IFIP TCS2000 - Sendai - Japan - 17–19 August 2000

Open Ended Systems, Dynamic Bisimulation and Tile Logic

Roberto Bruni Dip. Informatica, Univ. Pisa

joint work with

Ugo Montanari Dip. Informatica, Univ. Pisa

Vladimiro Sassone Dip. Matematica e Informatica, Univ. Catania

Research supported

by CNR Integrated Project *Progettazione e Verifica di Sistemi Eterogenei*;

by Esprit Working Groups *CONFER2* and *COORDINA*;

by TMR Network *GETGRATS*;

and by MURST project *TOSCA*.

Plan of the talk

- Introduction & Motivation
  - Bisimilarity congruences
  - Dynamic bisimilarity
  - Open ended systems
  - Tile logic
- Notation
  - Categories of substitutions
- **Bisimulation and SOS formats**
  - **Bisimilarity as a congruence**
  - **Dynamic bisimilarity**
- **Tile Model**
  - **Tile formats (monoidal, algebraic, term)**
  - **Tile bisimulation**
  - **Tile decomposition & Basic source**
- **Dynamic Tile Bisimulation**
  - **Ground tile bisimulation**
  - **Ground decomposition & Basic source**
  - **Dynamic bisimilarity as ground tile bisimilarity**
- Concluding Remarks

Intro & Motivation

:-) LTS (operational and abstract) semantics and SOS

- → **states as terms over Σ:** $[\mathbf{t_1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{t_2}]$
- → **bisimulation and bisimilarity:** $[\mathbf{t_1} \sim \mathbf{t_2}]$ **and** $[\mathbf{t_1} \simeq \mathbf{t_2}]$
- → **compositionality of abstract sem.:** $[\mathbf{t_1} \simeq \mathbf{t_2} \Rightarrow \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{t_1}] \simeq \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{t_2}]]$
- → **SOS spec. formats (e.g., De Simone, GSOS, `tyft`)**

;-⟩ But *structural axioms* $\mathbb{E}$ are often convenient

- $\equiv_{\mathbb{E}}$ **e.g., CHAM, UML graphs, π-calculus, ambients, ...**

:-⟨ Hence formats may 'fail' to apply

- $\xrightarrow{C[_]}$ **context closure of $\simeq$: not a bisimulation!**
- $\xrightarrow{C[_]}$ **context embedding while playing bisimulation**
- $\xrightarrow{C[_]}$ ***dynamic bisimulation* (MS92):** $[\mathbf{t} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{C}[_]} \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{t}]]$
- $\xrightarrow{C[_]}$ **application to reconfig. and open-ended systems**

Drawback: **meta-construction flavour and infinitary in principle**

Exploit *Tile Model* **(GM,BMM)**

- □ **abstract, uniform and finitary approach**

Categories of Substitutions

Signature Σ (one sorted) and **Variables** in X

Term algebras $\mathbb{T}_\Sigma(X)$ and $\mathbb{T}_\Sigma = \mathbb{T}_\Sigma(\varnothing)$

Substitutions $\sigma\colon X \to \mathbb{T}_\Sigma(X)$ (extend to $\sigma\colon \mathbb{T}_\Sigma(X) \to \mathbb{T}_\Sigma(X)$)

Canonical variables: $\underline{n} = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$

Finite substitution $\sigma = [t_1/x_1, \ldots, t_n/x_n]$

σ' can be applied elementwise to σ yielding $[\sigma'(t_1)/x_1, \ldots, \sigma'(t_n)/x_n]$

Context $t = C[x_1, ., x_n]$ (using at most $x_1, \ldots, x_n$)

$C[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ given by applying $[t_1/x_1, \ldots, t_n/x_n]$ to $C[x_1, ., x_n]$

Linear terms, contexts, substitutions

Categories of Substitutions (II)

Context as substitution from n terms to 1: $[C[x_1,\ldots,x_n]/x_1]$.

More generally: For $t_i \in \mathbb{T}_\Sigma(\underline{m})$, $\sigma\colon \underline{m} \to \underline{n}$.

given m terms as inputs, return n terms as output

$[t_1/x_1,\ldots,t_n/x_n]$ written just as $\langle t_1,\ldots,t_n\rangle$



Sequential composition is substitution application.

Brackets can be omitted **ex. a, b const. and f binary**

$\langle \mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}\rangle; \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x_1},\mathbf{x_2}),\mathbf{x_1}\rangle; \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x_2},\mathbf{x_1}) = \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}),\mathbf{a}\rangle; \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x_2},\mathbf{x_1}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}))$

Categories of Substitutions (III)

Algebraic Theories **(Law)**: **finite subs on Σ generated by**

Th. $\langle \mathbf{f} \rangle : \underline{n} \to \underline{1}$ **for** $f \in \Sigma$ **with arity** n



Th. $\langle \mathbf{x_1} \rangle : \underline{1} \to \underline{1}$



Th. $\langle \mathbf{x_2}, \mathbf{x_1} \rangle : \underline{2} \to \underline{2}$



Th. $\langle \mathbf{x_1}, \mathbf{x_1} \rangle : \underline{1} \to \underline{2}$



Th. $\langle \rangle : \underline{1} \to \underline{0}$

composing with tensor $_ \otimes _$ **and application** $_ ; _$





Bisimulation and sos

Bisimulation:

$t_1 \sim t_2$ and $t_1 \xrightarrow{a} s_1$ imply $t_2 \xrightarrow{a} s_2$ with $s_1 \sim s_2$

(and vice versa)

Bisimilarity $\simeq$ is the largest bisimulation

Is $\simeq$ a congruence? $t_i \simeq s_i \overset{?}{\Rightarrow} f(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \simeq f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$

De Simone, positive `GSOS`, `tyft/tyxt` formats

$$\frac{\{x_i \xrightarrow{a_i} y_i \mid i \in I\}}{f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \xrightarrow{a} t}$$

Conclusions $C[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \xrightarrow{a} t$ never allowed!

What about structural axioms?

Example

Example 1 $\Sigma = \{nil, \alpha._, \bar{\alpha}._, _ \mid _\}$

sync. axiom plus rules that propagates τ through $_ \mid _$ (asynch.)

$$\frac{}{\lambda.x_1 \mid \bar{\lambda}.x_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} x_1 \mid x_2} \qquad \frac{x_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} x_1'}{x_1 \mid x_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} x_1' \mid x_2} \qquad \frac{x_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} x_2'}{x_1 \mid x_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} x_1 \mid x_2'}$$

$\alpha.nil \simeq \bar{\alpha}.nil$, *but consider the context* $x_1 \mid \bar{\alpha}.nil$*:*

$\alpha.\mathbf{nil} \mid \bar{\alpha}.\mathbf{nil} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathbf{nil} \mid \mathbf{nil}$ $\qquad$ $\bar{\alpha}.\mathbf{nil} \mid \bar{\alpha}.\mathbf{nil} \not\rightarrow$

Hence $\alpha.nil \mid \bar{\alpha}.nil \not\simeq \bar{\alpha}.nil \mid \bar{\alpha}.nil$

Example 2 *In the running example* $\alpha.nil \not\simeq_{\mathrm{d}} \bar{\alpha}.nil$

To see this, take $\mathbf{C[x_1] = x_1 \mid \bar{\alpha}.nil}$

Dynamic Bisimulation

With *dynamic bisimulation*, all moves can put the states under comparison in the same context (note the $C[_]$)

$\mathbf{t_1 \sim_d t_2}$ and $\mathbf{C[t_1] \xrightarrow{a} s_1}$ imply $\mathbf{C[t_2] \xrightarrow{a} s_2}$ with $\mathbf{s_1 \sim_d s_2}$
(and vice versa)

Dynamic bisimilarity $\simeq_{\mathrm{d}}$ is the largest dyn. bisimulation

$\simeq_{\mathrm{d}}$ is the coarsest congr. that is also a (ordinary) bisim.

We introduce an alternative, original presentation:

Definition 1 *Given* LTS $L = (\mathbb{T}_\Sigma, \Lambda, \rightarrow)$
dynamic extension $\widehat{L} = (\mathbb{T}_\Sigma, \Lambda', \rightarrow \cup \rightrightarrows)$, *where:*
$s \overset{C[_]}{\rightrightarrows} C[s]$ *for all* $s \in \mathbb{T}_\Sigma$ *and all unary contexts* $C[_]$

Proposition 1 $s \simeq_{\mathrm{d}} t$ *in* L *iff* $s \simeq t$ *in* $\widehat{L}$

Main Features of Tile Logic

TL is a logic for modular descriptions of the dynamic evolution of concurrent systems

- ☐ Suited to deal with **synchronization issues**
- ☐ General notion of **configuration** and of **observation**
- ☐ Defines compositional models of computation in **space** and in **time**
- ☐ Allows to reason about **contexts**
- ☐ Admits suggestive **graphical presentation**
- ☐ Can model **heterogeneous systems**
- ☐ Yields an algebra of **(open) computation proofs**
- ☐ provides a **categorical framework**

TL has been applied to
process algebras **(GM,BMM,BFMM)**
message passing systems **(BMM)**
coordination languages **(MR)**
causal and located systems **(FM)**
π-calculus **(FM,BM)**
actor systems **(MT)**

Tile Model

A ***tiles system*** is a tuple $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{V}, N, R)$ where:
$\mathcal{H}$ monoidal category of ***configurations***
$\mathcal{V}$ monoidal category of ***observations***
$\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ have the same objects (called ***interfaces***)
N is the set of *tile names*
$R: N \to \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{H}$

if $R(\alpha) = \langle s, a, b, t \rangle$, written α: $s \xrightarrow[b]{a} t$, then
$$\begin{tikzcd} x \arrow[r, "s"] \arrow[d, "a"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\alpha"] & y \arrow[d, "b"] \\ z \arrow[r, "t"'] & w \end{tikzcd}$$

Tiles can be composed

$$\begin{tikzcd} \circ \arrow[r] \arrow[d] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\alpha"] & \circ \arrow[r] \arrow[d] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\beta"] & \circ \arrow[d] \\ \circ \arrow[r] & \circ \arrow[r] & \circ \end{tikzcd} \qquad \begin{tikzcd} \circ \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \circ \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \circ \arrow[d] \\ \circ \arrow[r] \arrow[d] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\alpha"] & \circ \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \circ \\ \circ \arrow[r] & \circ & \end{tikzcd} \qquad \begin{tikzcd} \circ \arrow[r] \arrow[d] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\alpha"] & \circ \arrow[d] \\ \circ \arrow[r] \arrow[d] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\beta"] & \circ \arrow[d] \\ \circ \arrow[r] & \circ \end{tikzcd}$$

Identities

$$\begin{tikzcd} x \arrow[r, "s"] \arrow[d, "id_x"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "id_s"] & y \arrow[d, "id_x"] \\ x \arrow[r, "s"'] & y \end{tikzcd} \qquad \begin{tikzcd} x \arrow[r, "id_x"] \arrow[d, "a"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "id_a"] & x \arrow[d, "a"] \\ z \arrow[r, "id_z"'] & z \end{tikzcd}$$

(possibly auxiliary tiles)

Tile Logic and Tile Formats

Given $\mathcal{R}$, the associated *tile logic* is obtained by adding some canonical 'auxiliary' tiles and then closing by composition both auxiliary and basic tiles.

aux. tiles can e.g. model isomorphic transf. of interfaces

$$\mathcal{R} \vdash s \xrightarrow[b]{a} t$$

Starting from signatures (generating $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{V}$)

$$\frac{\{x_i \xrightarrow{a_i} y_i\}}{C[x_1,\ldots,x_n] \xrightarrow{a} D[y_1,\ldots,y_n]}$$

$$\begin{tikzcd} \underline{n} \arrow[r, "C[x_1,\ldots,x_n]"] \arrow[d, "a_1\otimes\cdots\otimes a_n"'] & \underline{1} \arrow[d, "a"] \\ \underline{n} \arrow[r, "D[x_1,\ldots,x_n]"'] & \underline{1} \end{tikzcd}$$

note the canonical renaming of the y's

Algebraic format **(GM97)**: horizontal cartesianity

Monoidal format **(MM97)**: no auxiliary tiles

Term format **(BMM98)**: horizontal and vertical cartesianity

Example

$$\frac{x_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} x_1'}{x_1 \mid x_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} x_1' | x_2}$$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\underline{2} \arrow[r, "x_1|x_2"] \arrow[d, "\tau(\mathbf{x_1}),\mathbf{x_2}\equiv\tau\otimes\mathbf{id}"'] & \underline{1} \arrow[d, "\tau\equiv\tau(\mathbf{x_1})"] \\
\underline{2} \arrow[r, "\mathbf{x_1}|\mathbf{x_2}"'] & \underline{1}
\end{tikzcd}$$

(Basic Source)

$$\frac{\cdot}{\lambda.x_1 \mid \overline{\lambda}.x_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} x_1 | x_2}$$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\underline{2} \arrow[r, "\lambda.x_1|\overline{\lambda}.x_2"] \arrow[d, "\mathbf{x_1},\mathbf{x_2}\equiv\mathbf{id}\otimes\mathbf{id}"'] & \underline{1} \arrow[d, "\tau\equiv\tau(\mathbf{x_1})"] \\
\underline{2} \arrow[r, "\mathbf{x_1}|\mathbf{x_2}"'] & \underline{1}
\end{tikzcd}$$

(Not Basic Source)

Tile Bisimulation and Tile Decomposition

Tiles allow for a very general notion of bisimulation (note that t_1 and t_2 can be open terms)

$\mathbf{t_1} \sim_{\mathrm{t}} \mathbf{t_2}$ and $\mathcal{R} \vdash t_1 \xrightarrow[b]{a} s_1$ imply $\mathcal{R} \vdash t_2 \xrightarrow[b]{a} s_2$ with $\mathbf{s_1} \sim_{\mathrm{t}} \mathbf{s_2}$ (and vice versa)

Tile bisimilarity $\simeq_{\mathrm{t}}$ is the largest tile bisimulation

Definition 2 *A tile system $\mathcal{R}$ enjoys the* **decomposition property** *if for all $\mathcal{R} \vdash s \xrightarrow[b]{a} t$*

1. *if $s = s_1; s_2$ then*
   $\mathcal{R} \vdash s_1 \xrightarrow[c]{a} t_1$, $\mathcal{R} \vdash s_2 \xrightarrow[b]{c} t_2$ *with* $t = t_1; t_2$

2. *if $s = s_1 \otimes s_2$ then*
   $\mathcal{R} \vdash s_1 \xrightarrow[b_1]{a_1} t_1$, $\mathcal{R} \vdash s_2 \xrightarrow[b_2]{a_2} t_2$,
   with $a = a_1 \otimes a_2$, $b = b_1 \otimes b_2$ *and* $t = t_1 \otimes t_2$

Proposition 2 *If $\mathcal{R}$ enjoys the decomposition property, then tile bisimilarity is a congruence*

For basic source and tile bisimilarity congr. see (CONCUR 2000)

Decomposition Illustrated

$$\begin{tikzcd} \bullet \arrow[r, "s"] \arrow[d, "a"'] & \bullet \arrow[d, "b"] \\ \bullet \arrow[r, "t"'] & \bullet \end{tikzcd}$$

$$\begin{tikzcd} \bullet \arrow[r, "s_1"] \arrow[d, "a"'] & \bullet \arrow[r, "s_2"] & \bullet \arrow[d, "b"] \\ \bullet \arrow[rr, "t"'] & & \bullet \end{tikzcd}$$

implies

$$\begin{tikzcd} \bullet \arrow[r, "s_1"] \arrow[d, "a"'] & \bullet \arrow[r, "s_2"] \arrow[d, "c"'] & \bullet \arrow[d, "b"] \\ \bullet \arrow[r, "t_1"'] & \bullet \arrow[r, "t_2"'] & \bullet \end{tikzcd}$$

$$\begin{tikzcd} \bullet \arrow[r, Rightarrow, "s_1 \otimes s_2"] \arrow[d, "a"'] & \bullet \arrow[d, "b"] \\ \bullet \arrow[r, "t"'] & \bullet \end{tikzcd}$$

implies

$$\begin{tikzcd} \bullet \arrow[r, "s_1"] \arrow[dd, "a_1"'] & \bullet \arrow[dd, "b_1"] \\ & \\ \bullet \arrow[r, "t_1"'] & \bullet \end{tikzcd} \qquad \begin{tikzcd} \bullet \arrow[r, "s_2"] \arrow[d, "a_2"'] & \bullet \arrow[d, "b_2"] \\ \bullet \arrow[r, "t_2"'] & \bullet \end{tikzcd}$$

Ground Tile Bisimulation

Being interested in closed terms (*complete systems*), we introduce ***ground tile bisimulation*** (note the trivial trigger $id_{\underline{0}}$, with t_1 and t_2 ground)

$\mathbf{t_1} \sim_{\mathrm{g}} \mathbf{t_2}$ and $\mathcal{R} \vdash t_1 \xrightarrow[a]{id_{\underline{0}}} s_1$ imply $\mathcal{R} \vdash t_2 \xrightarrow[a]{id_{\underline{0}}} s_2$ with $\mathbf{s_1} \sim_{\mathrm{g}} \mathbf{s_2}$
(and vice versa)

Not defined on contexts, but on ground terms!

Ground tile bisimilarity $\simeq_{\mathrm{g}}$ is the largest ground tile bisim.

What is the analogous of decomposition property?

Ground Decomposition

Definition 3 *A term (resp. monoidal) tile system $\mathcal{R}$ enjoys the* **ground decomposition property** *if*
for all $\mathcal{R} \vdash s \xrightarrow[b]{id_0} t$

1. *if* $s = C[s_1]$
   (C (resp. linear) unary context), then
   $\mathcal{R} \vdash s_1 \xrightarrow[c]{id_0} t_1$, $\mathcal{R} \vdash C[x_1] \xrightarrow[b]{c} D[x_1]$ *with* $t = D[t_1]$

Theorem 1 *If a term (resp. monoidal) tile system $\mathcal{R}$ enjoys the ground decomposition property, then ground tile bisimilarity is a congruence*

The ground decomposition property can be enforced by syntactical constraints on basic tiles.

Proposition 3 *If a monoidal (resp. term) tile system $\mathcal{R}$ enjoys the basic source property, then ground tile bisimilarity is a congruence.*

But in the presence of structural axioms this may fail!

Dynamic Tile Bisimulation

How to obtain the coarsest congruence in any situation?

Dynamic Extension $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$:
Given $\mathcal{R}$ we add (for all $f \in \Sigma$):
the **auxiliary observation** $\tilde{f}$ (of arity n) and
the **auxiliary tiles**:

$$\begin{tikzcd} \underline{n} \arrow[r, "x_1,\ldots,x_n"] \arrow[d, "x_1,\ldots,x_n"'] & \underline{n} \arrow[d, "\tilde{f}(x_1,\ldots,x_n)"] \\ \underline{n} \arrow[r, "f(x_1,\ldots,x_n)"'] & \underline{1} \end{tikzcd} \qquad \begin{tikzcd} \underline{n} \arrow[r, "f(x_1,\ldots,x_n)"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{f}(x_1,\ldots,x_n)"'] & \underline{1} \arrow[d, "x_1"] \\ \underline{1} \arrow[r, "x_1"'] & \underline{1} \end{tikzcd}$$

For t generic context, $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}$ denotes the associated observation

(e.g., if $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x_1}), \mathbf{b})$ then $\tilde{\mathbf{t}} = \tilde{\mathbf{f}}(\tilde{\mathbf{f}}(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{x_1}), \tilde{\mathbf{b}})$)

Lemma 1 *Given a term (resp. monoidal) tile system $\mathcal{R}$, for each (resp. linear) context $t : \underline{n} \to \underline{1}$ we have:*

$\widehat{\mathcal{R}} \vdash x_1, \ldots, x_n \xrightarrow[\tilde{t}]{x_1,\ldots,x_n} t$ *and* $\widehat{\mathcal{R}} \vdash t \xrightarrow[x_1]{\tilde{t}} x_1$

Congruence Results

Theorem 2 *Given a term (resp. monoidal) tile system $\mathcal{R}$, the ground tile bisimilarity defined on $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ is a congruence.*

Definition 4 *For $\mathcal{R}$ a term (resp. monoidal) tile system, the* LTS *associated to $\mathcal{R}$ is $L_{\mathcal{R}}$ where*
$s \xrightarrow{a} t$ *iff* $\mathcal{R} \vdash s \xrightarrow[a]{id_0} t$

Theorem 3 *Ground tile bisimilarity on $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$, denoted by $\simeq_{\hat{g}}$, coincides with the dynamic bisimilarity on $L_{\mathcal{R}}$.*

This reconciles dynamic extension and dynamic bisimilarity

Congruence Proof

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bullet \arrow[r, "\mathbf{s}"] \arrow[d, "\mathbf{id}_{\underline{0}}"'] & \bullet \arrow[r, "\mathbf{C}[_]"] & \bullet \arrow[d, "\mathbf{a}"] \\
\bullet \arrow[rr, "\mathbf{t}"'] & & \bullet
\end{tikzcd}$$

remind that $\mathbf{s}; \mathbf{C}[_] = \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{s}]$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bullet \arrow[r, "\mathbf{s}"] \arrow[d, "\mathbf{id}_{\underline{0}}"'] & \bullet \arrow[r, "\mathbf{id}_{\underline{1}}"] \arrow[d, "\mathbf{id}_{\underline{1}}"] & \bullet \arrow[r, "\mathbf{C}[_]"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{\mathbf{C}}[_]"] & \bullet \arrow[d, "\mathbf{id}_{\underline{1}}"] \\
\bullet \arrow[r, "\mathbf{s}"] \arrow[d, "\mathbf{id}_{\underline{0}}"'] & \bullet \arrow[r, "\mathbf{C}[_]"] & \bullet \arrow[r, "\mathbf{id}_{\underline{1}}"'] \arrow[d, "\mathbf{a}"] & \bullet \arrow[d, "\mathbf{a}"] \\
\bullet \arrow[rr, "\mathbf{t}"'] & & \bullet \arrow[r, "\mathbf{id}_{\underline{1}}"'] & \bullet
\end{tikzcd}$$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bullet \arrow[r, "\mathbf{s}"] \arrow[d, "\mathbf{id}_{\underline{0}}"'] & \bullet \arrow[d, "\tilde{\mathbf{C}}[\mathbf{a}]"] \\
\bullet \arrow[r, "\mathbf{t}"'] & \bullet
\end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd}
\bullet \arrow[r, "\mathbf{C}[_]"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{\mathbf{C}}[\mathbf{a}]"'] & \bullet \arrow[d, "\mathbf{a}"] \\
\bullet \arrow[r, "\mathbf{id}_{\underline{1}}"'] & \bullet
\end{tikzcd}$$

Example

Example 3 *In our example let* $_ \mid _$ *be* ***associative*** *(but neither commutative nor with unit)*

$$\alpha.nil \mid \bar{\alpha}.nil \simeq_{g} \beta.nil \mid \bar{\beta}.nil \not\simeq_{\hat{g}} \alpha.nil \mid \bar{\alpha}.nil$$

consider the context $\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{x_1}] = \bar{\alpha}.\mathbf{nil} \mid \mathbf{x_1} \mid \alpha.\mathbf{nil}$***, then*** $\mathbf{C}[\alpha.\mathbf{nil} \mid \bar{\alpha}.\mathbf{nil}]$ ***can move twice, while*** $\mathbf{C}[\beta.\mathbf{nil} \mid \bar{\beta}.\mathbf{nil}]$ ***only once***

Instead, for $t_\lambda = nil \mid \lambda.nil \mid \bar{\lambda}.nil \mid nil$

$$t_\alpha \simeq_{g} t_\beta \simeq_{\hat{g}} t_\alpha$$

the nil ***processes block the interference of the environment***

Concluding Remarks

Tile logic as an **abstract, compositional framework** suitable to deal in a uniform way with

- ⋆ structural axioms
- ⋆ dynamic bisimulation
- ⋆ open ended systems
- ⋆ open terms (CONCUR 2000)

Exploiting the analogy between configurations and observations, dynamic bisimulation can be handled with:

- ⋆ finitary enrichment of the specification
- ⋆ pictorial congruence proof

Related works by Karen Bernstein, Robin Milner, Peter Sewell, James Leifer, Andrea Corradini, Reiko Heckel, Fabio Gadducci on **observing contexts**