

An Automata-theoretic Basis for Specification and Type Checking of Multiparty Protocols

Felix Stutz^{*1,2}[0000–0003–3638–4096] and
 Emanuele D’Osualdo^{1,3}[0000–0002–9179–5827]
 felix.stutz@uni.lu, emanuele.dosualdo@uni-konstanz.de

¹ MPI-SWS, Germany

² University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg

³ University of Konstanz, Germany

Abstract. We propose the Automata-based Multiparty Protocols framework (AMP) for top-down protocol development. The framework features a new very general formalism for global protocol specifications called Protocol State Machines (PSMs), Communicating State Machines (CSMs) as specifications for local participants, and a type system to check a π -calculus with session interleaving and delegation against the CSM specification. Moreover, we define a large class of PSMs, called “tame”, for which we provide a sound and complete PSPACE projection operation that computes a CSM describing the same protocol as a given PSM if one exists. We propose these components as a backwards-compatible new backend for frameworks in the style of Multiparty Session Types. In comparison to the latter, AMP offers a considerable improvement in expressivity, decoupling of the various components (e.g. projection and typing), and robustness (thanks to the complete projection).

Keywords: Communication protocols · Verification · Multiparty session types · Communicating state machines · Type checking

1 Introduction

Designing correct distributed communication protocols is an important and hard problem. Consider a finite set of protocol *participants* (i.e. independent processes) whose only means of interaction between each other is asynchronous message passing through reliable FIFO channels. The goal is to program each participant so that some global emergent behaviour is achieved, e.g. a leader is elected. Unfortunately, even when each participant is finite-state, the presence of unbounded delays (i.e. unbounded communication channels) makes any non-trivial property of the emergent global behaviour undecidable [14].

The top-down protocol design approach proposes to work around this issue by a reversal in the methodology: instead of first programming the participants and then checking that their global behaviour is what we desired it to be, we first

* corresponding author




Fig. 1: The components of top-down frameworks.

specify the desired global behaviour and then synthesize each participant’s local specification so that local behaviour gives rise to the correct global behaviour by construction. Each participant’s concrete implementation is then checked against its local specification, which (a) can be achieved by static means like type systems, and (b) makes the verification of the implementation local and modular.

Multiparty Session Types (MSTs) [44] is one of the most prominent and extensively studied formalisms supporting this top-down design methodology. The key components of the framework, depicted in Fig. 1, are: (1) **Global Types**: a dedicated language to specify correct global behaviour; (2) **Local Types**: a dedicated language to specify each participant’s actions in the protocol; (3) **Programs**: a programming language (typically a π -calculus) to express concrete implementations of each participant of the protocol.

Imagine, as a simple example, we want to specify a centralised leader election protocol, where an arbiter a selects a leader among p and q and the selected participant communicates the win to the other. A possible global type representing the protocol is $G = (a \rightarrow p : \text{sel} . p \rightarrow q : \text{win}) + (a \rightarrow q : \text{sel} . q \rightarrow p : \text{win})$ where $a \rightarrow q : \text{sel}$ says that a sends sel and q receives it and $+$ denotes branching. The local type of p would then be $(p \triangleleft a ? \text{sel} . p \triangleright q ! \text{win}) + p \triangleleft q ? \text{win}$ where $p \triangleleft a ? \text{sel}$ means “ p receives message sel from a ” and $q \triangleleft p ? \text{win}$ means “ p sends message win to q ”. Thus, p is supposed to listen for a message from a or from q ; in the former case it would then communicate the win to q , in the latter, just concede. A program implementation may consist of a process for each participant; the process for the arbiter a may implement any specific policy for selecting the leader (e.g. always choose p), as long as the communications follow the protocol.

The relationship between the three representations of the protocol, i.e. global types, local types, and programs, is delicate. First, the global type and the local types should give rise to the same behaviour; however it is not always possible to capture the behaviour of a global type with local types. Suppose, for instance, that we modified the leader election protocol G to $G' = (a \rightarrow p : \text{sel} . q \rightarrow p : \text{lose}) + (a \rightarrow q : \text{sel} . p \rightarrow q : \text{lose})$. While, from a global perspective, it is possible to insist on the losing participant informing the winner that they lost, locally, the losing participant has no way to determine whether they won or not. Therefore G' is not realisable by local processes: we say it is not projectable. Second, local types are a more abstract representation of the system than programs, but we still want to show that, when implementation details are omitted, a program only performs communications that adhere to the local specification.

In MSTs, the relationship between the three layers of the framework are enforced through two procedures: (i) **Projection**, which (when possible) extracts, from a global type G , some local types that are guaranteed to behave as described by G ; and (ii) **Type Checking**, which checks that the program implementation of each participant adheres to the behaviour specified in its local type.

In a perfect world, a framework for top-down protocol design should be:

1. **Expressive:** It should support as many protocols as possible.
2. **Decoupled:** Its components (global/local specifications, programs, projection, type checking) should depend on each other as little as possible, and be specified independently of their algorithmic implementation, to allow for reuse and modularity.
3. **Robust:** It should only reject a global specification if there is a genuine issue with it (i.e. no false positives).

Unfortunately, the MST frameworks in the literature leave something to be desired against this ideal picture. They all suffer from:

- **Expressivity Limitations:** Many legitimate protocols are rejected either because the global specification syntax is too restricted, or because the projection algorithm cannot handle them. For example, every MST framework we are aware of can only handle global types with *directed choice*, i.e. where every branching point involves exactly one sender and one receiver. This immediately rules out our example leader election protocol G because the branches involve different receivers.
- **Decoupling Limitations:** In MSTs, the syntax of global types directly influences the definition of the projection algorithm and the syntax of the local types, which in turn influence the type system design. Typically, changing one of the framework’s components requires adapting (and re-proving correctness of) all the others. Furthermore, many MST frameworks solely give the intended relation between global and local types through the projection algorithm and do not give a declarative definition.
- **Robustness Limitations:** The heuristic nature of the projection algorithms makes it very hard to predict if a global type will be handled or not by an MST framework, even in the case where the behaviour specified by the global type is unproblematic.

In this paper, we propose a new foundation for top-down protocol design machinery, dubbed AMP (Automata-based Multiparty Protocols), that achieves the expressivity, decoupling and robustness goals.

Expressivity of AMP. Figure 1 shows the components of AMP. To achieve expressivity, we propose a new general formalism for (finite-control) global protocol specifications, which we call *Protocol State Machines* (PSMs). The formalism is based on automata which are given semantics in terms of (finite and infinite) sets of words, over an alphabet of send ($p \triangleright q!m$) and receive ($q \triangleleft p?m$) actions. PSMs remove many of the restrictions of global types, while retaining their character: they specify the expected behaviour from a global perspective, and satisfy some basic correctness properties by construction (e.g. every send is eventually received, no type mismatches, etc). Owing to their generality, PSMs can represent

any global type, but can go well beyond them: they also strictly subsume High-Level Message Sequence Charts (HMSCs). For maximizing expressivity at the local level, we adopt Communicating State Machines (CSMs) as the formalism for local protocol specifications. They are a canonical representation for decentralised asynchronous communication and as such do not impose constraints over what can be represented. Finally, to maximise expressivity at the program level, we consider a π -calculus with session interleaving and delegation.

Decoupling of AMP. In AMP, decoupling is achieved through its handling of projection and type checking. For projection, the framework merely specifies the semantic requirements that a correct projection algorithm needs to satisfy: essentially that it produces a deadlock-free CSM which represents the same language as the input PSM. This limits the impact of projection on global and local specifications, and leaves open any algorithmic/manual strategy to achieve the projection goal. (We discuss how AMP proposes to actually implement projection in the discussion of robustness). For example, scenarios in which the user provides both the PSM and the CSM and a proof that they represent the same language and the CSM satisfies desirable properties (like deadlock freedom) or where an algorithm infers a PSM from a CSM, are both compatible with our framework thanks to this declarative approach to projection. This treatment is in line with some MST works where the fundamental property of projection is expressed in terms of some behavioural equivalence between local and global types. For type checking, decoupling is achieved by defining the type system by depending exclusively on programs and CSMs. The standard guarantees of subject reduction, communication safety and session fidelity are proven by appealing to properties of CSMs. This demonstrates how effective CSMs are in providing a clean decoupled interface between projection and type checking.

Robustness of AMP. Finally, we demonstrate how robustness can be achieved in AMP, by identifying a large class of PSMs, called *Tame PSMs*, for which we provide a decidable, sound and complete projection operation. Tame PSMs extend the reach of sound and complete projection beyond global types and can handle a large class of HMSCs as well as protocols that cannot be expressed as either global types nor HMSCs. The main constraint that makes a PSM tame is what we call *sender-driven choice*: that at any branching point, the sender in all the branches is the same participant and takes distinct actions in the branches. Our projection algorithm builds on a recently proposed complete projection for sender-driven global types [57]. Thanks to a surprising reduction, we manage to extend the algorithm to tame PSMs while keeping the complexity in PSPACE. Due to the fact that our projection operation is complete, only protocols that do not admit any valid projection will be rejected: those are protocols which simply cannot be implemented by local processes. We also show that our class is in a sense “maximally robust”: lifting the sender-driven restriction makes projection undecidable, even for global types. AMP is also robust in the sense that one can select the desired guarantees of the type system and check whether they can be enforced by checking (syntactic) properties of the global protocol, pinpointing exactly which guarantee is provided by a PSM. Finally, we show that the frame-

work is backwards-compatible with MSTs: not only can we encode global types into PSMs and project them, we also pinpoint the (simple) conditions under which our projection yields CSMs which are equivalent to local types.

Contributions. In summary:

- We propose PSMs as an expressive general formalism for (finite-control) global protocol specifications.
- We propose CSMs as a canonical model for local protocol specifications and specify their desired relationship with PSMs declaratively.
- We define the first session type system based on CSMs, pinpointing exactly the properties of the CSM that are needed to provide each of the desired guarantees; these properties can be enforced by construction by ensuring the PSMs conform to some simple checks.
- We define Tame PSMs (encompassing all directed and sender-driven global types) and give a sound and complete projection algorithm for them.
- We show that sender-driven choice is a necessary restriction even for global types: projection is undecidable otherwise.
- We characterise which class of PSMs corresponds to global types, and which CSMs correspond to local types, giving us full backward-compatibility with standard MST theory.

We think of AMP as a backend for top-down protocol design tools with the following workflow. Any specific tool, e.g. Scribble [80], provides a dedicated syntax for types and processes. Then, a global specification is compiled to a PSM (where the compiler guarantees its tameness, which would be trivial for global types) and invokes the projection of AMP, producing a CSM. This could be re-translated for user consumption, but also be used to drive typing using AMP. Failure of projection can be directly translated by the frontend to an explanation of why the protocol is flawed and must be repaired. Given the generality of PSMs, it should also be easier to experiment with extensions of the frontend language.

The appendix contains all proofs, omitted details, and additional examples.

2 Motivation and Key Ideas

In this section, we give an informal overview of the key ideas behind AMP before proceeding with the formal development from Section 3.

2.1 Global Specifications via Protocol State Machines

Our first goal is to define an expressive formalism for specifying global protocols, that is also constrained enough to make it tractable for top-down protocol development. One of the most accomplished such formalisms, used in MSTs, is *global types*. Figure 2 shows an example of a global type, represented in Figure 3 as an HMSC.

The term $p \rightarrow q : m_1$ indicates the transmission of message m_1 from p to q . The symbol $\mathbf{0}$ denotes termination of the protocol. Recursion can be specified

by binding a recursion variable X with μX and using X subsequently to jump back to where X was bound. Branching is denoted by $+$. In the example, p can pick between three branches by sending different messages to q . Subsequently, q sends messages to r in all branches: 1 in the top and middle branch and 3 in the bottom branch. Participant r is supposed to send messages v_1 or v_2 in the top and middle branch while it receives from p in the bottom branch, which also recurses using X .

What makes these formalisms tractable? Their first key characteristic is that, as a specification tool, they allow the user to (a) adopt a global point of view, describing what coordination between all the participants is induced by the protocol; (b) express this coordination without enumerating all possible interleavings of the send and receive events that can happen due to the asynchronous nature of communication, e.g. $p \rightarrow q : m_1$ indicates the send of the message immediately followed by its receipt, although in any asynchronous implementation, the receipt might happen at a much later point, after other independent events took place. In Fig. 2, r may lag behind arbitrarily while p and q keep sending messages. The second key characteristic of global types and HMSCs is that they are *finite-control*: their control structure can be described using a finite graph. This makes it possible to algorithmically manipulate them, e.g. for verifying they satisfy some desirable properties, or for extracting local protocol specifications.

Our aim is to distil these two characterising features and remove any other restriction that is not necessary, to obtain a more expressive global specification formalism. To do this, we take a language-theoretic view of protocols, where a protocol is seen as the set of sequences of send and receive events that are considered compliant with it. More precisely, a send event $p \triangleright q : m$ records that p sent the message m to q ; a receive event $q \triangleleft p : m$ records that q received message m from p . A protocol specification is the language of desired finite or infinite words of events. For the purpose of this section, we will focus on finite words, but the technical development considers both finite and infinite words.

Not all languages over these events are meaningful in the context of protocols. First, the sequences of events might not be feasible when using FIFO channels (e.g. $p \triangleright q : 1 \cdot q \triangleleft p : 2$ is not FIFO); we write FIFO for the language of all words that satisfy FIFO order. Second, if $p \triangleright q : m_1 \cdot r \triangleright q : m_2 \cdot q \triangleleft p : m_1 \cdot q \triangleleft r : m_2$ is accepted by a protocol, it ought to also accept $r \triangleright q : m_2 \cdot p \triangleright q : m_1 \cdot q \triangleleft p : m_1 \cdot q \triangleleft r : m_2$ as this kind of reorderings are induced by the scheduling of participants and network delays which are out of the control of participants. We write $\mathcal{C}(L)$ for the closure of the language L under such reorderings. Thus a language $L \subseteq \text{FIFO}$ represents the global interaction patterns of the protocols; moreover L can specify only some




Fig. 2: Example global type.

Fig. 3: A protocol as an HMSC.




Fig. 4: A PSM encoding for the protocol of Fig. 2.

of these interactions and get all the ones that should also be possible under the asynchronous semantics by declaring the full set of acceptable words to be $\mathcal{C}(L)$.

Now, to obtain a finite-control formalism, we propose to express such a “core” language L for the protocol $\mathcal{C}(L)$ using a finite state machine M with $\mathcal{L}(M) = L$. Since FIFO is not regular, the only feasible way of ensuring $\mathcal{L}(M) \subseteq \text{FIFO}$ is by requiring M to keep track of which sent messages are still pending, which a finite-state machine can only do up to some maximum capacity for the send buffers. We thus arrive at the requirement that $\mathcal{L}(M) \subseteq \text{FIFO}_B$, where FIFO_B is the set of words respecting FIFO but where the number of pending sends never exceed $B \in \mathbb{N}$ at any point in time. Note that FIFO_B is regular.

Building on these observations, we define a *Protocol State Machine* (PSM) to be a finite state machine M recognising words of send and receive events, with $\mathcal{L}(M) \subseteq \text{FIFO}_B$ for some $B \in \mathbb{N}$. Fig. 4 shows the protocol of Fig. 2 as a PSM. Interpreted as a mere automaton M , it recognises a language $\mathcal{L}(M)$ of words with at most one pending send at all time. (We call M $\Sigma 1$ -PSM because the total number of messages in flight is at most 1; if we allowed 1 message *per channel*, it would be called a 1-PSM.) As a PSM, however, M denotes the language $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}(M))$, which admits words with unbounded channel behaviours and is not even regular in general. For instance, $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}(M))$ includes words starting with $(p \triangleright q!m_3 \cdot q \triangleleft p?m_3 \cdot q \triangleright r!3 \cdot p \triangleright r!v_3)^n \cdot (r \triangleleft q?3 \cdot r \triangleleft p?v_3)^n \dots$ where r is running at a lower rate than the other participants, and leaves n pending sends from p and from q before it consumes them.

PSMs achieve a substantial gain in expressivity while retaining the key characteristics of global types. In terms of expressivity, every global type can be encoded as a $\Sigma 1$ -PSM; furthermore PSMs can be used to encode HMSCs, which strictly subsume global types because the latter cannot specify simultaneous message exchanges between a pair of participants [72]. PSMs can even represent protocols that are outside the reach of HMSCs. Consider, for example, the PSM in Fig. 5. In that protocol, p commits to some integer (abstracted as the label `int`) at the beginning by sending it to r and sends a `go` signal to q . Note that here we use the paired send and receive notation $p \rightarrow q:ok$ to emit the two events in sequence. Then q and r engage in some negotiation of arbitrary length until q decides to exit the loop, at which point r is finally allowed to receive the message sent by p . No HMSC can represent such protocol: the matching events $p \triangleright r!int$ and $r \triangleleft p?int$ are separated by an arbitrary number of events (with no opportunity for reordering up to $\mathcal{C}(-)$); since matching events in HMSCs need to belong to the same basic block, such block would also need to contain the arbitrarily many events in between, which is impossible.




Fig. 5: A protocol not expressible as an HMSC. Transitions labelled with $p \rightarrow q:m$ should be interpreted as emitting the sequence $p \triangleright q!m \cdot q \triangleleft p?m$.

Of course, this level of generality would be pointless if we were not able to provide for it in the other components of top-down protocol design. We start by studying the first crucial component: projection.

2.2 From Global to Local Specifications: Projection

When considering projection, our first concern is the goal of decoupling: we want to define a general interface for projection, such that both different algorithmic implementations of projection can be used without altering the design of the rest of the framework; and such that typing is not dependent on global specifications (nor projection details).

In AMP, the key to decoupling is in choosing *Communicating State Machines* (CSMs) as the formalism for local specifications. A CSM $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ associates a finite state automaton A_p to each participant $p \in \mathcal{P}$, where transitions can either send or receive on the channels of p ; the semantics of $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is defined on configurations that include the local states for each participant and an (unbounded) FIFO buffer for each channel. They induce a FIFO language $\mathcal{L}(\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\})$ over send/receive events, by considering as final the configurations where all the participants are in final local states and all the buffers are empty. CSMs thus represent a canonical general model of finite-control asynchronous protocol implementations.

Per se, this is not a particularly original choice: MST’s local types have been linked to CSMs of a certain shape before [30, 70], and HMSC-based work used them as local specifications. What AMP demonstrates is that it is possible to build the entire top-down methodology around CSMs (with fewer restrictions), including a session type system, gaining both in expressivity and in decoupling.

Having fixed our model for local behaviour, we can ask when it defines behaviour consistent with a global specification. We say a CSM $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is a *projection* of a PSM M if $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is deadlock-free and $\mathcal{L}(\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}(M))$.




Fig. 6: Example CSM.

We focus on the (*projection*) *synthesis problem*, producing a CSM as result. The corresponding decision problem is the *projectability problem*, which simply asks if there exists such a CSM. Notably, projectability can have lower complexity.

Even for simple protocols, projection can be tricky. Take the example of Fig. 2: r can never distinguish between the top two branches, as its only observations would be to have received 1 from q . The instance of the protocol with $m_1 \neq m_2$ and $v_1 \neq v_2$ would thus not be projectable. If $m_2 = m_3$ then q would not be able to send the appropriate message to r . Therefore, the only projectable instances with no redundant branches are the ones where $m_1, m_2,$ and m_3 are pair-wise distinct and $v_1 = v_2$. Figure 6 shows a candidate projection of the PSM in Fig. 2. If $m_2 = m_3$ or $v_1 \neq v_2$, the PSM is not projectable, and in fact the CSM can reach a deadlock.

Given CSMs are Turing-complete models, it is unsurprising that checking if a given CSM is a projection of a given PSM is undecidable. The key advantage of the top-down approach boils down to the fact that it is nevertheless often possible to efficiently *compute* a valid projection from a global specification. This is precisely the goal of the *projection* operation. A projection operation $(-)\downarrow$ is a function taking a PSMs as input and returning either \perp or a CSM; it is a *sound projection* if for all PSM M , if $M\downarrow = \{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ then $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is a projection of M ; it is a *complete projection* if for all projectable M , $M\downarrow \neq \perp$.

The MST literature proposed a number of sound but incomplete projection algorithms for global types. Incompleteness makes MST frameworks lack robustness: a projectable global type might still be rejected by the framework because the projection is unable to handle it; this leaves the user in the awkward position of having to build a mental model for the projection algorithm to be able to design viable global types. Li et al. [57] proposed the first sound and complete projection algorithm for sender-driven global types. Its PSPACE complexity stems from the need for determinisation. Their evaluation, though, showed that these corner cases will likely not occur in reality. This provides initial evidence that robustness is achievable without compromising efficiency.

As is to be expected, the jump in expressivity by adopting PSMs cannot come for free: the problem of computing a sound and complete projection for PSMs is in general undecidable, a fact inherited from being able to encode HMSCs. This does not defeat us, however: one of our main positive results is the definition of a very large class of PSMs, called *Tame PSMs*, that enjoys sound and complete PSPACE projection. A PSM is *tame* if it satisfies three constraints: (a) a technical refinement of the notion of the bound B for buffers, (b) that final states have no outgoing transitions, and (c) *sender-driven choice*: at each branching point, there is a single sender taking distinct actions.

Our proof works by reducing the problem to an instance of projectability of MSTs with sender-driven choice, which was proven to be decidable in PSPACE [57]. Our reduction is surprising because it produces a transformed protocol which is different from the original one: the encoded protocol language is different and involves additional participants and additional message exchanges; and yet its synthesized local specifications can be transformed back to local spec-

ifications for the original protocol. Due to the mismatch in expressivity between PSMs and global types, it is necessary that the reduction modifies the protocol semantics. Furthermore, we show the reduction preserves the complexity class, giving us a PSPACE algorithm for projectability of sender-driven PSMs.

Despite being a restriction, Tame PSMs are still much more general than global types: every sender-driven global type gives rise to a Tame PSM; moreover, every example given so far is tame. While the first two constraints (a) and (b) are not severe, the third condition (c) imposes a genuine restriction on expressivity.

In fact our main negative result is that sender-driven choice is in a sense “minimal”: we prove that projectability is undecidable for global types (the most primitive kind of PSMs) with general choice (aka “mixed choice”).

2.3 Processes and Typing

To complete the top-down toolkit, we provide a mean to check that a program correctly implements a protocol specified as a CSM. We achieve this by defining a CSM-based session type system for an expressive variant of π -calculus with session interleaving and delegation. The process calculus is adapted from [69] which represents a feature-rich modern presentation of multiparty session typing.

The type system’s main soundness argument hinges, as is standard, on a subject reduction result: if a typable program can take a step, it remains typable. From this, we derive two main safety correctness guarantees: typable programs cannot produce type mismatches (i.e. receiving a message that the process is not expecting) and terminated sessions do not leave orphan messages behind. We further prove a progress property under standard restrictions: roughly speaking, if the process contains only one session, then, if the type of the session is not final, the process can take a step (among the ones allowed by the type). Global progress in the presence of session interleaving is out of scope of this paper, but it may be attainable by adapting the (orthogonal) analysis employed in [25, 52].

In line with our decoupling goal, the guarantees of the type system are derived from the key properties of CSMs produced by projection (e.g. deadlock freedom). This makes it even compatible with the bottom-up methodology of [69] which forgoes global types and proposes to check key properties on local types directly. If a CSM satisfying the desired properties is provided to our type system, the corresponding guarantees apply to typable processes regardless of the existence of a PSM representing the protocol. This also liberates the type system completely from the choice of representation for global protocols.

Overall we obtain an expressive, decoupled and robust backend for top-down protocol development. Finally, we also show that this backend is backwards-compatible with MSTs: not only every sender-driven global type can be encoded as Tame PSM, but we also prove that, when there exists a local type that is a projection of a global type, our projection produces a CSM that can be translated back to a local type. This shows under which conditions PSMs and global types as well as CSMs and local types are equivalent, despite their structural differences.

3 Automata-based Protocol Specifications

We start our technical development by introducing a language-theoretic view of protocol specifications. We define protocols as special languages of words, and use CSMs as our local specifications of such languages. Finally, we introduce PSMs as global protocol specifications.

3.1 State Machines and Protocol Languages

Let Δ be a finite alphabet. The set of finite words over Δ is denoted by Δ^* , the set of infinite words by Δ^ω , and their union by Δ^∞ . We write ε for the empty word. For two strings $u \in \Delta^*$ and $v \in \Delta^\infty$, their concatenation is $u \cdot w$, and we say that u is a *prefix* of v , written $u \leq v$, if there is some $w \in \Delta^\infty$ such that $u \cdot w = v$; $\text{pref}(v)$ denotes all prefixes of v and is lifted to languages as expected. For a language $L \subseteq \Delta^\infty$, we distinguish between the language of finite words $L_{\text{fin}} := L \cap \Delta^*$ and the language of infinite words $L_{\text{inf}} := L \cap \Delta^\omega$.

Definition 3.1 (State machines). A state machine $A = (Q, \Delta, \delta, q_0, F)$ is a 5-tuple with a finite set of states Q , an alphabet Δ , a transition relation $\delta \subseteq Q \times (\Delta \cup \{\varepsilon\}) \times Q$, an initial state $q_0 \in Q$ from the set of states, and a set of final states F with $F \subseteq Q$. If $(q, a, q') \in \delta$, we also write $q \xrightarrow{a} q'$. A run is a finite or infinite sequence $q_0 \xrightarrow{a_0} q_1 \xrightarrow{a_1} \dots$, with $q_i \in Q$ and $a_i \in \Delta \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ for $i \geq 0$, such that q_0 is the initial state, and for each $i \geq 0$, it holds that $(q_i, a_i, q_{i+1}) \in \delta$. The trace of such run is the word $a_0 \cdot a_1 \cdot \dots \in \Delta^\infty$. A run is maximal if it ends in a final state or is infinite. The (core) language $\mathcal{L}(A)$ of A is the set of traces of all maximal runs. If Q is finite, we say A is a finite state machine (FSM). A state machine is dense if for every $q \xrightarrow{x} q' \in \delta$, the transition label x is ε implies that q has only one outgoing transition. A state machine is deterministic if $\forall (q, a, q') \in \delta. a \neq \varepsilon$ and $\forall (q, a, q'), (q, a, q'') \in \delta. q' = q''$. We call a dense state machine deterministic if $\forall (q, a, q'), (q, a, q'') \in \delta. q' = q''$. A state $q \in Q$ is called a sink state if it has no outgoing transitions, i.e. $\forall a \in \Delta \cup \{\varepsilon\}, q' \in Q. (q, a, q') \notin \delta$. We say a state machine is sink-final if, for every state, it is final iff it is a sink.

A language-theoretic view of protocols. Let $m \in \mathcal{V}$ be a finite set of messages and $p, q, \dots \in \mathcal{P}$ be a finite set of participants. The alphabet of p 's send and receive events is the set $\Gamma_p := \bigcup_{q \in \mathcal{P}, m \in \mathcal{V}} \{p \triangleright q!m, p \triangleleft q?m\}$. A send event $p \triangleright q!m$ records that p sent the message m to q ; a receive event $p \triangleleft q?m$ records that p received message m from q . The alphabet of all events is the set $\Gamma_{\mathcal{P}} := \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \Gamma_p$. A paired event is a send event and its corresponding receive event: $p \rightarrow q:m := p \triangleright q!m \cdot q \triangleleft p?m$. We define the alphabet of paired events as $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}} := \{p \rightarrow q:m \mid p, q \in \mathcal{P} \text{ and } m \in \mathcal{V}\}$. For the remainder of the paper, we fix an arbitrary set of participants \mathcal{P} and messages \mathcal{V} , and often write Γ for $\Gamma_{\mathcal{P}}$ and Σ for $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}}$. Given a word, we can project it to all letters of a certain shape: for instance, $w \downarrow_{p \triangleright q!}$ is the subword of w with all of its send events where p sends any message to q . We write $\mathcal{V}(w)$ for the sequence of values in w (in the same order). In $w = w_1 \dots \in \Gamma^\infty$, a send event $w_i = p \triangleright q!m$ is *matched* by a receive event $w_j = q \triangleleft p?m$ if $i < j$

and $\mathcal{V}((w_1 \dots w_i) \Downarrow_{\mathfrak{p} \triangleright \mathfrak{q}!}) = \mathcal{V}((w_1 \dots w_j) \Downarrow_{\mathfrak{q} \triangleleft \mathfrak{p} ?})$. A send event w_i is *unmatched* if there is no such receive event w_j . A language $L \subseteq \Gamma^\infty$ satisfies *feasible eventual reception* if for every finite word $w := w_1 \dots w_n \in \text{pref}(L)$ with an unmatched send event w_i , there is an extension $w \leq w' \in L$ such that w_i is matched in w' .

A sequence of send and receive events shall describe the execution of a protocol. We define when such a sequence uses channels in FIFO manner.

Definition 3.2 (FIFO Language). *A word $w \in \Gamma^\infty$ is FIFO-compliant if for each prefix w' of w , it holds that $\mathcal{V}(w' \Downarrow_{\mathfrak{q} \triangleleft \mathfrak{p} ?})$ is a prefix of $\mathcal{V}(w' \Downarrow_{\mathfrak{p} \triangleright \mathfrak{q} !})$, for every $\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$. We denote the set of all infinite FIFO-compliant words by FIFO_{inf} . For finite words, we require that all send events are matched. Thus, $\text{FIFO}_{\text{fin}} := \{w \mid w \text{ is FIFO-compliant and } \mathcal{V}(w \Downarrow_{\mathfrak{p} \triangleright \mathfrak{q} !}) = \mathcal{V}(w \Downarrow_{\mathfrak{q} \triangleleft \mathfrak{p} ?}) \forall \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}\}$. We denote the (non-regular) set of all FIFO words by $\text{FIFO} = \text{FIFO}_{\text{inf}} \uplus \text{FIFO}_{\text{fin}}$. A language $L \subseteq \text{FIFO}$ is called a FIFO language.*

As the model of distributed implementation of a protocol, we adopt communicating state machines: parallel compositions of finite-control processes communicating asynchronously via point-to-point FIFO channels.

Definition 3.3 (Communicating state machines). *We call $\mathcal{A} = \{\{A_{\mathfrak{p}}\}_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{P}}$ a communicating state machine (CSM) over \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{V} if $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a finite state machine with alphabet $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for every $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{P}$. The semantics of a CSM \mathcal{A} is the language $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \text{FIFO}$ whose definition is standard (see Appendix A.1). Roughly, for each pair of distinct participants $\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{P}$ there are two FIFO channels $\langle \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q} \rangle, \langle \mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{p} \rangle \in \text{Chan}$ allowing communication between the participants in the two directions. The FSM $A_{\mathfrak{p}} = (Q_{\mathfrak{p}}, \Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}}, \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}, q_{0,\mathfrak{p}}, F_{\mathfrak{p}})$ describes the possible actions of participant \mathfrak{p} . A transition $(q_{\mathfrak{p}}, \mathfrak{p} \triangleright \mathfrak{q}!m, q'_{\mathfrak{p}}) \in \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}$ indicates that when \mathfrak{p} takes a step from $q_{\mathfrak{p}}$ to $q'_{\mathfrak{p}}$, it will send a message m to \mathfrak{q} by enqueueing it in channel $\langle \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q} \rangle$. Similarly, $(q_{\mathfrak{p}}, \mathfrak{p} \triangleleft \mathfrak{q}?m, q'_{\mathfrak{p}}) \in \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}$ prescribes the reception by \mathfrak{p} of message m from the channel $\langle \mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{p} \rangle$. A CSM’s run always starts with empty channels and each participant running its respective initial state. We denote the set of all reachable configurations (from the initial configuration) by $\text{reach}(\mathcal{A})$. A deadlock of $\{\{A_{\mathfrak{p}}\}_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{P}}$ is a reachable configuration with no outgoing transition that has at least one non-empty channel or at least one participant not in a (local) final state.*

The formal definition is given in Appendix A.1. As an example, Fig. 6 shows the three state machines constituting a CSM.

The goal of a protocol designer is to define a protocol that can be realised as a CSM. The *projectable* languages are exactly those protocols which can.

Definition 3.4 (Projections and Projectability). *A language $L \subseteq \Gamma^\infty$ is said to be projectable if there exists a deadlock-free CSM $\{\{A_{\mathfrak{p}}\}_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{P}}$ such that it generates the same language (protocol fidelity), i.e., $L = \mathcal{L}(\{\{A_{\mathfrak{p}}\}_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{P}})$. We say that $\{\{A_{\mathfrak{p}}\}_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{P}}$ is a projection of L .*

The asynchronous nature of CSMs makes them unable to enforce the order between certain events without explicit synchronisation. For instance, any CSM

producing a word $p \triangleright q!m \cdot r \triangleright s!m' \cdot w$ will necessarily produce also $r \triangleright s!m' \cdot p \triangleright q!m \cdot w$. Which events can be reordered is context-dependent: the events in the word $p \triangleright q!m \cdot q \triangleleft p?m$ cannot be swapped, as the receive is only possible after the send. But in $p \triangleright q!m \cdot p \triangleright q!m \cdot q \triangleleft p?m$ the last two events can be reordered. This has been formalised as equivalence relation by Majumdar et al. [60], which can be seen as an instance of Lamport's happens-before relation [54] for systems with point-to-point FIFO channels.

Definition 3.5. *The indistinguishability relation $\sim \subseteq \Gamma^* \times \Gamma^*$ is the smallest equivalence relation such that*

- (1) *If $p \neq r$, then $w \cdot p \triangleright q!m \cdot r \triangleright s!m' \cdot u \sim w \cdot r \triangleright s!m' \cdot p \triangleright q!m \cdot u$.*
- (2) *If $q \neq s$, then $w \cdot q \triangleleft p?m \cdot s \triangleleft r?m' \cdot u \sim w \cdot s \triangleleft r?m' \cdot q \triangleleft p?m \cdot u$.*
- (3) *If $p \neq s \wedge (p \neq r \vee q \neq s)$, then $w \cdot p \triangleright q!m \cdot s \triangleleft r?m' \cdot u \sim w \cdot s \triangleleft r?m' \cdot p \triangleright q!m \cdot u$.*
- (4) *If $|w \downarrow_{p \triangleright q!}| > |w \downarrow_{q \triangleleft p?}|$, then $w \cdot p \triangleright q!m \cdot q \triangleleft p?m' \cdot u \sim w \cdot q \triangleleft p?m' \cdot p \triangleright q!m \cdot u$.*

We define $u \preceq_{\sim} v$ if there is $w \in \Gamma^$ such that $u \cdot w \sim v$. Observe that $u \sim v$ iff $u \preceq_{\sim} v$ and $v \preceq_{\sim} u$. For infinite words $u, v \in \Gamma^\omega$, we define $u \preceq_{\sim}^\omega v$ if for each finite prefix u' of u , there is a finite prefix v' of v such that $u' \preceq_{\sim} v'$. Define $u \sim v$ iff $u \preceq_{\sim}^\omega v$ and $v \preceq_{\sim}^\omega u$. We lift the equivalence relation \sim on words to languages. For a language L , we define*

$$\mathcal{C}(L) = \left\{ w' \mid \bigvee \begin{array}{l} w' \in \Gamma^* \wedge \exists w \in \Gamma^*. w \in L \text{ and } w' \sim w \\ w' \in \Gamma^\omega \wedge \exists w \in \Gamma^\omega. w \in L \text{ and } w' \preceq_{\sim}^\omega w \end{array} \right\}.$$

Lemma 3.6 ([60]). *For any CSM $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$, $\mathcal{L}(\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}(\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}))$.*

Example 3.7. For finite words $\mathcal{C}(-)$ is standard. For infinite words, though, the situation is a bit counterintuitive. Let us consider $w := (p \triangleright q!m \cdot q \triangleleft p?m)^\omega$. It is easy to construct a CSM $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$, with FSMs A_p and A_q , that accepts w . CSMs do not promise any sort of fairness for infinite runs so there is an infinite run for $(p \triangleright q!m)^\omega$ where only A_p 's transitions are scheduled. This is why $\mathcal{C}(-)$ is defined using \preceq_{\sim}^ω , giving $(p \triangleright q!m)^\omega \in \mathcal{C}((p \triangleright q!m \cdot q \triangleleft p?m)^\omega)$.

3.2 Protocol State Machines

We now introduce PSMs as a mean to specify protocol languages from a global, centralised perspective. The idea, shared with both global types and HMSCs, is to specify only a core subset of the admissible executions, e.g. the ones where there is a bounded delay between sends and matching receives, and obtain the full set of admissible executions by closing the core language using $\mathcal{C}(-)$.

We adapt the notion of B -bounded from [34] to formalise the idea of ‘‘bounded delay’’ between matching events.

Definition 3.8 (B -bounded and ΣB -bounded). *Let $B \in \mathbb{N}$ be a natural number. A FIFO-compliant word w is B -bounded, resp. ΣB -bounded, if for every prefix w' of w and participants $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$, it holds that $|w' \downarrow_{p \triangleright q!}| - |w' \downarrow_{q \triangleleft p?}| \leq B$, resp. $\sum_{p \neq q \in \mathcal{P}} (|w' \downarrow_{p \triangleright q!}| - |w' \downarrow_{q \triangleleft p?}|) \leq B$. We define the (regular) set of B -bounded FIFO words: $\text{FIFO}_B := \{w \in \text{FIFO} \mid w \text{ is } B\text{-bounded}\}$.*




Fig. 7: Kindergarten Leader Election (KLE).

Definition 3.9 (Protocol State Machine). A dense FSM $M = (Q, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, F)$ is a B -PSM if $\mathcal{L}(M) \subseteq \text{FIFO}_B$ and $\mathcal{L}(M)$ satisfies feasible eventual reception. The semantics of M defined as $\mathcal{S}(M) := \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}(M))$. Moreover, M is a PSM if it is a B -PSM for some B .

By definition, PSMs specify FIFO languages; importantly, although the core language $\mathcal{L}(M)$ is B -bounded, the semantics $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}(M))$ includes non- B -bounded words and will not even be regular in general. Note that, it is decidable to check if an FSM is a B -PSM.

In Appendix A.2, we show that $\mathcal{C}(-)$ preserves and reflects feasible eventual reception: if $L \subseteq \Gamma^\infty$ satisfies feasible eventual reception, then $\mathcal{C}(L)$ does, and if $\mathcal{C}(L)$ satisfies feasible eventual reception, then L does. More generally, every property that is preserved by $\mathcal{C}(-)$ can be soundly checked on the core language of a PSM. If the property is also reflected by $\mathcal{C}(-)$, the property holds if and only if it holds for the core language.

Definition 3.10. A PSM M is a $\Sigma 1$ -PSM if its core language $\mathcal{L}(M)$ is $\Sigma 1$ -bounded. We may abuse notation and use $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}}$ as alphabet for $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs.

Example 3.11 (Kindergarten Leader Election). We consider a protocol between two participants e (evens) and o (odds). It can be used to quickly settle a dispute between children (hence the name). Both children pick 0 or 1 and tell each other their pick at the same time. Child e wins if the sum is even while o wins if the sum is odd. At the end, the loser concedes by sending the message `win` to the winner. The protocol is specified as a PSM in Fig. 7a (and as an HMSC in Fig. 7b). Note that specifying this protocol requires the ability of issuing send and receive events independently. If one insisted on issuing send and matching receives together, as in global types and $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs, one of the children would be forced to reveal their hand first, undermining the purpose of the protocol.

4 Projection: From PSMs to CSMs

A CSM \mathcal{A} is a projection of a PSM M , if \mathcal{A} is a projection of $\mathcal{S}(M)$. In this section, we explain two main results. The first is positive: we show that sound and complete projection is decidable for Tame PSMs. The second is negative: we show that the sender-driven restriction of Tame PSMs is necessary: if we drop the restriction, projectability becomes undecidable even for sink-final $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs. The full proofs can be found in Appendix B.

4.1 Sound and Complete Projection for Tame PSMs

The idea of the decidability result is to reduce projectability of a Tame PSM to projectability of a (different) sender-driven global type, which can then be handled using the sound and complete algorithm of [57]. Furthermore, the reduction is such that a projection of the original PSM can be read off a projection of the global type. Before sketching the idea behind the reduction, we define Tame PSMs formally. Tame PSMs satisfy three conditions: they are sink-final, sender-driven, and satisfy some more fine-grained bounds on the message queues.

Definition 4.1 (Choice restrictions for PSMs). *Let $M = (Q, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, F)$ be a PSM. The PSM M satisfies sender-driven choice if there is a function $\lambda: Q \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ such that for all states q, q' such that $q \xrightarrow{x} q'$ with $x \in \Gamma$, it holds that $\lambda(q)$ is the sender for x , i.e., $x = \lambda(q) \triangleright _ ! _$. In addition, we say M is directed if for every state q , there is also a dedicated receiver \mathfrak{p} , i.e., all transition labels from q are of the form $\lambda(q) \triangleright \mathfrak{p} ! _$. Last, if there is no dedicated sender but all transitions are still distinct, i.e. M is deterministic, we say that it satisfies mixed choice.*

Definition 4.2 (Channel bounds for PSMs). *We define channel bounds as a partial function $\beta: \text{Chan} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ from channels to natural numbers, where $\text{dom}(\beta)$ denotes the domain of β . Given a PSM M , we say that M respects β if the following holds for every $\langle \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q} \rangle \in \text{Chan}$:*

- If $\langle \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q} \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$, then every message from \mathfrak{p} to \mathfrak{q} is immediately followed by a receive: for every state q and transition from q to q' labelled with $\mathfrak{p} \triangleright \mathfrak{q} ! m$, it holds that there is a single transition from q' and it is labelled with $\mathfrak{q} \triangleleft \mathfrak{p} ? m$.
- If $\langle \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q} \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$, then $w \Downarrow_{\mathfrak{p} \triangleright \mathfrak{q} !, \mathfrak{q} \triangleleft \mathfrak{p} ?}$ is $\beta(\langle \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q} \rangle)$ -bounded for every $w \in \mathcal{S}(M)$.

A PSM that respects β with $\beta = \emptyset$ is a PSM which only uses paired events, just like global types do. Thus checking the condition with $\beta = \emptyset$ is a trivial syntactic check. For general PSMs, it is possible to generate valid channel bounds with a sound algorithm we propose in Appendix B.1. We conjecture the algorithm to be also complete, i.e. to always output some bounds if they exist.

Definition 4.3 (Tame PSMs). *A Tame PSM is a pair (M, β) where the PSM M is sender-driven, sink-final, and respects the channel bounds β .*

We can now sketch the idea behind the reduction. Fundamentally, the gap in expressivity between Tame PSMs and sender-driven global types is that in PSMs sends and matching receives do not need to appear one right after the other. One can observe, however, that one could replicate the same asynchrony of some trace $\mathfrak{p} \triangleright \mathfrak{q} ! m \cdots \mathfrak{q} \triangleleft \mathfrak{p} ? m$ by introducing an intermediary participant $(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q})$ that is always ready to forward messages from \mathfrak{p} to \mathfrak{q} , leading to a trace $\mathfrak{p} \rightarrow (\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q}) : m \cdots (\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{q} : m$ where the sends and matching receives between participants and the intermediaries are now immediately adjacent. The channel bounds β tell us exactly for which channels we need to introduce intermediaries; moreover the bound on the buffers induced by β makes sure that these intermediaries will not introduce any spurious dependency in the executions. To consolidate the idea, we show how it applies to our KLE example.




Fig. 8: Kindergarten Leader Election after the Channel-participant Encoding.

Example 4.4 (Revisiting the KLE protocol). In Example 3.11, we introduced the Kindergarten Leader Election protocol, whose communication pattern cannot be represented as a $\Sigma 1$ -PSM/global type: both children need to commit to the number they send before they receive the other’s message. Its PSM (Fig. 7) is however tame: it is sink-final, sender-driven and respects $\beta(e, o) = \beta(o, e) = 1$. The “intermediary forwarders” idea applied to the protocol results in a protocol where some teachers (the intermediaries) will act as depositories for the initial choices of the two children. After committing their choice, each child is allowed to learn from the teacher the choice of the other child. The resulting PSM is given in Fig. 8. The names of the additional participants indicate the direction of communication: (e, o) forwards messages from e to o . Obviously, this encoding does not specify the same protocol. Still, our construction shows that one can obtain a projection of the original protocol from a projection of the modified one, by appropriately removing the forwarding actions of the teachers.

The example illustrates the simple case where $\beta(-) \leq 1$; in the more general case, the reduction is more involved and requires more intermediaries.

The workflow of our encoding is visualised in Fig. 9. Given a PSM M , one first computes its encoding $\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$. Second, one synthesizes a projection $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ of the encoded protocol using results from [57]. Third, one decodes to obtain a projection $\{\{\text{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ of M .




Fig. 9: Workflow of encoding.

Theorem 4.5. *Checking projectability of Tame PSMs is in PSPACE. One can also synthesize a projection in PSPACE.*

4.2 Mixed Choice yields Undecidable Projectability

Now, we show that the sender-driven choice restriction for Tame PSMs is necessary for projectability to be decidable. General PSMs inherit undecidability of projectability from HMSCs, which in turn was proven by Lohrey [59, Thm. 3.4]. Given our positive result for Tame PSMs, the proof for undecidability ought to break in the presence of sender-driven choice. The original proof goes through several (often implicitly given or omitted) automata-based transformations and does not give any insights about where and how the transformations break under the assumption of sender-driven choice.

Theorem 4.6. *The projectability problem for sink-final mixed-choice $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs is undecidable.*

We reduce the membership problem for Turing Machines to checking projectability of a sink-final mixed-choice $\Sigma 1$ -PSM with five participants. Initially, there is a branching which only two participants are involved in and learn about. Subsequently, all participants communicate Turing machine computations in the form of configurations in both branches. If the (projected) language of one of the other participants is not the same for both branches, the PSM cannot be implementable because they do not know which branch to comply with and easily deadlock. We also show that the reverse is the case. Hence, we specify a language for each branch and make both coincide if and only if the Turing Machine has no accepting computation, which is the case if and only if the PSM is projectable.

The full proof is in Appendix B.3. We adopt the proof strategy of Lohrey to PSMs and make every transformation explicit and carefully check which structural properties the transformations preserve, yielding a stronger undecidability result concerning the most rudimentary of PSMs: $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs.

5 Typing Programs against CSMs

We now overview the key ideas behind AMP’s type system. The formal details and full proofs can be found in Appendix C. To define programs, we take inspiration from the process calculus with session interleaving and delegation of [69]. The syntax of AMP’s programs is reproduced in Fig. 10. The processes P represent the static program text. As is standard, $\mathbf{0}$ is the terminated process, \parallel denotes parallel composition, $\mathbf{Q}[\vec{c}]$ denotes a sequential process running the code defined by a finite set of definitions \mathcal{D} . The prefixes $\oplus_{i \in I} c[\mathbf{q}_i]!l_i \langle c_i \rangle$ and $\&_{i \in I} c[\mathbf{q}_i]?l_i(y_i)$ denote internal and external choice respectively, with a non-empty finite set of indices I . The endpoint of participant \mathbf{p} of a channel between \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} in a session s , is denoted by $s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}]$; \mathbf{p} can send a label l and some payload p to \mathbf{q} in session s by $s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}]!l \langle p \rangle$, the dual reception is denoted by $s[\mathbf{q}][\mathbf{p}]?l \langle x \rangle$ (which binds the payload to x). To model delegation, a process must be able to send to another the capability to act as participant \mathbf{p} in session s , denoted $s[\mathbf{p}]$; the receiving process will bind such capability to a variable x and use it to form endpoints $x[\mathbf{q}]$; we thus have in general send/receive actions on $c[\mathbf{q}]$ where c can be a variable or some $s[\mathbf{p}]$.

The process $(\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A})P$ denotes the creation of a new bound session s used in P . The session is annotated with a (computationally irrelevant) CSM \mathcal{A} , taking the place of what is often a global type. So far, we treated messages in CSMs very abstractly as elements of a finite alphabet. In processes, messages are more structured: they have a label (from a finite set) and a payload (of some type). The messages used by the CSM will thus be pairs $l(t)$ of a label l and a payload type t , with the convention that if, from a state q , there are two outgoing transitions with the same sender, receiver and label, they will agree on the type.

In applications, the payload can be of any base type (e.g. integers, strings), or be a channel capability $s[\mathbf{p}]$ (for delegation). Since supporting base types is a

$$\begin{aligned}
c &::= x \mid s[p] \\
P &::= \mathbf{0} \mid P_1 \parallel P_2 \mid (vs : \mathcal{A}) P \mid \bigoplus_{i \in I} c[q_i]!l_i(c_i) . P_i \mid \&_{i \in I} c[q_i]?l_i(y_i) . P_i \mid \mathbf{Q}[\vec{c}] \\
R &::= \mathbf{0} \mid R_1 \parallel R_2 \mid (vs : \mathcal{A}) R \mid \bigoplus_{i \in I} c[q_i]!l_i(c_i) . P_i \mid \&_{i \in I} c[q_i]?l_i(y_i) . P_i \mid \mathbf{Q}[\vec{c}] \\
&\quad \mid s \blacktriangleright \sigma \mid \mathbf{err} \\
\mathcal{D} &::= (\mathbf{Q}[\vec{x}] = \bigoplus_{i \in I} c[q_i]!l_i(c_i) . P_i); \mathcal{D} \mid (\mathbf{Q}[\vec{x}] = \&_{i \in I} c[q_i]?l_i(y_i) . P_i); \mathcal{D} \mid \varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 10: Syntax of AMP’s π -calculus.

simple exercise, we follow [69] and focus on the harder case of channel capabilities as payloads. When using a CSM $\mathcal{A} = \{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ as a protocol specification for a session s , it is natural to consider the (control) states Q_p of A_p to be the local types that can be associated to $s[p]$. Therefore, in our setting we will consider the set L of the states of any \mathcal{A} annotating the process, as the possible payload types. For simplicity, we assume all CSMs use disjoint sets of states, so that we can unambiguously refer to the transitions from any state q by $\delta(q)$.

In particular, if the protocol specified by \mathcal{A} can delegate channels of a session following some CSM \mathcal{B} , then the message alphabet of \mathcal{A} will include states of \mathcal{B} . When the CSMs are obtained through projection, it is natural to first obtain \mathcal{B} so we can refer to its states in writing the PSM that projects to \mathcal{A} . We thus assume there is an acyclic “delegation partial order” between the CSMs of a process: $\mathcal{B} < \mathcal{A}$ means that \mathcal{A} can use the states of \mathcal{B} in its messages.

The semantics of the calculus is defined on runtime configurations R (defined in Fig. 10), which are processes which additionally contain message queues $s \blacktriangleright \sigma$ for each active session s . Here σ is a map from pairs of participants to sequences of messages. The reduction semantics is standard (cf. Appendix C). The only reduction rules we highlight here are the ones leading to an error configuration:

$$\frac{\forall i \in I. \sigma(q_i, p) = l(_) \dots \wedge l_i \neq l}{\&_{i \in I} s[p][q_i]?l_i(y_i) . P_i \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma \longrightarrow \mathbf{err}} \quad \frac{\sigma(p, q) \neq \varepsilon \text{ for some } p, q}{(vs : \mathcal{A}) s \blacktriangleright \sigma \longrightarrow \mathbf{err}}$$

The first rule models *unsafe communication*: a process is stuck because all the queues it is waiting to receive from are not empty, but the labels of the first messages do not match any of the cases the process is expecting. The second rule models *orphan messages*: a session where all participants terminated but that has still non-empty message queues. The safety guarantees of our type system will rule out both cases. Note that [68, 69] focuses on communication safety. In addition, they consider S-deadlock freedom, which implies no orphan messages, but is an undecidable property that needs to be checked and is not necessarily transferred to processes by the type system: the property only holds if there is only one session, in which case much stronger conditions transfer. In our setting, deadlock freedom is transferred throughout by projection and the type system, yielding no orphan messages.

Figure 11 shows the crucial rules of AMP’s type system. The typing judgement $\Theta \vdash A \vdash P$ uses a process P , a typing context Θ for the types of the parameters \vec{c} of sequential processes $\mathbf{Q}[\vec{c}]$ (the definitions of which are typed separately

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\Theta \mid \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}} \text{PT-0} \qquad \frac{\Theta \mid \Lambda \vdash P \quad \text{end}(q)}{\Theta \mid c : q, \Lambda \vdash P} \text{PT-END} \\
\\
\frac{\delta(q) = \{(p \triangleleft q_i ? l_i(p_i), q_i) \mid i \in I\} \quad \forall i \in I. \Theta \mid \Lambda, c : q_i, y_i : p_i \vdash P_i}{\Theta \mid \Lambda, c : q \vdash \&_{i \in I} c[q_i] ? l_i(y_i) . P_i} \text{PT-}\& \\
\\
\frac{\delta(q) \supseteq \{(p \triangleright q_i ! l_i(p_i), q_i) \mid i \in I\} \quad \forall i \in I. \Theta \mid \Lambda, c : q_i, \{c_j : p_j\}_{j \in I \setminus \{i\}} \vdash P_i}{\Theta \mid \Lambda, c : q, \{c_i : p_i\}_{i \in I} \vdash \oplus_{i \in I} c[q_i] ! l_i(c_i) . P_i} \text{PT-}\oplus \\
\\
\frac{\Lambda_s = \{s[p] : \text{init}(\mathcal{A}_p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} \quad \Theta \mid \Lambda, \Lambda_s \vdash P}{\Theta \mid \Lambda \vdash (vs : \mathcal{A}) P} \text{PT-v}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 11: Typing rules for processes; $\text{init}(-)$ denotes a CSM's initial state.

against Θ); a typing context Λ associating the variables x and the channel capabilities $s[p]$ occurring free in P , with some CSM state $q \in L$. Rule **PT-0** says that a terminated process is typable in the environment with no capabilities. Rule **PT-END** permits to discard the capabilities that have terminated: $\text{end}(q)$ holds for final states with no outgoing receive transition. Rules **PT- $\&$** and **PT- \oplus** deal with communication. Assume $c = s[p]$. According to **PT- $\&$** , to receive a message as participant p in session c , we look for the type q of c in the typing context and check the CSM transitions $\delta(q)$ are all receives $\{(p \triangleleft q_i ? l_i(p_i), q_i) \mid i \in I\}$. Then the process needs to be able to receive any branch i , resulting in the continuation P_i which is typed in the context extended with the corresponding payload type $y_i : p_i$, and with the type of c changed to q_i . According to **PT- \oplus** , to send, as c with type q , a message non-deterministically picked from a number of branches $i \in I$, we have to make sure q allows each branch, including matching the types of the payloads. Then each branch i continues as P_i which is typed in a context where c has type q_i and we lost ownership of the payload c_i . Finally, **PT-v** types a new session s used by P , by adding to the context a new binding $s[p] : q_p$ for each participant p of the CSM \mathcal{A} annotating the session, with q_p being the initial state of p in \mathcal{A} .

The first correctness criterion for the type system is to prove subject reduction: if a process is typable, then every configuration reachable from it will be typable. Thus, to state subject reduction, we need to define when a runtime configuration is typable. For this purpose, we define a second judgement $\Theta \mid \Lambda \mid \Omega \vdash R$ that includes a third typing context Ω used to type session message queues: associating to each channel $s[p][q]$ a sequence of message types $l(q)$ (label and payload type). The key to make typing of runtime configurations an inductive invariant, is the following rule:

$$\frac{(\vec{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A}) \quad \Lambda_{\vec{q}}^s = \{s[p] : \vec{q}_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} \quad \Theta \mid \Lambda, \Lambda_{\vec{q}}^s \mid \Omega, \Omega_{\xi}^s \vdash R}{\Theta \mid \Lambda \mid \Omega \vdash (vs : \mathcal{A}) R} \text{RT-v}$$

The main difference between RT-v and PT-v is that the typing context is not populated with capabilities associated to initial states; instead the prover can pick any CSM configuration (\vec{q}, ξ) —where \vec{q} collects the local state of each participant, and ξ the contents of the message queues— that is reachable from the initial configuration of \mathcal{A} . The states and the queues are used to initialise the typing context to type the process R using the restricted session.

In what follows we assume the definitions \mathcal{D} can be typed according to Θ . We say a process/runtime configuration is *well-annotated* if every CSM appearing in it is (1) deadlock-free, and (2) satisfies feasible eventual reception. Here, *annotated* indicates that the CSMs have no computational meaning but *well* shows the need for certain guarantees, which our type system can preserve. Note that a process is automatically well-annotated if the CSMs are obtained via projection.

Theorem 5.1 (Subject Reduction). *Given a well-annotated R , if $\Theta \vdash \emptyset \vdash \emptyset \vdash R$ and $R \longrightarrow R'$, then $\Theta \vdash \emptyset \vdash \emptyset \vdash R'$.*

Corollary 5.2 (Type Safety). *For a well-annotated R , if $\Theta \vdash \emptyset \vdash \emptyset \vdash R$ and $R \longrightarrow^* R'$, then R' does not contain **err**.*

For progress, the situation is more delicate: just like in [69] and most other MST systems, allowing session interleaving may introduce inter-session dependencies that are not modelled in the global protocol (which only pertains intra-session dependencies). We thus prove progress under these assumptions: (i) there is only one session running, and (ii) that each of its participants is implemented by a distinct process, and (iii) the CSM annotating it is sink-final. To encode these extra restrictions, we define a “Session Fidelity” variant of the typing judgement $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega \vdash_{SF} R$ which uses a subset of the rules of \vdash to enforce the restrictions above. Let $\Lambda_{\vec{q}}^s$ and Ω_{ξ}^s be defined as in the premises of RT-v.

Theorem 5.3 (Progress). *Let (\vec{q}, ξ) be a configuration of a sink-final, deadlock-free CSM \mathcal{A} satisfying feasible eventual reception. If $\Theta \vdash \Lambda_{\vec{q}}^s \vdash \Omega_{\xi}^s \vdash_{SF} R$, and (\vec{q}, ξ) can take a step, then there exist some R' and (\vec{q}', ξ') , such that $R \longrightarrow R'$, $(\vec{q}, \xi) \longrightarrow (\vec{q}', \xi')$, and $\Theta \vdash \Lambda_{\vec{q}'}^s \vdash \Omega_{\xi'}^s \vdash_{SF} R'$.*

Progress hinges on deadlock freedom of the CSM. In general, any (language) property of a PSM that is preserved and reflected by $\mathcal{C}(-)$ holds for its projection. However, as for progress, it is not necessarily easy to make the type system enforce the preservation of these properties at the global process level and requires careful treatment. [25] demonstrated how Kobayashi-style techniques [52] that can be used to show progress in the presence of session interleaving. We conjecture a similar system can be added on top of AMP’s type system.

6 Applications of AMP to MST Frameworks

Standard (expression-based) global types from MST frameworks can be seen as restricted special cases of PSMs. What is gained from using AMP for global types seen as PSMs? Is anything lost in doing so? In this section, we evaluate AMP as

a backend for projection/typing of standard global types. The key consequences of our results are:

- (a) Every sender-driven global type is a tame sink-final $\Sigma 1$ -PSM.
- (b) Tame sink-final $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs can be represented as a sender-driven global type.
- (c) Every collection of (expression-based) local types $\{\{L_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ can be expressed as a CSM $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ and vice versa.
- (d) AMP's projection is deadlock-free by construction, but MSTs typically insist on freedom of a stricter notion of deadlock which we call *soft deadlock*. We show AMP's projection can also be set to ensure soft deadlock freedom, without losing completeness.

These results help us settle two open questions:

- Expression-based global/local types are equi-expressive with respect to state-machine-based global/local specifications.
- Allowing mixed-choice in global types makes projectability undecidable.

Here, we give an overview while Appendix D presents the results in detail.

Global and local types. In most MST frameworks, protocols are specified using expression-based global types (G), which get projected to expression-based local types (L). Their syntax is specified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 G &::= \mathbf{0} \mid \sum_{i \in I} p_i \rightarrow q_i : m_i . G_i \mid \mu X . G \mid X \quad (\text{global types}) \\
 L &::= \mathbf{0} \mid \bigoplus_{i \in I} q_i ! m_i . L_i \mid \&_{i \in I} q_i ? m_i . L_i \mid \mu X . L \mid X \quad (\text{local types})
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ explicitly denotes termination and μX binds a recursion variable X . The remaining operators specify how messages are exchanged: for local types, sending and receiving are separate actions, while for global types they are specified in a single paired event. Typically only *deterministic* global types are considered, i.e. where every $\sum_{i \in I} p_i \rightarrow q_i : m_i . G_i$ has no $i \neq j$ with $p_i \rightarrow q_i : m_i = p_j \rightarrow q_j : m_j$. The choice restrictions we discussed, can be imposed on global types, e.g. sender-driven choice requires that, for $\sum_{i \in I} p_i \rightarrow q_i : m_i . G_i$, for all $i, j \in I$, $p_i = p_j$.

The standard semantics of global types has been given as a transition system, or as sets of traces. In both cases, the semantics allows reordering of events that are not causally related, e.g. $p \rightarrow q : 1 . r \rightarrow s : 2 . \mathbf{0}$ allows r and s to communicate before p and q . This is formalised, in the presentation of [57, 60, 70] (which we adopt here) as defining the semantics of a global type to be a set of traces closed under the indistinguishability relation \sim . With this view, it is immediate to represent any global type as a PSM. Given the restricted format of global types, the PSMs corresponding to translations of global types (like the one in Fig. 4) are $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs with a specific shape: they are tree-like, sink-final and recursion only happens at leaves and to ancestors [70]. On the face of it, it is unclear whether every $\Sigma 1$ -PSM can be modelled as global type.

Theorem 6.1. *For every sink-final $\Sigma 1$ -PSM M , there is a global type $\text{GAut}(M)$ with the same core language (and hence the same semantics). If M is non-deterministic (mixed-choice, sender-driven, or directed, resp.), then $\text{GAut}(M)$ is non-deterministic (mixed-choice, sender-driven, or directed, resp.).*

The main idea of Theorem 6.1 is that one can see a global type as a special regular expression, and thus we can adapt techniques like Arden’s lemma and Brzozowski derivatives to the case of PSMs. The key difficulty in the proof lays in showing the branching conditions are preserved: the standard automata transformations change the branching structure, and we need to produce new variants that do.

Similarly, local types can be directly read as the FSMs of a CSM. We can also provide an inverse transformation (preserving branching).

Theorem 6.2. *Let A_p be a sink-final FSM over Γ_p without mixed-choice states for a participant p . One can construct a local type L_p for p with $\mathcal{L}(L_p) = \mathcal{L}(A_p)$.*

Deadlocks and protocol termination. In MSTs, local types can only terminate with a $\mathbf{0}$, which signals at the same time that it is valid to stop the protocol, and that there is no further potential action. This implies that for a global type to be projectable into local types, all the participants need to know unambiguously when the protocol terminated globally. In contrast, using CSMs, it is possible to mark as final a state with outgoing transitions. Consider for instance the (directed) global type $G := (p \rightarrow q : m_1 . p \rightarrow r : m_1 . \mathbf{0}) + (p \rightarrow q : m_2 . \mathbf{0})$. AMP’s projection would produce the FSM $\begin{array}{c} \circ \xrightarrow{r \triangleleft p ? m_1} \circ \end{array}$ as the projection for r . It contains a non-sink final state: r is not informed of which branch was taken and needs to be prepared to terminate, or receive one more message.

AMP’s projection produces deadlock-free CSMs, where deadlocks are defined as configurations which cannot take a step, but their queues are not empty or some participant is in a non-final state. Projections to local types ensure the absence of another type of deadlock: a *soft deadlock*, i.e. a configuration that is a deadlock, or that cannot take a step but where some participant is in a *non-sink* state. Is the possibility of soft deadlocks desirable? We argue that this depends on the domain of application: in distributed computing, it would be fine if a server kept listening for incoming requests while, in embedded computing, it can be key that all participants eventually stop. We can show that it is possible to use AMP in both scenarios, without giving up on completeness.

Definition 6.3 (Strong Projectability). *A language $L \subseteq \Gamma^\omega$ is said to be strongly projectable if there exists a CSM $\{\{B_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ such that $\{\{B_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is free from soft deadlocks (soft deadlock freedom), and L is the language of $\{\{B_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ (protocol fidelity). We say that $\{\{B_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is a strong projection of L .*

Theorem 6.4. *Let G be a projectable global type. Then, the subset construction $\mathcal{C}(G, p)$ [57, Def. 5.4] is sink-final for every participant p if and only if there is a CSM that is a strong projection of G and this CSM satisfies feasible eventual reception or every of its state machines is deterministic.*

If we aim for a strong projection of a projectable global type, we construct the global type’s subset construction and check if it is sink-final. If it is not, there is no strong projection of it. If this is undesirable, the protocol needs redesigning. Theorem 6.2 can yield local types and $\text{LAut}(L)$ is the FSM for a local type L .

Undecidability for mixed-choice. Finally, these results together with our results from Section 4.2, can settle the open question of whether we can project mixed-choice global types algorithmically.

Corollary 6.5. *Both the projectability problem and the strong projectability problem for mixed-choice global types are undecidable.*

7 Related Work

Multiparty session types. Inspired by linear logic [40], Honda [43] proposed binary sessions types for sessions with two participants. Multiparty session types [44] extended the idea to multiple participants. Deniélou and Yoshida [30] were the first to extensively explore the relation between CSMs and local types, but their projection is not complete and only supports directed choice; moreover the approach was found to be somewhat flawed [69]. MSTs have been incorporated into a number of programming languages [5, 24, 50, 55, 58, 64, 67]. They have also been applied to various other domains like operating systems [32], web services [80], distributed algorithms [53], timed systems [12], cyber-physical systems [61], and smart contracts [29]. A number of works are devoted to mechanising MST meta-theory [21, 48, 49, 73]. Our results could potentially extend the expressivity of the types involved in these applications.

MST projectability/projection. Via a reduction to globally-cooperative HMSCs, Stutz [70] proved MST projectability to be decidable for the class of global types that can—but do not have to—terminate (called $\mathbf{0}$ -reachable). Li et al. [57] provided a direct MST projection algorithm that is complete for sender-driven global types, providing a PSPACE upper bound. Our results use a reduction to these later developments. The global specifications in [57] can be shown to be special cases of Tame $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs so our results strictly expand the reach of their results. For example, the protocols of Figs. 5 and 7 are all tame, yet out of the reach of both works. We also clarify the discrepancy between the notion of deadlock in global types and in [57] (cf. Section 6). Finally, [57, 70] do not have a type system, providing no way to link properties of projections with the ones of processes. Preliminary versions of some of our results appeared in the PhD thesis of the first author [71].

The almost totality of asynchronous MST works can only handle directed choice. An exception is [19], where unrestricted global types are considered (without a type system). They propose an incomplete projection algorithm that is correct with respect to a different notion of correct projection than the standard one we adopt and generalise. We refer to [60] for a survey on choice restrictions.

Hu and Yoshida [46] propose a scheme with global types and an incomplete projection, where the global types are not safe by construction and the restrictions on choice only appear at the local types. The safety of global types is ensured by a combination of model-checking with message buffers of size 1, and syntactic restrictions that ensure that any unsafety that might arise, will be visible in the 1-bounded executions. For PSMs satisfying the syntactic restrictions, the same approach could be applied. The types of [46] also include

connect/disconnect actions, which can be emulated in AMP by excluding deadlocks (but not soft deadlocks) and using non-sink final states.

Choreography automata and languages. Choreography Automata [7] are syntactically similar to Σ 1-PSMs, but do not employ any closure operation, requiring the user to specify all the allowed interleavings, and preventing finite state representations for many common communication patterns. In addition, Majumdar et al. [60] showed that their conditions for projectability are flawed for the asynchronous case (fixes for the synchronous case appeared in [38, p. 8]). Barbanera et al. [8] applies a language-theoretic approach to a limited class of *synchronous* choreographies (with no claim of completeness of projection).

Bottom-up MSTs. A number of MST-based works deviate from the top-down approach. For instance, [69] proposes a type system that only requires local types and not a global type. The typing ensures some operational correspondence between local types and processes, making it possible to model check local types to determine properties of the program. Their local types in the asynchronous setting are Turing-powerful, and therefore model checking is of limited use. By virtue of the decoupling achieved by our type system, AMP can be used in a bottom-up way too: safety of the CSM used to type a process, implies safety of the process, regardless of whether the CSM is obtained by projection or just given. Dagnino et al. [28] and Castellani et al. [20] also use a bottom-up strategy by reconstructing a so-called *deconfined* global type from the parallel composition of local programs of a single session. Deconfined global types are not automatically safe, and checking their safety is shown to be undecidable.

Extensions for MSTs. A number of extensions for MSTs have been considered (see [11] for a survey), including: parametrisation [23, 31], dependent types [31, 75, 76], graduality [47], fault-tolerance [10, 79]. Context-free session types [51, 74] specify binary sessions that are not representable with finite-control. It would be interesting to consider projection for PSMs generated by pushdown automata.

Distributed synthesis. In automata theory, distributed synthesis seeks a way to transform a sequential specification into an equivalent distributed implementation, which is close in spirit with the idea of extracting local types from global types. One of the few positive results in this area is Zielonka’s theorem [81], which shows that every regular trace language can be recognised by a so-called “asynchronous automaton”. Despite their name, asynchronous automata can be seen as a parallel composition of participants interacting through *synchronous* actions. In contrast, PSMs and CSMs represent non-regular FIFO languages, giving rise to a harder challenge.

High-level message sequence charts. HMSCs were defined in an industry standard [78], inspiring extensive academic research [33, 35, 36, 62, 66]. Projectability has been studied for HMSCs under the name “safe realisability” [3, 37, 59], and was shown to be undecidable in general [59]. Several restrictions of HMSCs have been proposed to make projectability decidable. For a detailed survey, we refer to [70]. Compared to PSMs, HMSCs only model finite runs; their PSM encoding equips them with an infinite run semantics. With our developments, it is

fairly straightforward to obtain a projection operation for sender-driven, sink-final HMSCs that respect some channel bounds. This class is incomparable to any of the decidable HMSC classes proposed in the literature. Since our type system only depends on CSMs, regardless of how they are obtained, AMP can type check a program against a projectable HMSC.

Choreographic programming. Choreographic programming [26, 39, 42] adopts the top-down approach even more radically than MSTs. In choreographic programming, the endpoint projection (EPP) aims at synthesizing a fully-featured program implementation directly from the global specification. As a result, the global specification describes the local computation alongside the communication structure (requiring infinite-state formalisms). In choreographies, one typically works with non-finite-control-state global specifications, so the hopes for a complete and decidable EPP are slim, justifying giving up on completeness. By only considering local computation in processes, the MST/AMP approach avoids this issue. Nevertheless, our results could still be useful for EPP when applied to the pure communication structure of choreographies. Notably, our method can project examples that cannot be projected using EPPs from the literature. Consider the choreography **if** $p.\star$ **then** $(p \rightarrow q: _ . q \rightarrow s: _)$ **else** $(p \rightarrow s: _ . s \rightarrow q: _)$, where message payloads are irrelevant and hence omitted and $p.\star$ denotes non-deterministic choice by p . The example is syntactically valid in [27] and can be easily encoded as a global type with sender-driven choice. However, their EPP would be undefined for q and s : it uses the merge from [18], which can only merge same sender receives. Our results would instead produce the desired projection.

Communicating state machines. CSMs are the canonical automata model for distributed systems. They have been studied in the context of model checking projections and do not apply a top-down methodology. The verification problem is undecidable in general since CSMs are Turing-powerful [14]. Several strategies to yield decidable classes have been proposed: assuming channels are lossy [1], restricting the communication topology [65, 77], or only allowing half-duplex communication for two participants [22]. The concept of existential boundedness [34] was initially defined for CSMs and yields decidability of control state reachability. The same holds for synchronisability [13, 41], which, intuitively, requires that every execution can be re-ordered (up to \sim) into phases of sends and receives such that messages can only be received in the same phase. Global types can only express 1-synchronisable and half-duplex communication [72].

Acknowledgments. The authors thank Anca Muscholl and Jorge A. Pérez for their discussions. This work was partially supported by the Luxembourg National Research Fund (FNR) under the grant agreement C22/IS/17238244/AVVA and by the ERC Consolidator Grant for the project “PERSIST” under the EU’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant No. 101003349).

Bibliography

- [1] Abdulla, P.A., Bouajjani, A., Jonsson, B.: On-the-fly analysis of systems with unbounded, lossy FIFO channels. In: Hu, A.J., Vardi, M.Y. (eds.) Computer Aided Verification, 10th International Conference, CAV'98, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 28 - July 2, 1998, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 1427, pp. 305–318, Springer (1998), <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0028754>
- [2] Alur, R., Etessami, K., Yannakakis, M.: Inference of message sequence charts. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* **29**(7), 623–633 (2003), <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2003.1214326>
- [3] Alur, R., Etessami, K., Yannakakis, M.: Realizability and verification of MSC graphs. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **331**(1), 97–114 (2005), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2004.09.034>
- [4] Alur, R., Yannakakis, M.: Model checking of message sequence charts. In: Baeten, J.C.M., Mauw, S. (eds.) CONCUR '99: Concurrency Theory, 10th International Conference, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, August 24-27, 1999, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 1664, pp. 114–129, Springer (1999), https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48320-9_10
- [5] Ancona, D., Bono, V., Bravetti, M., Campos, J., Castagna, G., Deniérou, P., Gay, S.J., Gesbert, N., Giachino, E., Hu, R., Johnsen, E.B., Martins, F., Mascardi, V., Montesi, F., Neykova, R., Ng, N., Padovani, L., Vasconcelos, V.T., Yoshida, N.: Behavioral types in programming languages. *Found. Trends Program. Lang.* **3**(2-3), 95–230 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1561/25000000031>
- [6] Arden, D.N.: Delayed-logic and finite-state machines. In: 2nd Annual Symposium on Switching Circuit Theory and Logical Design, Detroit, Michigan, USA, October 17-20, 1961, pp. 133–151, IEEE Computer Society (1961), <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.1961.13>
- [7] Barbanera, F., Lanese, I., Tuosto, E.: Choreography automata. In: Bliudze, S., Bocchi, L. (eds.) Coordination Models and Languages - 22nd IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference, COORDINATION 2020, Held as Part of the 15th International Federated Conference on Distributed Computing Techniques, DisCoTec 2020, Valletta, Malta, June 15-19, 2020, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12134, pp. 86–106, Springer (2020), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50029-0_6
- [8] Barbanera, F., Lanese, I., Tuosto, E.: Formal choreographic languages. In: ter Beek, M.H., Sirjani, M. (eds.) Coordination Models and Languages - 24th IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference, COORDINATION 2022, Held as Part of the 17th International Federated Conference on Distributed Computing Techniques, DisCoTec 2022, Lucca, Italy, June 13-17, 2022, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 13271, pp. 121–139, Springer (2022), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08143-9_8

- [9] Barendregt, H.P.: The lambda calculus - its syntax and semantics, Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics, vol. 103. North-Holland (1985), ISBN 978-0-444-86748-3
- [10] Barwell, A.D., Scalas, A., Yoshida, N., Zhou, F.: Generalised multiparty session types with crash-stop failures. In: Klin, B., Lasota, S., Muscholl, A. (eds.) 33rd International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2022, September 12-16, 2022, Warsaw, Poland, LIPIcs, vol. 243, pp. 35:1–35:25, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2022), <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2022.35>
- [11] Bejleri, A., Domnori, E., Viering, M., Eugster, P., Mezini, M.: Comprehensive multiparty session types. *Art Sci. Eng. Program.* **3**(3), 6 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.22152/programming-journal.org/2019/3/6>
- [12] Bocchi, L., Murgia, M., Vasconcelos, V.T., Yoshida, N.: Asynchronous timed session types - from duality to time-sensitive processes. In: Caires, L. (ed.) Programming Languages and Systems - 28th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2019, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2019, Prague, Czech Republic, April 6-11, 2019, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 11423, pp. 583–610, Springer (2019), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-17184-1_21
- [13] Bouajjani, A., Enea, C., Ji, K., Qadeer, S.: On the completeness of verifying message passing programs under bounded asynchrony. In: Chockler, H., Weissenbacher, G. (eds.) Computer Aided Verification - 30th International Conference, CAV 2018, Held as Part of the Federated Logic Conference, FloC 2018, Oxford, UK, July 14-17, 2018, Proceedings, Part II, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10982, pp. 372–391, Springer (2018), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96142-2_23
- [14] Brand, D., Zafiropulo, P.: On communicating finite-state machines. *J. ACM* **30**(2), 323–342 (1983), <https://doi.org/10.1145/322374.322380>
- [15] Brüggemann-Klein, A.: Regular expressions into finite automata. In: Simon, I. (ed.) LATIN '92, 1st Latin American Symposium on Theoretical Informatics, São Paulo, Brazil, April 6-10, 1992, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 583, pp. 87–98, Springer (1992), <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0023820>
- [16] Brüggemann-Klein, A., Wood, D.: One-unambiguous regular languages. *Inf. Comput.* **142**(2), 182–206 (1998), <https://doi.org/10.1006/inco.1997.2695>
- [17] Brzozowski, J.A.: Derivatives of regular expressions. *J. ACM* **11**(4), 481–494 (1964), <https://doi.org/10.1145/321239.321249>
- [18] Carbone, M., Honda, K., Yoshida, N.: Structured communication-centered programming for web services. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* **34**(2), 8:1–8:78 (2012), <https://doi.org/10.1145/2220365.2220367>
- [19] Castagna, G., Dezani-Ciancaglini, M., Padovani, L.: On global types and multi-party session. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* **8**(1) (2012), [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-8\(1:24\)2012](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-8(1:24)2012)
- [20] Castellani, I., Dezani-Ciancaglini, M., Giannini, P.: Asynchronous sessions with input races. In: Carbone, M., Neykova, R. (eds.) Proceedings of

- the 13th International Workshop on Programming Language Approaches to Concurrency and Communication-centric Software, PLACES@ETAPS 2022, Munich, Germany, 3rd April 2022, EPTCS, vol. 356, pp. 12–23 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.356.2>
- [21] Castro-Perez, D., Ferreira, F., Gheri, L., Yoshida, N.: Zooid: a DSL for certified multiparty computation: from mechanised metatheory to certified multiparty processes. In: Freund, S.N., Yahav, E. (eds.) PLDI ’21: 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, Virtual Event, Canada, June 20-25, 2021, pp. 237–251, ACM (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3453483.3454041>
- [22] Cécé, G., Finkel, A.: Verification of programs with half-duplex communication. *Inf. Comput.* **202**(2), 166–190 (2005), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2005.05.006>
- [23] Charalambides, M., Dinges, P., Agha, G.A.: Parameterized, concurrent session types for asynchronous multi-actor interactions. *Sci. Comput. Program.* **115–116**, 100–126 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2015.10.006>
- [24] Chen, R., Balzer, S., Toninho, B.: Ferrite: A judgmental embedding of session types in rust. In: Ali, K., Vitek, J. (eds.) 36th European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, ECOOP 2022, June 6-10, 2022, Berlin, Germany, LIPIcs, vol. 222, pp. 22:1–22:28, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2022), <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ECOOP.2022.22>
- [25] Coppo, M., Dezani-Ciancaglini, M., Yoshida, N., Padovani, L.: Global progress for dynamically interleaved multiparty sessions. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.* **26**(2), 238–302 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129514000188>
- [26] Cruz-Filipe, L., Montesi, F.: A core model for choreographic programming. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **802**, 38–66 (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2019.07.005>
- [27] Cruz-Filipe, L., Montesi, F., Peressotti, M.: Communications in choreographies, revisited. In: Haddad, H.M., Wainwright, R.L., Chbeir, R. (eds.) Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing, SAC 2018, Pau, France, April 09-13, 2018, pp. 1248–1255, ACM (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3167132.3167267>
- [28] Dagnino, F., Giannini, P., Dezani-Ciancaglini, M.: Deconfined global types for asynchronous sessions. In: Damiani, F., Dardha, O. (eds.) Coordination Models and Languages - 23rd IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference, COORDINATION 2021, Held as Part of the 16th International Federated Conference on Distributed Computing Techniques, DisCoTec 2021, Valletta, Malta, June 14-18, 2021, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12717, pp. 41–60, Springer (2021), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-78142-2_3
- [29] Das, A., Balzer, S., Hoffmann, J., Pfenning, F., Santurkar, I.: Resource-aware session types for digital contracts. In: 34th IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium, CSF 2021, Dubrovnik, Croatia, June 21-25, 2021, pp. 1–16, IEEE (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1109/CSF51468.2021.00004>

- [30] Deniérou, P., Yoshida, N.: Multiparty session types meet communicating automata. In: Seidl, H. (ed.) *Programming Languages and Systems - 21st European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2012, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2012, Tallinn, Estonia, March 24 - April 1, 2012. Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 7211, pp. 194–213, Springer (2012), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-28869-2_10
- [31] Deniérou, P., Yoshida, N., Bejléri, A., Hu, R.: Parameterised multiparty session types. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* **8**(4) (2012), [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-8\(4:6\)2012](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-8(4:6)2012)
- [32] Fähndrich, M., Aiken, M., Hawblitzel, C., Hodson, O., Hunt, G.C., Larus, J.R., Levi, S.: Language support for fast and reliable message-based communication in singularity OS. In: Berbers, Y., Zwaenepoel, W. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 2006 EuroSys Conference, Leuven, Belgium, April 18-21, 2006*, pp. 177–190, ACM (2006), <https://doi.org/10.1145/1217935.1217953>
- [33] Gazagnaire, T., Genest, B., Hérouët, L., Thiagarajan, P.S., Yang, S.: Causal message sequence charts. In: Caires, L., Vasconcelos, V.T. (eds.) *CONCUR 2007 - Concurrency Theory, 18th International Conference, CONCUR 2007, Lisbon, Portugal, September 3-8, 2007, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 4703, pp. 166–180, Springer (2007), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74407-8_12
- [34] Genest, B., Kuske, D., Muscholl, A.: On communicating automata with bounded channels. *Fundam. Inform.* **80**(1-3), 147–167 (2007), URL <http://content.iospress.com/articles/fundamenta-informaticae/fi80-1-3-09>
- [35] Genest, B., Muscholl, A.: Message sequence charts: A survey. In: *Fifth International Conference on Application of Concurrency to System Design (ACSD 2005)*, 6-9 June 2005, St. Malo, France, pp. 2–4, IEEE Computer Society (2005), <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACSD.2005.25>
- [36] Genest, B., Muscholl, A., Peled, D.A.: Message sequence charts. In: Desel, J., Reisig, W., Rozenberg, G. (eds.) *Lectures on Concurrency and Petri Nets, Advances in Petri Nets* [This tutorial volume originates from the 4th Advanced Course on Petri Nets, ACPN 2003, held in Eichstätt, Germany in September 2003. In addition to lectures given at ACPN 2003, additional chapters have been commissioned], *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 3098, pp. 537–558, Springer (2003), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-27755-2_15
- [37] Genest, B., Muscholl, A., Seidl, H., Zeitoun, M.: Infinite-state high-level mscs: Model-checking and realizability. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* **72**(4), 617–647 (2006), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2005.09.007>
- [38] Gheri, L., Lanese, I., Sayers, N., Tuosto, E., Yoshida, N.: Design-by-contract for flexible multiparty session protocols. In: Ali, K., Vitek, J. (eds.) *36th European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, ECOOP 2022, June 6-10, 2022, Berlin, Germany, LIPIcs*, vol. 222, pp. 8:1–8:28, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2022), <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.ECOOP.2022.8>

- [39] Giallorenzo, S., Montesi, F., Peressotti, M., Richter, D., Salvaneschi, G., Weisenburger, P.: Multiparty languages: The choreographic and multitier cases (pearl). In: Møller, A., Sridharan, M. (eds.) 35th European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, ECOOP 2021, July 11-17, 2021, Aarhus, Denmark (Virtual Conference), LIPIcs, vol. 194, pp. 22:1–22:27, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2021), <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ECOOP.2021.22>
- [40] Girard, J.: Linear logic. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **50**, 1–102 (1987), [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(87\)90045-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(87)90045-4)
- [41] Giusto, C.D., Laversa, L., Lozes, É.: On the k-synchronizability of systems. In: Goubault-Larrecq, J., König, B. (eds.) Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures - 23rd International Conference, FOSSACS 2020, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2020, Dublin, Ireland, April 25-30, 2020, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12077, pp. 157–176, Springer (2020), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45231-5_9
- [42] Hirsch, A.K., Garg, D.: Pirouette: higher-order typed functional choreographies. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **6**(POPL), 1–27 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3498684>
- [43] Honda, K.: Types for dyadic interaction. In: Best, E. (ed.) CONCUR ’93, 4th International Conference on Concurrency Theory, Hildesheim, Germany, August 23-26, 1993, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 715, pp. 509–523, Springer (1993), https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-57208-2_35
- [44] Honda, K., Yoshida, N., Carbone, M.: Multiparty asynchronous session types. In: Necula, G.C., Wadler, P. (eds.) Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2008, San Francisco, California, USA, January 7-12, 2008, pp. 273–284, ACM (2008), <https://doi.org/10.1145/1328438.1328472>
- [45] Hopcroft, J.E., Ullman, J.D.: Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages and Computation. Addison-Wesley (1979), ISBN 0-201-02988-X
- [46] Hu, R., Yoshida, N.: Explicit connection actions in multiparty session types. In: Huisman, M., Rubin, J. (eds.) Fundamental Approaches to Software Engineering - 20th International Conference, FASE 2017, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2017, Uppsala, Sweden, April 22-29, 2017, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10202, pp. 116–133, Springer (2017), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-54494-5_7
- [47] Igarashi, A., Thiemann, P., Tsuda, Y., Vasconcelos, V.T., Wadler, P.: Gradual session types. *J. Funct. Program.* **29**, e17 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956796819000169>
- [48] Jacobs, J., Balzer, S., Krebbers, R.: Connectivity graphs: a method for proving deadlock freedom based on separation logic. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **6**(POPL), 1–33 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3498662>

- [49] Jacobs, J., Balzer, S., Krebbers, R.: Multiparty GV: functional multiparty session types with certified deadlock freedom. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **6**(ICFP), 466–495 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3547638>
- [50] Jespersen, T.B.L., Munksgaard, P., Larsen, K.F.: Session types for rust. In: Bahr, P., Erdweg, S. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 11th ACM SIGPLAN Workshop on Generic Programming, WGP@ICFP 2015, Vancouver, BC, Canada, August 30, 2015*, pp. 13–22, ACM (2015), <https://doi.org/10.1145/2808098.2808100>
- [51] Keizer, A.C., Basold, H., Pérez, J.A.: Session coalgebras: A coalgebraic view on regular and context-free session types. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* **44**(3), 18:1–18:45 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3527633>
- [52] Kobayashi, N.: A new type system for deadlock-free processes. In: *CONCUR, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 4137, pp. 233–247, Springer (2006), https://doi.org/10.1007/11817949_16
- [53] Kouzapas, D., Gutkovas, R., Voinea, A.L., Gay, S.J.: A session type system for asynchronous unreliable broadcast communication. *CoRR abs/1902.01353* (2019), URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1902.01353>
- [54] Lamport, L.: Time, clocks, and the ordering of events in a distributed system. *Commun. ACM* **21**(7), 558–565 (1978), <https://doi.org/10.1145/359545.359563>
- [55] Lange, J., Ng, N., Toninho, B., Yoshida, N.: A static verification framework for message passing in go using behavioural types. In: Chaudron, M., Crnkovic, I., Chechik, M., Harman, M. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2018, Gothenburg, Sweden, May 27 - June 03, 2018*, pp. 1137–1148, ACM (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3180155.3180157>
- [56] Li, E., Stutz, F., Wies, T.: Deciding subtyping for asynchronous multiparty sessions. In: Weirich, S. (ed.) *Programming Languages and Systems - 33rd European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2024, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2024, Luxembourg City, Luxembourg, April 6-11, 2024, Proceedings, Part I*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 14576, pp. 176–205, Springer (2024), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57262-3_8
- [57] Li, E., Stutz, F., Wies, T., Zufferey, D.: Complete multiparty session type projection with automata. In: Enea, C., Lal, A. (eds.) *Computer Aided Verification - 35th International Conference, CAV 2023, Paris, France, July 17-22, 2023, Proceedings, Part III*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 13966, pp. 350–373, Springer (2023), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-37709-9_17
- [58] Lindley, S., Morris, J.G.: Embedding session types in haskell. In: Mainland, G. (ed.) *Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium on Haskell, Haskell 2016, Nara, Japan, September 22-23, 2016*, pp. 133–145, ACM (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1145/2976002.2976018>
- [59] Lohrey, M.: Realizability of high-level message sequence charts: closing the gaps. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **309**(1-3), 529–554 (2003), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2003.08.002>

- [60] Majumdar, R., Mukund, M., Stutz, F., Zufferey, D.: Generalising projection in asynchronous multiparty session types. In: Haddad, S., Varacca, D. (eds.) 32nd International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2021, August 24-27, 2021, Virtual Conference, LIPIcs, vol. 203, pp. 35:1–35:24, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2021), <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2021.35>
- [61] Majumdar, R., Pirron, M., Yoshida, N., Zufferey, D.: Motion session types for robotic interactions (brave new idea paper). In: Donaldson, A.F. (ed.) 33rd European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, ECOOP 2019, July 15-19, 2019, London, United Kingdom, LIPIcs, vol. 134, pp. 28:1–28:27, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2019), <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ECOOP.2019.28>
- [62] Mauw, S., Reniers, M.A.: High-level message sequence charts. In: Cavalli, A.R., Sarma, A. (eds.) SDL ’97 Time for Testing, SDL, MSC and Trends - 8th International SDL Forum, Evry, France, 23-29 September 1997, Proceedings, pp. 291–306, Elsevier (1997)
- [63] Muscholl, A., Peled, D.A.: Message sequence graphs and decision problems on mazurkiewicz traces. In: Kutyłowski, M., Pacholski, L., Wierzbicki, T. (eds.) Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 1999, 24th International Symposium, MFCS’99, Szklarska Poreba, Poland, September 6-10, 1999, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 1672, pp. 81–91, Springer (1999), https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48340-3_8
- [64] Neykova, R., Hu, R., Yoshida, N., Abdeljallal, F.: A session type provider: compile-time API generation of distributed protocols with refinements in f#. In: Dubach, C., Xue, J. (eds.) Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Compiler Construction, CC 2018, February 24-25, 2018, Vienna, Austria, pp. 128–138, ACM (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3178372.3179495>
- [65] Peng, W., Purushothaman, S.: Analysis of a class of communicating finite state machines. *Acta Informatica* **29**(6/7), 499–522 (1992), <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01185558>
- [66] Roychoudhury, A., Goel, A., Sengupta, B.: Symbolic message sequence charts. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* **21**(2), 12:1–12:44 (2012), <https://doi.org/10.1145/2089116.2089122>
- [67] Scalas, A., Yoshida, N.: Lightweight session programming in scala. In: Krishnamurthi, S., Lerner, B.S. (eds.) 30th European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, ECOOP 2016, July 18-22, 2016, Rome, Italy, LIPIcs, vol. 56, pp. 21:1–21:28, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2016), <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ECOOP.2016.21>
- [68] Scalas, A., Yoshida, N.: Less is more: multiparty session types revisited. Technical Report 6. Imperial College London (2018), URL <https://www.doc.ic.ac.uk/research/technicalreports/2018/DTRS18-6.pdf>
- [69] Scalas, A., Yoshida, N.: Less is more: multiparty session types revisited. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **3**(POPL), 30:1–30:29 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290343>

- [70] Stutz, F.: Asynchronous multiparty session type implementability is decidable - lessons learned from message sequence charts. In: Ali, K., Salvaneschi, G. (eds.) 37th European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, ECOOP 2023, July 17-21, 2023, Seattle, Washington, United States, LIPIcs, vol. 263, pp. 32:1–32:31, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2023), <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ECOOP.2023.32>
- [71] Stutz, F.: Implementability of Asynchronous Communication Protocols - The Power of Choice. Ph.D. thesis, Kaiserslautern University of Technology, Germany (2024), URL <https://kluedo.ub.rptu.de/frontdoor/index/index/docId/8077>
- [72] Stutz, F., Zufferey, D.: Comparing channel restrictions of communicating state machines, high-level message sequence charts, and multiparty session types. In: Ganty, P., Monica, D.D. (eds.) Proceedings of the 13th International Symposium on Games, Automata, Logics and Formal Verification, GandALF 2022, Madrid, Spain, September 21-23, 2022, EPTCS, vol. 370, pp. 194–212 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.370.13>
- [73] Thiemann, P.: Intrinsically-typed mechanized semantics for session types. In: Komendantskaya, E. (ed.) Proceedings of the 21st International Symposium on Principles and Practice of Programming Languages, PPDP 2019, Porto, Portugal, October 7-9, 2019, pp. 19:1–19:15, ACM (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3354166.3354184>
- [74] Thiemann, P., Vasconcelos, V.T.: Context-free session types. In: Garrigue, J., Keller, G., Sumii, E. (eds.) Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming, ICFP 2016, Nara, Japan, September 18-22, 2016, pp. 462–475, ACM (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1145/2951913.2951926>
- [75] Toninho, B., Caires, L., Pfenning, F.: Dependent session types via intuitionistic linear type theory. In: Schneider-Kamp, P., Hanus, M. (eds.) Proceedings of the 13th International ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Principles and Practice of Declarative Programming, July 20-22, 2011, Odense, Denmark, pp. 161–172, ACM (2011), <https://doi.org/10.1145/2003476.2003499>
- [76] Toninho, B., Yoshida, N.: Depending on session-typed processes. In: Baier, C., Lago, U.D. (eds.) Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures - 21st International Conference, FOSSACS 2018, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2018, Thessaloniki, Greece, April 14-20, 2018, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10803, pp. 128–145, Springer (2018), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-89366-2_7
- [77] Torre, S.L., Madhusudan, P., Parlato, G.: Context-bounded analysis of concurrent queue systems. In: Ramakrishnan, C.R., Rehof, J. (eds.) Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, 14th International Conference, TACAS 2008, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2008, Budapest, Hungary, March 29-April 6, 2008. Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 4963, pp. 299–314, Springer (2008), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78800-3_21

- [78] Union, I.T.: Z.120: Message sequence chart. Tech. rep., International Telecommunication Union (October 1996), URL <https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-Z.120>
- [79] Viering, M., Hu, R., Eugster, P., Ziarek, L.: A multiparty session typing discipline for fault-tolerant event-driven distributed programming. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **5**(OOPSLA), 1–30 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3485501>
- [80] Yoshida, N., Hu, R., Neykova, R., Ng, N.: The scribble protocol language. In: Abadi, M., Lluch-Lafuente, A. (eds.) *Trustworthy Global Computing - 8th International Symposium, TGC 2013, Buenos Aires, Argentina, August 30-31, 2013, Revised Selected Papers, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 8358, pp. 22–41, Springer (2013), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05119-2_3
- [81] Zielonka, W.: Notes on finite asynchronous automata. *RAIRO Theor. Informatics Appl.* **21**(2), 99–135 (1987), <https://doi.org/10.1051/ITA/1987210200991>

Appendix

A Additional Material for Section 3

A.1 Communicating State Machines

Definition A.1 (Semantics of Communicating State Machines). We denote the set of channels with $\text{Chan} = \{\langle p, q \rangle \mid p, q \in \mathcal{P}, p \neq q\}$. The set of global states of a CSM is given by $\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} Q_p$. Given a global state q , q_p denotes the state of p in q . A configuration of a CSM $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ is a pair (q, ξ) , where q is a global state and $\xi : \text{Chan} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^*$ is a mapping of each channel to its current content. The initial configuration (q_0, ξ_ε) consists of a global state q_0 where the state of each role is the initial state $q_{0,p}$ of A_p and a mapping ξ_ε , which maps each channel to the empty word ε . A configuration (q, ξ) is said to be final iff each individual local state q_p is final for every p and ξ is ξ_ε .

The global transition relation \rightarrow is defined as follows:

- $(q, \xi) \xrightarrow{p \triangleright q!m} (q', \xi')$ if $(q_p, p \triangleright q!m, q'_p) \in \delta_p$, $q_r = q'_r$ for every role $r \neq p$, $\xi'(\langle p, q \rangle) = \xi(\langle p, q \rangle) \cdot m$ and $\xi'(c) = \xi(c)$ for every other channel $c \in \text{Chan}$.
- $(q, \xi) \xrightarrow{q \triangleleft p?m} (q', \xi')$ if $(q_q, q \triangleleft p?m, q'_q) \in \delta_q$, $q_r = q'_r$ for every role $r \neq q$, $\xi'(\langle p, q \rangle) = m \cdot \xi(\langle p, q \rangle)$ and $\xi'(c) = \xi(c)$ for every other channel $c \in \text{Chan}$.
- $(q, \xi) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} (q', \xi)$ if $(q_p, \varepsilon, q'_p) \in \delta_p$ for some role p , and $q_q = q'_q$ for every role $q \neq p$.

A run of the CSM always starts with an initial configuration (q_0, ξ_0) , and is a finite or infinite sequence $(q_0, \xi_0) \xrightarrow{w_0} (q_1, \xi_1) \xrightarrow{w_1} \dots$ for which $(q_i, \xi_i) \xrightarrow{w_i} (q_{i+1}, \xi_{i+1})$. The word $w_0 w_1 \dots \in \Sigma^\infty$ is said to be the trace of the run. A run is called maximal if it is infinite or finite and ends in a final configuration. As before, the trace of a maximal run is maximal. The language $\mathcal{L}(\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}})$ of the CSM $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ consists of its set of maximal traces. A configuration is a deadlock if it is not final and has no outgoing transitions.

Majumdar et al. [60, Lm. 22] showed that the semantics of CSMs are closed under the indistinguishability relation \sim .

Lemma A.2. Let $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ be a CSM. Then, $\mathcal{L}(\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}(\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}))$.

A.2 Feasible Eventual Reception is Preserved and Reflected by the Indistinguishability Closure

Lemma A.3 (Feasible eventual reception is preserved and reflected by $\mathcal{C}(-)$). Let $L \subseteq \Gamma^\infty$ be a language. It holds that L satisfies feasible eventual reception iff $\mathcal{C}(L)$ satisfies feasible eventual reception.

Proof. Let us recall the definition of feasible eventual reception: for every finite word $w := w_1 \dots w_n \in \text{pref}(L)$ such that w_i is an unmatched send event, there is an extension $w \leq w' \in L$ of w such that w_i is matched in w' .

For the direction from left to right, it suffices to observe the following. For every (finite) prefix $u \in \text{pref}(\mathcal{C}(L))$ with an unmatched send event, there is $w \in L$ with $u \sim w$ and, by assumption, there is $w \leq w'$ where this send event is matched. For finite words, \sim does not affect matching (as it only considers the send and receive events for one channel). It is obvious that we can also use w' as witness for u .

Let us consider the direction from right to left. We need to show that for every finite word $w := w_1 \dots w_n \in \text{pref}(L)$ such that w_i is an unmatched send event, there is an extension $w \leq w' \in L$ of w such that w_i is matched in w' . By assumption, we know there is $u' = w_1 \dots w_n \dots \in \mathcal{C}(L)$ with $w \leq u'$ where w_i is matched. We do a case distinction whether u' is finite. If u' is finite, there is $u \in L$ with $u \sim u'$ by definition. It is straightforward that w_i is also matched in u , proving the claim. Let us suppose that u' is infinite. Despite, by definition, there is j such that w_j is the matching receive event for w_i . (It is obvious that $j > n$.) By definition of $\mathcal{C}(-)$, there is $u \in L$ with $u' \preceq^\omega u$. This means for each finite prefix v' of u' , there is a finite prefix v of u such that $v' \cdot v'' \sim v$ for some v'' . We choose $v' = w_1 \dots w_n \dots w_j$. Hence, we can obtain $v \in \text{pref}(L)$ where w_j occurs and matches w_i because, as argued before, \sim does not affect matching for finite words. For the definition of feasible eventual reception, we need a word in L . We choose u , which is a continuation of v , where w_j is still matched. \square

B Additional Material for Section 4

Without loss of generality, in what follows we assume there are no ε -transitions in a PSM M if $\mathcal{L}(M) = \{\varepsilon\}$.

B.1 Finding Channel Bounds for PSMs

Our algorithm to generate channel bounds consists of three phases.


First, we detect all channels for which we need a channel bound. For this, we consider every transition with label $(q_1, p \triangleright q!m, q_2)$ and check if there is only a single transition from q_2 such that $(q_2, p \triangleright q!m, q_3)$. If not, the channel $\langle p, q \rangle$ needs to have a channel bound. We call these *detected* channels.

Second, we check if the channel bound can be upperbounded. For every detected channel $\langle p, q \rangle$, we consider every loop with a message from p to q and check the following. We check if there is a sequence of messages from q back to p (possibly involving other intermediary participants), i.e., does the loop have a subword of the form

$$q \triangleright r_1!m_1 \cdot r_1 \triangleleft q?m_1 \cdot r_1 \triangleright r_2!m_2 \cdot r_2 \triangleleft r_1?m_2 \dots r_n \triangleright p!m_n \cdot p \triangleleft r_n?m_n \text{ for } n \geq 0.$$

where subword is defined in the expected way.

Intuitively, the condition enforces that any message sent in one iteration from p to q needs to be received before a message from p to q will be sent in the next iteration of the loop. Hence, if satisfied, p will not be able to go ahead with loop

Fig. 12: Local projections for participant e for KLE variants.

executions without q receiving its messages. If this condition is violated for any detected channel, the PSM will not respect any channel bounds. This condition is inspired from bounded HMSCs [4, 63], where they require the communication topology of every loop to form a strongly connected component, yielding that all channels will always be bounded.

Third, we compute the channel bounds. In the second step, we ensured that loops will not add unmatched messages to the channels. Hence, we do not need to account for loops in the computation of channel bounds. We consider every loop-free path from the initial state. For every detected channel, we compute the number of messages in the channel and the maximum over all loop-free paths yields the channel bound. We shall not restrict ourselves to paths ending in final states as we also consider infinite executions and there might be loop-free paths for which no extension to a final state exists.

B.2 Projection Synthesis and Projectability for a Class of PSMs

Li et al. [57] propose a sound and complete algorithm to generate projections of global types from MSTs. Transferred to our setting, this amounts to sink-final sender-driven Σ 1-PSMs. We propose an encoding that encodes PSMs as Σ 1-PSMs. This encoding preserves choice restrictions and is sink-final if and only if the original PSM is.

With Example 4.4, we gave intuition about the channel participant encoding for the KLE example. Fig. 12 provides the respective projection and decoded FSM for e .

We also hinted at the fact that only having one channel participant per channel can be unsound. The following example shows this.

Example B.1. Consider the word $p \triangleright q!m \cdot p \triangleright q!m \cdot q \triangleleft p?m \cdot q \triangleleft p?m$. For now, let us say that r acts as channel participant from p to q . Then, the encoded word would be $p \rightarrow r:m \cdot p \rightarrow r:m \cdot r \rightarrow q:m \cdot r \rightarrow q:m$. While the original version allows us to swap the 2nd and 3rd event: $p \triangleright q!m \cdot q \triangleleft p?m \cdot p \triangleright q!m \cdot q \triangleleft p?m$, this is not possible for the encoded word as r induces an ordering between them. Intuitively, this means that our encoding would not consider certain scenarios, possibly leading to unsoundness.

To avoid this, intuitively, we would want to introduce a new channel participant for every message. However, we only know how to check projectability

for a finite number of participants. Thus, we introduce the notion of *channel bounds* that allows us to restrict the number of channel participants. Intuitively, they restrict the number of messages in flight in a channel. This allows re-use of the channel participants for later messages. Obviously, if we imposed this on every channel, we would end up with finite state systems. Thus, we distinguish between channels for which we need channel participants and for which we do not need them: channel $\langle p, q \rangle$ does not need a channel bound if all its actions of shape $p \triangleright q!m$ are immediately followed by actions of shape $q \triangleleft p?m$.

We now formalise our encoding and prove it correct.

Formally, we introduce channel alphabets to define channel bounds.

Definition B.2 (Channel alphabets). *For readability, we define the alphabet of a channel $\langle p, q \rangle \in \mathbf{Chan}$: $\Gamma_{\langle p, q \rangle} := \Gamma_{\langle p, q \rangle, !} \uplus \Gamma_{\langle p, q \rangle, ?}$ where $\Gamma_{\langle p, q \rangle, !} := \{p \triangleright q!m \mid m \in \mathcal{V}\}$ and $\Gamma_{\langle p, q \rangle, ?} := \{q \triangleleft p?m \mid m \in \mathcal{V}\}$.*

Note that we already used these alphabets to define channel bounds in the main text but did not use a special symbol for them. Here, we also need to know when a word satisfies channel bounds.

Definition B.3 (More on channel bounds). *We say a word $w \subseteq \Gamma^\infty$ respects the channel bounds β if for every channel $\langle p, q \rangle \in \mathbf{Chan}$, the following holds: if $\beta(\langle p, q \rangle)$ is defined, then $w \downarrow_{\Gamma_{\langle p, q \rangle}}$ is $\beta(\langle p, q \rangle)$ -bounded.*

Proposition B.4. *If a PSM M respects channel bounds β , then every word in its semantics does.*

Remark B.5 (Notation). Intuitively, if a PSM respects channel bounds β , for channels that are not in the domain of β , the reception of a message is specified right after it was sent. We may call such events *paired* and will abuse notation: we assume transitions of PSMs are labelled with Σ if and only if the respective channel has an undefined channel bound in β .

Given a channel bound for a channel, we know the number of messages in this channel will never exceed this bound. Intuitively, we can therefore treat this channel as a ring buffer with a producer, i.e. the sender, and a consumer, i.e. the receiver. For both, we will keep track which is the next position to send to or to receive from. To this end, we use the additive group of integers modulo $\beta(\langle p, q \rangle)$ for every channel $\langle p, q \rangle$: $(\mathbb{Z}_{\beta(\langle p, q \rangle)}, +)$. It is common to write $5 \equiv 2 \pmod{\beta(\langle p, q \rangle)}$ for $\beta(\langle p, q \rangle) = 3$. In our setting, $\beta(\langle p, q \rangle)$ will always be clear from context. Therefore, we will omit it.

Definition B.6 (Channel participants). *Given channel bounds β , we define a set of channel participants for the channels in the domain of β :*

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{Ch}} := \bigcup_{0 \leq i < \beta(\langle p, q \rangle)} \{(p, q)_i\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}_{w\text{Ch}} := \mathcal{P} \uplus \mathcal{P}_{\text{Ch}}$$

to obtain the new set with both the original participants and the channel participants. The set of events Γ^{wCh} for \mathcal{P}_{wCh} is defined as follows:

$$\Gamma^{\text{wCh}} := \{ \mathbf{p} \triangleright (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i ! m, (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleleft \mathbf{p} ? m, (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleright \mathbf{q} ! m, \mathbf{q} \triangleleft (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i ? m \mid \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{P}, (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Ch}} \text{ and } m \in \mathcal{V} \},$$

Again, we define syntactic sugar for paired send and receive events:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p} \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i : m &:= \mathbf{p} \triangleright (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i ! m \cdot (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleleft \mathbf{p} ? m \quad \text{and} \\ (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \rightarrow \mathbf{q} : m &:= (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleright \mathbf{q} ! m \cdot \mathbf{q} \triangleleft (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i ? m \end{aligned}$$

for $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{P}$, $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Ch}}$ and $m \in \mathcal{V}$. The set of these is denoted by Σ^{wCh} . Note that, in Γ^{wCh} , participants do only send to and receive from the respective channel participants. Consequently, the alphabet for channel participants is $\Gamma_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}^{\text{wCh}} := \{ (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleright \mathbf{q} ! m, (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleleft \mathbf{p} ? m \mid m \in \mathcal{V} \}$ while the alphabet for $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$ is

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}^{\text{wCh}} := \{ \mathbf{p} \triangleright (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i ! m, \mathbf{p} \triangleleft (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})_j ? m \mid m \in \mathcal{V}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{P}, 0 \leq i < \beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle), \text{ and } 0 \leq j < \beta(\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle) \}.$$

Definition B.7 (Channel-ordered). We say a word w over Σ^{wCh} is channel-ordered if, for every channel $\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \in \text{Chan}$, the following holds:

- Let $w'_0 w'_1 \dots := w \Downarrow_{\mathbf{p} \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i : _} _$. It holds that $w'_i = \mathbf{p} \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_j : _$ for $j \equiv i$ for all i .
- Let $w'_0 w'_1 \dots := w \Downarrow_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \rightarrow \mathbf{q} : _} _$. It holds that $w'_i = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_j \rightarrow \mathbf{q} : _$ for $j \equiv i$ for all i .

We say that a word w over Γ^{wCh} is channel-ordered if there is channel-ordered word $w' \in (\Sigma^{\text{wCh}})^\infty$ such that $w' \sim w$.

For participant \mathbf{p} , we say a word w over $\Sigma_{\mathbf{p}}^{\text{wCh}}$ is channel-ordered if, for every channel $\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \in \text{Chan}$, the following holds:

- Let $w'_0 w'_1 \dots := w \Downarrow_{\mathbf{p} \triangleright (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i ! _} _$. It holds that $w'_i = \mathbf{p} \triangleright (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_j ! _$ for $j \equiv i$ for all i .
- Let $w'_0 w'_1 \dots := w \Downarrow_{\mathbf{q} \triangleleft (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i ? _} _$. It holds that $w'_i = \mathbf{q} \triangleleft (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_j ? _$ for $j \equiv i$ for all i .

Equipped with these definitions, we can define the channel participant encoding for a PSM that respects channel bounds, for which we briefly give an intuition.

We introduce channel participants $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i$ for every channel $\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$, concretely $\beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$ of them. From a PSM M , we obtain an encoded PSM $\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$ by substituting every send and receive event by the respective (paired) event involving the channel participants, e.g. we change $\mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q} ! m$ into $\mathbf{p} \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i : m$ if it is the i^{th} send event. Provided that we can obtain a projection $\{ \{ A_{\mathbf{p}} \} \}_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Ch}}}$ of $\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$, we can compute a CSM by rebending the messages to and from channel participants, yielding the decoding function $\text{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_{\mathbf{p}})$ for every \mathbf{p} . Note that, in such an encoded PSM, a participant \mathbf{p} only communicates with channel participants, i.e. all its communications are of form $\mathbf{p} \triangleright (\mathbf{p}, _)_i ! _$ or $\mathbf{p} \triangleleft (_, \mathbf{p})_i ? _$. For channel participants, it is even more restricted: a channel participant $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i$ solely receives from \mathbf{p} and sends to \mathbf{q} .

Definition B.8 (Channel-participant Encoding). *The channel-participant encoding for a PSM M that respects channel bounds β is a 6-tuple*

$$\left(\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}, \text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}, \text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}, \text{enc}_{\text{FSM}}, \text{dec}_{\text{FSM}}, A_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})} \text{ for } (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Ch}} \right)$$

with the following definitions:

- enc_{PSM} turns a PSM into a $\Sigma 1$ -PSM:

$$\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}((Q, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, F)) := (Q', \Sigma^{\text{wCh}}, \delta', q'_0, F') \quad \text{where}$$

- $Q' := Q \times (\{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)}\}_{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)})^2$,
- $q'_0 := (q_0, (\{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \mapsto 0\}_{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)})^2)$,
- $F' := F \times (\{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \mapsto 0\}_{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)})^2$,

and the transition relation δ' is defined as follows:

- $((q_1, \beta^1, \beta^2), x, (q_2, \beta^1, \beta^2)) \in \delta'$ if $x \in \Sigma$ and $(q_1, x, q_2) \in \delta$,
- $((q_1, \beta^1, \beta^2), \mathbf{p} \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_j : m, (q_2, \beta^1[\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \mapsto \beta^1(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle) + 1], \langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle, \beta^2)) \in \delta'$ if
 $(q_1, \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!m, q_2) \in \delta$ and $j = \beta^1(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$,
- $((q_1, \beta^1, \beta^2), (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})_j \rightarrow \mathbf{p} : m, (q_2, \beta^1, \beta^2[\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle \mapsto \beta^2(\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle) + 1])) \in \delta'$ if
 $(q_1, \mathbf{p} \triangleleft \mathbf{q}?m, q_2) \in \delta$ and $j = \beta^2(\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle)$.

- $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty} : \Gamma^\infty \rightarrow (\Sigma^{\text{wCh}})^\infty$:

$$\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_1 w_2 \dots) := \text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_1) \cdot \text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_2) \dots \quad \text{where}$$

$$\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{p} \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_j : m & \text{if } w_i = \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!m \text{ and } j \equiv |(w_1 \dots w_{i-1}) \Downarrow_{\mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!}_-| \\ (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_j \rightarrow \mathbf{p} : m & \text{if } w_i = \mathbf{q} \triangleleft \mathbf{p}?m \text{ and } j \equiv |(w_1 \dots w_{i-1}) \Downarrow_{\mathbf{q} \triangleleft \mathbf{p}?}_-| \\ w_i & \text{if } (w_i = \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!m \text{ or } w_i = \mathbf{q} \triangleleft \mathbf{p}?m) \\ & \text{and } \beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle) \text{ is undefined} \end{cases}.$$

- $\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty} : (\Sigma^{\text{wCh}})^\infty \rightarrow \Gamma^\infty$:

$$\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_1 w_2 \dots) := \text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_1) \cdot \text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_2) \dots \quad \text{where}$$

$$\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(x) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!m & \text{if } x = \mathbf{p} \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i : m \\ \mathbf{q} \triangleleft \mathbf{p}?m & \text{if } x = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \rightarrow \mathbf{p} : m \end{cases}.$$

- enc_{FSM} that turns an FSM over $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}$ to an FSM over $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}^{\text{wCh}}$:

$$\text{enc}_{\text{FSM}}((Q, \Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}, \delta, q_0, F)) := (Q', \Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}^{\text{wCh}}, \delta', q'_0, F') \quad \text{where}$$

- $Q' := Q \times \{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)}\}_{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)} \times \{\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\beta(\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle)}\}_{\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)}$,
- $q'_0 := (q_0, \{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \mapsto 0\}_{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)}, \{\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle \mapsto 0\}_{\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)})$,
- $F' := F \times (\{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \mapsto 0\}_{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)} \times \{\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle \mapsto 0\}_{\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)})$,

and the transition relation δ' is defined as follows:

- $((q_1, \beta^1, \beta^2), \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!m, (q_2, \beta^1, \beta^2)) \in \delta'$ if $(q_1, \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!m, q_2) \in \delta$ and $\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$,

- $((q_1, \beta^1, \beta^2), \mathbf{p} \triangleleft \mathbf{q}^? m, (q_2, \beta^1, \beta^2)) \in \delta'$ if $(q_1, \mathbf{p} \triangleleft \mathbf{q}^? m, q_2) \in \delta$ and $\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$,
 - $((q_1, \beta^1, \beta^2), \mathbf{p} \triangleright (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_j ! m, (q_2, \beta^1[\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle \mapsto \beta^1(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle) + 1], \beta^2)) \in \delta'$ if $(q_1, \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q} ! m, q_2) \in \delta$ and $j = \beta^1(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$, and
 - $((q_1, \beta^1, \beta^2), \mathbf{p} \triangleleft (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})_j ? m, (q_2, \beta^1, \beta^2[\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle \mapsto \beta^2(\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle) + 1],)) \in \delta'$ if $(q_1, \mathbf{p} \triangleleft \mathbf{q} ? m, q_2) \in \delta$ and $j = \beta^2(\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \rangle)$.
- dec_{FSM} that turns an FSM over $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}^{\text{wCh}}$ to an FSM over $\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}$:

$$\text{dec}_{\text{FSM}}((Q, \Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}^{\text{wCh}}, \delta, q_0, F)) := (Q, \Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}, \delta', q_0, F) \quad \text{where}$$

$$(q_1, h(x), q_2) \in \delta' \text{ if } (q_1, x, q_2) \in \delta \text{ with } h(x) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q} ! m & \text{if } x = \mathbf{p} \triangleright (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i ! m \\ \mathbf{p} \triangleleft \mathbf{q} ? m & \text{if } x = \mathbf{p} \triangleleft (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})_i ? m \end{cases} .$$

- $A_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i} := ((q_{0,f} \uplus \bigcup_{m \in \mathcal{V}} q_m), \Gamma_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})}, \delta, q_{0,f}, \{q_{0,f}\})$ where $(q_{0,f}, (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleleft \mathbf{p} ? m, q_m) \in \delta$ and $(q_m, (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleright \mathbf{q} ! m, q_{0,f}) \in \delta$ for every $m \in \mathcal{V}$.

Eventually, we want to prove the following: first, if the encoded PSM is projectable, then the original PSM is; second, if the original PSM is projectable, then the encoded PSM is projectable. In particular, we will show that the respective projections can be constructed. The second condition is important to obtain completeness.

What follows is a sequence of lemmas that establishes properties of the channel-participant encoding, ultimately leading to the desired result.

From now on, we fix a PSM M , channel bounds β and a corresponding channel-participant encoding

$$(\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}, \text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}, \text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}, \text{enc}_{\text{FSM}}, \text{dec}_{\text{FSM}}, A_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})} \text{ for } (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Ch}}) .$$

For readability, we assume that $\text{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(A_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}) = A_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}$.

In addition, without loss of generality, we assume that for every CSM, it holds that the FSM for every participant is deterministic. This is possible as, if there is a CSM (which is what we will need to show for projectability), each FSM that can be determinised individually. Observe that $\text{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(-)$ and $\text{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(-)$ preserve determinism.

The following lemma characterises the property that would not hold if we only introduced one channel participant per channel (cf. Example B.1).

Lemma B.9. *Let $w, u \in \Gamma^\infty$ be two FIFO-compliant words that respect β for which $w \sim u$ holds. For every $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Ch}}$, it holds that*

$$\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}^{\text{wCh}}} = \text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u) \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}^{\text{wCh}}} .$$

Proof. We define a function that, for an offset j , keeps every k^{th} send and every k^{th} receive event. Let $v := v_1 \dots \in \Gamma^\infty$.

$$h(v, j, k) := h'(\varepsilon, v_1, j, k) \cdot h'(v_1, v_2, j, k) \cdot \dots \cdot h'(v_1 \dots v_{i-1}, v_i, j, k) \cdot \dots$$

$$\text{where } h'(v', v_i, j, k) := \begin{cases} v_i & \text{if } v_i = \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!m \text{ and } j \equiv |v' \Downarrow_{\mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!}_-| \bmod k \\ v_i & \text{if } v_i = \mathbf{q} \triangleleft \mathbf{p}?m \text{ and } j \equiv |v' \Downarrow_{\mathbf{q} \triangleleft \mathbf{p}?}_-| \bmod k \\ \varepsilon & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

Claim 1: Let v be a FIFO-compliant word that respects β . For all channels $\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle$ and every $0 \leq j < \beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$, it holds that

$$h(v, j, \beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)) \in \{x \cdot y \mid x \in \Gamma_{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle, !} \text{ and } y \in \Gamma_{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle, ?}\}^\infty .$$

Proof of Claim 1: Towards a contradiction, assume that $h(v, j, \beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)) \notin \{x \cdot y \mid x = \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!_- \wedge y = \mathbf{q} \triangleleft \mathbf{p}?_-\}^\infty$ for some j . We know that v is FIFO-compliant. Thus, two send events occur next to each other: $h(v, j, \beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)) = \dots \cdot \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!_- \cdot \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!_- \cdot \dots$. We situate the above pattern in v :

$$v' \cdot \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!_- \cdot v'' \cdot \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!_- \cdot v''' .$$

By construction, $h(v, j, \beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle))$ only collects every k^{th} send and every k^{th} receive event. Thus, v'' contains $\beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle) - 1$ send events $\mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!_-$. Notably, it can also contain receive events of shape $\mathbf{q} \triangleleft \mathbf{p}?_-$. However, these will all match send events in v' because the matching receive event for the first $\mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!_-$ from above is also in $h(v, j, \beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle))$ and thus can only appear in v''' . In other words, v'' is empty for $h(v, j, \beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle))$. Thus, $v' \cdot \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!_- \cdot v'' \cdot \mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!_-$ contains at least $\beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle) + 1$ unmatched send events so v does not respect β , yielding a contradiction.

End Proof of Claim 1.

Claim 2: For every channel $\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle$ and $0 \leq j < \beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$, it holds that $h(w, j, k) = h(u, j, k)$.

Proof of Claim 2: Towards a contradiction, suppose that $h(w, j, k) \neq h(u, j, k)$. By Claim 1, we know that both $h(u, j, k)$ and $h(w, j, k)$ alternate between send and receive events. We consider the first difference and do a case analysis if it is a send or receive event. First, suppose that they differ on a receive event. Then, the received message is different from the message that was sent, contradicting FIFO-compliance for at least one of u or w . Second, suppose that they differ on a send event. Let us establish an intermediate fact that we contradict later. From $w \sim u$ and [60, Lm. 23], we know that $w \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}} = u \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}}$. It is straightforward that this implies that $w \Downarrow_{\mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!_-} = u \Downarrow_{\mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!_-}$ and, thus, also that every $\beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$ -th occurrence on both sides are the same (for every offset). However, the fact that $h(w, j, k)$ and $h(u, j, k)$ differ on some send contradicts this observation, yielding a contradiction.

End Proof of Claim 2.

We now show that Claim 2 implies $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle}_i}^{\text{wCh}} = \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u) \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle}_i}^{\text{wCh}}$ for every $\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle_i \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Ch}}$, which is the goal of this lemma. By construction of $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(-)$, we know that $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(v) \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle}_i}$ is built from v in the following way: starting with the i -th occurrence, every $\beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$ -th instance of a send event $\mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!_-$ turns into $\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle_i \triangleleft \mathbf{p}?_-$ and every $\beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$ -th instance of a receive event $\mathbf{q} \triangleleft \mathbf{p}?_-$

turns into $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleright \mathbf{q}! _$. The function $h(-, -, -)$ considers precisely this pattern to keep letters, i.e. keeping every $\beta((\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}))$ -th letter starting from any offset. Thus, Claim 2 implies our claim. \square

We continue by proving various properties about the channel participant encoding.

Lemma B.10. *The following properties hold:*

- (1) For every word $w \in \Gamma^\infty$, it holds that $\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)) = w$.
- (2) For every channel-ordered word $w \in (\Sigma^{\mathbf{wCh}})^\infty$, we have $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)) = w$.
- (3) Every word in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M))$ is channel-ordered.
- (4) Let $\{\{A_{\mathbf{p}}\}\}_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}}$ be a CSM. Then, for every \mathbf{p} , every word in $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(A_{\mathbf{p}}))$ is channel-ordered.
- (5) Let $w, u \in \Gamma^\infty$ be two FIFO-compliant words that respect β such that $w \sim u$. Then, it holds that $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \sim \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u)$.
- (6) Let $w, u \in (\Sigma^{\mathbf{wCh}})^\infty$ be two words such that $w \sim u$. Then, it holds that $\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \sim \mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u)$.
- (7) For every $w \in \Gamma^\infty$, it holds that $w \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ iff $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M))$.
- (8) For every channel-ordered word $w \in (\Sigma^{\mathbf{wCh}})^\infty$, it holds that $w \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M))$ iff $\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \in \mathcal{S}(M)$.

Proof. We consider every claim and use previously proven ones later:

- (1): Let $w := w_1 \cdot w_2 \dots$. Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)) \\
&= \mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_1 \cdot w_2 \dots)) \\
&= \mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_1) \cdot \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_2) \dots) \\
&= \mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_1)) \cdot \mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_2)) \dots \\
&= w_1 \cdot w_2 \dots
\end{aligned}$$

- (2): Let $w := w_1 \cdot w_2 \dots$ with $w_i \in \Sigma^{\mathbf{wCh}}$. Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)) \\
&= \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_1 \cdot w_2 \dots)) \\
&= \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_1) \cdot \mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_2) \dots) \\
&= \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_1)) \cdot \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_2)) \dots \\
&= w_1 \cdot w_2 \dots
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality hinges on the fact that w is channel-ordered as it makes sure that the indices for channel participants are introduced in the right way.

- (3): The construction of $\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(-)$ keeps track of which channel participants for each channel shall be used next, both for sending and receiving. The semantics allows reordering under \sim . Still, events from the same participant cannot be reordered beyond each other. Thus, all words are channel-ordered.

Note that the events of different channel participants might be reordered, e.g. , $(p, q)_{i+1} \triangleleft p?m_1 \cdot (p, q)_i \triangleleft p?m_2 \sim (p, q)_i \triangleleft p?m_2 \cdot (p, q)_{i+1} \triangleleft p?m_1$ but the matching send events by p will happen in the latter order.

- (4) Again, the property follows directly by construction, which keeps track of which channel participants to use next, both for sending and receiving.
- (5): With Lemma 23 from [60], we know that $u \sim w$ if and only if $u \Downarrow_{\Gamma_p} = w \Downarrow_{\Gamma_p}$ for every $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Again, because of [60, Lm. 23], it suffices to show that $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u) \Downarrow_{\Gamma_r} = \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \Downarrow_{\Gamma_r}$ for every $r \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}$. Let $r \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}$. We do a case analysis if $r \in \mathcal{P}$ or $r \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Ch}}$.

First, let $r \in \mathcal{P}$. By assumption, we know that $u \Downarrow_{\Gamma_r} = w \Downarrow_{\Gamma_r}$. Applying $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(-)$ on both sides yields $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u \Downarrow_{\Gamma_r}) = \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w \Downarrow_{\Gamma_r})$. By induction, it is straightforward to show that applying $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(-)$ first and then $(-)\Downarrow_{\Gamma_r}$ yields the same result, proving the claim. Intuitively, $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(-)$ requires the prefix of a word but it actually does only consider the part that is left after applying $(-)\Downarrow_{\Gamma_r}$ anyway.

Second, let $r = (p, q)_i \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Ch}}$. We need to show that $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u) \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{(p,q)_i}} = \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{(p,q)_i}}$, which follows from Lemma B.9.

- (6): With Lemma 23 from [60], it suffices to show that $\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u) \Downarrow_{\Gamma_r} = \mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \Downarrow_{\Gamma_r}$ for every $r \in \mathcal{P}$. It suffices to consider \mathcal{P} since those are the only participants that are left in $\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(-)$. Let $r \in \mathcal{P}$ be some participant. We show that $\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u) \Downarrow_{\Gamma_r} = \mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \Downarrow_{\Gamma_r}$. Again, from Lemma 23 from [60], we know that $u \Downarrow_{\Sigma_p^{\text{wCh}}} = w \Downarrow_{\Sigma_p^{\text{wCh}}}$ for every $p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}$. We instantiate this with r to obtain: $u \Downarrow_{\Sigma_r^{\text{wCh}}} = w \Downarrow_{\Sigma_r^{\text{wCh}}}$. We apply $\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(-)$ on both sides to obtain: $\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u \Downarrow_{\Sigma_r^{\text{wCh}}}) = \mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w \Downarrow_{\Sigma_r^{\text{wCh}}})$. By induction, it is straightforward to show that applying $\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(-)$ first and then $(-)\Downarrow_{\Gamma_r}$ yields the same result, proving the claim. Intuitively, we only keep events of r because of the projection and the decoding $\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(-)$ can also be applied to the whole word first (and vice versa).
- (7): For both directions, we use the following notation for the PSMs:

$$M = (Q, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, F) \text{ and}$$

$$\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M) = (Q \times (\{\langle p, q \rangle \mapsto [0, \beta(\langle p, q \rangle) - 1]\}_{\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)}\})^2, \Sigma^{\text{wCh}}, \delta', (q_0, \beta_0^1, \beta_0^2), F') .$$

The transition relation will be clear from context, so we use \rightarrow for both.

For the direction from left to right, we assume that $w' \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ and show that $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w') \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M))$. By definition, there is $w \sim w'$ such that $w \in \mathcal{L}(M)$. Thus, there is a run ρ in M with $\text{trace}(\rho) = w$.

We show that the run for w in M can be simulated in $\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$ for $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$. Let us assume there exists run $\rho := q_0 \xrightarrow{w_0} q_1 \xrightarrow{w_1} \dots$ for M for $w := w_0 \cdot w_1 \cdot \dots$. We claim the following: for every i with $q_i \xrightarrow{w_i} q_{i+1}$ and $(s_i, \beta_i^1, \beta_i^2)$ such that

- (a) $q_i = s_i$,
- (b) $\beta_i^1(\langle p, q \rangle) \equiv |(w_1 \dots w_{i-1}) \Downarrow_{p \triangleright q!}_-|$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$, and
- (c) $\beta_i^2(\langle p, q \rangle) \equiv |(w_1 \dots w_{i-1}) \Downarrow_{q \triangleleft p?}_-|$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$.

there is $(s_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1}^!, \beta_{i+1}^?)$ such that

- (a') $q_{i+1} = s_{i+1}$,
- (b') $\beta_{i+1}^!(\langle p, q \rangle) \equiv |(w_1 \dots w_i) \Downarrow_{p \triangleright q!} _ |$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (c') $\beta_{i+1}^?(\langle p, q \rangle) \equiv |(w_1 \dots w_i) \Downarrow_{q \triangleleft p?} _ |$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$, and
- (d') $(s_i, \beta_i^!, \beta_i^?) \xrightarrow{\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i)} (s_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1}^!, \beta_{i+1}^?)$.

For our simulation argument, we need one more ingredient: the two initial states, i.e. for $i = 0$, satisfy the above conditions. It is easy to check that this is the case. Then, the claim can be used to mimic the run in $\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$ for $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$.

Let us prove the claim. Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We assume that (a) to (c) hold and prove (a') to (d'). We choose $(s_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1}^!, \beta_{i+1}^?)$ such that (a') to (c') are satisfied, so it remains to prove that (d') holds. We do a simultaneous case analysis on the shape of w_i and whether the corresponding channel is in the domain β .

- $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$ and either $w_i = p \triangleright q!m$ or $w_i = q \triangleleft p?m$:
Since $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$, we have $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i) = w_i$ by definition as well as

$$\begin{aligned} |(w_1 \dots w_{i-1}) \Downarrow_{p \triangleright q!} _ | &\equiv |(w_1 \dots w_i) \Downarrow_{p \triangleright q!} _ | \text{ and} \\ |(w_1 \dots w_{i-1}) \Downarrow_{q \triangleleft p?} _ | &\equiv |(w_1 \dots w_i) \Downarrow_{q \triangleleft p?} _ | \end{aligned}$$

Again, since $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$, we also have that $\beta_i^! = \beta_{i+1}^!$ and $\beta_i^? = \beta_{i+1}^?$ by construction of $\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$. Thus, (d') is satisfied.

- $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$ and $w_i = p \triangleright q!m$:
By definition, $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i) = p \rightarrow (\langle p, q \rangle)_j : m$ for $j \equiv |(w_1 \dots w_{i-1}) \Downarrow_{p \triangleright q!} _ |$.
By construction, there is a transition labelled with $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i)$:

$$(s_i, \beta_i^!, \beta_i^?) \xrightarrow{\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i)} (s'_{i+1}, \widehat{\beta_{i+1}^!}, \widehat{\beta_{i+1}^?}) .$$

By construction, it is obvious that $s_{i+1} = s'_{i+1}$. Let us consider the changes for the channel bounds due to (b') and (c'). Since w_i is not a receive event, we have $\beta_{i+1}^? = \beta_i^?$. For every channel $\langle r, s \rangle$ different from $\langle p, q \rangle$, we also have $\beta_{i+1}^!(\langle r, s \rangle) = \beta_i^!(\langle r, s \rangle)$. For $\langle p, q \rangle$, it holds that $\beta_{i+1}^!(\langle p, q \rangle) \equiv \beta_i^!(\langle p, q \rangle) + 1$. This matches with the changes due to the semantics for $\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$. Thus, $\widehat{\beta_{i+1}^!} = \beta_{i+1}^!$ and $\widehat{\beta_{i+1}^?} = \beta_{i+1}^?$, which shows that (d') is satisfied.

- $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$ and $w_i = q \triangleleft p?m$:
This case is analogous to the previous one and, thus, omitted.

This shows that there is a run in $\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$ for $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$. With $w' \sim w$ and (5), we have that $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w') \sim \text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$. Together, it follows that $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w') \in \mathcal{S}(\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M))$, which concludes this direction.

For the direction from right to left, we claim it suffices to show that, for all $u' \in (\Sigma^{\text{wCh}})^\infty$, it holds that, if $u' \in \mathcal{S}(\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M))$, then $\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u') \in \mathcal{S}(M)$. Let us first explain why this claim is sufficient: we instantiate $u' = \text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$, which gives that if $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \in \mathcal{S}(\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M))$, then $\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)) \in$

$\mathcal{S}(M)$. By (1), we have that $\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)) = w$, proving the claim.

Let us now prove this claim. We assume that $u' \in \mathcal{S}(\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M))$ and show that $\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u') \in \mathcal{S}(M)$.

By definition, there is $u \sim u'$ such that $u \in \mathcal{L}(\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M))$. Thus, there is a run ρ in $\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$ with $\text{trace}(\rho) = u$. We claim that there is a run ρ' in M with $\text{trace}(\rho') = \text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u)$. As for the other direction, we prove a simulation-like argument for which both initial states are trivially related. Let us assume there exists run $\rho := (s_0, \beta_0^1, \beta_0^2) \xrightarrow{u_0} (s_1, \beta_1^1, \beta_1^2) \xrightarrow{u_1} \dots$ in M for $u := u_0 \cdot u_1 \cdot \dots$. We claim the following: for every i with $(s_i, \beta_i^1, \beta_i^2) \xrightarrow{u_i} (s_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1}^1, \beta_{i+1}^2)$, it holds that $s_i \xrightarrow{\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u_i)} s_{i+1}$. Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By construction of $\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$, there is $s_i \xrightarrow{x} s_{i+1}$ such that $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(x) = u_i$. We apply $\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(-)$ on both sides and obtain $\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(x)) = \text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u_i)$. By (1), it get $x = \text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u_i)$, which proves the claim. Together, this shows that there is a run with trace $\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u)$ in M .

With $u \sim u'$ and (6) we have that $\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u) \sim \text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u')$. Thus, we have $\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u) \in \mathcal{S}(M)$, which concludes this proof.

- (8): The direction from left to right was proven as part of the proof for (7). The direction from right to left follows from (7) if one instantiates $w = \text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$: if $\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ then $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)) \in \mathcal{S}(\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M))$; with (2), we obtain that $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\text{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)) = w$, proving the claim.

This concludes all proofs. \square

Lemma B.11. *Let $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ be a CSM. Then, for every $w \in \Gamma^\infty$ that respects β , it holds that $w \in \mathcal{L}(\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}})$ iff $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \in \mathcal{L}(\{\{\text{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{ch}}})$.*

Proof. We show that the run for w in $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ can be simulated for $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$ in $\{\{\text{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{ch}}}$, and vice versa.

Prior, we establish some notation that will be used for both cases.

Let $w := w_0 \cdot w_1 \dots$ and ρ be the run in $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ for w : $(\vec{q}_0, \xi_0) \xrightarrow{w_0} (\vec{q}_1, \xi_1) \xrightarrow{w_1} \dots$. For $\{\{\text{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{ch}}}$, we split the states of participants as follows: for participants from \mathcal{P} , we have \vec{s}_i as well as $\vec{\beta}_i^1$ and $\vec{\beta}_i^2$ for the respective channel bounds; for participants from \mathcal{P}_{ch} , we have \vec{t}_i . Then, let ρ' be the run in $\{\{\text{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{ch}}}$ for $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$:

$$(\vec{s}_0, \vec{\beta}_0^1, \vec{\beta}_0^2, \vec{t}_0, \xi_0) \xrightarrow{\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_0)} (\vec{s}_1, \vec{\beta}_1^1, \vec{\beta}_1^2, \vec{t}_1, \xi_1) \xrightarrow{\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_1)} \dots$$

Intuitively, the channel participants store the channel content while the actual channels are empty. More precisely, We introduce notation for this. Intuitively, $\xi(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$ contains what is stored in states $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i$ for i between from $\beta^2(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$ to $\beta^1(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$ (excl.) and all the other channel participants, i.e. $\beta^1(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$ to $\beta^2(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$ (excl.) are in their initial state; where we consider the indices for channel participants to form a ring buffer, e.g. , 5 to 2 (excl.) gives the sequence 5, 6, 0, 1 if the channel bound is 7.

Formally, we define $\text{cont}(\vec{t}, \vec{\beta}^1, \vec{\beta}^2, \langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle) := w_i \dots w_j$ for the states \vec{t} of channel participants if the following holds:

- $j = \vec{\beta}_p^1(\langle p, q \rangle)$,
- $i = \vec{\beta}_q^2(\langle p, q \rangle)$,
- for every $i \leq k < j$, it holds that $\vec{t}_{(p,q)_k} = q_m$ and $w_k = m$, and
- for every $j \leq k < i$, it holds that $\vec{t}_{(p,q)_k} = q_{0,f}$.

First, let us assume there exists run ρ for $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ for $w = w_0 \cdot w_1 \cdot \dots$. We claim the following: for every i with $(\vec{q}_i, \xi_i) \xrightarrow{w_i} (\vec{q}_{i+1}, \xi_{i+1})$ and $(\vec{s}_i, \vec{\beta}_i^1, \vec{\beta}_i^2, \vec{t}_i, \xi'_i)$ such that

- (a) $\vec{q}_i = \vec{s}_i$,
- (b) $\xi'_i(\langle p, q \rangle) = \xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (c) $\xi'_i(\langle p, q \rangle) = \varepsilon$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (d) $\xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle) = \text{cont}(\vec{t}_i, \vec{\beta}_i^1, \vec{\beta}_i^2, \langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$,

there is $(\vec{s}_{i+1}, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^2, \vec{t}_{i+1}, \xi'_{i+1})$ such that

- (a') $\vec{q}_{i+1} = \vec{s}_{i+1}$,
- (b') $\xi'_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle) = \xi_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (c') $\xi'_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle) = \varepsilon$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (d') $\xi_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle) = \text{cont}(\vec{t}_{i+1}, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^2, \langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$, and
- (e') $(\vec{s}_i, \vec{\beta}_i^1, \vec{\beta}_i^2, \vec{t}_i, \xi'_i) \xrightarrow{\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i)} 2 (\vec{s}_{i+1}, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^2, \vec{t}_{i+1}, \xi'_{i+1})$.

With the above claim, we need one more ingredient to show that the run for w can be mimicked with one for $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$: we need to relate the initial states. Concretely, we show that (a) to (d) hold for $i = 0$. In fact, all of these conditions are trivial: initially, all participants are in their initial state and all channels are empty.

Having related the initial states, it is straightforward that the above claim can be used to mimic the run for w in $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ in $\{\{\text{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{ch}}}\}$, having trace $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$. Intuitively, we start with the initial states and, for every w_i , we apply the above claim to obtain the mimicked run.

It remains to prove the above claim. Let i be some number. We assume that (a) to (d) hold. We show that (a') to (e') hold. We use (e') to obtain the witness $(\vec{s}_{i+1}, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^2, \vec{t}_{i+1}, \xi'_{i+1})$. We will still need to show that this transition is possible. We do a simultaneous case analysis whether w_i is a send or receive transition and whether the corresponding channel is in the domain of β .

- $w_i = p \triangleright q!m$ and $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$:
Because of $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$, we have that $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i) = w_i$. From (a), we know that \vec{q}_i and \vec{s}_i agree on the state for p , which is the active participant for w_i . Therefore, the send transition for (e') is possible. All claims (a') to (d') trivially follow by the semantics of CSMs and the fact that channel participants are not involved for transitions for which the corresponding channel is not in the domain of β .
- $w_i = q \triangleleft p?m$ and $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$:
From (a), we know that \vec{q}_i and \vec{s}_i agree on the state for q , which is the active participant for w_i . In addition, we know that the channel content for $\langle p, q \rangle$ are the same in ξ_i and ξ'_i from (b). Therefore, the receive transition for (e')

is possible. Again, the remaining claims (a’) to (d’) trivially follow by the semantics of CSMs and the fact that channel participants are not involved for transitions for which the corresponding channel is not in the domain of β .

- $w_i = p \triangleright q!m$ and $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$:

We have that $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i) = p \rightarrow (\langle p, q \rangle)_j : m$ where $j \equiv |(w_1 \dots w_{i-1}) \Downarrow_{p \triangleright q!} |$ by construction. We first argue that the transition in (e’) is possible. In fact, it contains two transitions: one send for p and one receive for $(\langle p, q \rangle)_j$. Because of (a), the states for p in \vec{q}_i and \vec{s}_i agree and, thus, the transition is possible. After this transition, message m is in the channel from p to $(\langle p, q \rangle)_i$ and, by (c), this is the only message. From (d), we also know that this channel participant is in its initial state in \vec{t}_{i+1} . Thus, it can receive m by construction, with which it updates its state to q_m . Therefore, this channel is empty again and, thus, (c’) holds. After the first send transition, p is in the same state and thus (a’) is satisfied by determinism. None of the other participants change their state and thus (b’) is (still) satisfied. There are only changes related $\langle p, q \rangle$. Thus, we only need to consider these changes for (d’).

By the semantics of CSMs, we have $\xi_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle) = \xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle) \cdot m$. We also have $(\vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1)_r = (\vec{\beta}_i^1)_r$ for all r .

Thus, it remains to show $\xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle) \cdot m = \text{cont}(\vec{t}_{i+1}, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1, \vec{\beta}_i^2, \langle p, q \rangle)$.

From $\text{cont}(\vec{t}_i, \vec{\beta}_i^1, \vec{\beta}_i^2, \langle p, q \rangle)$ to $\text{cont}(\vec{t}_{i+1}, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1, \vec{\beta}_i^2, \langle p, q \rangle)$, there are only the following changes: the state change of $(\langle p, q \rangle)_j$ in \vec{t}_{i+1} and the increase of $(\vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1)_p(\langle p, q \rangle) = (\vec{\beta}_i^1)_p(\langle p, q \rangle) + 1$, while $(\vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1)_r = (\vec{\beta}_i^1)_r$ for all $r \neq p$. It is easy to show that these add precisely m to $\text{cont}(\vec{t}_{i+1}, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1, \vec{\beta}_i^2, \langle p, q \rangle)$ to $\text{cont}(\vec{t}_i, \vec{\beta}_i^1, \vec{\beta}_i^2, \langle p, q \rangle)$ which proves the claim.

- $w_i = q \triangleleft p?m$ and $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$:

We have that $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i) = (\langle p, q \rangle)_j \rightarrow q : m$ where $j \equiv |(w_1 \dots w_{i-1}) \Downarrow_{q \triangleleft p?} |$ by construction. We first argue that the transition in (e’) is possible. In fact, it contains two transitions: one send for $(\langle p, q \rangle)_j$ and one receive for q . Regarding the second transition: because of (a), the states for p in \vec{q}_i and \vec{s}_i agree and, thus, the transition is possible. Regarding the first transition: since the previous transition is possible in $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$, we know that m is at the head of the channel $\xi(\langle p, q \rangle)$; from (d), we know that the state of $(\langle p, q \rangle)_j$ is q_m in \vec{t}_i , making the first transition possible and putting it back to its initial state. As for the other cases, it is straightforward that (a’) to (c’) are satisfied after these transitions.

It remains to show (d’). There are only changes related $\langle p, q \rangle$. Thus, we only need to consider these changes.

By the semantics of CSMs, we have $\xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle) = m \cdot \xi_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle)$. We also have $(\vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1)_r = (\vec{\beta}_i^1)_r$ for all r .

The only changes from $\text{cont}(\vec{t}_i, \vec{\beta}_i^1, \vec{\beta}_i^2, \langle p, q \rangle)$ to $\text{cont}(\vec{t}_{i+1}, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^2, \langle p, q \rangle)$ are: the state change of $(\langle p, q \rangle)_j$ in \vec{t}_{i+1} and the increase of $(\vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1)_p(\langle p, q \rangle) =$

$(\vec{\beta}_i^r)_p(\langle p, q \rangle) + 1$, while $(\vec{\beta}_{i+1}^r)_r = (\vec{\beta}_i^r)_r$ for all $r \neq p$. It is easy to show that these remove precisely m , which proves the claim.

This concludes the proof for this direction.

Second, let us assume there exists run ρ for $\{\{\text{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{wCh}}}\}$ for $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$. We claim the following: for every i with

$$(\vec{s}_i, \vec{\beta}_i^1, \vec{\beta}_i^2, \vec{t}_i, \xi_i') \xrightarrow{\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i)^2} (\vec{s}_{i+1}, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^2, \vec{t}_{i+1}, \xi_{i+1}')$$

and (\vec{q}_i, ξ_i) such that

- (a) $\vec{q}_i = \vec{s}_i$,
- (b) $\xi_i'(\langle p, q \rangle) = \xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (c) $\xi_i'(\langle p, q \rangle) = \varepsilon$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (d) $\xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle) = \text{cont}(\vec{t}_i, \vec{\beta}_i^1, \vec{\beta}_i^2, \langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$,

there is $(\vec{q}_{i+1}, \xi_{i+1})$ such that

- (a') $\vec{q}_{i+1} = \vec{s}_{i+1}$,
- (b') $\xi_{i+1}'(\langle p, q \rangle) = \xi_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (c') $\xi_{i+1}'(\langle p, q \rangle) = \varepsilon$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (d') $\xi_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle) = \text{cont}(\vec{t}_{i+1}, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^1, \vec{\beta}_{i+1}^2, \langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$, and
- (e') $(\vec{q}_i, \xi_i) \xrightarrow{w_i} (\vec{q}_{i+1}, \xi_{i+1})$.

As before, we need one more ingredient to show that one run simulates the other: the conditions hold for the initial states, i.e. $i = 0$. Again, this is trivially true. In fact, one can also prove the above claim analogously so we omit the full proof.

We want the channel participants only to faithfully forward messages. To formalise this, we define the notions of *forwarding* and *almost forwarding*.

Definition B.12 (Forwarding and almost forwarding). *A word $w = w_1 \dots \in (\Gamma_{(p,q)_i})^\infty$ if forwarding is for every odd j , it holds that $w_j = (p, q)_i \triangleleft p?m$ and $w_{j+1} = (p, q)_i \triangleright q!m$. If $w = w_1 \dots w_n$ is finite, it is almost forwarding if $w_1 \dots w_{n-1}$ is forwarding and $w_n = (p, q)_i \triangleleft p?m$. A language $L \subseteq (\Gamma_{(p,q)_i})^\infty$ is forwarding if for every word is. We say that an FSM A over alphabet $\Gamma_{(p,q)_i}$ is forwarding if its language $\mathcal{L}(A)$ is forwarding.*

Intuitively, for finite words, we only want forwarding words. For infinite words, though, it can happen that some send events will never be matched. Because of the channel bounds, this, however, cannot happen indefinitely, which is why we use the notion of almost forwarding for infinite words whose projection onto channel participants will be finite.

Lemma B.13. *Let M be a PSM that respects channel bounds β and $(p, q)_i$ be a channel participant. Then, the following holds for every $u \in \mathcal{S}(\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M))$:*

- If u is finite, then $w = u \downarrow_{\Gamma_{(p,q)_i}^{\text{wCh}}}$ is forwarding.
- If u is infinite, then $w = u \downarrow_{\Gamma_{(p,q)_i}^{\text{wCh}}}$ is almost forwarding or forwarding.

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{S}(\text{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M))$ be a word. We do a case distinction if u is finite or infinite.

Suppose u is finite. Then, we have to show that $w = u \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}^{\text{wCh}}}$ is forwarding. By assumption, we know that w respects β . We show that w is forwarding with reasoning from Lemma B.9. From Claim 1 in Lemma B.9, we know the following: for every $0 \leq j < \beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$, it holds that

$$h(w, j, \beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)) \in \{x \cdot y \mid x \in \Gamma_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i} \text{ and } y \in \Gamma_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}^{\text{?}}\}^* .$$

Later in that lemma, we have drawn the connection between $h(w, j, \beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle))$ and $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}^{\text{wCh}}}$. In particular, they consider the same pattern to keep letters: starting from the j -th occurrence, it turns every $\beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$ -th instance of a send event $\mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}! _$ turns into $\mathbf{p} \triangleright (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i! _$ and every $\beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$ -th instance of a receive event $\mathbf{q} \triangleleft \mathbf{p}? _$ turns into $\mathbf{q} \triangleleft (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i? _$. By construction and the fact that w is FIFO-compliant, we also know that these occurrences match, i.e. they carry the same message. Together, it follows that

$$w \in \{x \cdot y \mid x = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleleft \mathbf{p}?m \text{ and } y = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleright \mathbf{q}!m \text{ for some } m \in \mathcal{V}\}^* .$$

With this, it is obvious that w is forwarding.

Suppose that u is infinite. In this case, the same reasoning almost applies. The only difference is that it is possible that some send events are unmatched. However, because u respects β , we know that there can be at most $\beta(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle)$ such unmatched send events. Thus, for $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i$, there can be at most one unmatched send event. This is precisely the difference between almost forwarding and forwarding. \square

It will not be sufficient to only check that an implementation is (almost) forwarding. What is important is that the channel participant can react to all possible messages properly (and forwards them). We call this *amicable*.

Definition B.14 (Amicable). Let $A_{\mathbf{p}}$ be an FSM over $\Sigma_{\mathbf{p}}^{\text{wCh}}$, $A_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}$ be an FSM over $\Sigma_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}^{\text{wCh}}$, and B be the channel bound for $\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle$. We say that $A_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}$ is amicable with $A_{\mathbf{p}}$ if the following holds:

- $\mathcal{L}(A_{\mathbf{p}})$ is channel-ordered,
- $A_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}$ is forwarding, and
- for every run of $A_{\mathbf{p}}$ with trace u and $w = u \Downarrow_{\Sigma_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}} = w_1 \dots$, there is a run of $A_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}$ with trace $w_i \cdot w'_0 \cdot w_{i+1} \cdot B \cdot w'_1 \cdot w_{i+2} \cdot B \cdot w'_2 \cdot \dots$ where, for every j , $w'_j = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleright \mathbf{q}!m$ if $w_{i+j} \cdot B = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleleft \mathbf{p}?m$, and for every trace with prefix $w_i \cdot w'_0 \cdot \dots \cdot w_{i+j} \cdot B$, the only continuation is w'_j .

We say a CSM $\{\{A_{\mathbf{p}}\}_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}}\}$ is amicable if, for every $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$, $A_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}$ is amicable with $A_{\mathbf{p}}$ for every $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Ch}}$.

Given an amicable projection of an encoded PSM, there will be FSMs for channel participants. We observe that we can match the states of such FSMs to different letters which ought to be forwarded.

Proposition B.15 (Matching states and messages for amicable CSMs).

Let $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}}\}$ be an amicable CSM that satisfies feasible eventual reception. For every $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Ch}}$ with $A_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i} = (Q, \Sigma_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i}, \delta, q_0, F)$, there is a function $f: Q \rightarrow \mathcal{V} \uplus \{\varepsilon\}$ such that:

- if $f(q) = \varepsilon$, for every $(q, x, q') \in \delta$, it holds that $x = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleleft \mathbf{p}^?m$ for some $m \in \mathcal{V}$,
- if $f(q) = m$, then q is not final and for every $(q, x, q') \in \delta$, it holds that $x = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_i \triangleright \mathbf{q}!m$ for some $m \in \mathcal{V}$.

We now prove that amicable CSMs with channel participants can be used to mimic CSMs without channel participants and vice versa, when the right encoding and decoding functions for words is applied.

Lemma B.16. Let $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}}\}$ be an amicable CSM. For every word $w \in (\Gamma^{\text{wCh}})^\infty$ that respects β , it holds that

$$\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \in \mathcal{L}(\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}}\}) \text{ iff } \mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)) \in \mathcal{L}(\{\{\mathbf{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}).$$

Proof. We show that the run for $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$ in $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}}\}$ can be simulated in $\{\{\mathbf{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ for $\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w))$, and vice versa.

Prior, we establish some notation that will be used for both cases. We denote $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) := \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_1) \cdot \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_2) \cdot \dots$, assuming that $w := w_1 \cdot w_2 \cdot \dots$ where $w_i \in \Gamma$ for every i . Let ρ be the run in $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}}\}$ for $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$:

$$(\vec{s}_0, \vec{t}_0, \xi'_0) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_1)_2} (\vec{s}_1, \vec{t}_1, \xi'_1) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_2)_2} \dots$$

where we split the states for participants from \mathcal{P} , given by \vec{s}_i , and the ones from \mathcal{P}_{Ch} , given by \vec{t}_i . Let ρ' be the run in $\{\{\mathbf{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ for $\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w))$:

$$(\vec{q}_0, \xi_0) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_1))} (\vec{q}_1, \xi_1) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_2))} \dots$$

Compared to the proof of Lemma B.11, we are not given β^1 and β^2 explicitly. However, we can construct them from the part of w which has been consumed already. Formally, we define $\text{cont}(\vec{t}, w_1 \dots w_l, \langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle) := u_i \dots u_j$ for the states \vec{t} of channel participants and a prefix $w_1 \dots w_l$ of w if the following holds:

- $j \equiv |(w_1 \dots w_l) \downarrow_{\mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!} |$,
- $i \equiv |(w_1 \dots w_l) \downarrow_{\mathbf{q} \triangleleft \mathbf{p}^?} |$,
- for every $i \leq k < j$, it holds that $\vec{t}_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_k} = q'$ with $f(q') = m$ and $w_k = m$, and
- for every $j \leq k < i$, it holds that $\vec{t}_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})_k} = q'$ with $f(q') = \varepsilon$.

where we use the function $f(-)$ from Proposition B.15 to distinguish between send and receive states of the channel participants. Note that we use the same name $\text{cont}(-, -, -)$ but different parameters. Also, we have $\text{cont}(\vec{t}, \varepsilon, \langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle) = \varepsilon$ by definition. In fact, this only happens for initial states and this coincides with the fact that all channel participants are in their initial states initially, not storing any messages in transit.

First, let us assume there exists run ρ for $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$ in $\{\{\mathbf{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}}\}$.

We claim the following: for every i with $(\vec{s}_i, \vec{t}_i, \xi'_i) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i)_k} (\vec{s}_{i+1}, \vec{t}_{i+1}, \xi'_{i+1})$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and (\vec{q}_i, ξ_i) such that

- (a) $\vec{q}_i = \vec{s}_i$,
- (b) $\xi'_i(\langle p, q \rangle) = \xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (c) $\xi'_i(\langle p, q \rangle) = \varepsilon$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (d) $\xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle) = \text{cont}(\vec{t}_i, w_1 \dots w_{i-1}, \langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$,

there is $(\vec{q}_{i+1}, \xi_{i+1})$ such that

- (a') $\vec{q}_{i+1} = \vec{s}_{i+1}$,
- (b') $\xi'_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle) = \xi_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (c') $\xi'_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle) = \varepsilon$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (d') $\xi_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle) = \text{cont}(\vec{t}_{i+1}, w_1 \dots w_i, \langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$, and
- (e') $(\vec{q}_i, \xi_i) \xrightarrow{w_i} (\vec{q}_{i+1}, \xi_{i+1})$.

To use this claim, we need to argue that the initial states are related, i.e. the conditions hold for $i = 0$. Conditions (a) to (c) are trivially satisfied. For (d), it suffices to recall that $\text{cont}(\vec{t}, \varepsilon, \langle p, q \rangle) = \varepsilon$.

Now, we prove the claim. Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We assume that (a) to (d) hold and prove (a') to (e'). We use (e') to obtain $(\vec{q}_{i+1}, \xi_{i+1})$. We will still need to show, though, that this transition is possible. Let us do a case analysis on the shape of w_i . We do a simultaneous case analysis whether w_i is a send or receive transition and whether the corresponding channel is in the domain of β .

- $w_i = p \triangleright q!m$ and $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$:

Because of $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$, we have that $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i) = w_i$. Participant p is in the same state in \vec{s} and \vec{q} by (a). Since w_i is a send transition, it is always enabled and, thus, possible. The channels change in the same way in both runs: m is appended to $\langle p, q \rangle$. The states also change in the same way: only the one of p changes but in the same way due to determinism. Thus, it is easy to check that all properties (a') to (d') are satisfied.

- $w_i = p \triangleright q!m$ and $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$:

By definition, $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i) = p \rightarrow (p, q)_j : m$ for $j \equiv |(w_1 \dots w_{i-1}) \Downarrow_{p \triangleright q!} |$. Thus, there are two transitions in $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{ch}}}$: one send transition labelled with $p \triangleright (p, q)_j ! m$ and one receive transition labelled with $(p, q)_j \triangleleft p ? m$. Participant p is in the same state in \vec{s} and \vec{q} by (a). Since w_i is a send transition, it is always enabled and, thus, possible. (a') holds by determinism of the state machines for p . (b') is satisfied as we deal with a transition for which $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$. (c') is satisfied as the only message enqueued into a channel, with the first transition, is immediately received, with the second one. For the remaining property, we show that the changes related to the second transition match the ones of the channel in $\{\{\text{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$. It is obvious that we only need to consider the changes of the channel $\langle p, q \rangle$. For this, we have $\xi_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle) = \xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle) \cdot m$. With $\xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle) = \text{cont}(\vec{t}_i, w_1 \dots w_{i-1}, \langle p, q \rangle)$, it suffices to show that $\text{cont}(\vec{t}_i, w_1 \dots w_{i-1}, \langle p, q \rangle) \cdot m = \text{cont}(\vec{t}_{i+1}, w_1 \dots w_i, \langle p, q \rangle)$. And this easily follows from the definition of $\text{cont}(-, -, -)$ because the only state to change is the one of $(p, q)_j$ and adding w_i changes the indices in the way that the state of this channel participant is considered.

- $w_i = q \triangleleft p ? m$ and $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$:

Because of $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$, we have that $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i) = w_i$. Participant q is in the same state in \vec{s} and \vec{q} by (a). From (b) and the fact that the transition

is possible in $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{R}_{wch}}$, we know that the transition is also possible in $\{\{\text{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$. The channels change in the same way in both runs: m is removed from $\langle p, q \rangle$. The states also change in the same way: only the one of p changes but in the same way due to determinism. Thus, it is easy to check that all properties (a') to (d') are satisfied.

- $w_i = q \triangleleft p ? m$ and $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$:

By definition, $\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i) = (p, q)_j \rightarrow q : m$ for $j \equiv |(w_1 \dots w_{i-1}) \Downarrow_{q \triangleleft p ? _}|$. Thus, there are two transitions in $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{R}_{wch}}$: one send transition labelled with $(p, q)_j \triangleright q ! m$ and one receive transition labelled with $q \triangleleft (p, q)_j ? m$. In $\{\{\text{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$, we only have one transition.

We first argue that this transition is possible: participant q is in the same state in \vec{s} and \vec{q} by (a) so it is able to receive m and, from (d), we know that m is enqueued at the head of $\langle p, q \rangle$ in ξ_i .

It remains to show that the other properties are satisfied, for which the arguments are analogous. We still repeat them for understandability. (a') holds by determinism of the state machines for p . (b') is satisfied as we deal with a transition for which $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$. (c') is satisfied as the only message enqueued into a channel, with the first transition, is immediately received, with the second one. For the remaining property, we show that the changes related to the first transition match the ones of the channel in $\{\{\text{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$. It is obvious that we only need to consider the changes of the channel $\langle p, q \rangle$. For this, we have $\xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle) = m \cdot \xi_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle)$. With $\xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle) = \text{cont}(\vec{t}_i, w_1 \dots w_{i-1}, \langle p, q \rangle)$, it suffices to show that $\text{cont}(\vec{t}_i, w_1 \dots w_{i-1}, \langle p, q \rangle) = m \cdot \text{cont}(\vec{t}_{i+1}, w_1 \dots w_i, \langle p, q \rangle)$. And this easily follows from the definition of $\text{cont}(-, -, -)$ because the only state to change is the one of $(p, q)_j$ and adding w_i changes the indices in the way that the state of this channel participant is considered.

This concludes the proof for this direction.

Second, let us assume there exists run ρ' for $\{\{\text{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ for w . We claim the following: for every i with $(\vec{q}_i, \xi_i) \xrightarrow{w_i} (\vec{q}_{i+1}, \xi_{i+1})$ and $(\vec{s}_i, \vec{t}_i, \xi'_i)$ such that

- (a) $\vec{q}_i = \vec{s}_i$,
- (b) $\xi'_i(\langle p, q \rangle) = \xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (c) $\xi'_i(\langle p, q \rangle) = \varepsilon$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (d) $\xi_i(\langle p, q \rangle) = \text{cont}(\vec{t}_i, w_1 \dots w_{i-1}, \langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$,

there is $(\vec{s}_{i+1}, \vec{t}_{i+1}, \xi'_{i+1})$ such that

- (a') $\vec{q}_{i+1} = \vec{s}_{i+1}$,
- (b') $\xi'_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle) = \xi_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \notin \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (c') $\xi'_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle) = \varepsilon$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$,
- (d') $\xi_{i+1}(\langle p, q \rangle) = \text{cont}(\vec{t}_{i+1}, w_1 \dots w_i, \langle p, q \rangle)$ for every $\langle p, q \rangle \in \text{dom}(\beta)$, and
- (e') $(\vec{s}_i, \vec{t}_i, \xi'_i) \xrightarrow{\text{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w_i)} (\vec{s}_{i+1}, \vec{t}_{i+1}, \xi'_{i+1})$.

The conditions are basically the same. Thus, the initial states are still related, making the above claim sufficient to show our simulation argument. The proof is analogous to the one before and, thus, omitted. There is one minor difference: one

exploits the fact that a CSM is amicable to show that the channel participants faithfully forward the respective messages.

Equipped with these, we can show that both ways of the encoding are fine to take.

Lemma B.17. *Let M be a PSM and $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wch}}}$ and $\{\{B_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ be CSMs.*

- (a) *If $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wch}}}$ is an amicable projection of $\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$, then $\{\{\mathbf{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ is a projection of M .*
- (b) *If $\{\{B_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ is a projection of M , then $\{\{\mathbf{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(B_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wch}}}$ is a projection of $\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$.*

Proof. First, we prove (a). Thus, we assume that $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wch}}}$ is deadlock-free and forwarding as well as $\mathcal{L}(\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wch}}}) = \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M))$. We prove deadlock freedom and protocol fidelity.

For deadlock freedom, we assume, towards a contradiction, $\{\{\mathbf{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ has a deadlock. Let w be the trace of this run ending in a deadlock. We used a simulation argument to show that there is a run with trace $\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)$ in $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wch}}}$ in the second part of the proof for Lemma B.16. We can apply this result and reach also reach a configuration in $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ from which no further transitions can be taken. By determinism of each A_p , this configuration is unique. Hence, this is a deadlock and, yielding a contradiction.

For protocol fidelity, the following equivalences prove the claim:

$$\begin{aligned}
& w \in \mathcal{S}(M) \\
& \stackrel{(7)}{\Leftrightarrow} \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)) \\
& \stackrel{\text{Assumption}}{\Leftrightarrow} \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w) \in \mathcal{L}(\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wch}}}) \\
& \stackrel{\text{Lemma B.16}}{\Leftrightarrow} \mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w)) \in \mathcal{L}(\{\{\mathbf{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}) \\
& \stackrel{(1)}{\Leftrightarrow} w \in \mathcal{L}(\{\{\mathbf{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}})
\end{aligned}$$

Second, we prove (b). Thus, we assume that $\{\{B_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ is deadlock-free and $\mathcal{L}(\{\{B_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}) = \mathcal{S}(M)$. We prove deadlock freedom and protocol fidelity.

For deadlock freedom, we assume, towards a contradiction, $\{\{\mathbf{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(B_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wch}}}$ has a deadlock. Let w be the trace of this run ending in a deadlock. By construction of channel participants, there is $w' \in (\Sigma^{\text{wCh}})^*$ such that $w' \sim w$. Thus, there is $u \in \Gamma^*$ such that $w' = \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(u)$. We used a simulation argument to show that there is a run with trace u in $\{\{B_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wch}}}$ in the second part of the proof for Lemma B.11. We can apply this result and also reach a configuration in $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ from which no further transitions can be taken. By determinism of each B_p , this configuration is unique. Hence, this is a deadlock and, yielding a contradiction.

For protocol fidelity, the following equivalences prove the claim:

$$\begin{aligned}
& w \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)) \\
\stackrel{\text{def. \& constr.}}{\Leftrightarrow} & \exists w' \in (\Sigma^{\text{wCh}})^\infty \text{ such that } w' \sim w \text{ and } w' \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)) \\
\stackrel{(8)}{\Leftrightarrow} & \exists w' \in (\Sigma^{\text{wCh}})^\infty \text{ such that } w' \sim w \text{ and } \mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w') \in \mathcal{S}(M) \\
\stackrel{\text{Assumption}}{\Leftrightarrow} & \exists w' \in (\Sigma^{\text{wCh}})^\infty \text{ such that } w' \sim w \text{ and } \mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w') \in \mathcal{L}(\{\{B_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}) \\
\stackrel{\text{Lemma B.11}}{\Leftrightarrow} & \exists w' \in (\Sigma^{\text{wCh}})^\infty \text{ such that } w' \sim w \text{ and} \\
& \mathbf{enc}_{\Gamma^\infty}(\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w')) \in \mathcal{L}(\{\{\mathbf{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(B_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}}) \\
\stackrel{(2)}{\Leftrightarrow} & \exists w' \in (\Sigma^{\text{wCh}})^\infty \text{ such that } w' \sim w \text{ and } w' \in \mathcal{L}(\{\{\mathbf{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(B_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}}) \\
\stackrel{(*)}{\Leftrightarrow} & w \in \mathcal{L}(\{\{\mathbf{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(B_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}})
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equivalence follows by definition of the semantics but we keep the semantics $\mathcal{S}(-)$ instead of the language $\mathcal{L}(-)$, and $(*)$ follows from the fact that CSMs are closed under \sim [60, Lm. 22]. Furthermore, $\mathbf{dec}_{\Gamma^\infty}(w')$ respects β because every word in $\mathcal{S}(M)$ does (Proposition B.4) and w' is channel-ordered by (3). \square

It remains to show that we can obtain an amicable projection. For this, we use the fact that we can obtain a local language preserving projection.

Definition B.18 (Local language preserving projection [57]). *Let $L \subseteq \Gamma^\infty$ be a language and $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ be a projection of L . We say that $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ is local language preserving if it holds that $L \downarrow_{\Gamma_p} = \mathcal{L}(A_p)$ for every $p \in \mathcal{P}$. For a CSM $\{\{B_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}}$ to be local language preserving, we require $L \downarrow_{\Gamma_p} = \mathcal{L}(B_p)$ for every $p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}$.*

Lemma B.19 ([57]). *Let M be a projectable sink-final sender-driven $\Sigma 1$ -PSM and let $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ be its subset projection from [57, Def. 5.4]. The subset projection can be computed in PSPACE and $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ is a local language preserving projection.*

Proof. Their subset projection is defined for global types but the algorithm works on a global state machine which is a sink-final $\Sigma 1$ -PSM. The rest follows from [57, Cor. 8.2]. \square

Lemma B.20. *Let M be a PSM and let $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}}$ be a CSM. If $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}}$ is a local language preserving projection for $\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$, then $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}}$ is amicable.*

Proof. For every channel participant $(p, q)_i$, we have to show that $A_{(p,q)_i}$ is amicable with A_p . Let $(p, q)_i$ be a channel participant. By construction of $\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}$, we know that $(p, q)_i$ solely receives from p in $\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$. From Lemma B.13, we know that $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)) \downarrow_{\Gamma_{(p,q)_i}^{\text{wCh}}}$ is forwarding or almost forwarding (only possible if the projected word is infinite). Since $\{\{A_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wCh}}}$ is a local language preserving projection of $\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$, we know that all words in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)) \downarrow_{\Gamma_{(p,q)_i}^{\text{wCh}}}$ have a trace in $A_{(p,q)_i}$. Last, by construction, $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)) \downarrow_{\Gamma_p}$ is channel-ordered. Thus, again, by local language preservation, A_p is channel-ordered. Thus, it follows that $A_{(p,q)_i}$ is amicable with A_p . \square

Our main theorem combines the previous observations.

Theorem 4.5. *Checking projectability of Tame PSMs is in PSPACE. One can also synthesize a projection in PSPACE.*

Proof. Let (M, β) be a Tame PSM, i.e. be sender-driven, sink-final and respect channel bounds β . We apply the channel-participant encoding to obtain the sink-final Σ 1-PSM $\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$.

We claim that M is projectable if and only if $\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$ is projectable.

For the direction from left to right, let $\{\{B_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ be the witness for projectability of M . With Lemma B.17(b), $\{\{\mathbf{enc}_{\text{FSM}}(B_p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wch}}}\}$ is a projection of $\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$, proving its projectability.

For the direction from right to left, we apply Lemma B.19 to obtain a local language preserving projection $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ for $\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$. With Lemma B.20, it follows that $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is amicable. By Lemma B.17(a), $\{\{\mathbf{dec}_{\text{FSM}}(A_p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{wch}}}\}$ is a projection of M , proving its projectability.

This proves that M is projectable if and only if $\mathbf{enc}_{\text{PSM}}(M)$ is projectable.

The encodings (and decodings) can be constructed in polynomial time. Thus, we can check projectability and also obtain an projection of M in PSPACE (Lemma B.19). □

B.3 Additional Material for Section 4.2

Theorem 4.6. *The projectability problem for sink-final mixed-choice Σ 1-PSMs is undecidable.*

Proof. We consider the problem of checking if a word is accepted by a Turing Machine. This is known to be undecidable and we reduce it to checking projectability of a mixed-choice sink-final Σ 1-PSM. We basically construct a PSM with two branches at the top. For each, we construct a language and they coincide – which will be necessary for projectability – if and only if the Turing Machine does not halt in a final configuration. We assume familiarity with the concept of Turing Machines and refer to [45] for further details.

Let TM be a Turing Machine with tape alphabet Δ and states Q such that $\Delta \cap Q = \emptyset$. We have that $q_0 \in Q$ is the initial state and $q_f \in Q$ is, without loss of generality, the only final state. A configuration of TM is given by a word $a_1, \dots, a_i, q, b_1, \dots, b_j \in \Delta^* Q \Delta^*$. The initial configuration for input word w is $q_0 w$ while any configuration from $\Delta^* q_f \Delta^*$ is final. A computation is a sequence of configurations (u_1, \dots, u_m) such that u_{i+1} is the next configuration of TM , also denoted by $u_i \vdash_{TM} u_{i+1}$. A computation (u_1, \dots, u_m) accepts w if $u_1 = q_0 w$ and $u_m \in \Delta^* q_f \Delta^*$.

For our encoding, we use five participants p_1, \dots, p_5 who send configurations to each other. Thus, messages are from the set $\Delta \uplus \{\circ, \langle\langle, \rangle\rangle, \perp\} \uplus Q$ where \circ is sent by p_3 to indicate the start of a new pair of configurations and $\langle\langle$ and $\rangle\rangle$ delimit a configuration.

We introduce the notation $p \leftrightarrow q : m$ to abbreviate $p \rightarrow q : m \cdot q \rightarrow p : m$. We only specify interactions using $_ \leftrightarrow _ : _$. Using these, we will also define regular expressions and complements thereof and consider $p \leftrightarrow q : m$ as their single letters. By construction, every PSM will be $\Sigma 1$ -bounded and, in fact, every message is immediately acknowledged.

For a word $w = w_1 \dots w_i$, we write $p \leftrightarrow q : w$ for $p \leftrightarrow q : w_1 \dots p \leftrightarrow q : w_i$. For words $C_1, D_1, C_2, D_2, \dots, C_m, D_m \in (\Delta \uplus Q)^*$, we define the word

$$\begin{aligned} w(C_1, D_1, C_2, D_2, \dots, C_m, D_m) := & p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle\langle \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : C_1 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle\rangle \cdot \\ & p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle\langle \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : D_1 \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle\rangle \cdot \\ & p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle\langle \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : C_2 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle\rangle \cdot \\ & p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle\langle \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : D_2 \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle\rangle \cdot \\ & \dots \\ & p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle\langle \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : C_m \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle\rangle \cdot \\ & p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle\langle \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : D_m \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle\rangle \cdot \end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, p_2 sends the sequence C_i to p_1 while p_4 sends the sequence D_i to p_5 . Each sequence is started by a $\langle\langle$ -message and finished by a $\rangle\rangle$ -message between the respective pair. The participant p_3 starts each round by sending \circ .

Note that the communication of C_i between p_1 and p_2 can happen concurrently to both D_{i-1} and D_i between p_4 and p_5 . (This will later allow us to both detect if C_i and D_i do not coincide or C_i is no successor configuration of D_i .)

We define two languages L_l and L_r , which we later use for two branches of the PSM encoding.

$$\begin{aligned} L_l &:= \{\mathcal{C}(w(C_1, D_1, \dots, C_m, D_m)) \mid m \geq 1, C_1, D_1, \dots, C_m, D_m \in (\Delta \uplus Q)^*\} \\ L_r &:= L_l \setminus \{\mathcal{C}(w(u_1, u_1, \dots, u_m, u_m)) \mid (u_1, \dots, u_m) \text{ is an accepting computation}\} \end{aligned}$$

To make the resulting PSM sink-final, we define a sequence of messages that indicates the end of an execution:

$$w_{end} := p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \perp \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \perp \cdot p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \perp \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \perp$$

and append it to obtain $L'_l := \{w \cdot w_{end} \mid w \in L_l\}$ and $L'_r := \{w \cdot w_{end} \mid w \in L_r\}$.

We will show that both L_l and L_r , and thus, L'_l and L'_r , can be specified as $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs. Provided with PSMs for L_l and L_r , it is straightforward to construct a M_{TM} such that

$$\mathcal{S}(M_{TM}) = \{p_2 \rightarrow p_3 : l \cdot w \mid w \in L'_l\} \uplus \{p_2 \rightarrow p_3 : r \cdot w \mid w \in L'_r\} .$$

By definition of L'_l and L'_r , every word ends with w_{end} so M_{TM} is sink-final. (In fact, if there is an implementation, the FSM for each participant will also be sink-final.) We will show that M_{TM} is projectable if and only if TM does not accept the input w .

For this, it suffices to establish the following four facts:

- Claim 1: L_l and L_r can be specified as $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs.
- Claim 2: L_l is projectable.

- Claim 3: If TM has no accepting computation for w , then $\mathcal{L}(M_{TM})$ is projectable.
- Claim 4: If TM has an accepting computation for w , then $\mathcal{L}(M_{TM})$ is not projectable.

Claim 1: Both L_l and L_r can be specified as $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs.

Proof of Claim 1. It is easy to construct a PSM from a regular expression. Thus, for conciseness, we give regular expressions for the languages we consider or for their complements. For this, we introduce some more notation for concise specifications when using sets of messages:

$$p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} := (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : x_1 + \dots + p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : x_n) \cdot$$

First, let us consider L_l . Inspired by the definition of $w(C_1, D_1, \dots, C_m, D_m)$, we construct this regular expression r_l for L_l :

$$\begin{aligned} & (p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle\langle \cdot (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : (\Delta \uplus Q))^* \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle\rangle \cdot \\ & p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle\langle \cdot (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : (\Delta \uplus Q))^* \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle\rangle)^* \cdot \end{aligned}$$

Second, let us consider L_r . Recall that L_r should admit the encoding of all sequences of configurations except for accepting ones. We provide an exhaustive list of how such a sequence can fail to be an accepting computation. We provide a language $L_{r,i}$ for each and L_r is their union.⁴

- $L_{r,1}$ contains all sequences of configurations for which some C_k or D_k is actually not a configuration, i.e. not from $\Delta^* Q \Delta^*$.
- $L_{r,2}$ contains all sequences for which C_1 is not the correct initial configuration, i.e. it does not have the shape $q_0, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$ where $w = a_1 \cdots a_n$.
- $L_{r,3}$ contains all sequences for which q_f does not occur in C_m .
- $L_{r,4}$ contains all sequences where C_k and D_k differ in some position.
- $L_{r,5}$ contains all sequences for which C_{k+1} is no successor configuration for D_k .

For each $L_{r,i}$, we show that it can be specified as PSM (or regular expression). It is straightforward to obtain a PSM for L_r by adding one initial state and adding a transition from this one to the initial state for the PSM of $L_{r,i}$ for each i .

Language $L_{r,1}$:

We construct a regular expression for $w(C_1, D_1, \dots, C_m, D_m)$ for any m such that there is some C_i or D_i with either no message from Q or at least two

⁴ We renumbered the languages because some of Lohrey’s construction does not apply to this undecidability proof.

messages from Q :

$$\begin{aligned}
r_1 &:= (p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle \langle \cdot (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \Delta)^* \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : Q \cdot (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \Delta)^* \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle \langle \cdot (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \Delta)^* \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : Q \cdot (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \Delta)^* \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle \rangle)^* \cdot \\
&\quad (r_{l_0} + r_{l_2} + r_{r_0} + r_{r_2}) \cdot r_l^* \\
\text{where} \\
r_{l_0} &:= p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle \langle \cdot (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \Delta)^* \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle \langle \cdot (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \Delta \uplus Q)^* \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle \rangle \cdot \\
r_{l_2} &:= p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle \langle \cdot \\
&\quad (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \Delta)^* \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : Q \cdot (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \Delta)^* \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : Q \cdot (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \Delta \uplus Q)^* \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle \langle \cdot (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \Delta \uplus Q)^* \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle \rangle \cdot \\
r_{r_0} &:= p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle \langle \cdot (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \Delta \uplus Q)^* \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle \langle \cdot (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \Delta)^* \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle \rangle \cdot \\
r_{r_2} &:= p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle \langle \cdot (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \Delta \uplus Q)^* \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle \langle \cdot \\
&\quad (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \Delta)^* \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : Q \cdot (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \Delta)^* \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : Q \cdot (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \Delta \uplus Q)^* \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle \rangle \cdot
\end{aligned}$$

Let us explain how r_1 works. In the beginning, there are only C_i and D_i with one message from Q . At some point, one of the regular expressions $r_{l_0}, r_{l_2}, r_{r_0}$ or r_{r_2} has to match. These specify some way how the number of messages for Q can be wrong: r_{l_0} has no messages from Q between p_2 and p_1 while r_{r_0} has no messages from Q between p_4 and p_5 ; r_{l_2} has more than one message from Q between p_2 and p_1 while r_{r_2} has more than one message from Q between p_4 and p_5 . For each, the other pair can communicate any number of messages from Q to account for sequences where both C_i and D_i do not match. Subsequently, we use r_l to simply allow a sequence of any configuration.

Language $L_{r,2}$:

Let $w = a_1 \dots a_n$ be the input word for TM . Then, we can specify $L_{r,2}$ as follows:

$$\{\mathcal{C}(w(C_1, D_1, C_2, D_2, \dots, C_m, D_m)) \mid m \geq 1 \wedge C_1 \neq q_0, a_1, \dots, a_n\}$$

It is easy to see that we can change r_l to obtain a regular expression for $\{w(C_2, D_2, \dots, C_m, D_m) \mid m \geq 1\}$. Thus, it suffices to show that $w(C_1, D_1)$ with $C_1 \neq q_0, a_1, \dots, a_n$ can be specified as PSM. Again, we give a regular expression for the complement. We observe that the communication between p_2 and p_1 about the configuration can easily be specified as regular expression:

$$p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : q_0 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : a_1 \dots p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : a_n \ .$$

It is straightforward to construct a PSM for the complement of this regular expression. (Before we did not use the complement for $L_{r,1}$ because we could not guarantee that the same number of configurations would be communicated between both pairs.) When combined, this gives us the following regular expression (with the complement operator as syntactic sugar) for $L_{r,2}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle \langle \cdot \\
&\quad \overline{p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : q_0 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : a_1 \dots p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : a_n} \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle \rangle \cdot \\
&p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle \langle \cdot (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : (\Delta \uplus Q))^* \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle \rangle \cdot r_l \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Language $L_{r,3}$:

The following regular expression specifies all sequences for which the last C_m does not contain the final state $q_f \in Q$:

$$\begin{aligned} r_l &\cdot \\ p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle\langle \cdot (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : (\Delta \uplus Q \setminus \{q_f\}))^* \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle\rangle \cdot \\ p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle\langle \cdot (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : (\Delta \uplus Q))^* \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle\rangle \cdot \end{aligned}$$

Language $L_{r,4}$:

Intuitively, we can merge the loops for both C_i and D_i to check that some message at the same position is different. This is possible because all languages are closed under \sim by definition. We introduce this notation

$$\{p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : x \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : x \mid x \in \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}\}$$

which is an abbreviation for

$$(p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : y_1 \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : y_1) + \dots + (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : y_n \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : y_n) \cdot$$

With this, the following is a regular expression for $L_{r,4}$:

$$\begin{aligned} r_4 &:= r_l \cdot \\ & p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle\langle \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle\langle \cdot \\ & (\{p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : x_1 \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : x_1 \mid x_1 \in (\Delta \cup Q)\})^* \cdot \\ & (r_a + r_b + r_c) \cdot r_l \\ & \text{where} \\ r_a &:= (\{p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : x_2 \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : x_3 \mid x_2, x_3 \in (\Delta \cup Q) \text{ and } x_2 \neq x_3\}) \cdot \\ & (\{p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : x_4 \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : x_5 \mid x_4, x_5 \in (\Delta \cup Q)\})^* \cdot r_l \\ r_b &:= \{p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : x_7 \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle\rangle \mid x_7 \in (\Delta \cup Q)\} \cdot (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \Delta \cup Q)^* \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle\rangle \cdot r_l \\ r_c &:= \{p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle\rangle \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : x_6 \mid x_6 \in (\Delta \cup Q)\} \cdot (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \Delta \cup Q)^* \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle\rangle \cdot r_l \cdot \end{aligned}$$

The regular expression checks that at some point two configurations C_i and D_i do not agree on some position (using r_a), or C_i is longer than D_i (using r_b), or D_i is longer than C_i (using r_c).

Language $L_{r,5}$:

We use the same idea of merging the loops to compare as for the previous case and also use the same notation. We can give a regular expression that consists of different phases. First, we let p_2 and p_1 communicate about C_1 in order to then compare D_i with C_{i+1} for any i in a loop. We want that C_{i+1} is no successor of D_i for some i . Thus, we check if the changes from D_i to C_{i+1} are a valid transition for TM . The regular expression r_5 is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
r_5 &:= p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle \langle \cdot (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : (\Delta \uplus Q))^* \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad (r_d + r_e)^* \cdot (r_f + r_g) \cdot \\
&\quad p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle \langle \cdot (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : (\Delta \uplus Q))^* \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad r_l \\
\text{where} \\
r_d &:= p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle \langle \cdot p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle \langle \cdot \\
&\quad (\{p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : x_1 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : x_1 \mid x_1 \in (\Delta \cup Q)\})^* \cdot \\
&\quad (\{p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : a_1 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : a_2 \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : b_1 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : b_2 \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : c_1 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : c_2 \\
&\quad \mid a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2 \in (\Delta \cup Q)^*, a_1 \neq a_2 \text{ and } \exists w_1, w_2 \in \Delta^*. w_1 a_1 b_1 c_1 w_2 \vdash_{TM} w_1 a_2 b_2 c_2 w_2\}) \cdot \\
&\quad (\{p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : x_2 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : x_2 \mid x_2 \in (\Delta \cup Q)\})^* \cdot \\
&\quad p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle \rangle \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle \rangle \\
r_e &:= p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle \langle \cdot p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle \langle \cdot \\
&\quad (\{p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : x_1 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : x_1 \mid x_1 \in (\Delta \cup Q)\})^* \cdot \\
&\quad (\{p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : a_1 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : a_2 \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : b_1 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : b_2 \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \}) \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : c_2 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle \rangle \\
&\quad \mid a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_2 \in (\Delta \cup Q)^*, a_1 \neq a_2 \text{ and } \exists w_1 \in \Delta^*. w_1 a_1 b_1 \vdash_{TM} w_1 a_2 b_2 c_2\}) \cdot \\
r_f &:= p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle \langle \cdot p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle \langle \cdot \\
&\quad (\{p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : x_1 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : x_1 \mid x_1 \in (\Delta \cup Q)\})^* \cdot \\
&\quad (\{p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : a_1 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : a_2 \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : b_1 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : b_2 \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : c_1 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : c_2 \\
&\quad \mid a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2 \in (\Delta \cup Q)^*, a_1 \neq a_2 \text{ and } \nexists w_1, w_2 \in \Delta^*. w_1 a_1 b_1 c_1 w_2 \vdash_{TM} w_1 a_2 b_2 c_2 w_2\}) \cdot \\
&\quad (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \Delta \cup Q)^* \cdot (p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \Delta \cup Q)^* \cdot \\
&\quad p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle \rangle \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \rangle \rangle \\
r_g &:= p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \langle \langle \cdot p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle \langle \cdot \\
&\quad (\{p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : x_1 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : x_1 \mid x_1 \in (\Delta \cup Q)\})^* \cdot \\
&\quad (\{p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : c_1 \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \}) \mid c_1 \in (\Delta \cup Q)^* \rangle \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad (p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \Delta \cup Q)^* \cdot p_4 \leftrightarrow p_5 : \rangle \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

We distinguish two types of transitions: the ones that simply change letters in the middle of the configurations (r_d) and the ones that extend the tape (r_e). If one is matched against, we recurse using $(r_d + r_e)^*$. If not, $(r_f + r_g)$ is matched against and we, subsequently, allow any possible subsequent pair configurations using r_l . The regular expression r_f checks that the transition is not possible while r_g checks if C_{i+1} is shorter than D_i . Without loss of generality, we can assume that the tape never shrinks (as it could be encoded using an extra tape alphabet letter). Note that the transition check is a local condition and it suffices to check at most two more messages after the first different message. In fact, the words w_1 and w_2 in the conditions do not matter: either it is a transition for all such pairs or none. After the mismatch, we let D_i catch up and continue with r_l .

Mixed choice:

We explained how to construct a PSM for $L_{r,i}$ for every i . They are Σ_1 -PSMs by construction. In fact, each of them individually also satisfies sender-driven choice. However, when we combine both PSMs for $L_{r,4}$ and $L_{r,5}$ in order to obtain a PSM for L_r , the resulting PSM exposes mixed choice. Intuitively, this happens because $L_{r,4}$ checks C_i against D_i and $L_{r,5}$ checks D_i against C_{i+1} . Technically, when merging both PSMs, we reach a state after the sequence

$$p_3 \leftrightarrow p_2 : \circ \cdot p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \langle \langle$$

for which $L_{r,4}$ requires to have $p_3 \leftrightarrow p_4 : \circ$ next while $L_{r,5}$ requires to have a loop with $p_2 \leftrightarrow p_1 : \Delta \uplus Q$. It is not possible to let p_2 send a message to distinguish

both branches as the indistinguishability of both branches is necessary so that C_{i+1} can be compared to both D_i and D_{i+1} .

End Proof of Claim 1.

Claim 2: L_l is projectable.

Proof of Claim 2. By Theorem 6.1, the PSM for L_l can be represented as a global type with mixed choice. It is also 0-reachable [70], i.e. one can reach a final state from every state. For a 0-reachable global type G , [70, Lm. 4.10] showed that projections for $\mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(G)$ generalise to $\mathcal{L}_{\text{inf}}(G)$. They do not consider mixed choice but the proof generalises to the mixed choice setting as it does not use any restrictions on choice. [2] showed that a language L of finite words is projectable if and only if two closure conditions CC_2 and CC_3 hold. Hence, it suffices to show that both CC_2 and CC_3 .

In what follows, a word u is said to be complete if $u \Downarrow_{\mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}!} = u \Downarrow_{\mathbf{q} \triangleleft \mathbf{p} ?}$.
 CC_2 : If $w \in \Gamma^*$ is FIFO-compliant, complete, and for every participant $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$, there is $v \in L$ with $w \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}} = v \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}}$, then $w \in L$.
 CC_3 : If w is FIFO-compliant and for every participant $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$, there is $v \in \text{pref}(L)$ with $w \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}} = v \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}}$, then $v \in \text{pref}(L)$.

We show that L_l satisfies CC_2 . The proof for CC_3 is analogous. Let $w \in \Gamma^*$ be a FIFO-compliant and complete word such that for every participant $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$, there is $v \in L_l$ with $w \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}} = v \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}}}$. Let us give the structure of $w \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}_i}}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
w \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}_3}} &= (\mathbf{p}_3 \triangleright \mathbf{p}_2! \circ \mathbf{p}_3 \triangleleft \mathbf{p}_2? \circ \mathbf{p}_3 \triangleright \mathbf{p}_4! \circ \mathbf{p}_3 \triangleleft \mathbf{p}_4?)^{k_3} \text{ for some } k_3 \\
w \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}_2}} &= \mathbf{p}_2 \triangleleft \mathbf{p}_3? \circ \mathbf{p}_2 \triangleright \mathbf{p}_1! \langle \langle \cdot \mathbf{p}_2 \triangleleft \mathbf{p}_1? \langle \langle \cdot \\
&\quad (\mathbf{p}_2 \triangleright \mathbf{p}_1! a_{1,1} \cdot \mathbf{p}_2 \triangleleft \mathbf{p}_1? a_{1,1} \cdot \dots \mathbf{p}_2 \triangleright \mathbf{p}_1! a_{1,i_1} \cdot \mathbf{p}_2 \triangleleft \mathbf{p}_1? a_{1,i_1}) \cdot \\
&\quad \dots \\
&\quad (\mathbf{p}_2 \triangleright \mathbf{p}_1! a_{k_2,1} \cdot \mathbf{p}_2 \triangleleft \mathbf{p}_1? a_{k_2,1} \cdot \dots \mathbf{p}_2 \triangleright \mathbf{p}_1! a_{k_2,i_{k_2}} \cdot \mathbf{p}_2 \triangleleft \mathbf{p}_1? a_{k_2,i_{k_2}}) \\
&\quad \text{for some } k_2, i_1, \dots, i_{k_2} \\
w \Downarrow_{\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}_1}} &= \mathbf{p}_1 \triangleleft \mathbf{p}_2? \langle \langle \cdot \mathbf{p}_1 \triangleright \mathbf{p}_2! \langle \langle \cdot \\
&\quad (\mathbf{p}_1 \triangleleft \mathbf{p}_2? b_{1,1} \cdot \mathbf{p}_1 \triangleright \mathbf{p}_2! b_{1,1} \cdot \dots \mathbf{p}_1 \triangleleft \mathbf{p}_2? b_{1,j_1} \cdot \mathbf{p}_1 \triangleright \mathbf{p}_2! b_{1,j_1}) \cdot \\
&\quad \dots \\
&\quad (\mathbf{p}_1 \triangleleft \mathbf{p}_2? b_{k_1,1} \cdot \mathbf{p}_1 \triangleright \mathbf{p}_2! b_{k_1,1} \cdot \dots \mathbf{p}_1 \triangleleft \mathbf{p}_2? b_{k_1,j_{k_1}} \cdot \mathbf{p}_1 \triangleright \mathbf{p}_2! b_{k_1,j_{k_1}}) \\
&\quad \text{for some } k_1, j_1, \dots, j_{k_1}
\end{aligned}$$

(The projections for \mathbf{p}_4 and \mathbf{p}_5 are analogous to \mathbf{p}_2 and \mathbf{p}_1 and analogous reasoning applies.) By the fact that w is finite and complete, we know that $k_1 = k_2 = k_3$ and $i_l = j_l$ for every $1 \leq l \leq k$. By the fact that w is FIFO-compliant, the letters coincide, i.e. $a_{i,l} = b_{i,l}$ for every i and l . Therefore, it is straightforward that w can be obtained by reordering $w(C_1, D_1, \dots, C_k, D_k)$ using \sim and, thus, $w \in L_l$.

End Proof of Claim 2.

Claim 3: If TM has no accepting computation for w , then $\mathcal{L}(M_{TM})$ is projectable.

Proof of Claim 3. Recall that

$$\mathcal{L}(M_{TM}) = \{p_2 \rightarrow p_3 : l \cdot w \mid w \in L'_l\} \uplus \{p_2 \rightarrow p_3 : r \cdot w \mid w \in L'_r\} .$$

If w is not accepted, then L_l and L_r and, hence, L'_l and L'_r coincide by construction. Thus, it is irrelevant for p_1, p_4 , and p_5 which branch was taken. By Claim 2, L_l is projectable and so is $\mathcal{L}(M_{TM})$.

End Proof of Claim 3.

Claim 4: If TM has an accepting computation for w , then $\mathcal{L}(M_{TM})$ is not projectable.

Proof of Claim 4. Let (u_1, \dots, u_m) be an accepting computation for w . Then, there is $w_u = w(u_1, u_1, \dots, u_m, u_m)$ and, by construction, it holds that $w_u \notin L_r$. By definition of $\mathcal{L}(M_{TM})$, it holds that $p_2 \rightarrow p_3 : r \cdot w_u \cdot w_{end} \notin \mathcal{L}(M_{TM})$. However, for every participant $p \in \mathcal{P}$, there is $v \in \mathcal{L}(M_{TM})$ such that $w \Downarrow_{\Gamma_p} = v \Downarrow_{\Gamma_p}$. Together, this contradicts closure condition CC_2 which is a necessary condition for projectability. Thus, $\mathcal{L}(M_{TM})$ is not projectable.

End Proof of Claim 4.

This concludes the proofs for all claims and hence the overall proof. \square

C Additional Material for Section 5

In this section, we show CSMs are a good fit for type checking. They can be seamlessly integrated into a type system. To show this, we present a session type system that uses CSMs as interface for type checking, instead of local types. This clean separation of concerns makes our type system applicable to any type of protocol specification that can be projected to CSMs. CSMs are strictly more expressive than local types. Thus, the use of CSMs as intermediate interface improves generality without losing efficiency. For instance, with our projection result, we can take (Tame) PSMs as global protocol specifications and type check processes against them, with CSMs as intermediate interface for local specifications.

For the design of our type system, we follow [69] as a particularly streamlined instance of a session type system. There are two main differences. Scalas and Yoshida [69] do not consider global specifications, so they do not check against a global protocol specification, but they still use local types. In our type system, we use CSMs and show which of their properties will entail which properties of the typed program.

C.1 Payload Types and Delegation

In contrast to the explanation in the main text, we use global types (cf. Definition D.1) as representations for protocols in this section to elaborate more

on the payload types and delegation. We will show that every global type can be represented as PSM but, here, their syntactic nature makes examples more concise. While these are global specifications, all our examples transfer to CSMs but using them would be a bit harder to grasp.

So far, we treated message payloads as uninterpreted names from a fixed finite set. In practice, each message would be a label and a payload type. The label can indicate the branch that was taken while the payload type is interpreted as type of the data transmitted. For instance, consider the following global type:

$$G := p \rightarrow q : l(\mathbf{str}) + p \rightarrow q : r(\mathbf{int})$$

Here, l and r are labels so q knows which branch was taken. For the right branch, \mathbf{int} is interpreted as type of the payload. Thus, the payload should be of type integer, e.g. the number 2. If there is no payload, we simply omit it and only write the label.

A global type specifies the intended behaviour for one session. With a type system, it is interesting to consider systems with multiple sessions that possibly follow protocols given by different global types. For session s , the endpoint of participant p is denoted by $s[p]$.


Let us give an informal example of a process that follows the protocol specified by G ; more precisely let s be that session. Then, the process $P_p \parallel P_q$, where \parallel is parallel composition, would comply with the above global type:

$$\begin{aligned} P_p &:= s[p][q]! \langle \text{“foo”} \rangle . 0 \oplus s[p][q]! r \langle 2 \rangle . 0 \\ P_q &:= s[q][p]? l(x) . 0 \& s[q][p]? r(y) . 0 \end{aligned}$$

We use internal choice \oplus for P_p because it sends first: $s[p][q]! r \langle 2 \rangle$ indicates that endpoint $s[p]$ sends message $r \langle 2 \rangle$ to $s[q]$. For P_q , we use external choice $\&$ as it cannot actually choose but receives the sent message. It stores the payload in a variable which could be used subsequently, e.g. $s[q][p]? l(x)$ stores the message in x . Both processes terminate after their only action.

If all payload types are base types like \mathbf{str} , \mathbf{int} , \mathbf{Bool} , etc., type checking is rather simple. It gets more complicated and interesting if one adds the possibility to send channel endpoints. This amounts to sending an endpoint of a session, e.g. $s[p]$. Upon receiving, the receiver shall subsequently comply with what is specified. This is why sending a channel endpoint is called *delegation*. Usually, local types are used to specify channel endpoint types. However, we do not use local types so how do we specify such behaviour? We use the states from the subset projections of a global type because this specifies the behaviour of a participant in our setting. We assume that they are distinct across all considered state machines. Our model uses FSMs, giving us a finite set of labels. Note that one cannot only send the initial state. Each state corresponds to a position in the local behaviour. Sending non-initial states corresponds to sending subexpressions of local types.

Example C.1 (Delegation). We consider a protocol where (one) buyer a buys a book from a seller s who delegates the payment to a payment service p . The one buyer protocol is specified as follows:

Fig. 13: Projection of the one buyer protocol onto seller s .

$$G_1 := a \rightarrow s : query(\mathbf{str}) . s \rightarrow a : price(\mathbf{int}) . + \begin{cases} a \rightarrow s : buy . a \rightarrow s : card(\mathbf{str}) . G' \\ a \rightarrow s : no . \mathbf{0} \end{cases} \quad \text{where}$$

$$G' := + \begin{cases} s \rightarrow a : valid . s \rightarrow a : confirm . \mathbf{0} \\ s \rightarrow a : invalid . s \rightarrow a : cancel . \mathbf{0} \end{cases}$$

We project G_1 onto s to obtain the state machine in Fig. 13 with its set of states $\{q_1, \dots, q_9\}$. We define the second global type, which specifies the interaction between the seller s and the payment service p , including delegation.

$$G_2 := + \begin{cases} s \rightarrow p : price(\mathbf{int}) . s \rightarrow p : deleg(q_3) . \\ s \rightarrow p : no . \mathbf{0} \end{cases} + \begin{cases} p \rightarrow s : valid(q_5) . \mathbf{0} \\ p \rightarrow s : invalid(q_7) . \mathbf{0} \end{cases}$$

First, the seller delegates checking the card details to the payment service by sending q_3 . The payment service then takes care of the payment but we do not specify this here. Afterwards, the payment service delegates control back to the seller: depending on the outcome of the credit card check, they send q_5 or q_7 . Starting from there, the seller will either confirm or cancel. This choice is not up to the seller but determined by the label, *valid* or *invalid*, sent by the payment service earlier.

We use the states of a projection for seller s as syntactic marker for the behaviour that is expected from the receiver of that channel endpoint. Usually, this is achieved using local types. In general, local types are less expressive than state machines. However, with Theorem 6.2, we will show that their expressivity coincides for sink-final state machines, i.e. the ones where final states have no

outgoing transitions. Hence, any sink-final state machine can be turned into a local type. Such a local type, however, would correspond to the initial state and, with delegation, we can also send non-initial states, e.g. q_3 . Despite, it appears feasible to first construct a state machine that represents the same behaviour as starting from a non-initial state and, then, the same techniques for constructing a local type apply. For instance, the behaviour specified by q_3 can also be represented as local type:

$$s \triangleleft a?card(\mathbf{str}) . \oplus \left\{ \begin{array}{l} s \triangleright a!valid . s \triangleright a!confirm . \mathbf{0} \\ s \triangleright a!invalid . s \triangleright a!cancel . \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right.$$

We have seen an example for delegation. There, in order to talk about states from a projection of G_1 in G_2 , we need access to the projection of G_1 already before defining G_2 . If one considers CSMs, this is not necessarily the case. However, we still need a similar condition to prove that well-typed processes do not leave messages in channels behind, so-called orphan messages. Solely for this property, we assume a strict partial order $<$, i.e. it is irreflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive, for the CSMs under consideration. With its acyclicity, this relation provides means to decide which CSMs can use the control states of which in a system: for every \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} in a system, if $\mathcal{A} < \mathcal{B}$, then \mathcal{B} can use states from \mathcal{A} . We expect that this condition could be worked around with more sophisticated techniques but leave this for future work. Interestingly, Scalas and Yoshida [69], allow delegation using local types and do not impose such restrictions. However, they also do not prove the absence of orphan messages. It is unclear whether their type system can be extended to prove the absence of orphan messages without such restrictions.

C.2 Process Calculus

We first define processes and runtime configurations.

Definition C.2. *Processes, runtime configurations and process definitions are defined by the following grammar:*

$$\begin{aligned} c &::= x | s[p] \\ P &::= \mathbf{0} | P_1 \parallel P_2 | (\mathbf{vs} : \mathcal{A}) P | \oplus_{i \in I} c[\mathbf{q}_i]!l_i\langle c_i \rangle . P_i | \&_{i \in I} c[\mathbf{q}_i]?l_i(y_i) . P_i | \mathbf{Q}[\vec{c}] \\ R &::= \mathbf{0} | R_1 \parallel R_2 | (\mathbf{vs} : \mathcal{A}) R | \oplus_{i \in I} c[\mathbf{q}_i]!l_i\langle c_i \rangle . P_i | \&_{i \in I} c[\mathbf{q}_i]?l_i(y_i) . P_i | \mathbf{Q}[\vec{c}] \\ &\quad | s \blacktriangleright \sigma | \mathbf{err} \\ \mathcal{D} &::= (\mathbf{Q}[\vec{x}] = \oplus_{i \in I} c[\mathbf{q}_i]!l_i\langle c_i \rangle . P_i); \mathcal{D} | (\mathbf{Q}[\vec{x}] = \&_{i \in I} c[\mathbf{q}_i]?l_i(y_i) . P_i); \mathcal{D} | \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

The term c can either be a variable x or a session endpoint of shape $s[p]$ (which will have type q for some state q). Let us explain the constructors for processes and runtime configurations in more detail. The term $\mathbf{0}$ denotes termination while \parallel is the parallel operator. With $(\mathbf{vs} : \mathcal{A})$, we restrict a new session s

for which the CSM \mathcal{A} specifies the intended session behaviour. \mathcal{A} is ignored by our reduction semantics and solely used for type checking. We have internal (\oplus) and external ($\&$) choice and assume that $|I| > 0$. For runtime configurations, the use of processes P_i for continuations ensures that we only specify queue contents for active session restrictions. A session restriction is active if it is not guarded by internal or external actions. $\mathcal{Q}[\vec{c}]$ specifies the use of a process definition with identifier $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}$ and parameters \vec{c} for which \mathcal{D} provides the definitions. We only consider guarded process definitions (and c and c_i can be in \vec{x}). This allows us to properly distinguish between processes and runtime configurations later: in the reduction rules, we will only add queues for active session restrictions. We assume that \mathcal{D} has one single definition for every process identifier in \mathcal{Q} . Thus, we define $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{Q}, \vec{c})$ as unfolding of the process definition when its variables \vec{x} are substituted by \vec{c} . For runtime configurations, $s \blacktriangleright \sigma$ denotes that the queues of session s are currently σ . The function $\sigma : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \text{Msg}^*$ where $\text{Msg} \ni m ::= l\langle v \rangle$ specifies the queue content where l is from a finite set of labels. If all queues are empty, we exploit notation and use ε , i.e. $\varepsilon(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) := \varepsilon$. We will use the term **err** to specify if something went wrong.

The correctness of our typing relies on the CSMs used for annotations to be well-behaved, which we encode in the notion of well-annotated processes.

Definition C.3 (Well-annotated). We say a process/runtime configuration is well-annotated if every CSM appearing in it is:

- (i) deadlock-free, and
- (ii) satisfies feasible eventual reception.

Note that any CSM obtained through projection automatically satisfies the conditions of well-annotation.

In our process calculus, recursion can be achieved using process definitions $\mathcal{Q}[\vec{x}]$. Not that, for global and local types, recursion is usually defined using μt , which binds a recursion variable t that can be used subsequently (cf. Definitions D.1 and D.29).

Example C.4. In Fig. 14, we give a process P that uses projections of the global types from Example C.1: \mathcal{A} is a projection of G_1 and \mathcal{B} is a projection of G_2 . We assume base types **Bool**, **str** and **int** as well as a construct for if-then-else for illustrative purposes. In P , $\text{prices}[b]$ denotes a lookup for the price and is-valid: $\text{str} \rightarrow \text{Bool}$ is a function that checks if credit card details are valid. Note the use of variable y in P_p for the delegation. In fact, it does not know the endpoint, or local type, it receives but needs to trust that it can perform the respective actions on it. A type system can ensure this.

Definition C.5. We define a function $\lceil - \rceil$ to convert a process into a runtime configuration by adding channel types for active sessions:

$$\begin{aligned} \lceil P_1 \parallel P_2 \rceil &:= \lceil P_1 \rceil \parallel \lceil P_2 \rceil \\ \lceil (\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) P \rceil &:= (\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) (\lceil P \rceil \parallel s \blacktriangleright \varepsilon) \\ \lceil P \rceil &:= P \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
P &:= (\mathbf{v}s_1 : \mathcal{A})(\mathbf{v}s_2 : \mathcal{A}) P_a \parallel P_s \parallel P_p \quad \text{where} \\
P_a &:= s_1[\mathbf{a}][\mathbf{s}]!query\langle\text{“Alice in Wonderland”}\rangle . s_1[\mathbf{a}][\mathbf{s}]?price(p) . \\
&\quad \text{if } p > 10 \\
&\quad \text{then } s_1[\mathbf{a}][\mathbf{s}]!no . \mathbf{0} \\
&\quad \text{else } s_1[\mathbf{a}][\mathbf{s}]!buy . s_1[\mathbf{a}][\mathbf{s}]!card\langle\text{“1234..., 08/2024, 532”}\rangle . \\
&\quad \quad \&\left\{ \begin{array}{l} s_1[\mathbf{a}][\mathbf{s}]?confirm . \mathbf{0} \\ s_1[\mathbf{a}][\mathbf{s}]?cancel . \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right. \\
P_s &:= s_1[\mathbf{s}][\mathbf{a}]?query(b) . s_1[\mathbf{s}][\mathbf{a}]!price\langle prices[b]\rangle . \\
&\quad \&\left\{ \begin{array}{l} s_1[\mathbf{s}][\mathbf{a}]?no . s_2[\mathbf{s}][\mathbf{p}]!no . \mathbf{0} \\ s_1[\mathbf{s}][\mathbf{a}]?buy . s_2[\mathbf{s}][\mathbf{p}]!price\langle prices[b]\rangle . s_2[\mathbf{s}][\mathbf{p}]!deleg\langle s_1[\mathbf{s}]\rangle . P'_s \end{array} \right. \\
P'_s &:= \&\left\{ \begin{array}{l} s_2[\mathbf{s}][\mathbf{p}]?valid(y_1) . y_1[\mathbf{a}]!confirm . \mathbf{0} \\ s_2[\mathbf{s}][\mathbf{p}]?invalid(y_2) . y_2[\mathbf{a}]!cancel . \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right. \\
P_p &:= \&\left\{ \begin{array}{l} s_2[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{s}]?no . \mathbf{0} \\ s_2[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{s}]!price(p) . s_2[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{s}]?deleg\langle y \rangle . y[\mathbf{a}]?card(z) . \\ \quad \text{if is-valid}(z) \text{ then } s_2[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{s}]!valid\langle y \rangle . \mathbf{0} \text{ else } s_2[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{s}]!invalid\langle y \rangle . \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right.
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 14: An example process following the protocol of Example C.1.

We define structural (pre)congruence. Intuitively, this shows which kind of transformations do not change the meaning of a process or runtime configuration. For instance, parallel composition of P with $\mathbf{0}$ is basically the same as P itself.

Definition C.6. *For processes, the rules for structural congruence \equiv are the following:*

- $P_1 \parallel P_2 \equiv P_2 \parallel P_1$
- $(P_1 \parallel P_2) \parallel P_3 \equiv P_1 \parallel (P_2 \parallel P_3)$
- $P \parallel \mathbf{0} \equiv P$
- $(\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A})(\mathbf{v}s' : \mathcal{B})P \equiv (\mathbf{v}s' : \mathcal{B})(\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A})P$
- $(\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A})(P_1 \parallel P_2) \equiv P_1 \parallel (\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A})P_2$, if s is not free in P_1

We define structural precongruence \sqsubseteq for processes as the smallest precongruence relation that includes \equiv and $(\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A})\mathbf{0} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{0}$. For runtime configurations, the rules for structural congruence \equiv are the ones above. We define structural precongruence \sqsubseteq for runtime configurations as the smallest precongruence relation that includes \equiv and $(\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A})s \blacktriangleright \varepsilon \sqsubseteq \mathbf{0}$.

We only define one direction for the rules $(\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A})\mathbf{0} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{0}$ and $(\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A})s \blacktriangleright \varepsilon \sqsubseteq \mathbf{0}$. This is solely required to prove that structural congruence preserves typability for both processes and runtime configurations (cf. Lemmas C.20 and C.21). Intuitively, the other direction would require to impose conditions on the CSM \mathcal{A} . This treatment is not restrictive in terms of reductions: applying these rules from right to left will not change the possibility for reductions.

Last, we define the reduction rules for our process calculus.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{Q}, \vec{c}) \parallel R \longrightarrow R'}{\mathbb{Q}[\vec{c}] \parallel R \longrightarrow R'} \text{RR-Q} \qquad \frac{R \longrightarrow R'}{\mathbb{C}[R] \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}[R']} \text{RR-CTX} \\
\\
\frac{k \in I}{\bigoplus_{i \in I} s[p][q_i]!l_i(v_i) \cdot P_i \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q_k) \mapsto \vec{m}] \longrightarrow [P_k] \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q_k) \mapsto \vec{m} \cdot l_k(v_k)]} \text{RR-OUT} \\
\\
\frac{k \in I}{\&_{i \in I} s[p][q_i]?l_i(y_i) \cdot P_i \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(q_k, p) \mapsto l_k(v_k) \cdot \vec{m}] \longrightarrow [P_k[v_k/y_k]] \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q_k) \mapsto \vec{m}]} \text{RR-IN} \\
\\
\frac{R_1 \sqsubseteq R'_1 \quad R'_1 \longrightarrow R'_2 \quad R'_2 \sqsubseteq R_2}{R_1 \longrightarrow R_2} \text{RR-}\sqsubseteq \\
\\
\frac{\forall i \in I. \sigma(q_i, p) = l(_)\cdot \vec{m} \text{ and } l_i \neq l}{\&_{i \in I} s[p][q_i]?l_i(y_i) \cdot P_i \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma \longrightarrow \mathbf{err}} \text{RR-ERR1} \qquad \frac{\sigma(p, q) \neq \varepsilon \text{ for some } p, q}{(\mathbf{vs} : \mathcal{A}) s \blacktriangleright \sigma \longrightarrow \mathbf{err}} \text{RR-ERR2}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 15: Reduction rules for runtime configurations.

Definition C.7. For our reduction rules, we first define a reduction context:

$$\mathbb{C} ::= \mathbb{C} \parallel R \mid R \parallel \mathbb{C} \mid (\mathbf{vs} : \mathcal{A}) \mathbb{C} \mid []$$

In Fig. 15 we define the reduction rules. The rule RR-Q unfolds a process definition while RR-CTX allows us to descend for reductions using contexts. Both rules RR-OUT and RR-IN specify how a message is output to a queue or received as input from a queue. RR- \sqsubseteq allows us to consider structurally precongruent runtime configurations for reductions. RR-ERR1 yields an error if the next action is to receive but all possible incoming messages do not match any specified label. Last, RR-ERR2 yields an error if a session is over but there are non-empty queues for this session.

Remark C.8. To prove the absence of runtime error RR-ERR1, we require that feasible eventual reception holds. If the CSM does not have this property, there might be messages that could be left behind.

Example C.9. We give a reduction for the process specified in Example C.4. First, we apply the function $[-]$ to turn the process into a runtime configuration, yielding

$$R := (\mathbf{vs}_1 : \mathcal{A})(\mathbf{vs}_2 : \mathcal{B}) P_a \parallel P_s \parallel P_p \parallel s_1 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon \parallel s_2 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon$$

There is only one possible reduction step: the message *query* (“Alice in Wonderland”) is sent by $s_1[a]$ to $s_1[s]$. Then, we obtain the following runtime configuration:

$$R' := (\nu s_1 : \mathcal{A})(\nu s_2 : \mathcal{B}) P'_a \parallel P_s \parallel P_p \\ \parallel s_1 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon[(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{s}) \mapsto \text{query}(\text{“Alice in Wonderland”})] \parallel s_2 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon$$

where

$$P'_a := s_1[\mathbf{a}][\mathbf{s}]?price(p). \\ \text{if } p > 10 \\ \text{then } s_1[\mathbf{a}][\mathbf{s}]!no. \mathbf{0} \\ \text{else } s_1[\mathbf{a}][\mathbf{s}]!buy. s_1[\mathbf{a}][\mathbf{s}]!card(\text{“1234..., 08/2024, 111”}). \& \begin{cases} s_1[\mathbf{a}][\mathbf{s}]?confirm. \mathbf{0} \\ s_1[\mathbf{a}][\mathbf{s}]?cancel. \mathbf{0} \end{cases}$$

Despite dealing with runtime configurations, we can specify processes because the queues are specified at top level.

C.3 Type System for Processes and Runtime Configurations

Typing for base types is well-understood. Thus, we focus on the more difficult case of delegation, following work by Scalas and Yoshida [69]. Integration of base types is mostly orthogonal and would distract from the main concerns here so we briefly remark differences in the treatment of base types after presenting our type system.

For processes, we have two typing contexts: Θ and Λ . We consider states as syntactic markers for local specifications so we use L as type for such payloads. So far, we only considered a fixed set of participants \mathcal{P} . In a system with multiple CSMs, we write \mathcal{P}_A to denote the subset of participants of \mathcal{A} and Chan_A for the respective channels. We might also use the session s instead of the respective CSM.

Prior to giving definitions for our type system, let us remark that we make use of the *Barendregt Variable Convention* [9], which assumes that the names of bound variables is always distinct from the ones of free variables. This allows us not to explicitly rename variables, simplifying the formalisation both for writing and reading.

Definition C.10. *The process definition typing context Θ is a function from process identifiers to types for its parameters: $\Theta: \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \bar{L}$. A syntactic typing context is defined by the following grammar:*

$$\Lambda ::= A, s[\mathbf{p}] : L \mid \Lambda, x : L \mid \emptyset$$

A syntactic typing context is a typing context if every element has at most one type. Here, we do only consider typing contexts. We consider typing contexts to be equivalent up to reordering and, thus, we may also treat them as mappings. We use notation $\{\Lambda_i\}_{i \in I}$ to denote that we split Λ into $|I|$ typing contexts.

Equipped with these typing contexts, we can give the typing rules for processes. The first two rules solely deal with the process definition typing context,

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\vdash_{\varepsilon} : \Theta} \text{PT-DEF-}\varepsilon \qquad \frac{\Theta \mid \vec{x} : \vec{L} \vdash P \quad \Theta(\mathbf{Q}) = \vec{L}}{\vdash (\mathbf{Q}[\vec{x}] = P); \mathcal{D} : \Theta} \text{PT-DEF} \\
\\
\frac{\Theta(\mathbf{Q}) = \vec{L}}{\Theta \mid \vec{c} : \vec{L} \vdash \mathbf{Q}[\vec{c}]} \text{PT-Q} \qquad \frac{}{\Theta \mid \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}} \text{PT-0} \qquad \frac{\Theta \mid \Lambda \vdash P \quad \text{end}(q)}{\Theta \mid c : q, \Lambda \vdash P} \text{PT-END} \\
\\
\frac{\Theta \mid \Lambda_1 \vdash P_1 \quad \Theta \mid \Lambda_2 \vdash P_2}{\Theta \mid \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \vdash P_1 \parallel P_2} \text{PT-}\parallel \\
\\
\frac{\delta(q) \supseteq \{(p \triangleright q_i ! l_i(L_i), q_i) \mid i \in I\} \quad \forall i \in I. \Theta \mid \Lambda, c : q_i, \{c_j : L_j\}_{j \in I \setminus \{i\}} \vdash P_i}{\Theta \mid \Lambda, c : q, \{c_i : L_i\}_{i \in I} \vdash \bigoplus_{i \in I} c[q_i] ! l_i(c_i) . P_i} \text{PT-}\oplus \\
\\
\frac{\delta(q) = \{(p \triangleleft q_i ? l_i(L_i), q_i) \mid i \in I\} \quad \forall i \in I. \Theta \mid \Lambda, c : q_i, y_i : L_i \vdash P_i}{\Theta \mid \Lambda, c : q \vdash \&_{i \in I} c[q_i] ? l_i(y_i) . P_i} \text{PT-}\& \\
\\
\frac{\Lambda_s = \{s[p] : \text{init}(\mathcal{A}_p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} \quad \Theta \mid \Lambda, \Lambda_s \vdash P}{\Theta \mid \Lambda \vdash (\nu s : \mathcal{A}) P} \text{PT-}\nu
\end{array}$$

Fig. 16: The typing rules for processes. $\text{init}(-)$ denotes the initial state of a CSM.

which provides the types for process definitions. The other rules deal with the different constructs of our process calculus and how to type them. Most importantly, our type system ensures that all information in the typing context is used exactly once.

Definition C.11. We define $\text{end}(q)$ to hold when q is final and does not have outgoing receive transitions. The typing rules for processes are shown in Fig. 16. We assume that all CSMs in typing derivations are deadlock-free and satisfy feasible eventual reception.

The rules $\text{PT-DEF-}\varepsilon$ and PT-DEF ensure that the process definition typing context provides the right types for parameters. This is then used to type process definitions in a process, using PT-Q . PT-0 types $\mathbf{0}$ with an empty second typing context while PT-END can be used to remove type bindings $c : q$ where q is a final state without outgoing receive transitions. The rules $\text{PT-}\oplus$ and $\text{PT-}\&$ can be used to type internal and external choice. The rule $\text{PT-}\parallel$ allows us to split the typing contexts and type the respective processes independently. Last, $\text{PT-}\nu$ adds type bindings for a session s and requires that the remaining process is typed using this.

Our type system is *linear*, i.e. it requires that every type binding is used once and they can only be dropped if they correspond to final states without outgoing receive transitions. This ensures that all the actions specified by the CSM are actually taken and the participants of a session cannot stop earlier.




Fig. 17: Projections of two global types.

It might seem that p in $\text{PT-}\oplus$ and $\text{PT-}\&$ is unbound but, by assumption, q is distinct across all considered FSMs so it is clear from context. Let us explain $\text{PT-}\oplus$ in more detail. To type $\Theta \vdash \Lambda, c : q, \{c_i : L_i\}_{i \in I} \vdash \oplus_{i \in I} c[q_i]!l_i \langle c_i \rangle . P_i$, we require all send actions to be possible from q , i.e. $\delta(q) \supseteq \{(p \triangleright q_i!l_i(L_i), q_i) \mid i \in I\}$. We do not require all of them to be possible though, in contrast to the receive actions in $\text{PT-}\&$. In addition, for every $i \in I$, we require the following: $\Theta \vdash \Lambda, c : q_i, \{c_j : L_j\}_{j \in I \setminus \{i\}} \vdash P_i$, which gives c the new binding q_i and removes the type binding for the payload $c_i : L_i$. Intuitively, it is transferred when sending a message. Thus, in its counterpart $\text{PT-}\&$, the payload’s type will be used to type the continuation after receiving it, i.e. $y_i : L_i$.

The assumption that we only consider typing contexts, and not syntactic typing contexts, ensures that Λ in the conclusion of PT-v does not contain any s for instance. The same will hold for the typing rules for runtime configurations.

Remark C.12 (end(-) and final non-sink states). We use $\text{end}(q)$ to check if q is a final state without outgoing receive transitions. Following standard MST frameworks, we would simply require q to be final. Thus, our type system is slightly more general. However, when using our type system for projections from our approach, this will not be exploited: we base our projection on results by [57] and their (complete) conditions do not allow final state with outgoing send transitions.

Example C.13. Let us illustrate delegation with an example. We have the following global type:

$$G_1 := p \rightarrow q : l(\text{end}) . \mathbf{0}$$

for which we could model the payload of $l(\text{end})$ with an arbitrary state end such that $\text{end}(\text{end})$. For readability, we omit its treatment in the typing derivations. We obtain a projection \mathcal{A} of G_1 , giving Fig. 17a and Fig. 17b. Using the states of these, we define delegation in the second global type:

$$G_2 := + \begin{cases} p \rightarrow r : l_1(q_0) . \mathbf{0} \\ p \rightarrow r : l_2(\text{end}) . \mathbf{0} \end{cases}$$

A projection \mathcal{B} for G_2 is given in Fig. 17c and Fig. 17d. Let us define a process that uses both global types:

$$\begin{aligned}
P &:= (\nu s_1 : \mathcal{A})(\nu s_2 : \mathcal{B}) P_p \parallel P_q \parallel P_r \text{ where} \\
P_p &:= \oplus \begin{cases} s_1[p][r]!l_1\langle s_1[p] \rangle . \mathbf{0} \\ s_1[p][r]!l_2\langle \text{end} \rangle . s_1[p][q]!l\langle \text{end} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \end{cases} \\
P_q &:= s_1[q][p]?l(x) . \mathbf{0} \\
P_r &:= \& \begin{cases} s_2[r][p]?l_1(x) . x[q]!l\langle \text{end} \rangle . \mathbf{0} \\ s_2[r][p]?l_2(x) . \mathbf{0} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

In this example, the process definition typing context is always empty so we omit it. To fit it within the page limits, we give the typing derivation in pieces. We use numbers (0) – (5) to refer to the typing derivation for the respective branch. It should be read from bottom to top, starting from (0). We start with the initial part until typing we arrive at typing the parallel composition.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{(3) \quad s_1[p] : q_0, s_2[p] : q_4 \vdash P_p \quad (4) \quad s_1[q] : q_2 \vdash P_q \quad (5) \quad s_2[r] : q_7 \vdash P_r}{(2) : \Lambda_{s_1}, \Lambda_{s_2} \vdash P_p \parallel P_q \parallel P_r} \text{PT-}\parallel \text{ (TWICE)} \\
\\
\frac{\Lambda_{s_2} = s_2[p] : q_4, s_2[r] : q_7 \quad (2) \quad \Lambda_{s_1}, \Lambda_{s_2} \vdash P_p \parallel P_q \parallel P_r}{(1) : \Lambda_{s_1} \vdash (\nu s_2 : \mathcal{B}) P_p \parallel P_q \parallel P_r} \text{PT-v} \\
\\
\frac{\Lambda_{s_1} = s_1[p] : q_0, s_1[q] : q_2 \quad (1) \quad \Lambda_{s_1} \vdash (\nu s_2 : \mathcal{B}) P_p \parallel P_q \parallel P_r}{(0) : \emptyset \vdash (\nu s_1 : \mathcal{A})(\nu s_2 : \mathcal{B}) P_p \parallel P_q \parallel P_r} \text{PT-v}
\end{array}$$

We apply the rule for restrictions PT-v and then the one for parallel composition PT-||. Let us give the typing derivations for the individual branches.

$$\frac{\text{PT-}\oplus \frac{\delta(q_0) = \{(p \triangleright q!l\langle \text{end} \rangle), q_1\}}{\text{PT-END} \frac{\text{PT-}\oplus \frac{\delta(q_0) = \{(p \triangleright q!l\langle \text{end} \rangle), q_1\}}{\text{PT-END} \frac{\text{PT-}\mathbf{0} \frac{\emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \quad \text{end}(q_1)}{s_1[p] : q_1 \vdash \mathbf{0}}}{s_1[p] : q_0 \vdash s_1[p][q]!l\langle \text{end} \rangle . \mathbf{0}}}{s_1[p] : q_0, s_2[p] : q_6 \vdash s_1[p][q]!l\langle \text{end} \rangle . \mathbf{0}}}}{s_2[p] : q_5 \vdash \mathbf{0} \quad \text{end}(q_5)} \quad \delta(q_4) = \{(p \triangleright r!l_1(q_0), q_5), (p \triangleright r!l_2\langle \text{end} \rangle), q_6\}}}{(3) : s_1[p] : q_0, s_2[p] : q_4 \vdash P_p} \text{PT-}\oplus}$$

$$\frac{\delta(q_2) = \{(q \triangleleft p?l\langle \text{end} \rangle), q_3\}}{(4) : s_1[q] : q_2 \vdash P_q} \text{PT-}\& \frac{\text{PT-}\mathbf{0} \frac{\emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \quad \text{end}(q_3)}{s_1[q] : q_3 \vdash \mathbf{0}} \text{PT-END}}{\text{PT-}\&}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{PT-}\oplus \frac{\delta(q_0) = \{(p \triangleright q!l(\text{end}), q_1)\}}{\frac{\text{PT-}\mathbf{0} \frac{\overline{\emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}} \quad \text{end}(q_1)}{\text{PT-END} \frac{}{x : q_1 \vdash \mathbf{0}}} \quad \text{PT-END} \frac{}{x : q_0 \vdash x[q]!l(\text{end}) \cdot \mathbf{0}}}{\text{PT-END} \frac{}{s_2[r] : q_8, x : q_0 \vdash x[q]!l(\text{end}) \cdot \mathbf{0}}}} \\
\frac{\overline{\emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}} \quad \text{PT-}\mathbf{0} \quad \text{end}(q_9) \quad \text{PT-END} \quad \delta(q_7) = \{(r \triangleleft p?l_1(q_0), q_8), (r \triangleleft p?l_2(\text{end}), q_9)\}}{\frac{s_2[r] : q_9 \vdash \mathbf{0}}{(5) : s_2[r] : q_7 \vdash P_r}} \text{PT-}\&
\end{array}$$

During runtime, we have queues for each session. For these, we define queue types and use them in queue typing contexts.

Definition C.14. *Queue types are defined by the following grammar:*

$$\gamma ::= l(L) \cdot \gamma | \varepsilon$$

A syntactic queue typing context *is defined by the following grammar:*

$$\Omega ::= \Omega, s[p][q] :: \gamma | \emptyset$$

A syntactic queue typing context is a queue typing context if every element has at most one type. Here, we do only consider queue typing contexts. We consider queue typing contexts to be equivalent up to reordering and, thus, we may also treat them as mappings.

While the (second) typing context specifies states for each participant, the queue typing context specifies the content of the queues. This is all we need to define reductions following the respective communicating state machine.

Definition C.15. *We define the reductions for typing contexts as follows:*

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{q \xrightarrow{p \triangleright q!l(L)} q'}{s[p] : q, \Lambda \mid s[p][q] :: \gamma, \Omega \longrightarrow s[p] : q', \Lambda \mid s[p][q] :: \gamma \cdot l(L), \Omega} \text{TR-}\oplus \\
\frac{q \xrightarrow{p \triangleleft q?l(L)} q'}{s[p] : q, \Lambda \mid s[q][p] :: l(L) \cdot \gamma, \Omega \longrightarrow s[p] : q', \Lambda \mid s[q][p] :: \gamma, \Omega} \text{TR-}\&
\end{array}$$

These rules mimic exactly the semantics of communicating state machines.

We show that reductions for typing contexts are preserved when adding type bindings to the typing contexts.

Lemma C.16. *Let A_1, A'_1 , and A_2 be typing contexts and Ω_1, Ω'_1 , and Ω_2 be queue typing contexts. If $A_1 \mid \Omega_1 \longrightarrow A'_1 \mid \Omega'_1$, then $A_1, A_2 \mid \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \longrightarrow A'_1, A_2 \mid \Omega'_1, \Omega_2$.*

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\vdash \varepsilon : \Theta} \text{RT-DEF-}\varepsilon \qquad \frac{\Theta \mid \vec{x} : \vec{L} \vdash P \quad \Theta(Q) = \vec{L}}{\vdash (Q[\vec{x}] = P); \mathcal{D} : \Theta} \text{RT-DEF} \\
\\
\frac{\Theta(Q) = \vec{L}}{\Theta \mid \vec{c} : \vec{L} \mid \emptyset \vdash Q[\vec{c}]} \text{RT-Q} \qquad \frac{}{\Theta \mid \emptyset \mid \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}} \text{RT-0} \\
\\
\frac{\Theta \mid \Lambda \mid \Omega \vdash R \quad \text{end}(q)}{\Theta \mid \Lambda, c : q \mid \Omega \vdash R} \text{RT-END} \qquad \frac{\Theta \mid \Lambda_1 \mid \Omega_1 \vdash R_1 \quad \Theta \mid \Lambda_2 \mid \Omega_2 \vdash R_2}{\Theta \mid \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \mid \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \vdash R_1 \parallel R_2} \text{RT-}\parallel \\
\\
\frac{\delta(q) \supseteq \{(p \triangleright q_i ! l_i(L_i), q_i) \mid i \in I\} \quad \forall i \in I. \Theta \mid \Lambda, c : q_i, \{c_j : L_j\}_{j \in I \setminus \{i\}} \mid \Omega \vdash P_i}{\Theta \mid \Lambda, c : q, \{c_i : L_i\}_{i \in I} \mid \Omega \vdash \bigoplus_{i \in I} c[q_i] ! l_i \langle c_i \rangle . P_i} \text{RT-}\oplus \\
\\
\frac{\delta(q) = \{(p \triangleleft q_i ? l_i(L_i), q_i) \mid i \in I\} \quad \forall i \in I. \Theta \mid \Lambda, y_i : L_i, c : q_i \mid \Omega \vdash P_i}{\Theta \mid \Lambda, c : q \mid \Omega \vdash \&_{i \in I} c[q_i] ? l_i(y_i) . P_i} \text{RT-}\& \\
\\
\frac{(\vec{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A}) \quad \Lambda_s = \{s[p] : \vec{q}_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} \quad \Theta \mid \Lambda, \Lambda_s \mid \Omega, \Omega_s \vdash R}{\Theta \mid \Lambda \mid \Omega \vdash (vs : \mathcal{A}) R} \text{RT-v} \\
\\
\frac{}{\Theta \mid \emptyset \mid \{s[p][q] :: \varepsilon\}_{(p,q) \in \text{Chan}_s} \vdash s \blacktriangleright \varepsilon} \text{RT-EMPTYQUEUE} \\
\\
\frac{\Theta \mid \Lambda \mid \Omega, s[p][q] :: \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto \vec{m}]}{\Theta \mid \Lambda, v : L \mid \Omega, s[p][q] :: l(L) \cdot \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto l(v) \cdot \vec{m}]} \text{RT-QUEUE}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 18: Typing rules for runtime configurations; $\text{reach}(-)$ denotes the set of reachable configurations of the given CSM.

Proof. We do inversion on $\Lambda_1 \mid \Omega_1 \longrightarrow \Lambda'_1 \mid \Omega'_1$, yielding two cases. First, we have

$$\frac{q \xrightarrow{p \triangleright q ! l(L)} q'}{s[p] : q, \hat{\Lambda}_1 \mid s[p][q] :: \gamma, \hat{\Omega}_1 \longrightarrow s[p] : q', \hat{\Lambda}_1 \mid s[p][q] :: \gamma \cdot l(L), \hat{\Omega}_1} \text{TR-}\oplus$$

With this, it is obvious that the following holds:

$$\frac{q \xrightarrow{p \triangleright q ! l(L)} q'}{s[p] : q, \hat{\Lambda}_1, \Lambda_2 \mid s[p][q] :: \gamma, \hat{\Omega}_1, \Omega_2 \longrightarrow s[p] : q', \hat{\Lambda}_1, \Lambda_2 \mid s[p][q] :: \gamma \cdot l(L), \hat{\Omega}_1, \Omega_2} \text{TR-}\oplus$$

which is precisely what we have to show. The case for TR- $\&$ is analogous and, therefore, omitted. \square

After this small intermezzo on reductions for typing contexts, we now define the typing rules for runtime configurations.

Definition C.17. *The typing rules for runtime configurations are defined in Fig. 18. We require all CSMs in typing derivations to be deadlock-free and to satisfy feasible eventual reception.*

Most rules are analogous to the rules for processes. For RT-v, though, we do not require the CSM configuration to be initial but solely reachable, yielding typability of runtime configurations during execution. The rules for queues are standard: RT-QUEUE types queues from the first to the last message in the queue while RT-EMPTYQUEUE types empty queues.

Example C.18. In Example C.13, we gave a typing derivation for a process P using delegation. It is straightforward that this typing derivation can be mimicked for $\lceil P \rceil$. Here, we want to give a typing derivation after one reduction step, for the case where delegation happens. We have

$$R' := (\nu s_1 : \mathcal{A})(\nu s_2 : \mathcal{B}) \mathbf{0} \parallel P_q \parallel P_r \parallel s_1 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon \parallel s_2 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon[(p, r) \mapsto l_1 \langle s_1[p] \rangle] .$$

We give a typing derivation for $\emptyset \mid \emptyset \vdash R'$, with label (0). Again, we omit the process definition typing context since it is empty throughout.

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{RT-EMPTYQUEUE} \frac{}{\emptyset \mid \Omega_1 \vdash s_1 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon} \\ (6) \\ \frac{}{s_1[p] : q_0, \mid \Omega_2 \vdash s_2 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon[(p, r) \mapsto l_1 \langle s_1[p] \rangle]} \\ (3) \quad (4) \quad (5) \\ \frac{s_2[p] : q_5 \mid \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0} \quad s_1[q] : q_2 \mid \emptyset \vdash P_q \quad s_2[r] : q_7 \mid \emptyset \vdash P_r}{(2) : \Lambda_{s_1}, \Lambda'_{s_2} \mid \Omega_{s_1}, \Omega'_{s_2} \vdash \mathbf{0} \parallel P_q \parallel P_r \parallel s_1 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon \parallel s_2 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon[(p, r) \mapsto l_1 \langle s_1[p] \rangle]} \text{PT-}\parallel (4\times) \\ (2) \\ \frac{\Lambda_{s_1}, \Lambda'_{s_2} \mid \Omega_{s_1}, \Omega'_{s_2} \vdash \mathbf{0} \parallel P_q \parallel P_r \parallel s_1 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon \parallel s_2 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon[(p, r) \mapsto l_1 \langle s_1[p] \rangle]}{\Lambda'_{s_2} = s_2[p] : q_5, s_2[r] : q_7 \quad \Omega'_{s_2} = s_2[p][r] :: l_1(q_0), s_2[r][p] :: \varepsilon} \text{RT-v} \\ (1) : \Lambda_{s_1} \mid \Omega_{s_1} \vdash (\nu s_2 : \mathcal{B}) \mathbf{0} \parallel P_q \parallel P_r \parallel s_1 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon \parallel s_2 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon[(p, r) \mapsto l_1 \langle s_1[p] \rangle] \\ (1) \\ \frac{\Lambda_{s_1} \mid \Omega_{s_1} \vdash (\nu s_2 : \mathcal{B}) \mathbf{0} \parallel P_q \parallel P_r \parallel s_1 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon \parallel s_2 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon[(p, r) \mapsto l_1 \langle s_1[p] \rangle]}{\Lambda_{s_1} = s_1[p] : q_0, s_1[q] : q_2 \quad \Omega_{s_1} = s_1[p][q] :: \varepsilon, s_1[q][p] :: \varepsilon} \text{RT-v} \\ (0) : \emptyset \mid \emptyset \vdash (\nu s_1 : \mathcal{A})(\nu s_2 : \mathcal{B}) \mathbf{0} \parallel P_q \parallel P_r \parallel s_1 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon \parallel s_2 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon[(p, r) \mapsto l_1 \langle s_1[p] \rangle] \end{array}$$

The typing derivations for (4) and (5) are analogous to the ones in Example C.13. The typing derivation for (3) is straightforward with RT-END and RT-0, similar to what we presented for (3) in Example C.13. We give the typing derivation for (6):

$$(6) : \frac{\emptyset \mid s_2[p][r] :: \varepsilon, s_2[r][p] :: \varepsilon \vdash s_2 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon}{s_1[p] : q_0, \mid s_2[p][r] :: l_1(q_0), s_2[r][p] :: \varepsilon \vdash s_2 \blacktriangleright \varepsilon[(p, r) \mapsto l_1 \langle s_1[p] \rangle]} \text{RT-QUEUE}$$

The presentation of our type system is inspired by work from Scalas and Yoshida [69]. Thus, we want to highlight key differences. First, we handle sender-driven choice, which allows a participant to send to different receivers and to receive from different senders, while they only consider directed choice. In fact, our

processes can choose between different options when sending messages while their work restricts to a single choice. However, their treatment could be combined with control flow like if-then-else to cover more scenarios. Also, [69] employs subtyping similar to what we do for send actions so there can still be multiple branches when sending. In a sender-driven choice setting, there are subtleties for subtyping as one cannot simply add receives for instance. For details, we refer to [56] where CSMs are considered for subtyping and protocol refinement. With our framework, one can directly make use of their results: we can apply their subtyping algorithm to obtain another CSM against which we type check. Second, [69] only considers one error scenario: a participant would like to receive something but the first message in the respective queue does not match. We generalise this scenario to our setting and require that the first message in all respective queues does not match. In addition, we consider the error case where a session ended with non-empty queues. [69] also considers S-deadlock freedom and we refer to a discussion in Section 5. In the next section, we will prove that our type system prevents both these scenarios.

Remark C.19 (Adding base types). The treatment of base types and expressions in type systems is well-understood. Hence, it should be straightforward to extend our type system to add expressions. More specifically, one could then send the result of expressions and, hence, variables can be bound to values. Provided with (Boolean) expressions, it is also standard to add features of control-flow like if-then-else. For most flexible use of our results, it would make most sense if a user provided a type system for the expressions and base types they need. Then, the type system would use what we defined for local types (and hence delegation) and the provided type system for expressions. There is one important difference between both type systems. While ours is linear, the one for expressions does not need to be. With a non-linear type system, one can duplicate and drop type bindings from the typing context, using rules called *contraction* and *weakening*.

C.4 Soundness of Type System

For conciseness, we assume a process definition typing context Θ , typing contexts Λ , Λ_1 , Λ_2 , \dots , and queue typing contexts Ω , Ω_1 , Ω_2 , \dots in this section.

We presented a type system for processes and runtime configurations. While we closed the reduction semantics under structural precongrence \sqsubseteq , we have not stated the respective rules for our type system:

$$\frac{\Theta \mid \Lambda \vdash P \quad P \sqsubseteq P'}{\Theta \mid \Lambda \vdash P'} \text{PT-}\sqsubseteq \qquad \frac{\Theta \mid \Lambda \mid \Omega \vdash R \quad R \sqsubseteq R'}{\Theta \mid \Lambda \mid \Omega \vdash R'} \text{RT-}\sqsubseteq$$

We show that these rules are admissible, i.e. they can be added without changing the capabilities of the type system. This allows us not to consider these rules in the following proofs but still use them if convenient.

Lemma C.20 (Admissibility of structural precongrence for runtime configuration typing). *Let R_1 and R_2 be well-annotated runtime configurations. If $\Theta \mid \Lambda \mid \Omega \vdash R_1$ and $R_1 \sqsubseteq R_2$, then $\Theta \mid \Lambda \mid \Omega \vdash R_2$.*

Proof. We first consider the cases for structural congruence \equiv and then the additional ones for structural precongruence. We do a case analysis on \equiv and reason for both directions. Subsequently, we consider the two rules for \sqsubseteq .

– $R_1 \parallel R_2 \equiv R_2 \parallel R_1$:

By inversion, we know that RT- \parallel is the first rule applied in the typing derivation. This rule is symmetric so basically the typing derivation works.

– $(R_1 \parallel R_2) \parallel R_3 \equiv R_1 \parallel (R_2 \parallel R_3)$:

By inversion, we know that RT- \parallel is the first and second rule applied in the typing derivation. It is easy to see that the typing derivation can be rearranged to match the structure.

– $R \parallel \mathbf{0} \equiv R$:

First, assume that there is a typing derivation

$$\frac{\Theta \vdash \Lambda_1 \vdash \Omega_1 \vdash R \quad \Theta \vdash \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_2 \vdash \mathbf{0}}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \vdash R \parallel \mathbf{0}} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

We show there is a typing derivation $\Theta \vdash \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \vdash R$. Inversion yields that two rules can be applied for the given typing derivation $\Theta \vdash \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_2 \vdash \mathbf{0}$: RT-END and RT- $\mathbf{0}$. Thus, it follows that $\Omega_2 = \emptyset$. Also, $\Lambda_2 = \{s[p] : \vec{q}_p\}_{p \in S}$ for some set of participants S and $\text{end}(\vec{q}_p)$ for every $p \in S$. By inversion, there is a typing derivation for $\Theta \vdash \Lambda_1 \vdash \Omega_1 \vdash R$. With $\Omega_2 = \emptyset$, it remains to show that there is a typing derivation $\Theta \vdash \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_1 \vdash R$. The only difference is the typing context Λ_2 . This, however, can be taken care of using RT-END as in the other typing derivation, concluding this case.

Second, assume there is a typing derivation for R . We show there is a typing derivation for $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega \vdash R \parallel \mathbf{0}$. We first apply RT- \parallel to obtain

$$\frac{\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega \vdash R \quad \overline{\Theta \vdash \emptyset \vdash \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}} \text{RT-}\mathbf{0}}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega \vdash R \parallel \mathbf{0}} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

for which the right premise is met with RT- $\mathbf{0}$ and the left premise is given by assumption.

– $(\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) (\mathbf{v}s' : \mathcal{B}) R \equiv (\mathbf{v}s' : \mathcal{B}) (\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) R$:

By inversion, both typing derivations need to apply RT- \mathbf{v} twice in the beginning. It is straightforward that both rule applications do not interfere with each other, yielding the same premise to prove:

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda_s, \Lambda_{s'} \vdash \Omega, \Omega_s, \Omega_{s'} \vdash R$$

Thus, this is given by assumption.

– $(\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) (R_1 \parallel R_2) \equiv R_1 \parallel (\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) R_2$ and s is not free in R_1 :

First, we assume there is a typing derivation for $(\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) (R_1 \parallel R_2)$ and show there is a typing derivation for $R_1 \parallel (\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) R_2$. Applying inversion twice yields

$$\text{RT-}\parallel \frac{\frac{\Theta \vdash \Lambda_1 \vdash \Omega_1 \vdash R_1 \quad \Theta \vdash \Lambda_2, \Lambda_s \vdash \Omega_2, \Omega_s \vdash R_2}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \Lambda_s \vdash \Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_s \vdash R_1 \parallel R_2} (\vec{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A})}{\frac{\Lambda_s = \{s[p] : \vec{q}_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} \quad \Omega_s = \{s[p][q] :: \xi(p, q)\}_{(p, q) \in \text{Chan}_A}}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \vdash (\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) (R_1 \parallel R_2)} \text{RT-}\mathbf{v}}$$

where $\Lambda = \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2$ and $\Omega = \Omega_1, \Omega_2$. We claim we can assume that Λ_s and Ω_s are used in the typing derivation for $\Theta \vdash \Lambda_2, \Lambda_s \vdash \Omega_2, \Omega_s \vdash R_2$. By definition, these only contain type bindings related to s , which does not occur in R_1 by assumption. There might exist a typing derivation where parts of Λ_s or Ω_s appear in the typing derivation for R_1 but these can only be removed with the rules RT-END (not even with RT-EMPTYQUEUE since this requires $s \blacktriangleright \varepsilon$). Hence, such derivations can be mimicked in the typing derivation for R_2 , justifying our treatment of Λ_s and Ω_s . We construct a typing derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{(\vec{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A}) \quad \Lambda_s = \{s[p] : \vec{q}_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}}{\Omega_s = \{s[p][q] :: \xi(p, q)\}_{(p, q) \in \text{Chan}_A} \quad \Theta \vdash \Lambda_2, \Lambda_s \vdash \Omega_2, \Omega_s \vdash R_2} \text{RT-v}}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_2 \vdash (vs : \mathcal{A}) R_2} \quad \Theta \vdash \Lambda_1 \vdash \Omega_1 \vdash R_1}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \vdash R_1 \parallel (vs : \mathcal{A}) R_2} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

All premises coincide with the ones of the original typing derivation, concluding this case.

Second, we assume there is a typing derivation for $R_1 \parallel (vs : \mathcal{A}) R_2$ and show there is a typing derivation for $(vs : \mathcal{A}) (R_1 \parallel R_2)$. The proof is analogous to the previous case but we do not need to reason about the treatment of Λ_s and Ω_s but it suffices to show there is one typing and we can choose the respective treatment.

– $(vs : \mathcal{A}) s \blacktriangleright \varepsilon \sqsubseteq \mathbf{0}$:

We assume there is a typing derivation for $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega \vdash (vs : \mathcal{A}) s \blacktriangleright \varepsilon$. We show there is a typing derivation for $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega \vdash \mathbf{0}$. By inversion, we know that RT-v is the last rule to be applied and we get one of the premises:

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda_s \vdash \Omega, \Omega_s \vdash s \blacktriangleright \varepsilon$$

with $\Lambda_s = \{s[p] : \vec{q}_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}$ and $\Omega_s = \{s[p][q] :: \xi(p, q)\}_{(p, q) \in \text{Chan}_A}$. By inversion, RT-EMPTYQUEUE and RT-END are the only rules that can be applied in the typing derivation for $\Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda_s \vdash \Omega, \Omega_s \vdash \mathbf{0}$. Thus, we have $\Omega = \emptyset$, changing our proof obligation to $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega_s \vdash \mathbf{0}$. Since RT-EMPTYQUEUE does only change the queue typing context, we have that $\Lambda = \bigcup_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \{s'[p] : \vec{q}_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{s'}}$ for a set of sessions \mathcal{S} that does not contain s and $\text{end}(\vec{q}_p)$ for every $p \in \mathcal{P}_{s'}$ and $s' \in \mathcal{S}$. Therefore, we can also first apply RT-END $|\Lambda|$ times and last RT-EMPTYQUEUE to obtain a typing derivation for $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega_s \vdash \mathbf{0}$.

This concludes the proof. \square

We proved the admissibility lemma for the type system for runtime configurations. The proof for the type system for processes is analogous for most cases.

Lemma C.21 (Admissibility of structural precongurence for process typing). *Let P_1 and P_2 be well-annotated processes. If it holds that $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash P_1$ and $P_1 \sqsubseteq P_2$, then $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash P_2$.*

Proof. The respective cases are analogous to the ones in the proof of Lemma C.20. We only need to consider the case where $(vs : \mathcal{A}) \mathbf{0} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{0}$:

We assume there is a typing derivation for $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash (vs : \mathcal{A}) \mathbf{0}$. We show there is a typing derivation for $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \mathbf{0}$. By inversion, we know that PT-v is the last rule to be applied and we get one of the premises: $\Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda_s \vdash \mathbf{0}$ with $\Lambda_s = \{s[p] : \text{init}(\mathcal{A}_p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}$. By inversion, PT- $\mathbf{0}$ and PT-END are the only rules that can be applied in the typing derivation for $\Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda_s \vdash \mathbf{0}$. Since PT- $\mathbf{0}$ needs the second typing context to be empty, it is applied last and all other derivations are applications of PT-END. Therefore, $\Lambda = \bigcup_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \{s'[p] : \vec{q}_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{s'}}$ for some set of sessions \mathcal{S} that does not contain s and $\text{end}(\vec{q}_p)$ for every $p \in \mathcal{P}_{s'}$ and $s' \in \mathcal{S}$. Therefore, we can also first apply RT-END $|\Lambda|$ times and last RT- $\mathbf{0}$ to obtain a typing derivation for $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{0}$. \square

We proceed with a few observations about our type system that we will use later in the proof for our main result.

To start, we show that a term x cannot appear in a runtime configuration if there is no type binding for it in the typing context.

Lemma C.22. *Let R be a well-annotated runtime configuration. If $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega \vdash R$ and x is not in Λ , then x cannot occur in R .*

Proof. Towards a contradiction, assume that x occurs in R . Then, at some point in the typing derivation

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega \vdash R$$

one of the following rules applies to handle x : RT-Q, RT- \oplus , or RT- $\&$. Each of them requires all variables to occur in their respective typing contexts, yielding a contradiction. \square

We defined a type system for processes and one for runtime configurations. Both are very similar and we defined runtime configurations to only have queues for active sessions. Once a process becomes active, we turn it into a runtime configuration using $[-]$. We show that this preserves typability with an empty queue typing context.

Lemma C.23. *Let P be a well-annotated process. If $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash P$, then $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \emptyset \vdash [P]$.*

Proof. We prove this by induction on the structure of P .

For all except $P = P_1 \parallel P_2$ and $P = (vs : \mathcal{A}) P'$, it holds that $[P] = P$. For all typing rules that processes and runtime configurations share, the queue typing context is not changed in the respective runtime configuration typing rule. Thus, $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \emptyset \vdash [P]$.

For $P = P_1 \parallel P_2$, the claim follows directly by induction hypothesis.

Last, we consider $P = (vs : \mathcal{A}) P'$. We have the following typing derivation

$$\frac{\Lambda' = \{s[p] : \text{init}(\mathcal{A}_p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} \quad \Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda' \vdash P'}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash (vs : \mathcal{A}) P'} \text{PT-v}$$

We show there is a typing derivation where the last rule is RT-v. This requires a reachable configuration in the respective CSM: $(\vec{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A})$. In this case, we choose the initial states and empty channels, which allows us to use RT-EMPTYQUEUE for the queues.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda_s \vdash \emptyset \vdash P'}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda_s \vdash \Omega_s \vdash s \blacktriangleright \varepsilon} \text{RT-EMPTYQUEUE}}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda_s \vdash \Omega_s \vdash (P' \parallel s \blacktriangleright \varepsilon)} \text{RT-||}}{\frac{\Lambda_s = \{s[p] : \vec{q}_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} \quad \Omega_s = \{s[p][q] :: \xi(p, q)\}_{(p, q) \in \text{Chan}_A}}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \emptyset \vdash (v s : \mathcal{A}) (P' \parallel s \blacktriangleright \varepsilon)} \text{RT-v}} \text{RT-||}$$

where $\vec{q}_p = \text{init}(\mathcal{A}_p)$ for every p and $\xi(p, q) = \varepsilon$ for every p, q . Thus, (\vec{q}, ξ) is clearly reachable. Also, both second typing contexts then coincide: $\Lambda' = \Lambda_s$. Thus, $\Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda_s \vdash \emptyset \vdash P'$, the last premise to satisfy, follows from the induction hypothesis. \square

With the following lemma, we show that, if there is a typing derivation for a process, then the queue typing context is empty.

Lemma C.24. *If P is a well-annotated process such that $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega \vdash P$, then $\Omega = \emptyset$.*

Proof. We do induction on the depth of the typing derivation.

For the base case, we consider RT-0, for which the claim trivially holds, and RT-EMPTYQUEUE, for which we reach a contradiction because $s \blacktriangleright \sigma$ is no process.

Let us turn to the induction step:

- RT-Q: trivially holds
- RT-END: by inversion and induction hypothesis
- RT- \oplus : by inversion and induction hypothesis for every $i \in I$
- RT- $\&$: by inversion and induction hypothesis for every $i \in I$
- RT-||: by inversion and induction hypothesis twice
- RT-v: by inversion and induction hypothesis
- RT-QUEUE: contradiction because $s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto l\langle v \rangle \cdot \vec{m}]$ is no process

This concludes the proof. \square

In our type system, we type a queue from the first to the last element, when using RT-QUEUE. Thus, when applying inversion for this rule, we only get the type for the first element of a non-empty queue. The following lemma allows us to also obtain the type for its last element.

Lemma C.25 (Message list reversal). *Let γ be a queue type. If*

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega, s[p][q] :: \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto \vec{m}], \text{ then}$$

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda, v : L \vdash \Omega, s[p][q] :: \gamma \cdot l(L) \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto \vec{m} \cdot l\langle v \rangle] .$$

Proof. We prove this claim by induction on the length n of $\vec{m} = l_1\langle v_1 \rangle \cdot \dots \cdot l_n\langle v_n \rangle$.

If $n = 0$, the claim is exactly the assumption.

For the induction step, we assume that $\vec{m} = l_1\langle v_1 \rangle \cdot l_2\langle v_2 \rangle \cdot \dots \cdot l_n\langle v_n \rangle$ and the induction hypothesis holds for $l_2\langle v_2 \rangle \cdot \dots \cdot l_n\langle v_n \rangle$.

We want to show that

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega, s[p][q] :: \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto l_1\langle v_1 \rangle \cdot l_2\langle v_2 \rangle \cdot \dots \cdot l_n\langle v_n \rangle] \text{ implies}$$

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda, v : L \vdash \Omega, s[p][q] :: \gamma \cdot l(L) \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto l_1\langle v_1 \rangle \cdot l_2\langle v_2 \rangle \cdot \dots \cdot l_n\langle v_n \rangle \cdot l\langle v \rangle] .$$

By inversion of the premise, we know that $\Lambda = \Lambda', v_1 : L_1$ and $\gamma = L_1 \cdot \gamma'$ in order to type v_1 with some type L_1 . Thus, we can apply RT-QUEUE to our goal and then apply the induction hypothesis with $\Lambda = \Lambda'$ and $\gamma = \gamma'$ to conclude the proof. \square

Next, we show that the queue types reflect what is in the queues of runtime configurations.

Lemma C.26. *If $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega, s[p][q] :: l_1(L_1) \cdot \dots \cdot l_k(L_k) \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto l'_1\langle v'_1 \rangle, \dots, l'_n\langle v'_n \rangle]$, then $k = n$ and, for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, $l'_i = l_i$ and $v'_i : L_i$.*

Proof. We do an induction on the depth of the typing derivation.

For the induction base, we have the following typing derivation:

$$\frac{}{\Theta \vdash \emptyset \vdash \{s[p][q] :: \varepsilon\}_{(p,q) \in \text{Chan}_s} \vdash s \blacktriangleright \varepsilon} \text{RT-EMPTYQUEUE}$$

It is obvious that $k = 0 = n$ and there are no messages to consider.

For the induction step, we have the following typing derivation:

$$\frac{\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega, s[p][q] :: l_1(L_1) \cdot l_2(L_2) \cdot \dots \cdot l_k(L_k) \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto l'_2\langle v'_2 \rangle \cdot \dots \cdot l'_n\langle v'_n \rangle]}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda, v'_1 : L_1 \vdash \Omega, s[p][q] :: l_1(L_1) \cdot l_2(L_2) \cdot \dots \cdot l_k(L_k) \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto l_1\langle v'_1 \rangle \cdot l'_2\langle v'_2 \rangle \cdot \dots \cdot l'_n\langle v'_n \rangle]} \text{RT-QUEUE}$$

Let us first consider the length of the queue type and the queue: by induction hypothesis, we know that $n - 1 = k - 1$ and, thus, $k = n$. Second, let us consider the labels and payload types. For $i = 1$, the typing rule requires the labels to match and $v'_1 : L_1$ is required in the typing context. For $i > 1$, the induction hypothesis applies. \square

We also provided typing context reductions. Here, we show that these actually preserve reachability for the CSM associated with a session.

Lemma C.27 (Typing reductions preserve reachability). *Let $\Lambda = \hat{\Lambda}, \{A_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$ be a typing context and $\Omega = \hat{\Omega}, \{\Omega_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$ be a queue typing context with a set of sessions \mathcal{S} . Assume that*

- $\hat{\Lambda}, \{A_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \vdash \hat{\Omega}, \{\Omega_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \longrightarrow \hat{\Lambda}', \{A'_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \vdash \hat{\Omega}', \{\Omega'_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$, and
- for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, it holds that there is $(\bar{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $A_s = \{s[p] : q\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}$ and $\Omega_s = \{s[p][q] :: \xi(p, q)\}_{(p,q) \in \text{Chan}_A}$

Then, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, it holds that there is $(\bar{q}', \xi') \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $A'_s = \{s[p] : q'\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}$ and $\Omega'_s = \{s[p][q] :: \xi'(p, q)\}_{(p,q) \in \text{Chan}_A}$.

Proof. We do inversion on $\hat{A}, \{A_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mid \hat{\Omega}, \{\Omega_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \longrightarrow \hat{A}', \{A'_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mid \hat{\Omega}', \{\Omega'_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$, yielding two cases.

First, we have

$$\frac{q \xrightarrow{p \triangleright q!l(L)} q'}{s[p] : q, \bar{A} \mid s[p][q] :: \gamma, \bar{\Omega} \longrightarrow s[p] : q', \bar{A} \mid s[p][q] :: \gamma \cdot l(L), \bar{\Omega}} \text{TR-}\oplus$$

for some s , p , and q . For every $s' \neq s$, the claim trivially holds. For s , the changes to $s[p]$ and $s[p][q]$ mimic the semantics of the CSM while the premise $q \xrightarrow{p \triangleright q!l(L)} q'$ ensures that such a transition is possible.

For the second case where we have

$$\frac{q \xrightarrow{p \triangleleft q?l(L)} q'}{s[p] : q, \bar{A} \mid s[q][p] :: l(L) \cdot \gamma, \bar{\Omega} \longrightarrow s[p] : q', \bar{A} \mid s[q][p] :: \gamma, \bar{\Omega}} \text{TR-}\&$$

the reasoning is analogous but mimics the receive case of the CSM semantics. \square

With the substitution lemma, we prove that substituting a variable by a value with the same type preserves typability in our type system.

Lemma C.28 (Substitution Lemma). *Let R be a well-annotated runtime configuration. For all L , if it holds that $\Theta \mid A, x : L \mid \Omega \vdash R$, then*

$$\Theta \mid A, v : L \mid \Omega \vdash R[v/x] .$$

Proof. We do an induction on the depth of the typing derivation and do a case analysis on the last applied rule of the derivation.

For the induction base, we consider both rules with depth 0 and show that there is no R' such that $R \longrightarrow R'$. For both RT-**0** and RT-EMPTYQUEUE, the second typing context is empty, which contradicts our assumption that $x : L$ or $v : L$.

For the induction step, the induction hypothesis yields that the claim holds for typing derivations of smaller depth.

– RT-Q:

We have that

$$\frac{\Theta(Q) = L_1, \dots, L_n}{\Theta \mid c_1 : L_1, \dots, c_{i-1} : L_{i-1}, x : L_i, c_{i+1} : L_{i+1}, \dots, c_n : L_n \mid \emptyset \vdash Q[\vec{c}]} \text{RT-Q}$$

It is straightforward that we need to show precisely the same premise for the desired typing derivation:

$$\Theta \mid c_1 : L_1, \dots, c_{i-1} : L_{i-1}, v : L_i, c_{i+1} : L_{i+1}, \dots, c_n : L_n \mid \emptyset \vdash (Q[\vec{c}])[v/x] .$$

– RT-END: We have two cases.

First, we have

$$\frac{\Theta \mid A \mid \Omega \vdash R \quad \text{end}(q)}{\Theta \mid x : q, A \mid \Omega \vdash R} \text{RT-END}$$

x cannot occur in P_k . In the conclusion of the first typing derivation, we have the typing context $\Lambda, c : q, x : L, \{c_i : L_i\}_{i \in I \setminus \{k\}}$. Thus, by assumption that each element has at most one type in a typing context, we know that x cannot occur in $\Lambda, c : q, \{c_i : L_i\}_{i \in I \setminus \{k\}}$. With Lemma C.22, x cannot occur in P_k . Thus, $P_k[v/x] = P_k$ and the third premise in both typing derivations coincide, concluding this case.

– RT- $\&$:

We have

$$\frac{\delta(q) = \{(\mathbf{p} \triangleleft \mathbf{q}_i ? l_i(L_i), q_i) \mid i \in I\} \quad \forall i \in I. \Theta \vdash \Lambda, y_i : L_i, c : q_i \vdash P_i}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda, c : q \vdash \Omega \vdash \&_{i \in I} c[\mathbf{q}_i] ? l_i(y_i) . P_i} \text{RT-}\&$$

We do a case analysis if $x = c$ or not.

If not, the claim follows by inversion and induction hypothesis for the second premise.

If $x = c$, there is $x : q_i$ in the second premise to type $P_i[v/x]$. The existence of such a typing derivation follows from inversion and induction hypothesis when instantiated with $L = q_i$.

– RT- \parallel :

There are two symmetric cases. We only consider one of both. For this, we have

$$\frac{\Theta \vdash \Lambda_1, x : L \vdash \Omega_1 \vdash R_1 \quad \Theta \vdash \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_2 \vdash R_2}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda_1, x : L, \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \vdash R_1 \parallel R_2} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

We show that there is a typing derivation for

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda_1, v : L, \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \vdash (R_1 \parallel R_2)[v/x]$$

By our assumption that typing contexts have at most one type per element, Λ_1 and Λ_2 cannot share any names. By inversion, we have $\Theta \vdash \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_2 \vdash R_2$. Thus, by Lemma C.22, x cannot occur in R_2 . Hence, $(R_1 \parallel R_2)[v/x] = R_1[v/x] \parallel R_2$. We claim the following typing derivation exists:

$$\frac{\Theta \vdash \Lambda_1, v : L, \Omega_1 \vdash R_1 \quad \Theta \vdash \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_2 \vdash R_2}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda_1, v : L, \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \vdash R_1[v/x] \parallel R_2} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

The second premise is the same as in the original typing derivation. The first premise can be obtained by inversion on the original typing derivation and applying the induction hypothesis.

– RT- \mathbf{v} :

We have a typing derivation for

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda, x : L, \Lambda_s \vdash \Omega, \Omega_s \vdash R .$$

This case follows easily from inversion and applying the induction hypothesis to obtain a typing derivation for

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda, v : L, \Lambda_s \vdash \Omega, \Omega_s \vdash R[v/x] .$$

– RT-QUEUE:

We have a typing derivation for

$$\frac{\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega, s[p][q] :: \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto \vec{m}]}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda, v' : L \vdash \Omega, s[p][q] :: l(L) \cdot \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto l\langle v' \rangle \cdot \vec{m}]} \text{RT-QUEUE}$$

We do a case analysis if $x = v'$ or not. If so, the same typing derivation can simply be re-used as $v' : L$ also disappears in the original typing derivation. If not, the claim follows by inversion and application of the induction hypothesis.

This concludes the proof of the substitution lemma. \square

Now, we turn to the main result about our type system: *subject reduction*. In short, if there is a runtime configuration with a typing derivation that can take a step, then the typing contexts can also take a step and can be used to type the new runtime configuration.

Note that Theorem 5.1 in the main text follows from Theorem C.29.

Theorem C.29 (Subject Reduction). *Let R be a well-annotated runtime configuration with a set of active sessions \mathcal{S} . If*

- (1) $\vdash \mathcal{D} : \Theta$,
- (2) $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega \vdash R$ with $\Lambda = \hat{\Lambda}, \{\Lambda_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$ and $\Omega = \hat{\Omega}, \{\Omega_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$,
- (3) for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, it holds that there is $(\vec{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\Lambda_s = \{s[p] : q\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}$ and $\Omega_s = \{s[p][q] :: \xi(p, q)\}_{(p, q) \in \text{Chan}_A}$
- (4) $R \longrightarrow R'$,

then there exist Λ' and Ω' with $\Lambda \vdash \Omega \longrightarrow \Lambda' \vdash \Omega'$ such that $\Theta \vdash \Lambda' \vdash \Omega' \vdash R'$.

Proof. We do an induction on the depth of the typing derivation $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega \vdash R$ and do a case analysis on the last applied rule of the derivation.

For the induction base, we consider both rules with depth 0 and show that there is no R' such that $R \longrightarrow R'$.

– RT-0:

It is trivial that $\mathbf{0}$ cannot reduce.

– RT-EMPTYQUEUE:

In this case $R = s \blacktriangleright \varepsilon$ for which none of the reduction rules apply.

For the induction step, the induction hypothesis yields that the claim holds for typing derivations of smaller depth. We do a case analysis on the typing rule that was applied last.

– RT-Q:

We have that

$$\frac{\Theta(Q) = L_1, \dots, L_n}{\Theta \vdash c_1 : L_1, \dots, c_n : L_n \vdash \emptyset \vdash Q[\vec{c}]} \text{RT-Q}$$

Thus, we know that $R = Q[\vec{c}]$. However, none of the reduction rules apply, contradicting (4).

– RT-END:

We have that

$$\frac{\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega \vdash R \quad \text{end}(q)}{\Theta \vdash c : q, \Lambda \vdash \Omega \vdash R} \text{RT-END}$$

We have to show that

$$\frac{\Theta \vdash \Lambda' \vdash \Omega' \vdash R' \quad \text{end}(q)}{\Theta \vdash c : q, \Lambda' \vdash \Omega' \vdash R'} \text{RT-END}$$

The second premise $\text{end}(q)$ is the same for both. The first premise follows by the induction hypothesis, which also gives $\Lambda \vdash \Omega \longrightarrow \Lambda' \vdash \Omega'$, concluding this case.

– RT- \oplus :

Inversion on the typing derivation yields that $R = \oplus_{i \in I} s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_i]!l_i \langle v_i \rangle . P_i$. None of the reduction rules apply and, thus, there is no R' with $R \longrightarrow R'$, contradicting (4).

– RT- $\&$:

Inversion on the typing derivation yields that $R = \&_{i \in I} s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_i]?l_i(L_i) . P_i$. None of the reduction rules apply and, thus, there is no R' with $R \longrightarrow R'$, contradicting (4).

– RT- \parallel :

We do inversion on the reduction (4).

• RR-Q:

We have

$$\frac{\text{RT-Q} \frac{\Theta(\mathbf{Q}) = \vec{L}}{\Theta \vdash \vec{c} : \vec{L} \vdash \emptyset \vdash \mathbf{Q}[\vec{c}]} \quad \Theta \vdash \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_2 \vdash R_2}{\Theta \vdash \vec{c} : \vec{L}, \Lambda_2 \vdash \Omega_2 \vdash \mathbf{Q}[\vec{c}] \parallel R_2} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

By inversion on (4), we have

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Q}, \vec{c}) \parallel R_2 \longrightarrow R'}{\mathbf{Q}[\vec{c}] \parallel R_2 \longrightarrow R'} \text{RR-Q}$$

By assumption that \mathbf{Q} is defined in \mathcal{D} and by definition of \mathcal{D} , we have that

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_1; (\mathbf{Q}[\vec{x}] = P); \mathcal{D}_2$$

for some \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 .

We claim there is a typing derivation for

$$\Theta \vdash \vec{c} : \vec{L} \vdash P[\vec{c}/\vec{x}]$$

(1) states that $\vdash \mathcal{D} : \Theta$. Inversion on (1) for $|\mathcal{D}_1|$ times yields

$$\Theta \vdash \vec{x} : \vec{L} \vdash P .$$

We obtain a typing derivation after $|\vec{x}|$ applications of the substitution lemma (Lemma C.28).

We do a case analysis on the structure of P and simultaneously if $R' = \mathbf{err}$ for second case.

* $P = \oplus_{i \in I} x[\mathbf{q}_i]!l_i \langle x_i \rangle . P_i$:

Let us rewrite the typing context: $\vec{c} : \vec{L} = (x : q, \{x_j : L_j\}_{j \in I}, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}]$. Without loss of generality, let $x[\vec{c}/\vec{x}] = s[\mathbf{p}]$. Then $R' = [P_k[\vec{c}/\vec{x}]] \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}_k) \mapsto \vec{m} \cdot l_k \langle v_k \rangle]$ for some $k \in I$. We show there is a typing derivation for any $k \in I$:

$$\frac{\Theta \vdash (x : q_k, \{x_j : L_j\}_{j \in I \setminus \{k\}}, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}] \vdash \emptyset \vdash [P_k[\vec{c}/\vec{x}]]}{\Theta \vdash (c_k : L_k)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}], A_2 \vdash \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \cdot l_k(L_k[\vec{c}/\vec{x}]) \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}_k) \mapsto \vec{m} \cdot l_k \langle v_k \rangle]} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

$$\frac{}{\Theta \vdash (x : q_k, \{x_j : L_j\}_{j \in I}, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}], A_2 \vdash \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \cdot l_k(L_k) \vdash R'} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

By inversion on

$$\Theta \vdash (x : q, \{x_j : L_j\}_{j \in I}, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}] \vdash \left(\oplus_{i \in I} x[\mathbf{q}_i]!l_i \langle x_i \rangle . P_i \right)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}] ,$$

we get $\Theta \vdash (x : q_i, \{x_j : L_j\}_{j \in I \setminus \{i\}}, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}] \vdash P_i[\vec{c}/\vec{x}]$ for every $i \in I$. Instantiating $i = k$ and applying Lemma C.23 yields the desired premise:

$$\Theta \vdash (x : q_i, \{x_j : L_j\}_{j \in I \setminus \{i\}}, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}] \vdash \emptyset \vdash [P_i[\vec{c}/\vec{x}]]$$

We show there is a typing derivation

$$\frac{\Theta \vdash A_2 \vdash \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}_k) \mapsto \vec{m}]}{\Theta \vdash (c_k : L_k)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}], A_2 \vdash \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \cdot l_k(L_k[\vec{c}/\vec{x}]) \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}_k) \mapsto \vec{m} \cdot l_k \langle v_k \rangle]} \text{RT-QUEUE}$$

By inversion on $R \longrightarrow R'$, we have that $R_2 = s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}_k) \mapsto \vec{m}]$. By inversion on $\Theta \vdash A_2 \vdash \Omega_2 \vdash R_2$, we obtain

$$\Theta \vdash A_2 \vdash \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}_k) \mapsto \vec{m}]$$

which is the desired premise.

It is straightforward that there is a typing context reduction for the corresponding typing contexts, using TR- \oplus .

* $P = \&_{i \in I} x[\mathbf{q}_i]?l_i(y_i) . P_i$ and $R' \neq \mathbf{err}$:

Let us rewrite the typing context: $\vec{c} : \vec{L} = (x : q, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}]$. Without loss of generality, let $x[\vec{c}/\vec{x}] = s[\mathbf{p}]$. Then $R' = [P_k[v_k/y_k]] \parallel s \blacktriangleright [(\mathbf{q}_k, \mathbf{p}) \mapsto \vec{m}]$ and $R_2 = s \blacktriangleright [(\mathbf{q}_k, \mathbf{p}) \mapsto l_k \langle v_k \rangle \cdot \vec{m}]$. We show there is a typing derivation for any $k \in I$:

$$\frac{\Theta \vdash v_k : L_k, (x : q_k, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}] \vdash \emptyset \vdash [P_k[\vec{c}/\vec{x}][v_k/y_k]]}{\Theta \vdash A_2 \vdash \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}_k) \mapsto \vec{m}]} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

$$\frac{}{\Theta \vdash (x : q_k, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}], A_2 \vdash \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \vdash [P_k[\vec{c}/\vec{x}][v_k/y_k]] \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}_k) \mapsto \vec{m}]} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

By inversion on $\Theta \vdash (x : q, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}] \vdash (\&_{i \in I} x[\mathbf{q}_i]?l_i(y_i) . P_i)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}]$, we get

$$\Theta \vdash (x : q_i, y_i : L_i, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}] \vdash P_i[\vec{c}/\vec{x}]$$

for every $i \in I$. Instantiating $i = k$ and applying Lemma C.23 yields the desired premise:

$$\Theta \vdash v_k : L_k, (x : q_k, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}] \vdash \emptyset \vdash [P_k[\vec{c}/\vec{x}][v_k/y_k]]$$

The second premise is obtained by inversion on

$$\Theta \vdash v_k : L_k, A_2 \vdash \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{p}_k] :: l_k(L_k) \cdot \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright [(\mathbf{q}_k, \mathbf{p}) \mapsto l_k \langle v_k \rangle \cdot \vec{m}] .$$

It is straightforward that there is a typing context reduction for the corresponding typing contexts, using TR- $\&$.

* $P = \&_{i \in I} x[\mathbf{q}_i]?l_i(y_i) \cdot P_i$ and $R' = \mathbf{err}$:

Let us rewrite the typing context: $\vec{c} : \vec{L} = (x : q, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}]$. Without loss of generality, let $x[\vec{c}/\vec{x}] = s[\mathbf{p}]$. Then, by inversion on $R \rightarrow R'$, we have $R_2 = s \blacktriangleright \sigma$ and for every $i \in I$, $\sigma(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}) = l(_)\cdot \vec{m}$ and $l_i \neq l$. We claim that there is no typing derivation

$$\Theta \vdash (x : q, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}], A_2 \vdash \Omega_2 \vdash (\&_{i \in I} x[\mathbf{q}_i]?l_i(y_i) \cdot P_i)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}] \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma .$$

By inversion, such a typing derivation must have the following shape:

$$\frac{\frac{\delta(q) = \{\langle \mathbf{p} \triangleleft \mathbf{q}_i?l_i(L_i), q_i \rangle \mid i \in I\}}{\forall i \in I. \Theta \vdash (x : q_i, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}], y_i : L_i, \emptyset \vdash P_i} \text{RT-}\&}{\Theta \vdash (x : q, A_1)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}] \vdash \emptyset \vdash (\&_{i \in I} x[\mathbf{q}_i]?l_i(y_i) \cdot P_i)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}]} \text{RT-}\&}{\Theta \vdash A_2 \vdash \Omega_2 \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

Let us rewrite the typing and queue typing context:

$$(x : q, \Theta)[\vec{c}/\vec{x}], A_2 = \hat{A}, A_s \\ \Omega_2 = \hat{\Omega}, \Omega_s$$

By assumption, we know that there is $(\vec{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $A_s = \{s[\mathbf{p}] : q\}_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_A}$ and $\Omega_s = \{s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}] :: \xi(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})\}_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \text{Chan}_{\mathcal{A}}}$. Recall the condition on the reduction semantics: $\forall i \in I. \sigma(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}) = l(_)\cdot \vec{m}$ and $l_i \neq l$. Thus, with Lemma C.26, it follows that, for all $i \in I$, $\xi(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}) = l'_i(_)\cdot _$ with $l'_i \neq l_i$. For the CSM \mathcal{A} , this entails that \mathbf{p} expects to receive a message from a set of other participants, ranged over by \mathbf{q}_i , but the first message in each channel does not match. This yields a contradiction to feasible eventual reception: there has been at least one send event to \mathbf{p} and there is no matching receive event yet; because \mathbf{p} will never proceed, no matching receive event can ever happen.

- RR-CTX:

For the context rule, two cases apply: $R \parallel \mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{C} \parallel R$. Both cases can be proven analogous, which is why we only prove the first. We have that

$$\frac{\Theta \vdash A_1 \vdash \Omega_1 \vdash R_1 \quad \Theta \vdash A_2 \vdash \Omega_2 \vdash R_2}{\Theta \vdash A_1, A_2 \vdash \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \vdash R_1 \parallel R_2} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

and we want to show that

$$\frac{\Theta \vdash A'_1 \vdash \Omega'_1 \vdash R'_1 \quad \Theta \vdash A_2 \vdash \Omega_2 \vdash R_2}{\Theta \vdash A'_1, A_2 \vdash \Omega'_1, \Omega_2 \vdash R'_1 \parallel R_2} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

The second premise is trivially satisfied. The first premise follows from the induction hypothesis, which also yields that $A_1 \vdash \Omega_1 \rightarrow A'_1 \vdash \Omega'_1$. We can apply Lemma C.16 to obtain $A_1, A_2 \vdash \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \rightarrow A'_1, A_2 \vdash \Omega'_1, \Omega_2$, concluding this case.

- RR-OUT:

With three inversions on the typing derivation, we have a typing derivation with the following shape for $R = \oplus_{i \in I} s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_i]!l_i \langle v_i \rangle . P_i \parallel \sigma[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}_k) \mapsto \vec{m}]$:

$$\frac{\frac{\delta(q) \supseteq \{(\mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}_i!l_i \langle L_i \rangle, q_i) \mid i \in I\}}{\forall i \in I. \Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q_i, \{v_j : L_j\}_{j \in I \setminus \{i\}} \mid \Omega_1 \vdash P_i} \text{RT-}\oplus}{\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q, \{v_i : L_i\}_{i \in I} \mid \Omega_1 \vdash \oplus_{i \in I} s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_i]!l_i \langle v_i \rangle . P_i} \text{RT-}\oplus}$$

$$\frac{\vdots}{\frac{\Theta \mid \Lambda_2 \mid \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \mapsto \vec{m}]}{\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q, \{v_i : L_i\}_{i \in I}, \Lambda_2 \mid \Omega_1, \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \vdash R} \text{RT-}\text{QUEUE}} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

By inversion, we obtain all premises. We show that

$$\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q_k, \{v_i : L_i\}_{i \in I \setminus \{k\}} \mid \Omega_1 \vdash [P_k]} \text{RT-}\oplus}{\frac{\vdots}{\frac{\Theta \mid \Lambda_2, v_k : L_k \mid \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \cdot l_k \langle L_k \rangle \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}_k) \mapsto \vec{m} \cdot l_k \langle v_k \rangle]}{\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q_k, \{v_i : L_i\}_{i \in I \setminus \{k\}}, v_k : L_k, \Lambda_2 \mid \Omega_1, \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \cdot l_k \langle L_k \rangle \vdash R'} \text{RT-}\text{QUEUE}} \text{RT-}\parallel}$$

for $R' = [P_k] \parallel \sigma[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}_k) \mapsto \vec{m} \cdot l_k \langle v_k \rangle]$.

First, we show there is a typing derivation for

$$\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q_k, \{v_i : L_i\}_{i \in I \setminus \{k\}} \mid \Omega_1 \vdash [P_k]$$

first. We instantiate the premise

$$\forall i \in I. \Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q_i, \{v_j : L_j\}_{j \in I \setminus \{i\}} \mid \Omega_1 \vdash P_i$$

for $i = k$ and obtain

$$\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q_k, \{v_j : L_j\}_{j \in I \setminus \{k\}} \mid \Omega_1 \vdash P_k$$

By Lemma C.24, we know that $\Omega_1 = \emptyset$ and, thus, Lemma C.23 applies and concludes this case.

Second, we show there is a typing derivation for

$$\Theta \mid \Lambda_2, v_k : L_k \mid \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \cdot l_k \langle L_k \rangle \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}_k) \mapsto \vec{m} \cdot l_k \langle v_k \rangle]$$

From inversion of the original typing derivation, we have

$$\Theta \mid \Lambda_2 \mid \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}_k) \mapsto \vec{m}]$$

With Lemma C.25, the claim follows.

It remains to show that there is a transition for the respective typing contexts:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda &:= \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q, \{v_i : L_i\}_{i \in I}, \Lambda_2 \\ \Lambda' &:= \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q_k, \{v_i : L_i\}_{i \in I \setminus \{k\}}, v_k : L_k, \Lambda_2 \\ \Omega &:= \Omega_1, \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \\ \Omega' &:= \Omega_1, \hat{\Omega}_2, s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_k] :: \gamma \cdot l_k \langle L_k \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Note that the change from Λ to Λ' is solely the type of $s[\mathbf{p}]$ while $s[\mathbf{p}][q_k]$ is the only change from Λ to Λ' . Thus, we can simply apply $\text{TR-}\oplus$ to obtain a typing context reduction.

- **RR-IN:**

With three inversions on the typing derivation, we have a typing derivation with the following shape for

$$R = \&_{i \in I} s[\mathbf{p}][q_i] ? l_i(y_i) \cdot P_i \parallel \sigma[(q_k, \mathbf{p}) \mapsto l_k \langle v_k \rangle \cdot \vec{m}]:$$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\delta(q) = \{(\mathbf{p} \triangleleft q_i ? l_i(\hat{\Lambda}_1), q_i) \mid i \in I\}}{\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q \mid \Omega_1 \vdash \&_{i \in I} s[\mathbf{p}][q_i] ? l_i(y_i) \cdot P_i} \text{RT-}\&}{\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_2 \mid \hat{\Omega}_2, s[q_k][\mathbf{p}] :: \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(q_k, \mathbf{p}) \mapsto \vec{m}]} \text{RT-QUEUE}}{\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_2, v_k : L_k, \mid \hat{\Omega}_2, s[q_k][\mathbf{p}] :: l_k(L_k) \cdot \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(q_k, \mathbf{p}) \mapsto l_k \langle v_k \rangle \cdot \vec{m}]} \text{RT-}\parallel} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

By inversion, we obtain all the premises. We show that there is a typing derivation of shape

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q_k, v_k : L_k \mid \Omega_1 \vdash [P_k[v_k/y_k]]} \text{RT-}\&}{\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_2 \mid \hat{\Omega}_2, s[q_k][\mathbf{p}] :: \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(q_k, \mathbf{p}) \mapsto \vec{m}]} \text{RT-QUEUE}}{\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q, v_k : L_k, \hat{\Lambda}_2 \mid \Omega_1, \hat{\Omega}_2, s[q_k][\mathbf{p}] :: \gamma \vdash [P_k[v_k/y_k]] \parallel \sigma[(q_k, \mathbf{p}) \mapsto \vec{m}]} \text{RT-}\parallel} \text{RT-}\parallel$$

First, we show there is a typing derivation for

$$\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q_k, v_k : L_k \mid \Omega_1 \vdash [P_k[v_k/y_k]] \ .$$

From inversion, we get the following premise from the original typing derivation:

$$i \in I. \Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, y_i : L_i, s[\mathbf{p}] : q_i \mid \Omega_1 \vdash P_i$$

which we instantiate with $i = k$ to obtain:

$$\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, y_k : L_k, s[\mathbf{p}] : q_k \mid \Omega_1 \vdash P_k \ .$$

With Lemma C.28, we get

$$\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_1, v_k : L_k, s[\mathbf{p}] : q_k \mid \Omega_1 \vdash P_k[v_k/y_k] \ .$$

By Lemma C.24, we know that $\Omega_1 = \emptyset$ and, thus, Lemma C.23 applies and concludes this case.

Second, there is a typing derivation for

$$\Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_2 \mid \hat{\Omega}_2, s[q_k][\mathbf{p}] :: \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(q_k, \mathbf{p}) \mapsto \vec{m}]$$

by inversion on the original typing derivation.

It remains to show that there is a transition for the respective typing contexts:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda &:= \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q, \hat{\Lambda}_2, v_k : L_k \\ \Lambda' &:= \hat{\Lambda}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q_k, v_k : L_k, \hat{\Lambda}_2 \\ \Omega &:= \Omega_1, \hat{\Omega}_2, s[q_k][\mathbf{p}] :: l_k(L_k) \cdot \gamma \\ \Omega' &:= \Omega_1, \hat{\Omega}_2, s[q_k][\mathbf{p}] :: \gamma \end{aligned}$$

Note that the change from Λ to Λ' is solely the type of $s[\mathbf{p}]$ while $s[\mathbf{q}_k][\mathbf{p}]$ is the only change from Λ to Λ' . Thus, we can simply apply TR- $\&$ to obtain a typing context reduction.

- RR-ERR1:

By assumption, we have a typing derivation for $\&_{i \in I} s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_i]?l_i(y_i) \cdot P_i \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma$ and it holds that $\forall i \in I. \sigma(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}) = l(_) \cdot \vec{m}$ and $l_i \neq l$. By inversion and Lemma C.24, the typing derivation must have the following shape:

$$\frac{\frac{\delta(q) = \{\mathbf{p} \triangleleft \mathbf{q}_i?l_i(L_i), q_i \mid i \in I\}}{\forall i \in I. \Theta \vdash \hat{A}_1, y_i : L_i, s[\mathbf{p}] : q_i \mid \emptyset \vdash P_i} \text{RT-}\&}{\Theta \vdash \hat{A}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q \mid \emptyset \vdash \&_{i \in I} s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_i]?l_i(y_i) \cdot P_i} \text{RT-}\&}{\vdots}{\frac{\Theta \vdash \Lambda_2 \mid \Omega_2 \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma}{\Theta \vdash \hat{A}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q, \Lambda_2 \mid \Omega_2 \vdash \&_{i \in I} s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}_i]?l_i(y_i) \cdot P_i \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma} \text{RT-}\parallel}$$

Let us rewrite the typing and queue typing context:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_1, s[\mathbf{p}] : q, \Lambda_2 &= \hat{A}, A_s \\ \Omega_2 &= \hat{\Omega}, \Omega_s \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, we know that there is $(\vec{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\Lambda_s = \{s[\mathbf{p}] : q\}_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}}$ and $\Omega_s = \{s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}] :: \xi(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})\}_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \text{Chan}_{\mathcal{A}}}$. Recall the condition on the reduction semantics: $\forall i \in I. \sigma(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}) = l(_) \cdot \vec{m}$ and $l_i \neq l$. Thus, with Lemma C.26, it follows that, for all $i \in I$, $\xi(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}) = l'_i(_) \cdot _$ with $l'_i \neq l_i$. For the CSM \mathcal{A} , this entails that \mathbf{p} expects to receive a message from a set of other participants, ranged over by \mathbf{q}_i , but the first message in each channel does not match. Thus, none of them will ever be received. This yields a contradiction to feasible eventual reception: there has been at least one send event to \mathbf{p} and there is no matching receive event yet; because \mathbf{p} will never proceed, no matching receive event can ever happen.

- RT-v:

By inversion on the typing derivation, there is a typing derivation

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda \mid \Omega \vdash (\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) R .$$

We do inversion on (4), yielding two reduction rules that apply.

- RR-CTX:

We have

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} (\vec{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A}) \quad \Lambda_s = \{s[\mathbf{p}] : \vec{q}_{\mathbf{p}}\}_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}} \\ \Omega_s = \{s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}] :: \xi(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})\}_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \text{Chan}_{\mathcal{A}}} \quad \Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda_s \mid \Omega, \Omega_s \vdash R \end{array}}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda \mid \Omega \vdash (\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) R} \text{RT-v}$$

By inversion, we obtain all premises. We show that

$$\frac{(\vec{q}', \xi') \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A}) \quad \Lambda'_s = \{s[p] : q'_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} \quad \Omega'_s = \{s[p][q] :: \xi'(p, q)\}_{(p, q) \in \text{Chan}_A} \quad \Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda'_s \mid \Omega, \Omega'_s \vdash R'}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda \mid \Omega \vdash (vs : \mathcal{A}) R'} \text{RT-v}$$

The first premise is the same as for the original typing derivation. We know that $\Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda_s \mid \Omega, \Omega_s \vdash R$. With the induction hypothesis, we get

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda'_s \mid \Omega, \Omega'_s \vdash R' \text{ and } \Lambda, \Lambda_s \mid \Omega, \Omega_s \longrightarrow \Lambda, \Lambda'_s \mid \Omega, \Omega'_s .$$

The first fact proves the last premise for the new typing derivation. For the remaining ones, we apply Lemma C.27, which yields that there is $(\vec{q}', \xi') \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\Lambda'_s = \{s[p] : q'_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}$ and $\Omega'_s = \{s[p][q] :: \xi'(p, q)\}_{(p, q) \in \text{Chan}_A}$. These are precisely the remaining premises for the new typing derivation. It is obvious that there is a reduction for the typing contexts, which concludes this case.

- RR-ERR2:

We have a typing derivation for

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda \mid \Omega \vdash (vs : \mathcal{A}) s \blacktriangleright \sigma$$

and know $\sigma(p, q) \neq \varepsilon$ for some p, q . We do inversion on the typing derivation:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \Theta \vdash \Lambda, \Lambda_s \mid \Omega, \Omega_s \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma \end{array} \quad \text{RT-QUEUE} \quad (\vec{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A}) \quad \Lambda_s = \{s[p] : \vec{q}_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} \quad \Omega_s = \{s[p][q] :: \xi(p, q)\}_{(p, q) \in \text{Chan}_A}}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda \mid \Omega \vdash (vs : \mathcal{A}) s \blacktriangleright \sigma} \text{RT-v}$$

By definition of Λ_s , there is a type $s[p] : q$ for every $p \in \mathcal{P}_A$. There is a typing derivation for

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda, \{s[p] : \vec{q}_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} \mid \Omega, \{s[p][q] :: \xi(p, q)\}_{(p, q) \in \text{Chan}_A} \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma .$$

The only applicable typing rules (in the whole derivation) are RT-END, RT-EMPTYQUEUE, and RT-QUEUE. By our assumption that there is a strict partial order for the CSMs in our system, $s[-]$ does not appear in σ . Thus, RT-END needs to be applied to reduce the typing context $\{s[p] : \vec{q}_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}$ to only contain Λ , which can then be used to type the queue with RT-QUEUE. The premise of RT-END requires that $\text{end}(q)$, i.e. q is a final state and has not outgoing receive transition. This, however, entails that (\vec{q}, ξ) is a non-final configuration where all participants are in final states and the channels are not empty, yielding a deadlock. This contradicts the fact that \mathcal{A} is deadlock-free, concluding this case.

- RT-QUEUE:

We have the typing derivation

$$\frac{\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega, s[p][q] :: \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto \vec{m}]}{\Theta \vdash \Lambda, v : L \vdash \Omega, s[p][q] :: l(L) \cdot \gamma \vdash s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto l\langle v \rangle \cdot \vec{m}]} \text{RT-QUEUE}$$

However, there is not R' such that $s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q) \mapsto l\langle v \rangle \cdot \vec{m}] \longrightarrow R'$, contradicting (4).

This concludes the proof of subject reduction. \square

From subject reduction, *type safety* follows: if a process can be typed, any runtime configuration that can be reached from this process cannot contain an error. Note that Corollary 5.2 in the main text follows from Corollary C.30.

Corollary C.30 (Type Safety). *Assume that $\vdash \mathcal{D} : \Theta$ and $\Theta \vdash \emptyset \vdash P$ for some well-annotated process P . If $[P] \longrightarrow^* R$, then, $R \neq \mathbf{err}$.*

Proof. From Lemma C.23, we know that $\Theta \vdash \emptyset \vdash [P]$. By definition $\longrightarrow^* := \{\longrightarrow^k \mid k \geq 0\}$. We prove a stronger claim: For all $k \geq 0$, if $[P] \longrightarrow^k R$, then,

- $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \Omega \vdash R$ with $\Lambda = \hat{\Lambda}, \{A_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$ and $\Omega = \hat{\Omega}, \{\Omega_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$, and
- for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, it holds that there is $(\vec{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $A_s = \{s[p] : q\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}$ and $\Omega_s = \{s[p][q] :: \xi(p, q)\}_{(p, q) \in \text{Chan}_A}$

This claim entails that $R \neq \mathbf{err}$ because \mathbf{err} cannot be typed but R can be typed.

We prove the claim by induction on k .

For $k = 0$, the claim trivially follows because both the typing and queue typing context is empty, trivially satisfying the conditions.

For the induction step, we have $[P] \longrightarrow^k R$, the claim holds for R , and $R \longrightarrow R'$. With Subject Reduction (Theorem C.29), we proved precisely what we need to show for R' . \square

Subject reduction shows that any step of a runtime configuration can be mimicked by the typing contexts and these can be used to type the new runtime configuration. Since \mathbf{err} cannot be typed, this shows that a typed runtime configuration can never reduce to \mathbf{err} , yielding type safety. While this is a safety property, *session fidelity* deals with progress. Roughly speaking, if the typing contexts can take a step, then the runtime configuration can also take a step. In most MST frameworks, this can only be proven in the presence of a single session. Thus, we define the following restriction of our type system.

Definition C.31. *We define \Vdash_{SF} to be \vdash but without the rules PT-v and RT-v. Using this, we define \vdash_{SF} for processes as follows:*

$$\frac{\forall p \in \mathcal{P}_A. \forall c : q \in A_p. \text{end}(q) \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}_A. \Theta \vdash A_p, s[p] : \text{init}(A_p) \Vdash_{SF} Q_p}{\Theta \vdash \{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} \vdash_{SF} (vs : \mathcal{A}) (\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} Q_p)} \text{PT-v'}$$

We also define \vdash_{SF} for runtime configurations:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} (\vec{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A}) \\ \forall \mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}. \forall c : q' \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{p}}. \text{end}(q') \quad \forall \mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}. \Theta \vdash \Lambda_{\mathbf{p}}, s[\mathbf{p}] : \vec{q}_{\mathbf{p}} \Vdash_{SF} Q_{\mathbf{p}} \\ \Theta \vdash \Lambda' \vdash \{s[\mathbf{p}][\mathbf{q}] :: \xi(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})\}_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \text{Chan}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Vdash_{SF} s \blacktriangleright \sigma \end{array}}{\Theta \vdash \{\Lambda_{\mathbf{p}}\}_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}}, \Lambda' \vdash \emptyset \vdash_{SF} (\mathbf{vs} : \mathcal{A}) (\prod_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}} Q_{\mathbf{p}}) \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma} \text{RT-v'}$$

If $\Theta \vdash \{\Lambda_{\mathbf{p}}\}_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}}, \Lambda' \vdash \emptyset \vdash_{SF} (\mathbf{vs} : \mathcal{A}) (\prod_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}} Q_{\mathbf{p}}) \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma$ holds, we know that we can obtain the premises by inversion. For conciseness, we use the following notation to refer to the CSM configuration (\vec{q}, ξ) :

$$\Theta \vdash \{\Lambda_{\mathbf{p}}\}_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}}, \Lambda' \vdash \emptyset \stackrel{(\vec{q}, \xi)}{\vdash_{SF}} (\mathbf{vs} : \mathcal{A}) (\prod_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}} Q_{\mathbf{p}}) \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma .$$

Proposition C.32. *Let P be a process, R be a runtime configuration and assume $\vdash_{SF} \mathcal{D} : \Theta$. If $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash_{SF} (\mathbf{vs} : \mathcal{A}) P$, then P is restriction-free. If $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \emptyset \vdash_{SF} (\mathbf{vs} : \mathcal{A}) R$, then R is restriction-free.*

Intuitively, \vdash_{SF} allows us to have one restriction with CSM \mathcal{A} and requires that all different participants of \mathcal{A} are played by different processes in parallel. As argued in the main text, these are standard restrictions for session fidelity (and deadlock freedom).

As for \vdash , we show a correspondence between processes and runtime configurations for \Vdash_{SF} and \vdash_{SF} .

Lemma C.33. *Let P be a well-annotated process.*

If $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \Vdash_{SF} P$, then $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \emptyset \Vdash_{SF} [P]$. If $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash_{SF} P$, then $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \emptyset \vdash_{SF} [P]$.

Proof. We prove the claim \Vdash_{SF} by induction on the structure of P , as for Lemma C.23. For all except $P = P_1 \parallel P_2$ and $P = (\mathbf{vs} : \mathcal{A}) P'$, it holds that $[P] = P$. For all typing rules that processes and runtime configurations share, the queue typing context is not changed in the respective runtime configuration typing rule. Thus, $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \emptyset \vdash [P]$. For $P = P_1 \parallel P_2$, the claim follows directly by induction hypothesis. Since \Vdash_{SF} has no rule for restriction, we do not need to consider $P = (\mathbf{vs} : \mathcal{A}) P'$.

In contrast, \vdash_{SF} only applies to P with shape $(\mathbf{vs} : \mathcal{A}) (\prod_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}} Q_{\mathbf{p}}) \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma$, so we only need to consider such processes. As for Lemma C.23, we can pick the initial states and empty channels. The remaining premises follow from the first claim. \square

Note that Theorem 5.3 in the main text is a consequence of Theorem C.34.

Theorem C.34 (Session fidelity with sink-final FSMs). *Let \mathcal{A} be a deadlock-free CSM that satisfies feasible eventual reception and, for every $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$, $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{p}}$ is sink-final. Let R be a runtime configuration. We assume that*

- (1) $\vdash_{SF} \mathcal{D} : \Theta$,
- (2) $\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \emptyset \stackrel{(\vec{q}, \xi)}{\vdash_{SF}} (\mathbf{vs} : \mathcal{A}) R$, and

(3) $(\vec{q}, \xi) \rightarrow (\vec{q}'', \xi'')$ for some \vec{q}'' and ξ'' .

Then, there is (\vec{q}', ξ') with $(\vec{q}, \xi) \rightarrow (\vec{q}', \xi')$ and R' with $R \rightarrow R'$ such that

$$\Theta \vdash \Lambda \vdash \emptyset \vdash_{SF}^{(\vec{q}', \xi')} (\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) R'.$$

Proof. By assumption, we know that $(\vec{q}, \xi) \xrightarrow{x} (\vec{q}', \xi')$. We do a case analysis on the shape of x .

First, let $x = \mathbf{r} \triangleright \mathbf{q} \parallel l(L)$. We do inversion on (2) and rewrite Λ as $\{\Lambda_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}, \Lambda'$:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} (\vec{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A}) \\ \forall p \in \mathcal{P}_A. \forall c : q' \in \Lambda_p. \text{end}(q') \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}_A. \Theta \vdash \Lambda_p, s[p] : \vec{q}_p \Vdash_{SF} Q_p \\ \Theta \vdash \Lambda' \vdash \{s[p][q] :: \xi(p, q)\}_{(p, q) \in \text{Chan}_A} \Vdash_{SF} s \blacktriangleright \sigma \end{array}}{\Theta \vdash \{\Lambda_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}, \Lambda' \vdash \emptyset \vdash_{SF} (\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) (\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} Q_p) \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma} \text{RT-V'}$$

and obtain all its premises as well as the fact that $R = (\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} Q_p) \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma$. From the fact that \vec{q}_r has outgoing transitions, we know that it is not final, which in turn means that $\text{end}(\vec{q}_r)$ does not hold. Hence, two typing rules can apply: PT-Q and PT- \oplus .

We do a case analysis and show that applying PT-Q will eventually lead to applying PT- \oplus as well. First, we do an inversion:

$$\frac{\Theta(Q) = \vec{L}}{\Theta \vdash \vec{c} : \vec{L} \Vdash_{SF} Q[\vec{c}]} \text{PT-Q}$$

Assume that we type $Q[\vec{x}]$ and $Q[\vec{x}] = P'$. From (1), it follows that $\Theta \vdash \vec{x} : \vec{L} \Vdash_{SF} P'$. By assumption, we know that process definitions are guarded. Thus, P' needs to be typed with PT- \oplus . The following arguments are very similar from now on. In fact, there are two differences: first, we would carry $\vec{x} : \vec{L}$ around, and second, we would apply RR-Q to prove that $R \rightarrow R'$. For conciseness, we refrain from doing so and focus on the case without the indirection through a process definition.

Thus, we consider PT- \oplus as typing rule for Q_r . By inversion, we have

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \delta(q) \supseteq \{(p \triangleright q_i \parallel l_i(L_i), q_i) \mid i \in I\} \\ \forall i \in I. \Theta \vdash \hat{\Lambda}_r, s[r] : q_i, \{c_j : L_j\}_{j \in I \setminus \{i\}} \vdash P_i \end{array}}{\Theta \vdash \hat{\Lambda}_r, s[r] : q, \{c_i : L_i\}_{i \in I} \vdash \bigoplus_{i \in I} s[r][q_i] \parallel l_i \langle c_i \rangle . P_i} \text{PT-}\oplus$$

and obtain all premises as well as the facts that $Q_r = \bigoplus_{i \in I} c[q_i] \parallel l_i \langle c_i \rangle . P_i$ and $\Lambda_r = \hat{\Lambda}_r, \{c_i : L_i\}_{i \in I}$.

Because of $\delta(q) \supseteq \{(p \triangleright q_i \parallel l_i(L_i), q_i) \mid i \in I\}$, it is possible that $l \neq l_i$ for all $i \in I$ since $|I| > 0$ by definition. However, we know that there exists at least one label l_i that can be sent and we choose to use this for the witness (\vec{q}', ξ') . This is precisely the reason why we cannot ensure that every possible send transition in the CSM can be followed but we can ensure that there is at least one to follow. Let $k \in I$ such that $l_k = l$. We choose

$$R' := (\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A \setminus \{r\}} Q_p) \parallel P_k \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q_k) \mapsto \sigma(p, q_k) \cdot l_k \langle v_k \rangle]$$

Note that Q_k is restriction by (2). Thus, P_k is restriction-free, which entails that $\lceil P_k \rceil = P_k$. With RR-OUT and RR-CTX, it is straightforward to show that $R \longrightarrow R'$. It remains to show that

$$\Theta \vdash \{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}, A' \mid \emptyset \vdash_{SF}^{(\vec{q}', \xi')} (vs : \mathcal{A}) \left(\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A \setminus \{r\}} Q_p \right) \parallel P_k \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{q}) \mapsto \sigma(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{q}) \cdot l_k \langle v_k \rangle]$$

We start building a typing derivation:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} (a) : (\vec{q}', \xi') \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A}) \\ (b) : \forall p \in \mathcal{P}_A. \forall c : q' \in A_p. \text{end}(q') \quad (c) : \forall p \in \mathcal{P}_A \setminus \{r\}. \Theta \vdash A_p, s[p] : \vec{q}' \Vdash_{SF} Q_p \\ (d) : \Theta \vdash \hat{A}_r, \{c_i : L_i\}_{i \in I \setminus \{k\}}, s[r] : \vec{q}' \Vdash_{SF} P_k \\ (e) : \Theta \vdash A', c_k : L_k \vdash \{s[p][q] :: \xi(p, q)\}_{(p, q) \in \text{Chan}_A} \Vdash_{SF} s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(p, q_k) \mapsto \sigma(p, q_k) \cdot l_k \langle v_k \rangle] \end{array}}{\Theta \vdash \{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}, A' \mid \emptyset \vdash_{SF} (vs : \mathcal{A}) \left(\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A \setminus \{r\}} Q_p \right) \parallel P_k \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{q}) \mapsto \sigma(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{q}) \cdot l_k \langle v_k \rangle]} \text{RT-v'}$$

We now argue why (a) to (e) hold.

- (a): This trivially holds since (\vec{q}, ξ) was reachable and there is a transition from the latter to (\vec{q}', ξ') .
- (b): This is precisely the same premise obtained by inversion of (2).
- (c): This follows from the premise obtained by inversion of (2). We solely do not need the fact for Q_r .
- (d): This is one of the premises we obtained through inversion of the typing for Q_r with typing rule PT- \oplus .
- (e): For all channels different from $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{q} \rangle$, we can build the typing derivation with the premises obtained by inversion of (2). For $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{q} \rangle$, we observe that the message was appended, while the typing rules type message queues from the start. However, by applying Lemma C.25, we also obtain a respective typing derivation.

This concludes this case.

Second, let $x = \mathbf{r} \triangleleft \mathbf{q} ? l(L)$. The proof is very similar but also differs in some places. Thus, we spell it out for completeness. Notably, we can always choose $(\vec{q}', \xi') = (\vec{q}'', \xi'')$ in this case since receives always need to be handled.

We do inversion on (2):

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} (\vec{q}, \xi) \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A}) \\ \forall p \in \mathcal{P}_A. \forall c : q' \in A_p. \text{end}(q') \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}_A. \Theta \vdash A_p, s[p] : \vec{q} \Vdash_{SF} Q_p \\ \Theta \vdash A' \vdash \{s[p][q] :: \xi(p, q)\}_{(p, q) \in \text{Chan}_A} \Vdash_{SF} s \blacktriangleright \sigma \end{array}}{\Theta \vdash \{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}, A' \mid \emptyset \vdash_{SF} (vs : \mathcal{A}) \left(\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} Q_p \right) \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma} \text{RT-v'}$$

and obtain all its premises as well as the fact that $R = \left(\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A} Q_p \right) \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma$. From the fact that \vec{q}_r has outgoing transitions, we know that it is not final, which in turn means that $\text{end}(\vec{q}_r)$ does not hold. Hence, two typing rules can apply: PT-Q and PT- $\&$.

The case analysis here is analogous to the first case, eventually leading to an application of PT- $\&$ of course.

Thus, we consider PT- $\&$ as typing rule for Q_r . By inversion, we have

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \delta(q) = \{(p \triangleleft \mathbf{q}_i ? l_i(L_i), q_i) \mid i \in I\} \\ \forall i \in I. \Theta \vdash \hat{A}_r, c : q_i, y_i : L_i \vdash P_i \end{array}}{\Theta \vdash \hat{A}_r, s[r] : q \vdash \&_{i \in I} s[r][q_i] ? l_i(y_i) \cdot P_i} \text{PT-}\&$$

and obtain all premises as well as that $Q_{\mathbf{r}} = \&_{i \in I} s[\mathbf{r}][q_i]?l_i(y_i) \cdot P_i$ and $\Lambda_{\mathbf{r}} = \hat{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{r}}, \{c_i : L_i\}_{i \in I}$.

Because of $\delta(q) = \{(p \triangleleft q_i?l_i(L_i), q_i) \mid i \in I\}$, we know that there is $k \in I$ with $l \neq l_i$. We choose

$$R' := (\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A \setminus \{\mathbf{r}\}} Q_p) \parallel P_k[v_k/y_k] \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(q, \mathbf{r}) \mapsto \vec{m}]$$

where $\sigma(q, \mathbf{r}) = l_k \langle v_k \rangle \cdot \vec{m}$. Note that Q_k is restriction by (2). Thus, P_k is restriction-free, which entails that $[P_k[v_k/y_k]] = P_k[v_k/y_k]$. With RR-IN and RR-CTX, it is straightforward to show that $R \longrightarrow R'$. It remains to show

$$\Theta \mid \{\Lambda_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}, \Lambda' \mid \emptyset \vdash_{SF}^{(\vec{q}', \xi')} (\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) (\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A \setminus \{\mathbf{r}\}} Q_p) \parallel P_k[v_k/y_k] \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{r}, q) \mapsto \vec{m}]$$

We start building a typing derivation:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} (a) : (\vec{q}', \xi') \in \text{reach}(\mathcal{A}) \\ (b) : \forall p \in \mathcal{P}_A. \forall c : q' \in \Lambda_p. \text{end}(q') \quad (c) : \forall p \in \mathcal{P}_A \setminus \{\mathbf{r}\}. \Theta \mid \Lambda_p, s[p] : \vec{q}'_p \Vdash_{SF} Q_p \\ (d) : \Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{r}}, v_k : L_k, s[\mathbf{r}] : \vec{q}'_{\mathbf{r}} \Vdash_{SF} P_k[v_k/y_k] \\ (e) : \Theta \mid \hat{\Lambda}' \mid \{s[p][q] :: \xi(p, q)\}_{(p, q) \in \text{Chan}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Vdash_{SF} s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{r}, q) \mapsto \vec{m}] \end{array}}{\Theta \mid \{\Lambda_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A}, \Lambda' \mid \emptyset \vdash_{SF} (\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) (\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_A \setminus \{\mathbf{r}\}} Q_p) \parallel P_k[v_k/y_k] \parallel s \blacktriangleright \sigma[(\mathbf{r}, q) \mapsto \vec{m}]} \text{RT-v'}$$

where $\Lambda' = \hat{\Lambda}', v_k : L_k$, which is possible as v_k was in the message queue $\sigma(\mathbf{r}, q)$ before.

We now argue why (a) to (e) hold.

- (a): This trivially holds since (\vec{q}, ξ) was reachable and there is a transition from the latter to (\vec{q}', ξ') .
- (b): This is precisely the same premise obtained by inversion of (2).
- (c): This follows from the premise obtained by inversion of (2). We solely do not need the fact for $Q_{\mathbf{r}}$.
- (d): This is almost one of the premises we obtained through inversion of the typing for $Q_{\mathbf{r}}$ with typing rule PT- $\&$. We simply need to apply Lemma C.28 to obtain the respective typing derivation.
- (e): For all channels different from $\langle \mathbf{r}, q \rangle$, we can build the typing derivation with the premises obtained by inversion of (2). For $\langle \mathbf{r}, q \rangle$, we can use the same and simply skip one step for the message that it is not in the channel anymore.

This concludes this case and hence the whole proof. \square

From subject reduction and session fidelity, deadlock freedom would easily follow.

Lemma C.35 (Deadlock freedom with sink-final FSMs). *Let \mathcal{A} be a deadlock-free CSM that satisfies feasible eventual reception and, for every $p \in \mathcal{P}_A$, \mathcal{A}_p is sink-final. Let P be a process. Assume that*

- $\vdash_{SF} \mathcal{D} : \Theta$,
- $\Theta \mid \Lambda \vdash_{SF} (\mathbf{v}s : \mathcal{A}) P$,
- \mathcal{A}_p is sink-final for every $p \in \mathcal{P}_A$, and

– $\llbracket (\nu s : \mathcal{A}) P \rrbracket \longrightarrow^* R$.

Then, it holds that $R \sqsubseteq \mathbf{0}$ or there is R' such that $R \longrightarrow R'$.

Proof Sketch. First, we claim that for all $k \geq 0$ with $\llbracket (\nu s : \mathcal{A}) P \rrbracket \longrightarrow^k R$, it holds that $\Theta \vdash A \vdash \emptyset \vdash_{SF}^{(\vec{q}, \xi)} R$ for some \vec{q} and ξ . This can be shown using subject reduction Theorem C.29. We do a case analysis if there is (\vec{q}', ξ') with $(\vec{q}, \xi) \longrightarrow (\vec{q}', \xi')$.

If so, we know from Theorem C.34 that there is R' with $R \longrightarrow R'$, which concludes this case.

Suppose that there is no (\vec{q}', ξ') with $(\vec{q}, \xi) \longrightarrow (\vec{q}', \xi')$. By the assumption that \mathcal{A} is deadlock-free and, thus, all \vec{q} are final states (and ξ only has empty channels).

D Additional Material for Section 6

We structure our formalisation in subsections, aligning with the key consequences (a) to (d), explained in the main text. Combining these and previous results, we will close this section by proving undecidability of the projectability problem and the strong projectability problem in the presence of mixed choice.

D.1 Additional Material for Consequence (a)

We present syntax and semantics of global types following [70].

Definition D.1 (Syntax of global types). Global types for MSTs are defined by the grammar:

$$G ::= \mathbf{0} \mid \sum_{i \in I} \mathfrak{p}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{q}_i : m_i . G_i \mid \mu t . G \mid t$$

The term $\mathbf{0}$ explicitly represents termination while $\mathfrak{p}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{q}_i : m_i$ indicates an interaction where \mathfrak{p}_i sends message m_i to \mathfrak{q}_i . We assume $|I| > 0$ and, if $|I| = 1$, we omit the sum operator. The operators μt and t can be used to encode loops. We require them to be guarded, i.e., there must be at least one interaction between the binding μt and the use of the recursion variable t . Without loss of generality, all occurrences of recursion variables t are bound and distinct. A global type satisfies mixed choice if for each syntactic subterm $\sum_{i \in I} \mathfrak{p}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{q}_i : m_i . G_i$, its branches are unique, i.e. $\forall i, j \in I. i \neq j \Rightarrow \mathfrak{p}_i \neq \mathfrak{p}_j \vee \mathfrak{q}_i \neq \mathfrak{q}_j \vee m_i \neq m_j$; otherwise it is non-deterministic. Directed choice requires the sender and receiver to be the same but messages to be distinct for branches: $\forall i, j \in I. i \neq j \Rightarrow \mathfrak{p}_i = \mathfrak{p}_j \wedge \mathfrak{q}_i = \mathfrak{q}_j \wedge m_i \neq m_j$. In contrast, sender-driven choice requires each receiver-message pair to be distinct: $\forall i, j \in I. i \neq j \Rightarrow \mathfrak{p}_i = \mathfrak{p}_j \wedge (\mathfrak{q}_i \neq \mathfrak{q}_j \vee m_i \neq m_j)$. We may say that a global type is directed or sender-driven.

Figure 2 represents a global type from MSTs.

Definition D.2 (Semantics of global types). *Let G be a global type. We index every syntactic subterm of G with a unique index to distinguish common syntactic subterms, denoted with $[G, k]$ for syntactic subterm G and index k . Without loss of generality, the index for G is 1: $[G, 1]$. We define $\text{GAut}(G) = (Q_{\text{GAut}(G)}, \Sigma, \delta_{\text{GAut}(G)}, q_{0, \text{GAut}(G)}, F_{\text{GAut}(G)})$ where*

- $Q_{\text{GAut}(G)}$ is the set of all indexed syntactic subterms $[G, k]$ of G ,
- $\delta_{\text{GAut}(G)}$ is the smallest set containing
 - $([\sum_{i \in I} p_i \rightarrow q_i : m_i, [G_i, k_i], k], p_i \rightarrow q_i : m_i, [G_i, k_i])$ for each $i \in I$,
 - $([\mu t. [G', k'_2], k'_1], \varepsilon, [G', k'_2])$ and $([t, k'_3], \varepsilon, [\mu t. [G', k'_2], k'_1])$,
- $q_{0, \text{GAut}(G)} = [G, 1]$, and $F_{\text{GAut}(G)} = \{\mathbf{0}, k \mid k \text{ is an index for subterm } \mathbf{0}\}$.

We obtain the semantics using $\sim: \mathcal{L}(G) := \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}(\text{GAut}(G)))$.

For every global type G , $\text{GAut}(G)$, when viewed as a PSM, satisfies a number of properties, which were defined in [70, Def. 3.5].

Definition D.3 (Ancestor-recursive, non-merging, intermediate recursion, etc.). *Let $A = (Q, \Delta, \delta, q_0, F)$ be a finite state machine. For convenience, we write $q \rightarrow q'$ if $q \xrightarrow{x} q'$ for some $x \in \Delta$. We say that A is ancestor-recursive if there is a function $\text{lvl}: Q \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that, for every transition $q \xrightarrow{x} q' \in \delta$, one of the two holds:*

- (i) $\text{lvl}(q) > \text{lvl}(q')$, or
- (ii) $x = \varepsilon$ and there is a run from the initial state q_0 (without going through q) to q' which can be completed to reach q : $q_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow q_n$ is a run with $q_n = q'$ and $q \neq q_i$ for every $0 \leq i \leq n$, and the run can be extended to $q_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow q_n \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow q_{n+m}$ with $q_{n+m} = q$. Then, the state q' is called ancestor of q .

We call the first (i) kind of transition forward transition while the second (ii) kind is a backward transition. The state machine A is said to be free from intermediate recursion if every state q with more than one outgoing transition, i.e., $|\{q' \mid q \rightarrow q' \in \delta\}| > 1$, has only forward transitions. We say that A is non-merging if every state only has one incoming edge with greater level, i.e., for every state q' , $\{q \mid q \rightarrow q' \in \delta \wedge \text{lvl}(q) > \text{lvl}(q')\} \leq 1$.

Stutz [70, Prop. 3.6] show that state machines for sender-driven global types satisfy the above properties. It is straightforward that this also holds for mixed-choice and non-deterministic global types.

Proposition D.4. *Let G be a global type. Then, $\text{GAut}(G)$ is a sink-final, ancestor-recursive, non-merging, dense $\Sigma 1$ -PSM without intermediate recursion. If G is non-deterministic, mixed-choice, sender-driven or directed, so is $\text{GAut}(G)$.*

D.2 Additional Material for Consequence (b)

Every global type’s state machine is a sink-final tree-like $\Sigma 1$ -PSM, when viewed as a PSM. This raises an obvious question. For which kind of PSMs can we have global types that have the same (core) language? And can we preserve the various

restrictions on choice, e.g. sender-driven choice, for those? Such preservation is particularly interesting in the light of our undecidability result for projectability of mixed-choice $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs. It is immediate that we can only achieve this for $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs because we consider the core language and not the semantics.

Anti-patterns. Visually, we want to transform a $\Sigma 1$ -PSM with an arbitrary structure into a tree-like structure where recursion only happens at leaves and to ancestors. There are several anti-patterns one needs to consider: e.g. mutual recursion, intermediate recursion, and merging. As is standard for a tree-like shape, we assume states have different levels: the initial state has the highest level and the level usually decreases when taking a transition. If not, it is considered recursion. First, recursion is supposed to lead to an ancestor, i.e. a state from which the state itself can be reached without increasing the level again; if this is not the case, we call this *mutual recursion*. Second, recursion should happen at a leaf, i.e. there is no outgoing transition to a state with smaller level; if there is such a transition, there is *intermediate recursion*. Third, every state ought to have at most one incoming transition; if not, we call this *merging*.

Naive approach breaks choice restrictions. It is rather easy to remove these anti-patterns by duplicating various parts of the $\Sigma 1$ -PSM. This will easily introduce non-determinism though, defeating the goal of preserving restrictions on choice. With this in mind, the problem becomes significantly more challenging.

Overview of our workflow. We develop a workflow that transforms $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs to tree-like $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs with recursion at leaves and to ancestors, which are easily turned into global types. Let us first give a very high-level overview and report on technical challenges. The key insight to establish the desirable properties is the use of regular expressions as intermediate representations. It is well-known that Arden's Lemma [6] can be used to transform an FSM into a regular expression, but it produces one regular expression for every final state. We flip Arden's lemma, prove it correct, and use it to produce a regular expression for the (only) initial state. This is only sound as we solely consider sink-final $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs. (Our results can only preserve the restrictions of choice for sink-final $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs, which is reasonable because global types as PSMs are always sink-final.) To prove the preservation of choice restrictions, we also define these for regular expressions over Γ , inspired by deterministic regular expressions by Brüggemann-Klein and Wood [16]. Let us now explain how regular expressions help to establish the desirable properties. Intuitively, one can traverse a regular expression bottom-up and generate an FSM for the same language. The expression for alternative $r_1 + r_2$ becomes a branch to the two respective FSMs for r_1 and r_2 . For concatenation $r_1 \cdot r_2$, we simply connect both FSMs, and for Kleene star r^* we make the initial state final and add transitions from the final to the initial state. While this gives an idea of our approach, such treatment still introduces (undesirable) non-determinism to connect different FSMs. To avoid this, we employ Brzozowski derivatives [17], but adapt them to PSMs. They allow us to pull the first event out so we can use labelled transitions to connect the FSMs. Of course, we also prove that these PSM derivatives preserve the restrictions on choice.

Our workflow comprises the following steps:

- (0) make the PSM sink-final for the price of introducing non-determinism
- (1) compute a regular expression for the initial state of the sink-final PSM
- (2) convert regular expression to a PSM that is ancestor-recursive, non-merging, dense, and intermediate-recursion-free
- (3) if the original PSM is a $\Sigma 1$ -PSM, transform the result from the previous step to a global type

Without loss of generality, we assume that every sink state is final: any state, for which this is not the case, can simply be removed while preserving the core language and semantics of a PSM.

For the last step, we only consider $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs because global types always jointly specify send and receive events.

Remark D.5. Our constructions do also apply to FSMs over other alphabets. For these, the reasoning about preserving sender-driven choice often translates to preserving determinism. Thus, it shows that the above structural conditions do not change expressivity for sink-final deterministic FSMs. For FSMs for participants of protocols, this establishes a connection to local types, as shown later.

Step (0): Sink State iff Final State. This can be considered to be a pre-processing step for PSMs that are not sink-final, making the workflow more general. This transformation step simply introduces a new final sink state to which transitions can lead non-deterministically.

We give a construction with a single fresh final state, which can be (non-deterministically) reached instead of any previous final state.

Procedure D.6 (PSM: Sink State iff Final State). Let $M = (Q, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, F)$ be a PSM with $\varepsilon \notin \mathcal{S}(M)$. We define a function that turns M into a sink-final PSM:

$$\text{psm2sink-final-psm}(M) := (Q \uplus \{q_f\}, \Gamma, \delta', q_0, \{q_f\})$$

where $(q_1, x, q_2) \in \delta'$ if $(q_1, x, q_2) \in \delta$ as well as $(q_1, x, q_f) \in \delta'$ if $(q_1, x, q_2) \in \delta$ and $q_2 \in F$.

The condition that $\varepsilon \notin \mathcal{S}(M)$ ensures that there is a predecessor state for every final state to which we can add the transition.

Proposition D.7. *Let $\Sigma 1$ -PSM be a M such that $\varepsilon \notin \mathcal{S}(M)$. Then, the PSM $\text{psm2sink-final-psm}(M)$ is sink-final.*

It is obvious that this construction introduces and, thus, does not preserve sender-driven choice.

Step (1): From Sink-final PSMs to Regular Expressions. This transformation step translates a sink-final PSM to a regular expression over Γ that specifies the same core language. It is well-known that this can be done using

Arden’s Lemma [6]. We cannot apply the standard technique though, as it would produce as many regular expressions as final states. Such treatment makes it very hard to argue about the preservation of sender-driven choice. Instead, we exploit the fact that the PSM is sink-final and produce a single regular expression for the initial state. This also enables the treatment of infinite words, which solely require an infinite run that necessarily does not end in a final state.

We define regular expressions and include infinite words in their semantics.

Definition D.8 (Regular Expressions). *Let Δ be an alphabet. Regular expressions (REs) over Δ are inductively defined by the following grammar where $a \in \Delta$:*

$$r ::= \varepsilon | a | r + r | r \cdot r | r^*$$

The concatenation operator \cdot has precedence over $+$. We define $\mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(a) = \{a\}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r_1 + r_2) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r_1) \cup \mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r_2)$, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r_1 \cdot r_2) = \{w_1 \cdot w_2 \mid w_1 \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r_1), w_2 \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r_2)\}$, and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r^) = \{w_1 \dots w_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall i \leq n. w_i \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r)\}$. The infinite language $\mathcal{L}_{\text{inf}}(r)$ is defined as $\{w \in \Delta^\omega \mid \forall w' \in \text{pref}(w). w' \in \text{pref}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r))\}$. The language $\mathcal{L}(r)$ is the union of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{inf}}(r)$. The function $\text{sym}(r)$ is the set of all letters in r , i.e. the smallest subset $\Delta' \subseteq \Delta$ such that $\mathcal{L}(r) \subseteq (\Delta')^\infty$. We denote the set of all regular expressions over Δ with \mathcal{R}_Δ .*

Instead of constructing the regular expressions for final states, as is standard with Arden’s Lemma, we construct one for the initial state. This is sound because a state is a sink if and only if it is final. It also lets us handle infinite words. For a state machine, an infinite word is part of its semantics if there is an infinite run. Here, we mimic this: an infinite word is in the semantics of a regular expression if every prefix of the word is a prefix of a word in the finite semantics.

Lemma D.9 (Arden’s Lemma – swapped). *Let r_1 and r_2 be two regular expressions over an alphabet Δ . If r_1 does not contain the empty string, i.e. $\varepsilon \notin \mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r_1)$, then $r_3 = r_2 + (r_1 \cdot r_3)$ has a unique solution that is $r_3 = r_1^* \cdot r_2$.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to the original one:

$$\begin{aligned} r_3 &= r_2 + r_1 \cdot r_3 \\ &= r_2 + r_1 \cdot (r_2 + r_1 \cdot r_3) \\ &= r_2 + r_1 \cdot r_2 + r_1 \cdot r_1 \cdot r_3 \\ &= \dots \\ &= r_2 + r_1 \cdot r_2 + r_1^2 \cdot r_3 + r_1^3 \cdot r_3 + \dots \\ &= (\varepsilon + r_1 + r_1^2 + r_1^3 + \dots) \cdot r_2 \\ &= r_1^* \cdot r_2 \end{aligned}$$

□

For sender-driven PSMs, we want to show that sender-driven choice is preserved. Therefore, we need a notion of sender-driven choice for regular expressions. We define this following work on deterministic regular expressions [16].

Definition D.10 (Marking and unmarking regular expressions). Let Δ be an alphabet and $r \in \mathcal{R}_\Delta$ be a regular expression. We define a function $\mathbf{mark}(r)$ that simply subscripts every letter in r with a distinct index and the inverse function $\mathbf{unmark}(r)$, which is also defined for words over Δ .

Definition D.11 (Mixed-choice, sender-driven and directed regular expressions). Let $r \in \mathcal{R}_\Gamma$. We say that r is a sender-driven regular expression if the following holds: for every $u \in \Gamma^*$ and $x, y \in \Gamma$, if $ux \in \mathbf{pref}(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{mark}(r)))$, $uy \in \mathbf{pref}(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{mark}(r)))$ and $x \neq y$, then $\mathbf{unmark}(x) \neq \mathbf{unmark}(y)$ as well as $\mathbf{unmark}(x) \in \{\mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}! _ \mid \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{P}\}$ and $\mathbf{unmark}(y) \in \{\mathbf{p} \triangleright \mathbf{q}! _ \mid \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{P}\}$ for some $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$. For directed choice, we also require \mathbf{q} to be the same for both x and y and, for mixed choice, we solely require $\mathbf{unmark}(x) \neq \mathbf{unmark}(y)$.

Compared to deterministic regular expressions, our definition requires the special alphabet Γ (and adds a condition for sender-driven and directed choice).

Proposition D.12. Every mixed-choice, sender-driven or directed RE is a deterministic RE.

Definition D.13. Let Δ be an alphabet and $L \subseteq \Delta^\infty$. We define a function that collects all first letters of L : $\mathbf{first}(L) := \mathbf{pref}(L) \cap \Delta$. The function $\mathbf{follow}(L, a)$ collects all letters that can occur after a in L : $\mathbf{follow}(L, a) := \{b \mid wab \in \mathbf{pref}(L)\}$ and $\mathbf{follow}(L, \varepsilon) := \mathbf{first}(L)$.

The following lemma follows from a straightforward adaption of Lemma 2.2 by Brüggemann-Klein and Wood [16].

Lemma D.14. An RE $r \in \mathcal{R}_\Gamma$ is a sender-driven RE if and only if, for every $z \in \mathbf{sym}(\mathbf{mark}(r)) \uplus \{\varepsilon\}$ and every $x, y \in \mathbf{follow}(\mathbf{mark}(r), z)$, if $x \neq y$, then $\mathbf{unmark}(x) \neq \mathbf{unmark}(y)$, as well as $\mathbf{unmark}(x) \in \mathcal{L}(\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}})$ and $\mathbf{unmark}(y) \in \mathcal{L}(\Gamma_{\mathbf{p}})$ for some $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$.

Intuitively, one can check if an RE over Γ is an sender-driven RE as follows. For every subexpression of the form $r_1 + r_2$ and $r_1^* \cdot r_2$, the REs r_1 and r_2 should not share any first letters and the union of their first letters belongs to the same participant. It suffices to consider these operators as these are the only ones where lookahead to take a decision about the path in the RE is needed.

Procedure D.15 (PSM to RE). Let $M = (Q, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, F)$ be a sink-final PSM. We generate a system of equations. For every $q_1 \in Q$, we introduce r_{q_1} as follows:

$$r_{q_1} = \sum_{(q_1, x, q_2) \in \delta} x \cdot r_{q_2}$$

Given the initial state q_0 , we can solve the system of equations for r_{q_0} with Lemma D.9, yielding a regular expression $\mathbf{psm2regex}(M)$.

The following lemma states the correctness of the previous procedure.

Lemma D.16. *For every sink-final PSM M , it holds that $\mathcal{L}(\text{psm2regex}(M)) = \mathcal{L}(M)$. If M is a sender-driven PSM, then $\text{psm2regex}(M)$ is a sender-driven RE. If $\varepsilon \notin \mathcal{S}(M)$, then ε does not occur in $\text{psm2regex}(M)$.*

Proof. With the assumption that M is sink-final, the first claim easily follows from Lemma D.9. For the second claim, let us investigate how the system of equations, from which $\text{psm2regex}(M)$ is obtained, is solved. We observe that every equation is guarded, i.e. there is a letter from Σ before an occurrence of r_q for some state q . Solving the system of equations for the initial state r_{q_0} can only involve substitution and the application of Lemma D.9. For both, sender-driven choice of M is preserved for the RE across all equations, yielding a sender-driven RE for r_{q_0} . For the third claim, it suffices to observe that no ε is introduced in the system of equations. \square

Step (2): From Regular Expressions to Ancestor-recursive Non-merging Dense Intermediate-recursion-free PSMs. After the transformation, we want the PSM to be ancestor-recursive, non-merging, dense and intermediate-recursion-free by construction. We need to carefully design this transformation because the standard approach introduces non-determinism, for instance for union. Resolving this non-determinism would easily break the desired structural properties, making the whole workflow pointless. We apply the idea of derivatives in order not to introduce non-determinism. To preserve sender-driven choice, we also ensure that sender-driven regular expressions are closed under Brzozowski Derivatives. Given a regular expression r and a letter a , we can use them to construct a regular expression that specifies the language of words in the semantics of r which start with a and omits a . We apply a similar idea to PSMs in order not to introduce non-determinism when constructing PSMs from regular expressions.

Definition D.17 ([17]). *Let Δ be an alphabet. We define the Brzozowski derivative $\text{brz-deriv} : \Delta \times \mathcal{R}_\Delta \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_\Delta$ as follows:*

$$\text{brz-deriv}(a, r) := \begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{if } r = a \\ \text{brz-deriv}(a, r_1) + \text{brz-deriv}(a, r_2) & \text{if } r = r_1 + r_2 \\ \text{brz-deriv}(a, r_1) \cdot r_2 & \text{if } r = r_1 \cdot r_2 \wedge \varepsilon \notin \mathcal{L}(r_1) \\ \text{brz-deriv}(a, r_1) \cdot r_2 + \text{brz-deriv}(a, r_2) & \text{if } r = r_1 \cdot r_2 \wedge \varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}(r_1) \\ \text{brz-deriv}(a, r_1) \cdot r_1^* & \text{if } r = r_1^* \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Lemma D.18 (Correctness of Brzozowski Derivatives [17]). *Let r be a regular expression over an alphabet Δ and $a \in \Delta$ be a letter. If $\text{brz-deriv}(a, r)$ is defined, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(\text{brz-deriv}(a, r)) = \{w \mid aw \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r)\} .$$

If $\text{brz-deriv}(a, r)$ is not defined, it holds that $\{w \mid aw \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r)\} = \emptyset$.

We extend this result to infinite words.

Lemma D.19 (Brzowski Derivatives for infinite words). *Let r be a regular expression over an alphabet Δ and $a \in \Delta$ be a letter. If $\text{brz-deriv}(a, r)$ is defined, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{inf}}(\text{brz-deriv}(a, r)) = \{w \mid aw \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{inf}}(r)\} .$$

If $\text{brz-deriv}(a, r)$ is not defined, it holds that $\{w \mid aw \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{inf}}(r)\} = \emptyset$.

Proof. For the first claim, we consider infinite words. By definition, an infinite word is in a language if all its prefixes are a prefix of some word in the finite language. Thus, it suffices to show that $\text{pref}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(\text{brz-deriv}(a, r))) = \text{pref}(\{w \mid aw \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{inf}}(r)\} \cap \Delta^*)$. By definition, the prefixes of infinite words and finite words are the same for a regular expression. Thus, it remains to show that

$$\text{pref}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(\text{brz-deriv}(a, r))) = \text{pref}(\{w \mid aw \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r)\} \cap \Delta^*) .$$

This follows from Lemma D.18.

The second claim simply follows from Lemma D.18 and the definition of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{inf}}(-)$, which requires $\mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(-)$ to be non-empty. \square

From the correctness of Brzowski derivatives, this observation follows immediately.

Corollary D.20. *Let r be a regular expression over an alphabet Δ and $D \subseteq \Delta$ be the first letters in words in r , i.e. $D := \{a_1 \mid a_1 \dots a_n \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r)\}$. Then, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(r) = \bigsqcup_{a \in D} \{a \cdot w \mid w \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{fin}}(\text{brz-deriv}(a, r))\} .$$

Intuitively, we pull out every first letter for union and concatenation to avoid the introduction of ε -transitions. For this to work, we need to introduce a PSM derivative (function). If we used the Brzowski Derivative, we could not apply structural induction to prove equivalence of the regular expression and the PSM. Still, we show sender-driven choice is preserved by the Brzowski Derivative.

Lemma D.21. *Let r be an sender-driven RE and $x \in \text{first}(\mathcal{L}(r))$. Then, it holds that $\text{brz-deriv}(x, r)$ is a sender-driven RE.*

Proof. Brüggemann-Klein and Wood [16] show that deterministic REs, which they call 1-unambiguous, are closed under the Brzowski derivative. Their result generalises to sender-driven REs. They define star normal form for regular expressions [16, Def. 3.3]. They recall that deterministic REs can always be specified by an RE in star normal form [15]. With [16, Thm. B], they show that the Brzowski derivative of a deterministic RE in star normal form is again deterministic and in star normal form. The conditions on sender-driven choice for REs do not restrict representability in star normal form and, thus, the result generalises to sender-driven REs. \square

The last ingredient for our transformation is a procedure that applies the derivative to PSMs, preserving the properties of interest.

Lemma D.22 (PSM for derivative). *Let $M = (Q, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, F)$ be a PSM that is ancestor-recursive, non-merging, dense, intermediate-recursion-free, and sink-final. and let $a \in \mathbf{first}(\mathcal{L}(M))$. Then, there is a PSM, $\text{psm-deriv}(a, M)$, such that $\mathcal{L}(\text{psm-deriv}(a, M)) = \text{brz-deriv}(a, \mathcal{L}(M))$, which is ancestor-recursive, non-merging, dense, intermediate-recursion-free, and sink-final. If M is sender-driven, $\text{psm-deriv}(a, M)$ is sender-driven.*

Proof. Let q_0 be the initial state of M , Q_1 be the states with incoming transitions from q_0 , and Q_2 be the states with outgoing transition to q_0 . (Without loss of generality, we can assume that these are ε -transitions.) Formally $Q_1 := \{q_1 \mid (q_0, _, q_1) \in \delta\}$ and $Q_2 := \{q_2 \mid (q_2, \varepsilon, q_0) \in \delta\}$. By assumption that $a \in \mathbf{first}(\mathcal{L}(M))$, we know that there is $q_1 \in Q_1$ such that $(q_0, a, q_1) \in \delta$. We construct $\text{psm-deriv}(a, M)$ as follows. We take q_1 as its initial state and do only keep the states for which q_1 is an ancestor. For every state q_2 in Q_2 , which was not deleted, we copy the original PSM M , remove the state q_2 and replace it by the initial state from the copy. By assumption that the original PSM M is ancestor-recursive, non-merging, dense, intermediate-recursion-free, and sink-final, this construction yields a PSM $\text{psm-deriv}(a, M)$ with the same properties and $\mathcal{L}(\text{psm-deriv}(a, M)) = \text{brz-deriv}(a, \mathcal{L}(M))$. By construction, $\text{psm-deriv}(a, M)$ is sender-driven if M is sender-driven. \square

With this, we can provide the procedure that translates REs to PSMs.

Procedure D.23 (RE to PSM). Given a regular expression r without ε over Γ , we inductively construct the PSM $\text{regex2psm}(r)$:

1. a : one initial state with one transition labelled a to one final state;
2. $r_1 + r_2$: We add one initial state. We do the same for both r_1 . We describe it for r_1 : we compute $\text{psm-deriv}(a, \text{regex2psm}(r_1))$ for every first letter a and add a transition labelled with the letter from the initial state to the initial state of the PSM.
3. $r_1 \cdot r_2$: We construct the FSM for r_1 . For r_2 , we apply the derivative idea again: we compute $\text{psm-deriv}(a, \text{regex2psm}(r_2))$ for every first letter a and copy each FSM as often as there are final states in the FSM for r_1 and add transitions from each such final state.
4. r^* : For Kleene Star, we construct the FSM for the inner regex and connect the final state(s) with the initial one by an ε -transition and make the initial one final. (These are backward transitions and, thus, should to be labelled ε for the PSM to be dense.)

We prove the previous procedure to be correct.

Lemma D.24. *Let r be a regular expression over Γ without ε and $\text{regex2psm}(r)$ be a PSM. Then, the core language of both are the same: $\mathcal{L}(r) = \mathcal{L}(\text{regex2psm}(r))$. Also, $\text{regex2psm}(r)$ is ancestor-recursive, non-merging, intermediate-recursion-free, dense, and sink-final. If r is a sender-driven RE, then $\text{regex2psm}(r)$ is a sender-driven PSM.*

Proof. We prove the claims by induction on the structure of the regular expression r .

The case for a single letter $r = a$ is obvious.

Let $r = r_1 \cdot r_2$. We first show that $\mathcal{L}(r_1 \cdot r_2) = \mathcal{L}(\text{regex2psm}(r_1 \cdot r_2))$. The PSM construction applies the PSM derivative $\text{psm-deriv}(a, \text{regex2psm}(r_2))$ for every $a \in \text{first}(\mathcal{L}(\text{regex2psm}(r_2)))$ and copies the resulting PSM for every final state of $\text{regex2psm}(r_1)$ and adds a transition with label a . Thus, for every word w in $\text{regex2psm}(r_1 \cdot r_2)$, we have that

- $w \in \mathcal{L}(\text{regex2psm}(r_1)) \cap \Gamma^\omega$ or
- $w = u \cdot a \cdot v$ with $u \in \mathcal{L}(\text{regex2psm}(r_1))$, $a \in \text{first}(\mathcal{L}(\text{regex2psm}(r_2)))$, and $v \in \mathcal{L}(\text{psm-deriv}(a, \text{regex2psm}(r_2)))$.

By induction hypothesis, we have that $\mathcal{L}(r_1) = \mathcal{L}(\text{regex2psm}(r_1))$ and $\mathcal{L}(r_2) = \mathcal{L}(\text{regex2psm}(r_2))$. By Lemma D.22, $\mathcal{L}(\text{psm-deriv}(a, r_2)) = \mathcal{L}(\text{brz-deriv}(a, r_2))$. Hence, we obtain:

- $w \in \mathcal{L}(r_1) \cap \Gamma^\omega$ or
- $w = u \cdot a \cdot v$ with $u \in \mathcal{L}(r_1)$, $a \in \text{first}(\mathcal{L}(r_2))$, and $v \in \mathcal{L}(\text{brz-deriv}(a, r_2))$.

By the semantics of regular expressions and Lemmas D.18 and D.19, it follows that $w \in \mathcal{L}(r_1 \cdot r_2)$, which shows language equality.

By induction hypothesis, we know that $\text{regex2psm}(r_1)$ and $\text{regex2psm}(r_2)$ are ancestor-recursive, non-merging, dense, intermediate-recursion-free, and sink-final. By Lemma D.22, for every $a \in \text{first}(\mathcal{L}(\text{regex2psm}(r_2)))$, it holds that $\text{psm-deriv}(a, \text{regex2psm}(r_2))$ is ancestor-recursive, non-merging, intermediate-recursion-free, dense, sink-final and sender-driven if $\text{regex2psm}(r_2)$ is. Thus, by construction, the PSM $\text{regex2psm}(r_1 \cdot r_2)$ is ancestor-recursive, non-merging, dense, intermediate-recursion-free, and sink-final, where the multiple copies ensure ancestor-recursiveness and non-merging property and the derivatives preserve density; and sender-driven choice is also preserved.

For $r_1 + r_2$, the construction applies the PSM derivative to avoid introducing non-determinism (as is common in standard constructions for FSMs from REs) if it was not present before. If it was there before, it preserves it to avoid subsequent merging and, thus, avoids introducing non-sink final states. For sender-driven choice, the assumption for the regular expression yields that the first letters are pair-wise distinct and, thus, the newly introduced branching satisfies the sender-driven choice condition for PSMs. The remaining reasoning is very similar to the previous case for concatenation and, hence, omitted. Here, both r_1 and r_2 are treated the same, like the second part of concatenation.

For r_1^* , we simply introduce a backward transition, which ought to be labelled by ε and it is. In fact, these are the only ε -transition, ensuring that the PSM is dense. Note that we construct a PSM without forward transitions that are labelled with ε . This is different from state machines for global types where every subterm of shape $\mu t . G$ has only one incoming backward and one outgoing forward transition labelled by ε . In this construction, we basically merge the states for $\mu t . G$ and G . It is also the place where recursion is introduced, ensuring ancestor-recursion and intermediate recursion freedom. For sender-driven choice, analogously, the assumption for the regular expression yields that the first letters

are pair-wise distinct and, thus, the branch that decides whether to start or repeat with r_1 or continue with the next regular expression satisfies the sender-driven choice condition for the PSMs. \square

Step (3): From Ancestor-recursive Non-merging Dense Intermediate-recursion-free PSMs to Global Types. While the previous steps apply to arbitrary (sink-final) PSMs, this one only applies for $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs since global types specify send and receive events together. This transformation is rather straightforward. The global type can be constructed via a traversal of the $\Sigma 1$ -PSM.

Procedure D.25 ($\Sigma 1$ -PSM to Global Type). Let M be ancestor-recursive, dense, non-merging, and intermediate-recursion-free $\Sigma 1$ -PSM. As a preprocessing step, we merge asynchronous events and assume M works on the alphabet of synchronous events $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}}$. We start with an empty global type and start the traversal from initial state:

- If the state is final: add 0 and return;
- if the state has an incoming transition:
add μt . for fresh t and store t for this state;
- if the state has an outgoing transition to previously seen state:
add t for the destination of the outgoing transition and return;
- if the state has outgoing transitions to unseen states:
add $\Sigma_{i \in I}$ with a fresh index set I (for $|I|$ branches) with one branch for each next state with according transition label and recurse for each of next states.

Note that a state can have an incoming transition and more than one outgoing transitions, in contrast to the state machine of a global type where every subterm of shape $\mu t . G$ has only one incoming and one outgoing transition labelled by ε . In this construction, the states for $\mu t . G$ and G are merged. We denote the result of this procedure with $\text{psm2gt}(M)$.

The following lemma states the correctness of the previous procedure.

Lemma D.26. *Let M be ancestor-recursive, non-merging, dense, intermediate-recursion-free, and sink-final $\Sigma 1$ -PSM and $\text{psm2gt}(M)$ be the global type constructed from M . Then, their core languages are equal: $\mathcal{L}(M) = \mathcal{L}(\text{psm2gt}(M))$. If M is a sender-driven PSM, then $\text{psm2gt}(M)$ is a sender-driven global type.*

Proof. The assumptions guarantee that the traversal does not revisit states and only sink states are final. The preprocessing simplifies the translation to the corresponding terms of a global type. The claim then follows easily by construction. We sketch how to formalise it. One can define a formalism that jointly/recursively represents languages starting from states in an FSM and (partial) global types. The construction iteratively refines this representation, preserving the specified language and sender-driven choice if given. \square

Wrapping Up: From PSMs to Global Types. Let us first observe that part of this workflow can be applied when using the more general alphabet Γ where send and receive events may not happen next to each other, yielding the following results.

Lemma D.27. *For every PSM M with $\varepsilon \notin \mathcal{S}(M)$, there is an ancestor-recursive, non-merging, dense, and intermediate-recursion-free PSM M' with the same core language. If M is sink-final and satisfies mixed choice (sender-driven choice, or directed choice respectively), then M' is sink-final and satisfies mixed choice (sender-driven choice, or directed choice respectively). If M is not sink-final, restrictions on choice are not preserved.*

Proof. Let M be a sink-final PSM with $\varepsilon \notin \mathcal{S}(M)$. We do a case analysis if M is sink-final. If M is sink-final,

$$\text{regex2psm}(\text{psm2regex}(M))$$

is such a PSM and any restriction on choice is preserved by Lemmas D.16 and D.24. If M is not sink-final,

$$\text{regex2psm}(\text{psm2regex}(\text{psm2sink-final-psm}(M)))$$

is such a PSM by Proposition D.7 and Lemmas D.16 and D.24. \square

For the special case of $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs, we can convert such PSMs to global types, proving the main result in this section.

Theorem 6.1. *For every sink-final $\Sigma 1$ -PSM M , there is a global type $\text{GAut}(M)$ with the same core language (and hence the same semantics). If M is non-deterministic (mixed-choice, sender-driven, or directed, resp.), then $\text{GAut}(M)$ is non-deterministic (mixed-choice, sender-driven, or directed, resp.).*

Proof. For the first claim, let M be a sink-final $\Sigma 1$ -PSM. We do a case analysis if $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}(M)$.

If so, we know that $\mathcal{S}(M) = \{\varepsilon\}$ because M is sink-final and no transition is labelled by ε . Then, $G = 0$ has the same core language.

If not, we can apply our workflow and construct the global type

$$\text{psm2gt}(\text{regex2psm}(\text{psm2regex}(M)))$$

which represents the same core language and any restriction on choice is preserved by Lemmas D.16, D.24 and D.26.

With the optional step (0), our workflow can also transform non-sink-final $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs into global types; however, at the price of adding non-determinism.

Theorem D.28. *Every $\Sigma 1$ -PSM M with $\varepsilon \notin \mathcal{S}(M)$ can be represented as a non-deterministic global type with the same core language.*

Proof. Let M be a non-sink-final $\Sigma 1$ -PSM with $\varepsilon \notin \mathcal{S}(M)$. Then,

$$\text{psm2gt}(\text{regex2psm}(\text{psm2regex}(\text{psm2sink-final-psm}(M))))$$

is a non-deterministic global type that represents the same core language by Proposition D.7 and Lemmas D.16, D.24 and D.26. \square

D.3 Additional Material for Consequence (c)

Local types are defined analogously to global types. We present local types which allow participants to send and receive from different participants, as defined in [60].

Definition D.29 (Local Types). *The local types for a role p are defined as:*

$$L ::= 0 \mid \bigoplus_{i \in I} q_i ! m_i . L_i \mid \&_{i \in I} q_i ? m_i . L_i \mid \mu X . L \mid X$$

where the internal choice (\oplus) and external choice ($\&$) both respect $\forall i, j \in I. i \neq j \Rightarrow (q_i, m_i) \neq (q_j, m_j)$. As for global types, we assume every recursion variable is bound, each recursion operator (μ) uses a different identifier t , We assume $|I| > 0$ and, if $|I| = 1$, we omit \oplus and $\&$. The semantics is defined analogously to global types, using a state machine $\text{LAut}(-)$, and is omitted.

The workflow of Appendix D.2 can obtain a local type from a sink-final FSM over Γ_p for a participant p . If a deterministic FSM is not sink-final, there is no sink-final deterministic FSM for the same language, making a non-deterministic local type the most one can achieve. If the FSM has no mixed-choice states, the transformation yields a local type. If it has, the structure still resembles the one of local types but requires the simultaneous specification of receiving and sending.

Theorem 6.2. *Let A_p be a sink-final FSM over Γ_p without mixed-choice states for a participant p . One can construct a local type L_p for p with $\mathcal{L}(L_p) = \mathcal{L}(A_p)$.*

D.4 Additional Material for (d)

In this section, we provide the formalisation to prove Theorem 6.4.

When using local types, final configurations are always sink-state configurations, i.e. where each participant is in a sink state. For our setting, this is not the case and has repercussions on the semantics and meaning of deadlocks: we can have final configurations where some participants are not in a final state. If there is no next transition for such a configuration, we call it a soft deadlock. We define the notion of soft deadlocks and recall the definition of strong projectability.

Definition D.30 (Soft Deadlocks, Strong Projectability). *Let $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ be a CSM. A configuration (\vec{q}, ξ) is a soft deadlock if there is no (\vec{q}', ξ') with $(\vec{q}, \xi) \rightarrow (\vec{q}', \xi')$ and (\vec{q}, ξ) is no final sink-state configuration. We say $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is free from soft deadlocks if every reachable configuration is no soft deadlock. A language $L \subseteq \Gamma^\omega$ is said to be strongly projectable if there exists a CSM $\{\{B_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ such that $\{\{B_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is free from soft deadlocks (soft deadlock freedom), and L is the language of $\{\{B_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ (protocol fidelity). We say that $\{\{B_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is a strong projection of L .*

With this notion of deadlock, intuitively, a configuration can only be considered actually final if no state machine has an outgoing transition. It is obvious that every deadlock is a soft deadlock. Different applications call for different notions of deadlock freedom. In distributed computing, it is fine if a server keeps listening for incoming requests while, in embedded computing, it can be essential that all participants eventually stop. We believe this is a design choice.

Intuitively, if one aims for soft deadlock freedom, no state with outgoing transitions needs to be final because, for soft deadlocks, only final sink-state configurations matter. One could require a projection to be sink-final. However, while this is a sufficient, it is not obviously necessary: any final non-sink-state configuration could simply not get stuck, never exploiting the fact it is final. We show that this is not the case if one of two conditions hold for CSMs.

We use the subset construction from [57, Def. 5.4], denoted by $\mathcal{C}(G, \mathfrak{p})$ for participant \mathfrak{p} , which simply projects the global type’s state machine onto the participant alphabet and determinises the result.

Definition D.31 (Subset construction). *Let G be a global type and \mathfrak{p} be a participant. Then, the subset construction for \mathfrak{p} is defined as*

$$\mathcal{C}(G, \mathfrak{p}) = (Q_{\mathfrak{p}}, \Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}}, \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}, s_{0,\mathfrak{p}}, F_{\mathfrak{p}}) \text{ where}$$

- $\delta(s, a) := \{q' \in Q_G \mid \exists q \in s, q \xrightarrow{a} \xrightarrow{\varepsilon}^* q' \in \delta_{\downarrow}\}$ for every $s \subseteq Q_G$ and $a \in \Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}}$,
- $s_{0,\mathfrak{p}} := \{q \in Q_G \mid q_{0,G} \xrightarrow{\varepsilon}^* q \in \delta_{\downarrow}\}$,
- $Q_{\mathfrak{p}} := \text{lfp}_{\{s_{0,\mathfrak{p}}\}}^{\subseteq} \lambda Q. Q \cup \{\delta(s, a) \mid s \in Q \wedge a \in \Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}}\} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$,
- $\delta_{\mathfrak{p}} := \delta|_{Q_{\mathfrak{p}} \times \Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}}}$, and
- $F_{\mathfrak{p}} := \{s \in Q_{\mathfrak{p}} \mid s \cap F_G \neq \emptyset\}$.

To prove Theorem 6.4, we add two more equivalent statements and prove four implications, yielding a cycle and equivalence of all statements. It is trivial that Theorem 6.4 follows from Theorem D.32.

Theorem D.32. *Let G be a projectable global type. Then, the following statements are equivalent, where $\mathcal{C}(G, \mathfrak{p})$ is the subset construction of G onto \mathfrak{p} :*

- (i) *There is a sink-final CSM that is a projection of G and satisfies feasible eventual reception or every of its state machines is deterministic. G can be implemented by a sink-final CSM that satisfies feasible eventual reception or every of its state machines is deterministic.*
- (ii) *The subset construction $\mathcal{C}(G, \mathfrak{p})$ is sink-final for every participant \mathfrak{p} .*
- (iii) *All reachable final configurations of $\{\{\mathcal{C}(G, \mathfrak{p})\}_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ are sink-state.*
- (iv) *There is a CSM that is a strong projection of G and this CSM satisfies feasible eventual reception or every of its state machines is deterministic.*

Proof. Note that the subset projection is basically the subset construction but checks validity conditions [57, Sec. 5]. Together with completeness of their approach [57, Thm. 7.1], the Send Validity condition enforces that any final state in the subset projection, and thus construction of a projectable global type, cannot have outgoing send transitions.

Proof that (i) implies (ii):

Let $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ be a sink-final CSM that satisfies feasible eventual reception or every of its state machines is deterministic, and is a projection of G . Towards a contradiction, assume that the subset construction is not sink-final. Without loss of generality, let $\mathcal{C}(G, \mathfrak{p})$ be the subset construction with at least one final non-sink state and let s be one of the states that is final and has outgoing transitions.

By the fact that s is final, there is $0 \in s$. By the fact that s has outgoing transitions, there is $G' \in s$ with $G' \xrightarrow{x} G''$ for $x \downarrow_{I_p} \in I_p$ and some G'' . Because of Send Validity [57, Def. 5.4], we have $x = \mathfrak{q} \rightarrow \mathfrak{p} : m$ for some participant \mathfrak{q} and message m .

In the subset construction, two subterms G_1 and G_2 do only occur in the same state \vec{s}_p of $\mathcal{C}(G, \mathfrak{p})$ if there are two runs $G \xrightarrow{w}^* G_1$ and $G \xrightarrow{w'}^* G_2$ with $w \in \Gamma^*$, $w' \in \Gamma^*$, and $w \downarrow_{I_p} = w' \downarrow_{I_p}$. Here, we use choose $G_1 = 0$ and $G_2 = G'$. Thus, we have $w \in \mathcal{L}(G)$.

Let (\vec{s}, ξ) be the configuration of the subset construction $\{\{\mathcal{C}(G, \mathfrak{p})\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ that is reached after processing w . Because of protocol fidelity, determinacy of the subset construction and $w \in \mathcal{L}(G)$, it holds that (\vec{s}, ξ) is final. Recall there is a transition from G' to G'' labelled with $\mathfrak{q} \rightarrow \mathfrak{p} : m$, so we can extend w' to obtain $w'' := w' \cdot \mathfrak{p} \triangleright \mathfrak{q} ! m$ for which $w \downarrow_{I_p} = w'' \downarrow_{I_p}$. Let (\vec{s}'', ξ'') be the configuration of $\{\{\mathcal{C}(G, \mathfrak{p})\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ after processing w'' . By construction of the traces, the channels are empty after processing w'' . Hence, we have $\xi''(\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{p}) = m$ with the additional send event in w'' . Because of $w \downarrow_{I_p} = w'' \downarrow_{I_p}$, it holds that $\vec{s}_p = \vec{s}''_p$. Let us consider the two configurations of $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ that are reached with w and w'' . By [60, Lm. 20], they will have the same channel contents as the subset construction respectively. Let (\vec{t}, ξ) and (\vec{t}'', ξ'') be the configurations of $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ after processing w and w'' respectively. By $w \downarrow_{I_p} = w'' \downarrow_{I_p}$, it is possible and we assume that $\vec{t}_p = \vec{t}''_p$. Note that we do not assume determinacy of $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ but we can assume that both runs end in the same state for \mathfrak{p} since all ways of non-determinism need to be accounted for. We show that \vec{t}_p is not sink-final: it is final but has at least one outgoing transition.

To start, we show that \vec{t}_p is final. It suffices to show that (\vec{t}, ξ) is a final configuration. By the fact that (\vec{s}, ξ) is final, ξ has only empty channels. Towards a contradiction, assume that \vec{t}_r is not final for some participant r . Then, w is not in $\mathcal{L}(\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\})$ if there is no other run for w but, if there were, $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ still deadlocks in the configuration (\vec{t}, ξ) , contradicting deadlock freedom. Hence, (\vec{t}, ξ) is final.

It remains to show that \vec{t}_p has an outgoing transition. We do a case analysis on the side condition for $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$.

First, we assume that $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ satisfies feasible eventual reception. We use the second configuration (\vec{t}'', ξ'') where \mathfrak{p} is in the same state. We know that m is the first message in $\xi''(\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{p})$. It was sent and must be received. Thus, \vec{t}''_p has at least one outgoing transition.

Second, assume that A_x is deterministic for every participant x . Again, we use the second configuration (\vec{t}'', ξ'') where p is in the same state. By the semantics of global types, there is an extension w''' of w'' with $w''' \in \mathcal{L}(G)$ that contains the receive event $p \triangleleft q?m$ for the enqueued message m . If w''' is finite, it is straightforward that p needs to be able to receive the message m from q to satisfy protocol fidelity, ensuring an outgoing transition. If w''' is infinite, towards a contradiction, assume that \vec{t}_p has no outgoing transition. The semantics require that every prefix $u \in \text{pref}(w''')$ is in $\text{pref}(\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\})$. However, if \vec{t}_p could not receive m , because of determinacy of A_p , there is a prefix of w''' that is not. This contradicts the assumption that $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is a projection of G .

Proof that (ii) implies (iii):

By assumption, all final configurations are sink-state configurations. Hence, all reachable final configurations are sink-state configurations.

Proof that (iii) implies (iv):

We claim that $\{\{\mathcal{C}(G, p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is such a CSM. Because of soundness [57, Thm. 6.1], we know that $\{\{\mathcal{C}(G, p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ satisfies protocol fidelity and is deadlock-free. Hence, it suffices to show $\{\{\mathcal{C}(G, p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is free from soft deadlocks. Since $\{\{\mathcal{C}(G, p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is deadlock-free, the only way there could be soft deadlocks is that there is a reachable stuck final configuration that is no sink-state configuration. This is impossible because every reachable final configuration is a sink-state configuration by assumption. It remains to show that $\{\{\mathcal{C}(G, p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ satisfies one of both side conditions. Both properties hold. First, the subset construction determinises by definition. Second, every global type satisfies feasible eventual reception by construction and a projection preserves this property.

Proof that (iv) implies (i):

We know there is a strong projection for G (with certain properties) and want to show there is a sink-final projection (with the same properties). From the assumption, let $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ be a strong projection of G . By definition, every strong projection is also a projection of G because soft deadlock freedom implies deadlock freedom. We assume it is not sink-final for some participant p as the claim follows trivially otherwise. This means that A_p has final states that have outgoing transitions. We will show that these states do not need to be final for any such p . Hence, we can turn $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ to a sink-final CSM $\{\{A'_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ by inductively applying this to all participants whose state machines are not sink-final.

We claim that, for a strong projection $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$, whether a state is final or not does only matter for soft deadlock freedom and not protocol fidelity. Assume it was relevant for protocol fidelity. Then, there is a reachable non-sink-state configuration that is final, which means that all participants are in final states and the channels are empty. We established earlier that no final state can have an outgoing send transition. Thus, this would constitute a soft deadlock, contradicting the fact that $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ is a strong projection.

From soft deadlock freedom, we know that there is no stuck reachable final non-sink-state configuration. In other words, all the stuck configurations are final sink-state configurations. Thus, any non-sink final state does not need to be final. This proves the claim that the existence of $\{\{A_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}\}$ always implies the

existence of a sink-final CSM $\{\{A'_p\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ which is our witness for projectability. The side conditions for both statements are the same and not affected by our construction so they simply carry over. \square

For our result, it is fine to assume projectability of G as it is a prerequisite for strong projectability. If we aim for a strong projection, we can construct the global type's subset projection (the subset construction with validity conditions) and check if it is sink-final. If it provides one that is not, there is no strong projection of it. If this is undesirable, the protocol needs redesigning. To obtain local types from a CSM of sink-final state machines, we can use Theorem 6.2. This requires no mixed-choice states, which is always the case for the subset projection.

Corollary D.33. *Let G be a strongly projectable global type. Then, there is a local type L_p for every $p \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\{\{\text{LAut}(L_p)\}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ is a strong projection of G .*

D.5 Projectability and Strong Projectability for Global Types with Mixed Choice is Undecidable

In Section 4.2, we constructed a sink-final mixed-choice $\Sigma 1$ -PSM to prove undecidability of the respective projectability problem. With our results from Appendix D.2, we can transform this encoding into a mixed-choice global type.

Corollary 6.5. *Both the projectability problem and the strong projectability problem for mixed-choice global types are undecidable.*

Proof. From Theorem 4.6, we know that the projectability problem is undecidable for sink-final mixed-choice $\Sigma 1$ -PSMs in general. From Theorem 6.1, we know that such PSMs can be transformed into a mixed-choice global type, which proves the claim for the projectability problem. By construction, all participants are informed when the protocol of the encoding ends, making the projectability and soft projectability problem equivalent. This proves the claim for the soft projectability problem. \square