource.NonD$ resource without merging them.

```
fun OptProgress :: ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process  $\Rightarrow$  ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process  $\Rightarrow$  ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process
where OptProgress p q =
  Opt (Seq p (InjectL (output p) (output q)))
      (Seq q (InjectR (output p) (output q)))
```

The result takes the non-deterministic combination of the children's inputs and produces the non-deterministic combination of their outputs, and it is valid whenever the two children are valid.

lemma [*simp*]:

```
shows OptProgress-input: input (OptProgress x y) = NonD (input x) (input y)
and OptProgress-output: output (OptProgress x y) = NonD (output x) (output y)
and OptProgress-valid: valid (OptProgress x y) = (valid x  $\wedge$  valid y)
<proof>
```

10 Primitive Action Substitution

We define a function to substitute primitive actions within any process composition. The target actions are specified through a predicate on their parameters. The replacement composition is then a function of those primitives.

primrec *process-subst* ::

```
(('a, 'b) resource  $\Rightarrow$  ('a, 'b) resource  $\Rightarrow$  'l  $\Rightarrow$  'm  $\Rightarrow$  bool)  $\Rightarrow$ 
 (('a, 'b) resource  $\Rightarrow$  ('a, 'b) resource  $\Rightarrow$  'l  $\Rightarrow$  'm  $\Rightarrow$  ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process)  $\Rightarrow$ 
 ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process  $\Rightarrow$  ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process
```

where

```
process-subst P f (Primitive a b l m) = (if P a b l m then f a b l m else Primitive a b l m)
```

```
| process-subst P f (Identity a) = Identity a
| process-subst P f (Swap a b) = Swap a b
| process-subst P f (Seq p q) = Seq (process-subst P f p) (process-subst P f q)
| process-subst P f (Par p q) = Par (process-subst P f p) (process-subst P f q)
| process-subst P f (Opt p q) = Opt (process-subst P f p) (process-subst P f q)
| process-subst P f (InjectL a b) = InjectL a b
| process-subst P f (InjectR a b) = InjectR a b
| process-subst P f (OptDistrIn a b c) = OptDistrIn a b c
| process-subst P f (OptDistrOut a b c) = OptDistrOut a b c
| process-subst P f (Duplicate a) = Duplicate a
```

$|$ $\text{process-subst } P f (\text{Erase } a) = \text{Erase } a$
 $|$ $\text{process-subst } P f (\text{Represent } p) = \text{Represent } (\text{process-subst } P f p)$
 $|$ $\text{process-subst } P f (\text{Apply } a b) = \text{Apply } a b$
 $|$ $\text{process-subst } P f (\text{Repeat } a b) = \text{Repeat } a b$
 $|$ $\text{process-subst } P f (\text{Close } a b) = \text{Close } a b$
 $|$ $\text{process-subst } P f (\text{Once } a b) = \text{Once } a b$
 $|$ $\text{process-subst } P f (\text{Forget } a) = \text{Forget } a$

If no matching target primitive is present, then the substitution does nothing

lemma *process-subst-no-target*:

$(\bigwedge a b l m. (a, b, l, m) \in \text{set } (\text{primitives } x) \implies \neg P a b l m) \implies \text{process-subst } P f x = x$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

If a process has no primitives, then any substitution does nothing on it

lemma *process-subst-no-prims*:

$\text{primitives } x = [] \implies \text{process-subst } P f x = x$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

If the replacement process does not change the inputs, then input is preserved through the substitution

lemma *process-subst-input [simp]*:

$(\bigwedge a b l m. P a b l m \implies \text{input } (f a b l m) = a) \implies \text{input } (\text{process-subst } P f x) = \text{input } x$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

If the replacement additionally does not change the outputs, then the output is also preserved through the substitution

lemma *process-subst-output [simp]*:

assumes $\bigwedge a b l m. P a b l m \implies \text{input } (f a b l m) = a$
and $\bigwedge a b l m. P a b l m \implies \text{output } (f a b l m) = b$
shows $\text{output } (\text{process-subst } P f x) = \text{output } x$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

If the replacement is additionally valid for every target, then validity is preserved through the substitution

lemma *process-subst-valid [simp]*:

assumes $\bigwedge a b l m. P a b l m \implies \text{input } (f a b l m) = a$
and $\bigwedge a b l m. P a b l m \implies \text{output } (f a b l m) = b$
and $\bigwedge a b l m. P a b l m \implies \text{valid } (f a b l m)$
shows $\text{valid } (\text{process-subst } P f x) = \text{valid } x$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Primitives after substitution are those that didn't satisfy the predicate and anything that was introduced by the function applied on satisfying primitives' parameters.

lemma *process-subst-primitives*:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{primitives } (\text{process-subst } P f x) \\ &= \text{concat } (\text{map } \\ & \quad (\lambda(a, b, l, m). \text{if } P a b l m \text{ then primitives } (f a b l m) \text{ else } [(a, b, l, m)])) \\ & (\text{primitives } x) \\ & \langle \text{proof} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

After substitution, no target action is left unless some replacement introduces one

lemma *process-subst-targets-removed*:

assumes $\bigwedge a b l m a' b' l' m'$.

$\llbracket (a, b, l, m) \in \text{set } (\text{primitives } x); P a b l m; (a', b', l', m') \in \text{set } (\text{primitives } (f a b l m)) \rrbracket$

$\implies \neg P a' b' l' m'$

— For any target primitive of the process, no primitive in its replacement is also a target

and $(a, b, l, m) \in \text{set } (\text{primitives } (\text{process-subst } P f x))$

shows $\neg P a b l m$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Process substitution distributes over list-based sequential and parallel composition

lemma *par-process-list-subst*:

$\text{process-subst } P f (\text{par-process-list } xs) = \text{par-process-list } (\text{map } (\text{process-subst } P f) xs)$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *seq-process-list-subst*:

$\text{process-subst } P f (\text{seq-process-list } xs) = \text{seq-process-list } (\text{map } (\text{process-subst } P f) xs)$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

11 Useful Notation

We set up notation to easily express the input and output of a process. We use two bundle: including one introduces the notation, while including the other removes it.

abbreviation $\text{spec} :: ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) \text{ process} \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) \text{ resource} \Rightarrow ('a, 'b) \text{ resource} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$

where $\text{spec } P a b \equiv \text{input } P = a \wedge \text{output } P = b$

bundle *spec-notation*

begin

notation $\text{spec } ((-): (-) \rightarrow (-) [1000, 60] 60)$

end

bundle *spec-notation-undo*

begin

```

no-notation spec ((-): (-) → (-) [1000, 60] 60)
end

```

Set up notation bundles to be imported in a controlled way, along with inverses to undo them

We also set up infix notation for sequential and parallel process composition. Once again, we use two bundles to add and remove this notation. In this case that is even more useful, as out parallel composition notation overrides that of (\parallel).

```

bundle process-notation
begin
no-notation Shuffle (infixr  $\parallel$  80)
notation Seq (infixr ;; 55)
notation Par (infixr  $\parallel$  65)
end

```

```

bundle process-notation-undo
begin
notation Shuffle (infixr  $\parallel$  80)
no-notation Seq (infixr ;; 55)
no-notation Par (infixr  $\parallel$  65)
end

```

```

end
theory CopyableElimination
  imports Process
begin

```

12 Copyable Resource Elimination

We can show that copyable resources are not strictly necessary for the theory, being instead a convenience feature, by taking any valid process and transforming it into one that does not use any copyable resources. The cost is that we introduce new primitive actions, which represent the explicit assumptions that the resources that were copyable have actions that correspond to *Duplicate* and *Erase* in the domain. While an equivalent assumption (that such actions exist in the domain) is made by making an atom copyable instead of linear, that avenue fixes the form of those actions and as such lessens the risk of error in manually introducing them for this frequent pattern.

The concrete transformation takes a process of type $(\prime a, \prime b, \prime l, \prime m)$ *process* to one of type $(\prime a + \prime b, \prime c, \prime l + \text{String.literal}, \prime m + \text{unit})$ *process*. Note the following:

- The two resource atom types are combined into one to form the new

linear atoms.

- The new copyable atoms can be of any type, because the result makes no use of them.
- The old labels are combined with string literals to add label simple labels for the new actions.
- The old metadata is combined with *unit*, allowing the new actions to have no metadata.

12.1 Replacing Copyable Resource Actions

To remove the copyable resource actions *Duplicate* and *Erase* we replace them with *Primitive* actions with the corresponding input and output, string labels and no metadata.

```

primrec makeDuplEraToPrim
  :: ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process ⇒ ('a, 'b, 'l + String.literal, 'm + unit) process
where
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (Primitive a b l m) = Primitive a b (Inl l) (Inl m)
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (Identity a) = Identity a
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (Swap a b) = Swap a b
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (Seq p q) = Seq (makeDuplEraToPrim p) (makeDuplEraToPrim
q)
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (Par p q) = Par (makeDuplEraToPrim p) (makeDuplEraToPrim
q)
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (Opt p q) = Opt (makeDuplEraToPrim p) (makeDuplEraToPrim
q)
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (InjectL a b) = InjectL a b
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (InjectR a b) = InjectR a b
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (OptDistrIn a b c) = OptDistrIn a b c
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (OptDistrOut a b c) = OptDistrOut a b c
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (Duplicate a) =
    Primitive (Copyable a) (Copyable a ⊙ Copyable a) (Inr STR "Duplicate")
(Inr ())
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (Erase a) =
    Primitive (Copyable a) Empty (Inr STR "Erase") (Inr ())
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (Represent p) = Represent (makeDuplEraToPrim p)
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (Apply a b) = Apply a b
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (Repeat a b) = Repeat a b
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (Close a b) = Close a b
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (Once a b) = Once a b
  | makeDuplEraToPrim (Forget a) = Forget a

```

12.2 Making Copyable Resource Terms Linear

To eventually replace copyable resources, we first define how resource terms are replaced. Linear atoms are injected into the left side of the sum while

copyable ones are injected into the right side, but both are turned into linear atoms in the result.

primrec *copyableToRes-term* :: ('a, 'b) *res-term* \Rightarrow ('a + 'b, 'c) *res-term*

where

copyableToRes-term res-term.Empty = *res-term.Empty*
 | *copyableToRes-term res-term.Anything* = *res-term.Anything*
 | *copyableToRes-term (res-term.Res a)* = *res-term.Res (Inl a)*
 | *copyableToRes-term (res-term.Copyable a)* = *res-term.Res (Inr a)*
 | *copyableToRes-term (res-term.Parallel xs)* =
 res-term.Parallel (map copyableToRes-term xs)
 | *copyableToRes-term (res-term.NonD a b)* =
 res-term.NonD (copyableToRes-term a) (copyableToRes-term b)
 | *copyableToRes-term (res-term.Executable a b)* =
 res-term.Executable (copyableToRes-term a) (copyableToRes-term b)
 | *copyableToRes-term (res-term.Repeatable a b)* =
 res-term.Repeatable (copyableToRes-term a) (copyableToRes-term b)

Replacing copyable resource terms preserves term equivalence

lemma *copyableToRes-term-equiv*:

$x \sim y \Longrightarrow \text{copyableToRes-term } x \sim \text{copyableToRes-term } y$
 ⟨proof⟩

Replacing copyable resource terms does not affect the nature of non-atoms

lemma *copyableToRes-term-is-Empty [simp]*:

is-Empty (copyableToRes-term x) = *is-Empty x*
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *copyableToRes-term-has-Empty [simp]*:

list-ex is-Empty (map copyableToRes-term xs) = *list-ex is-Empty xs*
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *copyableToRes-term-has-no-Empty [simp]*:

list-all ($\lambda x. \neg \text{is-Empty } x$) (map copyableToRes-term xs) = *list-all ($\lambda x. \neg \text{is-Empty } x$) xs*
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *copyableToRes-term-is-Parallel [simp]*:

is-Parallel (copyableToRes-term x) = *is-Parallel x*
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *copyableToRes-term-has-Parallel [simp]*:

list-ex is-Parallel (map copyableToRes-term xs) = *list-ex is-Parallel xs*
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *copyableToRes-term-has-no-Parallel [simp]*:

list-all ($\lambda x. \neg \text{is-Parallel } x$) (map copyableToRes-term xs) = *list-all ($\lambda x. \neg \text{is-Parallel } x$) xs*
 ⟨proof⟩

Replacing copyable resource terms does not affect whether they are normalised

lemma *normalised-copyableToRes-term [simp]*:

$\text{normalised } (\text{copyableToRes-term } x) = \text{normalised } x$ (**is normalised** $(?f x) = \text{normalised } x$)

— Note the pattern matching, which is needed to later refer to *copyableToRes-term* with the right type variable for copyable resources in its output
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Term rewriting step commutes with the copyable term replacement

lemma *remove-one-empty-copyableToRes-term-commute:*

$\text{remove-one-empty } (\text{map } \text{copyableToRes-term } xs) = \text{map } \text{copyableToRes-term } (\text{remove-one-empty } xs)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *merge-one-parallel-copyableToRes-term-commute:*

$\text{merge-one-parallel } (\text{map } \text{copyableToRes-term } xs) = \text{map } \text{copyableToRes-term } (\text{merge-one-parallel } xs)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *step-copyableToRes-term:*

$\text{step } (\text{copyableToRes-term } x) = \text{copyableToRes-term } (\text{step } x)$ (**is step** $(?f x) = ?f$ $(\text{step } x)$)
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

By induction, the replacement of copyable terms also passes through term normalisation

lemma *normal-rewr-copyableToRes-term:*

$\text{normal-rewr } (\text{copyableToRes-term } x) = \text{copyableToRes-term } (\text{normal-rewr } x)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Copyable term replacement is injective

lemma *copyableToRes-term-inj:*

$\text{copyableToRes-term } x = \text{copyableToRes-term } y \implies x = y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Making Copyable Resources Linear

We then lift the term-level replacement to resources

lift-definition $\text{copyableToRes} :: ('a, 'b) \text{ resource} \Rightarrow ('a + 'b, 'c) \text{ resource}$
is copyableToRes-term $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *copyableToRes-simps [simp]:*

$\text{copyableToRes } \text{Empty} = \text{Empty}$
 $\text{copyableToRes } \text{Anything} = \text{Anything}$
 $\text{copyableToRes } (\text{Res } a) = \text{Res } (\text{Inl } a)$
 $\text{copyableToRes } (\text{Copyable } a) = \text{Res } (\text{Inr } a)$
 $\text{copyableToRes } (\text{Parallel } xs) = \text{Parallel } (\text{map } \text{copyableToRes } xs)$
 $\text{copyableToRes } (\text{NonD } x y) = \text{NonD } (\text{copyableToRes } x) (\text{copyableToRes } y)$
 $\text{copyableToRes } (\text{Executable } x y) = \text{Executable } (\text{copyableToRes } x) (\text{copyableToRes } y)$

$\text{copyableToRes (Repeatable } x \ y) = \text{Repeatable (copyableToRes } x) \ (\text{copyableToRes } y)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Resource-level replacement is injective, which is vital for preserving composition validity

lemma *copyableToRes-inj*:
fixes $x \ y :: ('a, 'b) \text{ resource}$
shows $(\text{copyableToRes } x :: ('a + 'b, 'c) \text{ resource}) = \text{copyableToRes } y \implies x = y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *copyableToRes-eq-conv [simp]*:
 $(\text{copyableToRes } x = \text{copyableToRes } y) = (x = y)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Resource-level replacement can then be applied over a process

primrec *process-copyableToRes* :: $('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) \text{ process} \Rightarrow ('a + 'b, 'c, 'l, 'm) \text{ process}$

where

- $\text{process-copyableToRes (Primitive ins outs } l \ m) =$
 $\text{Primitive (copyableToRes ins) (copyableToRes outs) } l \ m$
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (Identity } a) = \text{Identity (copyableToRes } a)$
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (Swap } a \ b) = \text{Swap (copyableToRes } a) \ (\text{copyableToRes } b)$
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (Seq } p \ q) = \text{Seq (process-copyableToRes } p) \ (\text{process-copyableToRes } q)$
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (Par } p \ q) = \text{Par (process-copyableToRes } p) \ (\text{process-copyableToRes } q)$
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (Opt } p \ q) = \text{Opt (process-copyableToRes } p) \ (\text{process-copyableToRes } q)$
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (InjectL } a \ b) = \text{InjectL (copyableToRes } a) \ (\text{copyableToRes } b)$
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (InjectR } a \ b) = \text{InjectR (copyableToRes } a) \ (\text{copyableToRes } b)$
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (OptDistrIn } a \ b \ c) =$
 $\text{OptDistrIn (copyableToRes } a) \ (\text{copyableToRes } b) \ (\text{copyableToRes } c)$
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (OptDistrOut } a \ b \ c) =$
 $\text{OptDistrOut (copyableToRes } a) \ (\text{copyableToRes } b) \ (\text{copyableToRes } c)$
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (Duplicate } a) = \text{undefined}$
— There is no sensible definition for *Duplicate*, but we will not need one
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (Erase } a) = \text{undefined}$
— There is no sensible definition for *Erase*, but we will not need one
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (Represent } p) = \text{Represent (process-copyableToRes } p)$
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (Apply } a \ b) = \text{Apply (copyableToRes } a) \ (\text{copyableToRes } b)$
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (Repeat } a \ b) = \text{Repeat (copyableToRes } a) \ (\text{copyableToRes } b)$
- $|\ \text{process-copyableToRes (Close } a \ b) = \text{Close (copyableToRes } a) \ (\text{copyableToRes } b)$

$$\begin{aligned} &| \text{process-copyableToRes } (\text{Once } a \ b) = \text{Once } (\text{copyableToRes } a) \ (\text{copyableToRes } b) \\ &| \text{process-copyableToRes } (\text{Forget } a) = \text{Forget } (\text{copyableToRes } a) \end{aligned}$$

12.3 Final Properties

The final transformation proceeds by first *makeDuplEraToPrim* to remove the resource actions that depend on their copyable nature and then *process-copyableToRes* to make all copyable resources into linear ones. We verify that the result:

- Has the expected type,
- Has as input the original input made linear,
- Has as output the original output made linear,
- Is valid iff the original is valid.
- Contains no copyable atoms

notepad begin

<proof>

end

lemma *eliminateCopyable-input:*

input (process-copyableToRes (makeDuplEraToPrim x)) = copyableToRes (input x)

<proof>

lemma *eliminateCopyable-output:*

output (process-copyableToRes (makeDuplEraToPrim x)) = copyableToRes (output x)

<proof>

lemma *eliminateCopyable-valid:*

valid (process-copyableToRes (makeDuplEraToPrim x)) = valid x

<proof>

lemma *set2-process-eliminateCopyable:*

fixes *x :: ('a, 'b, 'l, 'm) process*

shows *set2-process (process-copyableToRes (makeDuplEraToPrim x)) = {}*

<proof>

end

References

- [1] B. Fürer, A. Lochbihler, J. Schneider, and D. Traytel. Quotients of bounded natural functors. In N. Peltier and V. Sofronie-Stokkermans,

editors, *Automated Reasoning*, pages 58–78, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing.