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Abstract

We define a notion of connection in a fibre bundle that is compatible with a singular foliation of the base. Fibre bundles equipped with such connections are shown to simultaneously generalise regularly foliated bundles in the sense of Kamber-Tondeur, bundles that are equivariant under the actions of Lie groupoids with simply connected source fibres, and singular foliations. We define hierarchies of diffeological holonomy groupoids associated to such bundles, which arise from the parallel transport of germs of local conservation laws on the base that take values in the total space. In particular, for any singular foliation with “enough” local conservation laws, our construction recovers the holonomy groupoid defined by Androulidakis and Skandalis as a special case. Finally we prove functoriality of all our constructions under appropriate morphisms.
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1 Introduction

In this paper, we extend the notion of a partial connection in a fibre bundle to the singular setting, obtaining singular partial connections. Fibre bundles with singular partial connections, which we refer to as singularly foliated bundles, simultaneously generalise singular foliations, regularly foliated bundles, and bundles that are equivariant under the actions of Lie groupoids with simply connected source fibres. We use certain diffeological pseudo-bundles consisting of germs of conserved sections to systematically construct hierarchies of holonomy groupoids for singularly foliated bundles as diffeological quotients of path spaces, and show that our constructions are functorial under suitably defined morphisms of singularly foliated bundles. In particular, we recover the well-known holonomy groupoid of [2] as a special case for any singular foliation with sufficiently many local conserved functions.

Singular foliations are involutive, locally finitely generated families of vector fields on manifolds. As famously proved by Stefan [56] and Sussmann [57], such objects integrate to give decompositions of their ambient manifolds into immersed submanifolds, possibly of differing dimension, called leaves. Singular foliations are ubiquitous in mathematics and its applications. For instance, every Poisson manifold has a singular foliation by symplectic leaves, and conversely a singular foliation of a manifold by symplectic leaves suffices to determine a Poisson structure [28]. More generally, any integrable Dirac manifold admits a singular foliation by presymplectic leaves [26]. Singular foliations also generalise regular foliations, which are among the primary instances of Connes’ noncommutative geometries [19, 21].

An essential construction for the noncommutative perspective is the holonomy groupoid of a regular foliation, which was introduced by Winkelnkemper [59] as a model for the leaf space. As described by Phillips [52], the holonomy groupoid is in a precise sense the smallest desingularisation of the naive “space of leaves” obtained as the quotient by leaves that admits a (locally Hausdorff) manifold structure. It is upon the locally Hausdorff holonomy groupoid of a foliation (or étale versions thereof) that a great deal of progress has been made in index theory [25, 16, 40, 9, 10, 13, 17, 11, 8, 12, 48, 46] and equivariant/cyclic cohomology [20, 24, 34, 22, 33, 29, 50, 23, 49, 45]. An alternative toolbox for the study of regular foliations that has been developing since the nineteen-nineties is diffeology [38, 39], which provides a way of doing differential topology on conventionally badly behaved spaces $\mathcal{X}$ by declaring which maps from Euclidean domains into $\mathcal{X}$ are smooth. Recent progress by the author in this area [47] shows that the holonomy groupoid of a regular foliation is just the largest of an infinite family of diffeological holonomy groupoids constructed using solutions of parallel transport differential equations in diffeological bundles. Thus, while the Winkelnkemper holonomy groupoid is the smallest Lie groupoid that integrates a regular foliation, it is far from being the smallest diffeological groupoid that does so.

Defining holonomy groupoids for singular foliations dates back to the mid nineteen-eighties with work of Pradines and Bigonnet [14, 53]. Significant further progress was made by Debord in [30, 31] in the study of holonomy groupoids for singular foliations arising from Lie algebroids.
whose anchor maps are injective on a dense set (these types of foliations are now known as Debord foliations [44, Definition 3.6]). Such foliations are special in that their holonomy groupoids are Lie groupoids. At present, the most general family of singular foliations for which holonomy groupoids can be defined are those associated to locally finitely generated, involutive families of vector fields, in the spirit of those originally studied by Stefan and Sussmann. The holonomy groupoids of such general foliations were formulated by Androulidakis and Skandalis in [2]. Holonomy groupoids at this level of generality are topologically pathological, but, as is evident in the recent preprint [58] of Garmendia and Villatoro, are diffeologically quite well-behaved, arising as spaces of classes of leafwise paths identified via their maps on transversal slices. The years since the Androulidakis-Skandalis construction have seen a great deal of further research conducted into singular foliations and their holonomy, see for instance [4, 3, 6, 32, 5, 33, 58].

The present paper constitutes a generalisation of the holonomy groupoid constructions in [47] to singular foliations, and is inspired in part by the recent work of Garmendia and Villatoro [58], who showed how to recover the Androulidakis-Skandalis holonomy groupoid as a quotient of a diffeological path space. In the author’s view, the primary contribution of this paper is a novel perspective on the holonomy of singular foliations which arises from parallel transport of local conservation laws. In particular, this places the holonomy of singular foliations in the same realm of differential geometry that deals with symmetries and conservation laws of differential equations in the sense of [1, 51]. In addition, the diffeological pseudo-bundles of germs that we introduce in this paper are shown to be extensions of jet bundles, which are closely related to (but topologically distinct from) classical objects in sheaf theory such as étale spaces of sheaves. We believe that these pseudo-bundles may be of independent interest and utility. Let us now outline the content of the paper in more detail.

Section 2 consists of a recollection of the well-known definitions and results from singular foliations, jet bundle theory and diffeology that will be required for our constructions later in the paper. We remark here that our notation $\Gamma_k$ for the $k$th order jet bundles differs from the $J^k$ that is usually seen in the literature - this is to ensure compatibility with the pseudo-bundles of germs that we introduce in the following section. In particular, the $k$-jet at a point $x \in M$ of a particular section $\sigma$ of a fibre bundle over $M$ is denoted

$$[\sigma]_x^k,$$

rather than the usual $j^k_x\sigma$.

Section 3 is where we introduce the key diffeological constructions with which the holonomy groupoids of singularly foliated bundles can be systematically constructed. In particular, we associate to any sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ of smooth sections of a fibre bundle $\pi_B : B \to M$ over a manifold $M$ a canonical diffeological pseudo-bundle $\Gamma_k(\mathcal{F})$ over $M$, whose fibre over $x \in M$ consists of all the germs $[\sigma]^k_x$ at $x$ of elements $\sigma$ of $\mathcal{F}$ defined around $x$. When $\mathcal{F}$ is the sheaf of all sections of $\pi_B$, the “pseudo-bundle of germs” $\Gamma_k(\pi_B)$ ought to be thought of as a “completion” of the usual tower of jet bundles $\Gamma_k(\pi_B)$ associated to $\pi_B$, which is sufficiently rich to capture the behaviour of non-analytic smooth sections. The concept of jet prolongation of a vector field to a jet bundle is extended to germinal prolongation of a vector field to a bundle of germs, which is a crucial component in the definition of our holonomy groupoids.
We include in Section 3 a discussion of the relationship between pseudo-bundles of germs and classical sheaf theoretic concepts. In particular, we show in Proposition 3.9 that any suitably smooth morphism of sheaves of sections induces a morphism of the corresponding pseudo-bundles of germs, following which we give a counterexample to the converse being true. Finally, Proposition 3.12 and Example 3.13 show that while the pseudo-bundle of germs of a sheaf is isomorphic as a set to the well-known étale space associated to the sheaf, the topology it inherits from its diffeology is (often strictly) contained in the usual étale topology. These considerations regarding the topology of pseudo-bundles of germs are not required anywhere in our constructions, and are included out of independent interest.

Section 3 concludes by recalling the diffeological path categories $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ of diffeological spaces $\mathcal{X}$ introduced in [17], and generalises the leafwise path category of a regular foliation introduced therein to the singular case. Elements of the leafwise path category $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F})$ of a singular foliation $\mathcal{F}$ are triples

$$(\gamma, [X]^{\delta}, d), \quad (2)$$

where $X$ is some locally-defined vector field in $\mathcal{F}$, $d > 0$ a real number, and $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} = [0, \infty) \to M$ an integral curve of $X$ such that $X$ vanishes in a neighbourhood of $\gamma(0)$ and of $\gamma([d, \infty))$. This definition draws from the analogous definition used by Garendia and Villatoro in [58]. We also define an abstract notion of holonomy groupoid associated to a lifting map into paths of a pseudo-bundle, which serves as the framework for the constructions of Section 4.

In Section 4 we generalise the notion of a singular foliation to a *singularly foliated bundle*. In the same way that regularly foliated bundles in the sense of Kamber and Tondeur [42] are defined in terms of a partial connection on the total space of the bundle, our singularly foliated bundles are defined in terms of what we call *singular partial connections*. Roughly speaking, a singular partial connection $\ell$ in a fibre bundle over a singular foliation allows us to lift vector fields from the foliation of the base to fields on the total space. We show that singularly foliated bundles simultaneously generalise singular foliations, regularly foliated bundles, and bundles which are equivariant under the actions of Lie groupoids with simply connected source fibres. Now associated to any singularly foliated bundle $\pi_B : B \to M$ with foliation $\mathcal{F}$ of the base are pseudo-bundles $\pi_B^{\mathcal{F}} : \Gamma_k(\pi_B)^{\mathcal{F}} \to M$ of germs/jets of sections which are locally invariant under flows of $\mathcal{F}$. These $\mathcal{F}$-invariant sections generalise the “distinguished sections” considered in [47], and may be thought of as local $B$-valued conservation laws for $\mathcal{F}$. We prove the following.

**Theorem 1.1** (Theorem 4.10). Let $\pi_B : B \to M$ be a singularly foliated bundle. Let $k$ denote any of the symbols $0, \ldots, \infty, \sigma$. Then for each $(\gamma, [X]^{\delta}, d) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F})$ and for each $(x, [\sigma]^{k}_{x}) \in \Gamma_k(\pi_B)^{\mathcal{F}}_{\gamma(0)}$, the map

$$t \mapsto (\gamma(t), [F\ell(X)\circ \sigma \circ F[\sigma]^{k}_{x})$$

is the unique solution to the initial value problem

$$\frac{d}{dt}f(t; x, [\sigma]^{k}_{x}) = \psi^{k}(\ell(X)) \left(f(t; x, [\sigma]^{k}_{x})\right), \quad f(0; x, [\sigma]^{k}_{x}) = (x, [\sigma]^{k}_{x})$$

in the diffeological space $\Gamma_k(\pi_B)^{\mathcal{F}}$ for which $\pi_B^{\mathcal{F}} \circ f(-; x, [\sigma]^{k}_{x}) = \gamma(-)$. Moreover, the lifting
map \( L(\pi_B^{k,F}) : \mathcal{P}(F) \times \pi_B^k \Gamma_k(\pi_B)^F \to \mathcal{P}(\Gamma_k(\pi_B)^F) \) defined by

\[
L(\pi_B^{k,F})(\gamma, [X]^g, d; x, [\sigma]^k_z)(t) := (\gamma(t), [\mathrm{Fl}_t^\ell(X) \circ \sigma \circ \mathrm{Fl}_t^X]^{k_z}_t(x)), \quad t \in [0, \infty)
\]

is smooth. Here \( \mathrm{Fl} \) denotes the flow and \( p^k(X) \) denotes the \( k \)-prolongation of the vector field \( X \), while \( (\gamma, [X]^g, d) \) and \( [\sigma]^k_z \) are as in Equations (2) and (1) respectively.

In words, Theorem 4.10 simply says that conjugation by the flows of an element of \( F \) solves a parallel transport differential equation, and defines a lifting map from leafwise paths to paths in \( \Gamma_k(\pi_B)^F \). In particular, any local conservation law about a point can be extended to a local conservation law along any path in \( F \) starting at that point. Each of the lifting maps \( L(\pi_B^{k,F}) \) of a singularly foliated bundle \( \pi_B : B \to M \) induces a transport functor from the leafwise path category \( \mathcal{P}(F) \) to the diffeological groupoid of diffeomorphisms between the fibres of \( \Gamma_k(\pi_B)^F \).

The fibres of this functor determine an equivalence relation on \( \mathcal{P}(F) \), and the quotient of \( \mathcal{P}(F) \) by this equivalence relation is the holonomy groupoid \( \mathcal{H}(\pi_B^{k,F}) \). The arguments of [47, Theorem 5.15] then apply to show that we have a hierarchy

\[
\mathcal{H}(\pi_B^{k,F}) \xrightarrow{\Pi_B^{0,\infty}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\Pi_B^{k+1,\infty}} \mathcal{H}(\pi_B^{k+1,F}) \xrightarrow{\Pi_B^{k,\infty}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\Pi_B^{k,F}} \mathcal{H}(\pi_B^{k,F}) \xrightarrow{\Pi_B^{k,F}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\Pi_B^{k,F}} \mathcal{H}(\pi_B^{k,F}) \xrightarrow{\Pi_B^{k,F}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\Pi_B^{k,F}} \mathcal{H}(\pi_B^{k,F})
\]

of diffeological holonomy groupoids associated to the tower

\[
\Gamma_k(\pi_B) \to \Gamma_\infty(\pi_B) \to \cdots \to \Gamma_1(\pi_B) \to B
\]

of germ/jet bundles.

Following this, we prove in Theorem 4.15 that in the case of a singular foliation \((M, F)\), with \( M \) of dimension \( n \), the holonomy groupoid \( \mathcal{H}(\pi^{g,F}_{M \times \mathbb{R}^n}) \) associated to the trivial singularly foliated bundle \( M \times \mathbb{R}^n \to M \) recovers the holonomy groupoid of Garmendia-Villatoro, provided the foliation admits sufficiently many local, \( \mathbb{R}^n \)-valued conservation laws. Thus, by [58, Theorem 5.5], our construction recovers the holonomy groupoid of Androulidakis-Skandalis [2] in such cases. We give a family of explicit examples for which the hypotheses of Theorem 4.15 hold, and some simple counter examples. It is conceivable that the holonomy groupoid of Androulidakis-Skandalis can be recovered in complete generality using a clever choice of bundle \( B \). Presently, however, the conservation laws of singular foliations are not sufficiently well-understood to say anything conclusive. Section 4 is concluded by defining a class of morphisms of singularly foliated bundles, which generalises the morphisms described by Garmendia-Villatoro [58, Definition 6.11], and we prove in Theorem 4.21 that the hierarchy (3) of holonomy groupoids is functorial under such morphisms. The paper is concluded in Section 5 with a discussion of open questions.
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2 Background and prerequisites

2.1 Notational conventions

All manifolds and fibre bundles are assumed to be smooth, Hausdorff, without boundary and connected, and all maps thereof assumed to be smooth. Given any manifold \( M \), we use \( \mathfrak{X}_M \) to denote the sheaf of smooth vector fields on \( M \), and \( C^\infty_M \) the sheaf of smooth, real-valued functions on \( M \). If \( \pi_B : B \to M \) is a fibre bundle, then we denote by \( \Gamma_{\pi_B} \) the sheaf of sections of \( \pi_B \). Given a smooth map \( f : M \to N \) of manifolds, and sheaves \( \mathcal{S}_M \) on \( M \) and \( \mathcal{S}_N \) on \( N \), we denote by \( f_! \mathcal{S}_M \) the pushforward of \( \mathcal{S}_M \) and by \( f^! \mathcal{S}_N \) the pullback of \( \mathcal{S}_N \) [37, p. 65].

Given a vector field \( X \) on an open set \( O \) in a manifold \( M \), we use \( \text{Fl}^X \) to denote its flow. That is, for \( x \in O \), \( t \mapsto \text{Fl}^X_t(x) \) is the unique solution to the initial value problem

\[
\frac{d}{dt}f(t;x) = X(f(t;x)), \quad f(0;x) = x
\]

defined by the vector field \( X \).

2.2 Singular foliations

We begin by recalling the standard sheaf-theoretic definition of a singular foliation.

Definition 2.1. Let \( M \) be a smooth manifold. A singular foliation on \( M \) is a subsheaf \( \mathcal{F} \subset \mathfrak{X}_M \) of \( C^\infty_M \)-modules on \( M \) for which the following hold.

1. \( \mathcal{F} \) is closed under Lie brackets in the sense that for every open set \( O \) of \( M \), \( \mathcal{F}(O) \) is closed under the Lie bracket of vector fields.

2. \( \mathcal{F} \) is locally finitely generated in the sense that for each \( x \in M \), there exists an open neighbourhood \( O_x \) of \( x \) and a finite family \( X_1, \ldots, X_k \) of elements of \( \mathcal{F}(O_x) \) such that \( \mathcal{F}(O_x) \) is the \( C^\infty_M(O_x) \)-span of the \( X_i \).

One can alternatively describe a singular foliation of a manifold \( M \) as a locally finitely generated submodule of the compactly supported vector fields on \( M \) which is closed under Lie brackets, as in [2]. By [33, Remark 1.8] these definitions are equivalent. One of the most important facts regarding singular foliations is the Stefan-Sussmann integration theorem [56,57].

Theorem 2.2. Let \( M \) be a manifold with a singular foliation \( \mathcal{F} \). Then \( \mathcal{F} \) integrates to give a decomposition of \( M \) into smoothly immersed submanifolds called leaves.
The following important theorem, due to Androulidakis and Skandalis [2, Theorem 0.1], says that the leaves of a singular foliation always arise as the orbits of a certain topological groupoid, called the holonomy groupoid of the foliation.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let \( M \) be a manifold with a singular foliation \( \mathcal{F} \). Then there exists a topological groupoid \( \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}) \) for which the following hold.

1. \( \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}) \) integrates the foliation \( \mathcal{F} \), in the sense that its orbits are the leaves of \( \mathcal{F} \).

2. \( \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}) \) is minimal in the sense that if \( G \) is any Lie groupoid which integrates \( \mathcal{F} \), there is an open subgroupoid \( G_0 \) of \( G \) and a surjective morphism \( G_0 \to \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}) \) of topological groupoids.

The groupoid \( \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}) \) is called the holonomy groupoid of \( \mathcal{F} \).

Androulidakis and Skandalis built their groupoid using “bisubmersions” defined by iterated flows of the vector fields defining the foliation. Recent work by Garmendia and Villatoro [58] recovers the Androulidakis-Skandalis holonomy groupoid as a diffeological quotient of a certain path space. It is the Garmendia-Villatoro construction that most closely resembles the construction we give in this article.

A very large family of examples of singular foliations is furnished by Lie algebroids as we now describe.

**Example 2.4.** A Lie algebroid consists of a (finite rank) vector bundle \( \pi_A : A \to M \) over a manifold \( M \) together with a Lie bracket on the space \( \Gamma(M; A) \) of its smooth sections and a morphism \( \rho : A \to TM \) of vector bundles known as the anchor map. Then the image of the compactly supported smooth sections of \( A \) under \( \rho \) is a singular foliation [2, Example 1.3]. Of particular importance are Lie algebroids that are integrable in the sense that they integrate to Lie groupoids. The characterisation of which Lie algebroids are integrable in this sense was solved by Crainic and Fernandes [27]. Lie algebroids arise in many geometric situations.

1. Lie algebras, which are Lie algebroids over a point and are integrated by Lie groups by Lie’s third theorem.

2. Regular foliations, defined by Lie algebroids with injective anchor map. Such foliations are integrated by their Winkelnkemper-Phillips holonomy groupoids [39] [52].

3. Debord foliations, associated to algebroids whose anchor maps are injective on a dense set. The integration problem for these foliations was solved by Debord in [30] [31].

4. Poisson manifolds \( M \), whose Lie algebroids \( T^*M \to M \) are equipped with a Lie bracket arising from the Poisson structure. Poisson manifolds admit (and are characterised by) singular foliations by symplectic leaves [27, p.113].

We will not be making use of Lie algebroids in this article. Like the constructions of Androulidakis-Skandalis and Garmendia-Villatoro, our constructions will be founded on the more general Definition 2.1.
2.3 Jet bundles and prolongation

We recall in this subsection some well-known theory of jet bundles, drawn primarily from \[54, 1\]. Although the reader is likely familiar with this theory already, we include the following outline both to introduce our rather unconventional notation (which we choose for consistency with the bundles of germs to be introduced in Subsection 3.1) and to point out the structures that will be most relevant in our constructions.

**Definition 2.5.** Let \( \pi_B : B \to M \) be a fibre bundle, and let \( k \geq 0 \). We say that two local sections \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_2 \) of \( \pi_B \) defined in a neighbourhood of \( x \in M \) have the same \( k \)-jet at \( x \) if \( \sigma_1(x) = \sigma_2(x) \), and for any local coordinate neighbourhood \( O \cong O_M \times O_F \) of \( b \), one has

\[
\frac{\partial^{|I|}\sigma_1^i}{\partial x^I}(x) = \frac{\partial^{|I|}\sigma_2^i}{\partial x^I}(x)
\]

for all \( i = 1, \ldots, \dim(F) \), and all multi-indices \( I \) with \( |I| \leq k \). Having the same \( k \)-jet at a point \( x \) is an equivalence relation on the set of local sections defined about \( x \), and we denote the \( k \)-jet equivalence class of any such local section by \( [\sigma]^k_x \).

The \( k \)-jets of local sections fit into a fibre bundle in a natural way.

**Definition 2.6.** Let \( \pi_B : B \to M \) be a fibre bundle, and let \( k \geq 0 \). For each \( x \in M \), denote the set of all \( k \)-jets of local sections defined near \( x \) by \( \Gamma_k(\pi_B)_x \), and define \( \Gamma_k(\pi_B) := \bigsqcup_{x \in M} \Gamma_k(\pi_B)_x \), with \( \pi^k_{\pi_B} : \Gamma_k(\pi_B) \to M \) denoting the canonical projection. Define \( \pi^0_{\pi_B} : \Gamma_k(\pi_B) \to B \) by

\[
\pi^0_{\pi_B}(x, [\sigma]^k_x) := \sigma(x),
\]

and observe that any choice of local coordinate trivialisation \( (x^i, f^a) \) on \( O \) about a point \( b \in B \) determines coordinates

\[
(x^i, f^a, f^a_i, \ldots, f^a_{\ell^I}) := \left( x^i, f^a, \frac{\partial f^a}{\partial x^i}, \ldots, \frac{\partial^{|I|} f^a}{\partial x^I} \right)
\]

(4)

on the set \( \left( \pi^0_{\pi_B} \right)^{-1}(O) \). These coordinates give the projection \( \pi_k : \Gamma_k(\pi_B) \to M \) the structure of a fibre bundle, called the \( k \)th order jet bundle of \( \pi_B \).

The jet bundles of a fibre bundle \( \pi_B : B \to M \) admit projections \( \pi^{k,l}_{\pi_B} : \Gamma_l(\pi_B) \to \Gamma_k(\pi_B) \) defined by

\[
\pi^{k,l}_{\pi_B}([\sigma]^l_x) := [\sigma]^k_x, \quad [\sigma]^l_x \in \Gamma_l(\pi_B)
\]

for any \( l \geq k \), and these projections form a projective system. The projective limit of this system, denoted \( \Gamma_\infty(\pi_B) \), inherits a natural smooth structure as a projective limit of manifolds, which may be equivalently thought of as arising from the projective limit diffeology \([11, \text{Section 1.39}]\). The space \( \Gamma_\infty(\pi_B) \) is usually identified with the set of \( \infty \)-jets of local sections of \( \pi_B \), and
admits a canonical projection $\pi_B^\infty : \Gamma_\infty(\pi_B) \to M$ given by

$$\pi_B^\infty([\sigma]^\infty_x) := x, \quad [\sigma]^\infty_x \in \Gamma_\infty(\pi_B).$$

One therefore obtains a hierarchy of jet bundles

$$\Gamma_\infty(\pi_B) \to \cdots \xrightarrow{\pi_{k+1}^B} \Gamma_k(\pi_B) \xrightarrow{\pi_{k+1}^B} \cdots \xrightarrow{\pi_{1+1}^B} \Gamma_1(\pi_B) \xrightarrow{\pi_{0+1}^B} B \xrightarrow{\pi_B} M.$$ 

Since we will be concerned primarily with singular foliations, which arise from families of vector fields, we will need to know about vector fields on jet bundles. A particularly important class of vector fields on fibre bundles, in which we will be primarily interested, is those that are projectable in the following sense.

**Definition 2.7.** Let $\pi_B : B \to M$ be a fibre bundle. A vector field $X$ on $B$ is said to be **projectable** if there is a vector field $(\pi_B)_*(X)$ on $M$ for which

$$d\pi_B \circ X = (\pi_B)_*(X) \circ \pi_B$$

on all of $B$. We denote by $\mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj}}(B)$ the set of projectable vector fields on $B$.

Projectable vector fields on a bundle prolong in a natural way to vector fields on the associated jet bundles.

**Definition 2.8.** Let $\pi_B : B \to M$ be a fibre bundle, and let $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj}}(B)$ be a projectable vector field. For $1 \leq k \leq \infty$, the $k$-jet prolongation of $X$ is the vector field $p^k(X) \in \mathfrak{X}(\Gamma_k(\pi_B))$ defined by

$$p^k(X)(x, [\sigma]^k_x) := \frac{d}{dt} \bigg|_{t=0} \left( F^\pi_1(X)(x), [F^\pi_1(X) \circ \sigma] \circ F^\pi_1(X^k \circ \sigma) \right)$$

for all $[\sigma]^k_x \in \Gamma_k(\pi_B)$. We denote by $\mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj}}(\Gamma_k(\pi_B))$ the image of $p^k$.

Suppose now that $\pi_B : B \to M$ is a fibre bundle and $X$ is a projectable vector field on $B$ which, in coordinates \([1]\), is given by $X = a^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} + b^\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial f^\alpha}$, where $a^i$ are smooth functions depending only on the $x^i$ while the $b^\alpha$ depend on both the $x^i$ and the $f^\alpha$. Then for any $1 \leq k < \infty$, the $k$-jet prolongation $p^k(X)$ of $X$ is given in coordinates over a point $(x^i, f^\alpha, f^\alpha_i, \ldots) \in \Gamma_k(\pi_B)$ by the formula (cf. \([51]\) Theorem 2.36))

$$p^k(X) = a^i D_i^{(k)} + \sum_{|I| = k} (D_I^{(k)})^a - \sum_{J \subseteq I} (D_I^{(k)})^a f_J^b \frac{\partial}{\partial f^b} + \sum_{|I| = 0} (D_I^{(k)})^a \frac{\partial}{\partial f^b}$$

where the sum over $J \subset I$ is a sum over all strict subsets of the multi-index $J$, and where we have absorbed the constants arising from the symmetry of mixed partial derivatives into our notation as in \([1]\) Equation 1.15. For $k = \infty$, the formula simplifies to

$$p^\infty(X) = a^i D_i^{(\infty)} + \sum_{|I| = 0} (D_I^{(\infty)})^a \frac{\partial}{\partial f^b}.$$
Here $D^{(k)}_I = D^{(k)}_{i_1} \cdots D^{(k)}_{i_k}$, where $D^{(k)}_{i}$ is the total derivative operator defined by $D_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} + \sum_{|I|=0}^{k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\left|I\right|} f^{n}_{I_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{i_j}}$. The prolongation formula \( \Box \) can be used to deduce the following fact, which justifies our choice of notation in denoting the image of $p^k$ in $X(\Gamma_k(\pi_B))$ by $X_{proj}(\Gamma_k(\pi_B))$.

**Proposition 2.9.** Let $\pi_B : B \to M$ be a fibre bundle, and let $X$ be a projectable vector field on $B$. Then the $p^k(X)$ are a projectable family, in the sense that

$$d\pi_B^{l,k} \circ p^k(X) = p^l(X) \circ \pi_B^{l,k}$$

on $\Gamma_k(\pi_B)$ for all $l \leq k$. □

Via the jet prolongation operators, therefore, we can think of projectable vector fields on a fibre bundle $\pi_B : B \to M$ as defining a tower of projectable vector fields associated to the tower of jet bundles for $\pi_B$.

**Proposition 2.10.** Let $\pi_B : B \to M$ be a fibre bundle. Then for each $l \leq k \leq \infty$ there is a bracket-preserving homomorphism $(\pi_B^l)^* : X_{proj}(\Gamma_k(\pi_B)) \to X_{proj}(\Gamma_l(\pi_B))$ and the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X_{proj}(\Gamma_\infty(\pi_B)) & \to & X_{proj}(\Gamma_l(\pi_B)) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\cdots & & \cdots \\
\pi_B^\infty & \to & (\pi_B^l)^* \\
\pi_B^l & \to & (\pi_B^l)^* \\
X_{proj}(B) & \xrightarrow{id} & X_{proj}(B)
\end{array}
\]

commutes. □

### 2.4 Diffeology

We recall in this subsection some basic objects of study in diffeology that will be relevant for our constructions. The most comprehensive reference on diffeology is the wonderful book \[41\] by P. Iglesias-Zemmour.

**Definition 2.11.** A function $\varphi : U \to X$ from an open subset $U$ of some finite-dimensional Euclidean space to a set $X$ is called a parametrisation. A diffeology on a set $X$ is a family $D$ of parametrisations satisfying the following axioms.

1. The family $D$ contains all constant parametrisations.

2. If $\varphi : U \to X$ is a parametrisation such that every point $u \in U$ has an open neighbourhood $V \subset U$ for which $\varphi|_V$ is an element of $D$, then $\varphi$ itself is an element of $D$.

3. For every element $\varphi : U \to X$ of $D$, every open set $V$ of any finite-dimensional Euclidean space, and for every smooth function $f : V \to U$, the composite $\varphi \circ f : V \to X$ is contained in $D$. 
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A set with a diffeology is called a **diffeological space**, and the elements of the diffeology are called its **plots**. If $X$ and $Y$ are two diffeological spaces, then a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be **smooth** if for every plot $\varphi : U \rightarrow X$ of $X$, the composite $f \circ \varphi : U \rightarrow Y$ is a plot of $Y$. A smooth bijection of diffeological spaces is said to be a **diffeomorphism** if it is smooth with smooth inverse.

Every manifold is a diffeological space, with diffeology constituted by the set of all parametrizations that are smooth in the usual sense. Moreover a map between manifolds is smooth in the manifold sense if and only if it is smooth in the diffeological sense. Thus the category of manifolds and smooth maps is a full and faithful subcategory of the category of diffeological spaces and smooth maps.

Diffeologies can be pushed forward and pulled back by functions of sets. This fact will be invoked frequently for our constructions.

**Definition 2.12.** Let $X$ and $Y$ be sets, and let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a function.

1. If $X$ has a diffeology, then the **pushforward diffeology induced by $f$** is defined by declaring a parametrisation $\varphi : U \rightarrow Y$ to be a plot if and only if every $u \in U$ has an open neighbourhood $V \subset U$ such that either $\varphi|_V$ is constant, or equal to the composite $f \circ \psi$ for some plot $\psi : V \rightarrow X$ of $X$. The map $f$ is said to be a **subduction** if it is surjective and if $Y$ is equipped with the pushforward diffeology induced by $f$.

2. If $Y$ has a diffeology, then the **pullback diffeology induced by $f$** is defined by declaring a parametrisation $\psi : U \rightarrow X$ to be plot if and only if the composite $f \circ \psi : U \rightarrow Y$ is a plot of $Y$. The map $f$ is said to be an **induction** if it is injective and if $X$ is equipped with the pullback diffeology from $Y$.

The following special cases are of particular importance. Let $X$ be a diffeological space.

1. If $\sim$ is any equivalence relation on $X$, then the **quotient diffeology** $X / \sim$ is the pushforward diffeology arising from the quotient $X \rightarrow X / \sim$.

2. If $S$ is any subset of $X$, then the **subspace diffeology** on $S$ is the pullback diffeology arising from the inclusion $S \hookrightarrow X$.

3. If $Y$ is any other diffeological space, then the **product diffeology** on $X \times Y$ is the smallest diffeology for which the projections onto the factors are subductions.

Quotients, subspaces and products will always be assumed to be equipped with the respective diffeologies defined above unless otherwise stated.

One of the features of the category of diffeological spaces is that the set of all morphisms between any two objects in the category is itself an object.

**Definition 2.13.** Let $X$ and $Y$ be diffeological spaces, and denote by $C^\infty(X,Y)$ the set of all smooth maps $f : X \rightarrow Y$. The **functional diffeology** on $C^\infty(X,Y)$ is defined by declaring a parametrisation $\tilde{f} : U \rightarrow C^\infty(X,Y)$ to be a plot if and only if for every plot $\varphi : V \rightarrow X$ of $X$, the transpose

$$\tilde{f}^t : U \times V \ni (u,v) \mapsto \tilde{f}(u)(\varphi(v)) \in Y$$
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of \( \hat{f} \) is a plot of \( \mathcal{Y} \).

The familiar notion of a fibre bundle over a manifold has a far reaching generalisation to diffeological spaces. It is the flexibility afforded by this generalisation that permits most of the constructions in this paper.

**Definition 2.14.** A **diffeological pseudo-bundle** is a subduction \( \pi_B : B \to X \) of diffeological spaces. Such a pseudo-bundle is in particular called a **diffeological vector pseudo-bundle** if each fibre of \( \pi_B \) is a vector space for which the vector space operations are smooth with respect to the subspace diffeology, and such that the zero section is smooth.

A diffeological pseudo-bundle need not have fibres that are all diffeomorphic, and of course need not be locally trivial in any sense (see for instance Example 3.7). An important subclass of diffeological pseudo-bundles are **diffeological fibrations**, which have mutually diffeomorphic fibres and which are locally trivial under pullbacks by plots. Diffeological fibrations are distinguished by the behaviour of their **structure groupoids**. Before we give the definition of this object, let us record what we mean by diffeological categories and groupoids.

**Definition 2.15.** Let \( C \) be a small category, with object set identified as a subset of the morphism set via the map which sends each object to its associated identity morphism. We say that \( C \) is a **diffeological category** if its set of morphisms is equipped with a diffeology for which the range, source, and composition are all smooth. If \( C \) is in addition a groupoid, whose inversion map is smooth, we call \( C \) a **diffeological groupoid**.

Let now \( \pi_B : B \to X \) be a smooth surjection of diffeological spaces. Denote by \( \text{Aut}(\pi_B) \) the groupoid with object set \( X \), and with morphisms from \( x \) to \( y \) constituted by the set \( \text{Diff}(B_x, B_y) \) of all diffeomorphisms from the fibre \( B_x \) over \( x \) to the fibre \( B_y \) over \( y \), with the obvious range, source, inversion and composition. The groupoid \( \text{Aut}(\pi_B) \) admits a smallest diffeology, called the **functional diffeology**, under which the evaluation map \( \text{ev} : \text{Aut}(\pi_B) \times_{s,s} \pi_B \ni (f, b) \mapsto f(b) \in B \) is smooth, and under which \( \text{Aut}(\pi_B) \) is a diffeological groupoid (see [41, 8.7] for details).

**Definition 2.16.** Let \( \pi_B : B \to X \) be a surjection of diffeological spaces. Equipped with the functional diffeology, we refer to \( \text{Aut}(\pi_B) \) as the **structure groupoid** of the surjection \( \pi_B \). We say that \( \pi_B \) is a **diffeological bundle** if the characteristic map \( (r, s) : \text{Aut}(\pi_B) \to X \times X \) is a subduction.

Diffeological bundles, unlike general diffeological pseudo-bundles, have a typical fibre to which all other fibres are diffeomorphic, and the pullback of a diffeological bundle along any plot is locally trivial [41, p. 240].

By definition, singular foliations arise from certain families of sections of tangent bundles. To use diffeology to study singular foliations, therefore, we need a notion of tangent bundle for a diffeological space. A number of definitions have been proposed for this purpose, which, while coincident for manifolds, do not coincide for general diffeological spaces (see [18] for a detailed discussion). The point of view that we find useful here, as in [47], is that of **internal** tangent spaces and bundles. The paper [18] provides a categorical definition of internal tangent spaces based on work of Hector [38], which may be summarised as follows.
Definition 2.17. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a diffeological space and let $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Denote by $p_x$ the set of all plots centered at $x$, that is, plots $\varphi : U \to \mathcal{X}$ such that $0 \in U$ and $\varphi(0) = x$. Denote by $T_0 \text{dom}(\varphi)$ the tangent space at zero of the domain of any such plot, and by $\vec{v}_\varphi$ the image of $\vec{v} \in T_0 \text{dom}(\varphi)$ in the direct sum $\bigoplus_{\varphi \in p_x} T_0 \text{dom}(\varphi)$. The internal tangent space of $\mathcal{X}$ at $x$ is the quotient space $T_x \mathcal{X}$ of the direct sum by the subspace generated by all vectors of the form $\vec{v}_\varphi - \vec{v}_{\varphi' \circ f}$, where $\vec{v} \in T_0 \text{dom}(\varphi)$ and where $f : \text{dom}(\varphi) \to \text{dom}(\varphi')$ is any smooth function for which the germs of $\varphi$ and $\varphi' \circ f$ at zero are equal. The class of an element $\vec{v}_\varphi$, $\vec{v} \in T_0 \text{dom}(\varphi)$, will be denoted $\varphi^*(\vec{v})$.

Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a diffeological space, and consider the set $T \mathcal{X} := \bigsqcup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} T_x \mathcal{X}$. For any plot $\varphi : U \to \mathcal{X}$ and for any $u \in U$, denote by $\tau_u : v \mapsto v + u$ the $u$-translation map, so that $\tau_u^{-1}(U)$ contains 0 and $\varphi \circ \tau_u : \tau_u^{-1}(U) \to \mathcal{X}$ is a plot centered at $\varphi(u)$. Define $d\varphi : TU \to T \mathcal{X}$ by the formula

$$d\varphi(u, \vec{v}) := (\varphi(u), (\varphi \circ \tau_u)^*(\vec{v})), \quad (u, \vec{v}) \in TU.$$ 

These maps were first considered by Hector \[38\]. Then there exists a smallest diffeology on $T \mathcal{X}$, called the dus diffeology \[18\], for which the natural projection $\pi_{T \mathcal{X}} : T \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ is a diffeological vector pseudo-bundle, and which contains the parametrisations $d\varphi : TU \to T \mathcal{X}$ as plots.

Definition 2.18. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a diffeological space. The diffeological vector pseudo-bundle $\pi_{T \mathcal{X}} : T \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ is called the internal tangent bundle of $\mathcal{X}$.

The internal tangent bundle is functorial under smooth maps of diffeological spaces.

Definition 2.19. Let $f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ be a smooth map of diffeological spaces. For any plot $\varphi$ of $\mathcal{X}$ centered at $x$, define

$$df(x, \varphi^*(\vec{v})) := (f(x), (f \circ \varphi)^*(\vec{v})), \quad x \in \mathcal{X}$$

and extend by linearity to a map $df : T \mathcal{X} \to T \mathcal{Y}$. Then $df$ is a smooth map \[18\] Proposition 4.8] called the pushforward or differential of $f$.

Finally, we recall that every diffeological space admits a natural topology with respect to which all plots are continuous.

Definition 2.20. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a diffeological space. The D-topology on $\mathcal{X}$ is the topology whose open sets are precisely those sets $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ for which $\varphi^{-1}(A)$ is open for all plots $\varphi$ of $\mathcal{X}$.

For manifolds, the D-topology coincides with the usual topology. Although the D-topology will not play a central role in any of our constructions, we will see in Subsection 3.2 that it gives the étale space of any sheaf of sections of a fibre bundle a natural topology which is distinct from the usual étale topology.
3 Diffeological constructions

3.1 Pseudo-bundles of germs

In [17], we introduced “bundles of germs” of sections of certain fibre bundles. This construction can be generalised easily as follows. Let \( \pi_B : B \to M \) be a smooth fibre bundle over a smooth manifold \( M \), and let \( \mathcal{S} \) be a sheaf of smooth sections of \( \pi_B \). Assume that \( \mathcal{S} \) is locally nonempty, in the sense that for each \( x \in M \), we can find an open neighbourhood \( \mathcal{O} \) of \( x \) such that \( \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{O}) \) is nonempty. Define the total space \( \mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}} \) of the sheaf \( \mathcal{S} \) as the union

\[
\mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}} := \bigcup_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{O})
\]

over all open sets \( \mathcal{O} \) in \( M \) of elements of \( \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{O}) \). Thus \( \mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}} \) is the set of all locally defined sections of \( \pi_B \) that belong to some \( \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{O}) \). The arguments of [11 1.63] can be used to show that a diffeology may be defined on \( \mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}} \) as follows.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let \( M \) be a manifold, and let \( \mathcal{S} \) be a sheaf of smooth sections of some fibre bundle \( B \) over \( M \). Declare a parametrisation \( \tilde{\sigma} : U \to \mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}} \) to have the property \( \text{funct} \) if for all \( u_0 \in U \) and \( x_0 \in \text{dom}(\tilde{\sigma}(u_0)) \), there exists an open neighbourhood \( V \subset U \) of \( u_0 \) and an open neighbourhood \( \mathcal{O} \subset \text{dom}(\tilde{\sigma}(u_0)) \) of \( x_0 \) for which \( \mathcal{O} \subset \text{dom}(\tilde{\sigma}(u)) \) for all \( u \in V \) and for which the map \( V \times \mathcal{O} \ni (u, x) \mapsto \tilde{\sigma}(u)(x) \in B \) is smooth. Then the collection of parametrisations with the property \( \text{funct} \) defines a diffeology on \( \mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}} \).

**Proof.** Observe first that if \( \tilde{\sigma} : U \ni u \mapsto \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{O}') \) is a constant plot, then we can simply take \( \mathcal{O} := \mathcal{O}' \) and \( V = U \) to see that \( \tilde{\sigma} \) has property \( \text{funct} \). Therefore axiom 1 of Definition 2.11 is satisfied. To see that axiom 2 is satisfied, suppose that \( \tilde{\sigma} : U \to \Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{S}) \) is a parametrisation such that for each \( u_0 \in U \), there exists an open neighbourhood \( V \) of \( u_0 \) such that \( \tilde{\sigma}|_V \) has property \( \text{funct} \). Then by definition \( \tilde{\sigma} \) must itself have property \( \text{funct} \), so that axiom 2 is satisfied. Finally, to prove that axiom 3 is satisfied, suppose that \( \tilde{\sigma} : U \to \Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{S}) \) has property \( \text{funct} \) and that \( U' \) is some open Euclidean domain with \( \varphi : U' \to U \) a smooth function. Let \( u_0' \in U' \) and denote \( u_0 := \varphi(u_0') \in U \). Let \( V \) be an open neighbourhood of \( u_0 \) in \( U \), and let \( \mathcal{O} \) be an open subset of \( \text{dom}(\tilde{\sigma}(u_0')) \) for which \( \mathcal{O} \subset \text{dom}(\tilde{\sigma}(u)) \) for all \( u \in V \) and for which \( V \times \mathcal{O} \ni (u, x) \mapsto \tilde{\sigma}(u)(x) \in B \) is smooth. Then \( V' := \varphi^{-1}(V) \) is an open neighbourhood of \( u_0' \) in \( U' \), the open set \( \mathcal{O} \) satisfies \( \mathcal{O} \subset \text{dom}(\tilde{\sigma} \circ \varphi(u)) \) for all \( u \in U \) and \( V' \times \mathcal{O} \ni (u', x) \mapsto \tilde{\sigma}(\varphi(u'))(x) \in B \) is smooth. Therefore axiom 3 is satisfied also. \( \Box \)

**Definition 3.2.** Let \( M \) be a manifold, and \( \mathcal{S} \) a sheaf of smooth sections of some fibre bundle over \( M \). Then the diffeology on \( \mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}} \) given in Proposition 3.1 is called the functional diffeology on \( \mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}} \).

Let us now consider the diffeological subspace

\[
\Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{S}) := \{(x, \sigma) : x \in \text{dom}(\sigma)\}
\]

of the diffeological product \( M \times \mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}} \). There is then clearly a surjective, smooth map \( \pi_{\Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{S})} : \)
\( \Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{F}) \to M \) defined by

\[
\pi_{\Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{F})}(x, \sigma) := x, \quad (x, \sigma) \in \Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{F}),
\]

which is moreover a subduction. Indeed, for any plot \( \tilde{x} : U \to M \) and for any \( u \in U \) we can always find an open neighbourhood \( V \) of \( u \) in \( U \) such that \( \tilde{x}(V) \) is contained in some open neighbourhood \( \mathcal{O} \) of \( \tilde{x}(u) \) for which \( \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O}) \) contains some element \( \sigma \). Now defining \( \rho : V \to \Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{F}) \) by simply

\[
\rho(v) := (\tilde{x}(v), \sigma), \quad v \in V
\]

we have that \( \pi_{\Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{F})} \circ \rho = \tilde{x} \), making \( \pi_{\Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{F})} \) a subduction as claimed. The fibre \( \Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{F})_x \) over any \( x \in M \) is the nonempty space consisting of sections \( \sigma \) of \( \mathcal{F} \) defined on some open neighbourhood of \( x \), equipped with the functional diffeology of Definition 3.2. The subduction \( \pi_{\Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{F})} \) is the first step on the way to defining a genuinely useful object. Our next example shows why \( \pi_{\Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{F})} \) is too large to be of much use in its own right.

**Example 3.3.** Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a singular foliation of \( M \), and denote the corresponding sheaf by the same symbol. Each fibre \( \Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{F})_x \) is then *almost* a Lie algebra. Indeed, if \( X \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O}_1) \) and \( Y \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O}_2) \) contain \( x \) in their domains of definition, then on the open neighbourhood \( \mathcal{O} := \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \mathcal{O}_2 \) of \( x \), the Lie bracket \( [X, Y] \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O}) \) is defined. There is, however, nothing special about the choice \( \mathcal{O} := \mathcal{O}_1 \cap \mathcal{O}_2 \), and indeed \( [X, Y] \) also makes sense on any open neighbourhood \( \mathcal{O}' \) of \( x \) within \( \mathcal{O} \) and technically defines a distinct element \( [X, Y]|_{\mathcal{O}'} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O}') \). One encounters essentially the same problem when trying to define vector space operations in \( \Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{F})_x \). To rectify this sort of problem we work instead with a quotient of \( \Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{F}) \).

Let us again return to a sheaf \( \mathcal{G} \) of sections of a bundle \( \pi_B : B \to M \). Let us denote the germ at \( x \) of any local section \( \sigma \) of \( \pi_B \) defined in an open neighbourhood of \( x \) by \( [\sigma]^{\mathcal{G}}_x \). We define an equivalence relation \( \sim_{\mathcal{G}} \) on \( \Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{G}) \) by declaring \( (x, \sigma) \sim_{\mathcal{G}} (y, \eta) \) if and only if \( x = y \) and \( [\sigma]^{\mathcal{G}}_x = [\eta]^{\mathcal{G}}_x \). We denote by \( \Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G}) \) the diffeological quotient of \( \Gamma(\mathcal{G}) \) by the equivalence relation \( \sim_{\mathcal{G}} \), and denote by \( \pi_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathcal{G}} : \Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G}) \to M \) the obvious surjection

\[
\pi_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathcal{G}}(x, [\sigma]^{\mathcal{G}}_x) := x, \quad (x, [\sigma]^{\mathcal{G}}_x) \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G}).
\]

Since both the quotient map \( q : \Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{G}) \to \Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G}) \) and the projection \( \Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{G}) \to M \) are subductions, so too is the projection \( \pi_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathcal{G}} : \Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G}) \to M \). Thus \( \pi_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathcal{G}} : \Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G}) \to M \) is a diffeological pseudo-bundle.

**Definition 3.4.** Let \( \mathcal{G} \) be a sheaf of sections of a fibre bundle \( \pi_B : B \to M \). Then the subduction \( \pi_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathcal{G}} : \Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G}) \to M \) is called the *pseudo-bundle of germs* of \( \mathcal{G} \). If in particular \( \mathcal{G} \) is the sheaf of all sections of \( \pi_B \), then we denote the pseudo-bundle of germs of \( \mathcal{G} \) by simply \( \pi_B^{\mathcal{G}} : \Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(\pi_B) \to M \).

In fact the pseudo-bundle of germs of the full sheaf of sections of a fibre bundle \( \pi_B : B \to M \) is a diffeological fibration, in the sense that all its fibres are isomorphic to the single diffeological space \( C_{g,0}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{\dim(M)}, F) \) of germs at zero of smooth functions from \( \mathbb{R}^{\dim(M)} \) into the typical fibre \( F \) of \( B \). This can be seen, for instance, using an associated bundle construction in a similar
fashion to [47, Remark 5.7] - one need only replace the “distinguished functions” considered therein with coordinate maps on $M$. Thus it is entirely reasonable to refer to $\Gamma_g(\pi_B)$ as the bundle of germs of sections of $\pi_B$. Let us now study its relationship with the jet bundles of $\pi_B$.

For each $k \leq \infty$ we have a canonical projection $\pi^{k,g}_B : \Gamma_g(\pi_B) \rightarrow \Gamma_k(\pi_B)$ onto the $k$th order jet bundle of $\pi_B$ defined by

$$\pi^{k,g}_B(x,[\sigma]^g_x) := (x,[\sigma]^k_x), \quad (x,[\sigma]^k_x) \in \Gamma_g(\pi_B).$$

The arguments of [47, Proposition 5.14] show that these projections are smooth, and are compatible with the jet projections $\pi^{l,k}_B : \Gamma_k(\pi_B) \rightarrow \Gamma_{l}(\pi_B)$ in the sense that $\pi^{l,g}_B = \pi^{l,k}_B \circ \pi^{k,g}_B$ for all $l \leq k$. We therefore have a tower

$$
\cdots \rightarrow \Gamma_{k+1}(\pi_B) \xrightarrow{\pi^{k+1,\infty}_B} \Gamma_k(\pi_B) \xrightarrow{\pi^{k,\infty}_B} \Gamma_{k+1}(\pi_B) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow B
$$

of diffeological fibrations which extends the usual well-known tower of jet bundles of $\pi_B$.

Now there is not in general an easily identifiable Lie bracket on the space of vector fields on $\Gamma_g(\pi_B)$, however there does exist a certain diffeological subspace of vector fields which carries a natural Lie bracket. These vector fields are those that are contained in the image of a germinal prolongation operator from projectable vector fields on $B$ to vector fields on $\Gamma_g(\pi_B)$.

**Definition 3.5.** Let $\pi_B : B \rightarrow M$ be a fibre bundle. For $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj}}(B)$, the vector field $p^g(X)$ on $\Gamma_g(\pi_B)$ defined by the formula

$$p^g(X)(x,[\sigma]^g_x) := \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \left( \text{Fl}_{t}^{\pi_B}(X)(x), [\text{Fl}_{t}^{\pi_B} \circ \sigma \circ \text{Fl}_{-t}^{\pi_B}(X)]^g_{\text{Fl}_{t}^{\pi_B}(X)(x)} \right)$$

is called the **germinal prolongation of** $X$. The associated linear map $p^g : \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj}}(B) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(\Gamma_g(\pi_B))$ is called the **germinal prolongation operator**, and its image is denoted $\mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj}}(\Gamma_g(\pi_B))$.

Our next result relates the germinal prolongation operator to the jet prolongations of projectable vector fields, and can be seen as a justification of the nomenclature “germinal prolongation”.

**Proposition 3.6.** Let $\pi_B : B \rightarrow M$ be a fibre bundle. Then for each $k \leq \infty$, we have

$$d\pi^{k,g}_B \circ p^g(X) = p^k(X) \circ \pi^{k,g}_B$$

for all $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj}}(B)$. Consequently the tower of prolongations of Proposition 2.10 completes to a tower.
Proof. For any $k \leq \infty$ and $X \in \mathfrak{x}_{\text{proj}}(B)$, we have

$$d\pi_{B}^{k,\mathbb{G}} \circ p^{k}(X)(x, [\sigma^{\mathbb{G}}_{x}]) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \pi_{B}^{k,\mathbb{G}}\left( F_{t}^{\pi_{B}}(X)(x), [F_{t}^{\pi_{B}} \circ \sigma \circ F_{-t}^{\pi_{B}}](X)^{k,\mathbb{G}}_{F_{t}^{\pi_{B}}(X)(x)} \right)$$

$$= \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \left( F_{t}^{\pi_{B}}(X)(x), [F_{t}^{\pi_{B}} \circ \sigma \circ F_{-t}^{\pi_{B}}](X)^{k}_{F_{t}^{\pi_{B}}(X)(x)} \right)$$

$$= p^{k}(X)(\pi_{B}^{k,\mathbb{G}}(x, [\sigma^{\mathbb{G}}_{x}]))$$

for all $(x, [\sigma^{\mathbb{G}}_{x}]) \in \Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}(\pi_{B})$. }

The injectivity of the jet prolongation operators apparent from Equation (6) together with Proposition 3.6 implies that the germinal prolongation operator $p^{\mathbb{G}} : \mathfrak{x}_{\text{proj}}(B) \rightarrow \mathfrak{x}(\Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}(\pi_{B}))$ of a bundle $\pi_{B} : B \rightarrow M$ is injective. Consequently, on $\mathfrak{x}_{\text{proj}}(\Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}(\pi_{B}))$ we have a Lie bracket that is well-defined by the formula

$$[p^{\mathbb{G}}(X), p^{\mathbb{G}}(Y)] := p^{\mathbb{G}}([X, Y]), \quad X, Y \in \mathfrak{x}_{\text{proj}}(B),$$

with respect to which each $(\pi_{B}^{k,\mathbb{G}})_{*}$ is a homomorphism of Lie algebras. While we will not be making use of this feature in this article, we remark that it distinguishes $\mathfrak{x}_{\text{proj}}(\Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}(\pi_{B}))$ as a rather special subspace of $\mathfrak{x}(\Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}(\pi_{B}))$, which, like the vector fields of many other diffeological spaces [18], does not carry a natural Lie bracket in general.

It is in examples arising from singular foliations that one sees the justification for the terminology “pseudo-bundle” in that the fibres of a pseudo-bundle of germs need not be isomorphic in general.

**Example 3.7.** Consider the foliation $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathbb{R}$ generated by the vector field $X := f \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$, where $f$ is any smooth function on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $f(x) = 0$ for all $x \leq 0$ and such that $f(x) \neq 0$ for all $x > 0$. Then for any $x_{0} < 0$, the fibre $\Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}(\mathcal{F})_{x_{0}}$ consists of only a single point (every multiple of $X$ is equal to zero in a neighbourhood of $x_{0}$), while the fibre $\Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}(\mathcal{F})_{y_{0}}$ for any $y_{0} > 0$ is the infinite-dimensional diffeological space consisting of all germs of smooth functions defined near the point $y_{0}$. 
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The pseudo-bundles of germs of singular foliations are of course of particular interest - as we alluded to in Example 3.3, they are canonically pseudo-bundles of diffeological Lie algebras.

**Proposition 3.8.** Let \( F \subset X(M) \) be a singular foliation of a manifold \( M \). For each \( x \in M \), let \( q_x : \Gamma(F)_x \to \Gamma_g(F)_x \) be the quotient map, and define a Lie algebra structure on \( \Gamma_g(F)_x \) by the formulae

\[
[q_x(X), q_x(Y)] := q_x([X, Y]), \quad q_x(X) + q_x(Y) = q_x(X + Y), \quad \alpha q_x(X) := q_x(\alpha X)
\]

for \( X, Y \in \Gamma(F)_x \) and \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \). Then these Lie algebra operations are well-defined and smooth with respect to the subspace diffeology on \( \Gamma_g(F)_x \subset \Gamma_g(F) \), and \( \pi^g : \Gamma_g(F) \to M \) is a diffeological vector pseudo-bundle of Lie algebras.

**Proof.** Well-definedness of the operations follows from the comments made in Example 3.3. Let us therefore check only smoothness. Let \( \bar{X} : U \to \Gamma_g(F)_x \) and \( \bar{Y} : V \to \Gamma_g(F)_x \) be plots. Then we may assume \( U \) and \( V \) to be sufficiently small so as to be equal to composites

\[
\bar{X} = q_x \circ \tilde{X}, \quad \bar{Y} = q_x \circ \tilde{Y}
\]

where \( \tilde{X} : U \to \Gamma(F)_x \) and \( \tilde{Y} : V \to \Gamma(F)_x \) are plots. Smoothness of \((u, v) \mapsto [\bar{X}(u), \bar{Y}(v)]\) follows from a coordinate calculation, and now by smoothness of \( q_x \), the map

\[
(u, v) \mapsto [q_x \bar{X}(u), q_x \bar{Y}(v)] = q_x([\bar{X}(u), \bar{Y}(v)]) \in \Gamma_g(F)_x
\]

is smooth, making the Lie bracket smooth as claimed. \( \square \)

### 3.2 Relationship with sheaves

In this subsection we present some results and examples which relate our pseudo-bundles of germs to more well-known objects arising in sheaf theory. The first such result, which is of crucial importance in defining the correct notion of morphism between singularly foliated bundles, is that a smooth morphism of sheaves gives rise to a morphism of the associated pseudo-bundles.

**Proposition 3.9.** Let \( M \) be a manifold and let \( \mathcal{F}^1 \) and \( \mathcal{F}^2 \) be sheaves of sections of fibre bundles \( \pi_{B_1} \) and \( \pi_{B_2} \) over \( M \) respectively. Suppose that \( \bar{F} : \mathcal{F}^1 \to \mathcal{F}^2 \) is a morphism of sheaves for which the induced morphism \( \mathcal{F}^1_{\text{loc}} \to \mathcal{F}^2_{\text{loc}} \) is smooth (see Proposition 3.7). Then the formula

\[
F(x, [\sigma]_x^g) := (x, \bar{F}(\sigma))_x^g, \quad (x, [\sigma]_x^g) \in \Gamma_g(\mathcal{F}^1)
\]

defines a morphism \( F : \Gamma_g(\mathcal{F}^1) \to \Gamma_g(\mathcal{F}^2) \) of diffeological pseudo-bundles.

**Proof.** It is clear that \( F \) preserves fibres, so we need only check smoothness. Since for each \( i = 1, 2 \) the quotient diffeology on \( \Gamma_g(\mathcal{F}^i) \) is inherited from the functional diffeology on \( \mathcal{F}^i_{\text{loc}} \), smoothness of the map \( \mathcal{F}^1_{\text{loc}} \to \mathcal{F}^2_{\text{loc}} \) associated to \( \bar{F} \) ensures smoothness of \( F \). \( \square \)

The converse of Proposition 3.9 is not true in general - namely, a smooth morphism of pseudo-bundles of germs need not arise from any morphism (smooth or otherwise) of the underlying sheaves. This can be seen in the simplest of examples.
Example 3.10. Consider $M = \mathbb{R}$, and $B = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ with $\pi_B : B \to M$ the projection onto the first factor. Consider the map $F : \Gamma_g(\pi_B) \to \Gamma_g(\pi_B)$ defined by

$$F(x, [f]^g_{\pi_B}) := (x, [m_x f]^g_{\pi_B}), \quad (x, [f]^g_{\pi_B}) \in \Gamma_g(\pi_B),$$

where $m_x f$ denotes the function $y \mapsto x f(y)$. Then $F$ is smooth - indeed, if $U$ is any open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\tilde{x} : U \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{f} : U \to C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ are any two plots, then for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$, smoothness of

$$(u, y) \mapsto x \tilde{f}(u)(y)$$

guarantees that $F \circ (\tilde{x}, [\tilde{f}]^g_{\pi_B}) : \mathbb{R}^n \to \Gamma_g(\pi_B)$ is smooth. Now suppose that $\tilde{F} : C^\infty_{\mathbb{R}} \to C^\infty_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a morphism of sheaves. Then for $F$ to be induced by $\tilde{F}$, we must in particular have

$$[\tilde{F}(\text{id})]^g_{\pi_B} = [0 \text{id}]^g_{\pi_B} = 0,$$

so that there must exist $\epsilon > 0$ for which $\tilde{F}(\text{id})$ vanishes identically on $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$. However, for $x \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \setminus 0$, we have

$$[\tilde{F}(\text{id})]^g_x = 0 \neq [m_x \text{id}]^g_x.$$

Thus $F$ cannot arise from any morphism of sheaves.

Morphisms of pseudo-bundles of germs which arise from morphisms of sheaves in the sense of Proposition 3.9 will play an important role in the correct notion of morphism between singularly foliated bundles. We thus record the following definition.

Definition 3.11. Let $M$ be a manifold and let $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ be sheaves of sections of fibre bundles over $M$. We say that a morphism $F : \Gamma_g(\mathcal{S}_1) \to \Gamma_g(\mathcal{S}_2)$ is sheaf-induced if it arises from a smooth morphism of the sheaves $\mathcal{S}_1 \to \mathcal{S}_2$ in the sense of Proposition 3.9.

For a sheaf $\mathcal{S}$ of sections of a fibre bundle $\pi_B$ over a manifold $M$, we clearly have that $\Gamma_g(\mathcal{S})$ is equal as a set to the étale space [37, p. 67]

$$E(\mathcal{S}) := \bigsqcup_{x \in M} \mathcal{S}_x = \Gamma_g(\mathcal{S})$$

of the sheaf $\mathcal{S}$. The étale space $E(\mathcal{S})$ is usually equipped with the étale topology, whose open sets are those sets of the form

$$U(\sigma, \mathcal{O}) := \{ [\sigma]^g_x : x \in \mathcal{O} \}$$

defined for open sets $\mathcal{O}$ of $M$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{O})$. The set $\Gamma_g(\mathcal{S})$ may also be thought of with the D-topology (see Definition 2.20) arising from the diffeology on $\Gamma_g(\mathcal{S})$ described in Definition 3.2 whose open sets are precisely those subsets $A$ for which $\rho^{-1}(A)$ is open in $\text{dom}(\rho)$ for all plots $\rho$ of $\Gamma_g(\mathcal{S})$. The next result shows that the D-topology is coarser than the étale topology.

Proposition 3.12. Let $M$ be a manifold and let $\mathcal{S}$ be a sheaf of sections of some fibre bundle $\pi_B : B \to M$ over $M$. If a subset $A$ of $\Gamma_g(\mathcal{S})$ is open in the D-topology with respect to the functional diffeology on $\Gamma_g(\mathcal{S})$, then it is also open with respect to the étale topology.
Proof. If \( A \) is empty then the statement is trivially true. Suppose instead that \( A \) is nonempty and fix a point \((x, [\sigma]_g) \in A\). Choose a representative \( \sigma \) of \([\sigma]_g\). We must find an open neighbourhood \( \mathcal{O} \) of \( x \) in \( M \) such that \( U(\sigma, \mathcal{O}) \) is contained in \( A \).

Let \( U \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be an open set associated to a local coordinate system \( \varphi : U \to M \) with \( x \in \text{range}(\varphi) \), which we assume to be small enough that \( \text{range}(\varphi) \subset \text{dom}(\sigma) \). Then the parametrisation \( \rho : U \to \Gamma_g(\mathcal{F}) \) defined by

\[
\rho(u) := (\varphi(u), [\sigma]_{\varphi(u)})
\]

is a plot, and therefore

\[
\rho^{-1}(A) = \{ u \in U : (\varphi(u), [\sigma]_{\varphi(u)}) \}
\]

is an open subset of \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Defining \( \mathcal{O} := \varphi(\rho^{-1}(A)) \), we see then that \( U(\sigma, \mathcal{O}) \subset A \), giving the result.

The next example shows that these topologies typically do not coincide - that is, the D-topology is often strictly coarser than the étale topology.

**Example 3.13.** Consider again \( M = \mathbb{R} \) and \( B = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \) the trivial bundle with \( \pi_B : B \to M \) the projection onto the first factor. Fix \( x_0 \in \mathbb{R} \), and consider the plot \( \rho : \mathbb{R} \to \Gamma_g(\pi_B) \) defined by

\[
\rho(t) := (x_0, [f_t]_{x_0}),
\]

where \( f_t \) is the map \( x \mapsto tx \). Considering \( \Gamma_g(\pi_B) \) with its étale topology, the set

\[
U(\text{id}, \mathbb{R}) := \{ (x, [\text{id}]_x) : x \in \mathbb{R} \}
\]

is open in \( \Gamma_g(\pi_B) \). However,

\[
\rho^{-1}(U(\text{id}, \mathbb{R})) = \{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \rho(t) \in U(\text{id}, \mathbb{R}) \} = \{1\} \subset \mathbb{R}
\]

is not open. Therefore étale-open sets in \( \Gamma_g(\pi_B) \) need not be open in the D-topology.

### 3.3 The leafwise path category

In [47], we introduced a diffeological version of the Moore path category for any regular foliation \((M, \mathcal{F})\). The objects of this category are simply points in \( M \), while the morphisms are smooth, leafwise paths which have sitting instants in that they are constant in small neighbourhoods of their endpoints. Composition of morphisms in this category is simply concatenation of paths. In [58], the authors introduce an analogous diffeological space for singular foliations, however concatenation of paths in this space no longer defines a category. In this section, we introduce a hybrid of these two approaches - a diffeological space of integral curves of vector fields defining a singular foliation, for which concatenation of paths defines an associative and smooth multiplication.

We begin by recalling the definition of the path category of a diffeological space from [47] (cf. [55]).
Definition 3.14. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a diffeological space. The path category of $\mathcal{X}$ is the diffeological subspace $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ of the diffeological product $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{X}) \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ consisting of pairs $(\gamma, d)$ for which there exist neighbourhoods of 0 and of $[d, \infty)$ in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ on which $\gamma$ is constant. Path categories are functorial - given any smooth map $f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ of diffeological spaces, the formula

$$\mathcal{P}(f)(\gamma, d) := (f \circ \gamma, d)$$

defines a smooth functor $\mathcal{P}(f) : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$ of diffeological categories.

Given any diffeological space $\mathcal{X}$, range and source maps $r$ and $s$ mapping $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \to \mathcal{X}$ are defined respectively by $(\gamma, d) \mapsto \gamma(d)$ and $(\gamma, d) \mapsto \gamma(0)$, and whenever $r(\gamma_2, d_2) = s(\gamma_1, d_1)$, we define the product $(\gamma_1 \gamma_2, d_1 + d_2)$ of $(\gamma_1, d_1)$ and $(\gamma_2, d_2)$ by the formula

$$\gamma_1 \gamma_2(t) := \begin{cases} 
\gamma_2(t), & \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq d_2 \\
\gamma_1(t - d_2), & \text{for } d_2 \leq t < \infty.
\end{cases}$$

This product, together with the range and source maps, are smooth, so that $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is a diffeological category [47 Proposition 3.22]. Moreover [47 Proposition 3.23] there is a smooth involution $\iota : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \ni (\gamma, d) \mapsto (\gamma^{-1}, d) \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ defined by the formula

$$\gamma^{-1}(t) := \begin{cases} 
\gamma(d - t), & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq d \\
\gamma(0), & \text{for } t \geq d.
\end{cases}$$

Under favourable circumstances, which will be explicated in this section, the involution $\iota$ descends to a genuine inversion on certain diffeological quotients of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, giving such quotients the structures of diffeological groupoids.

Suppose in particular that $(M, \mathcal{F})$ is a singularly foliated manifold, and let $\Gamma_\mathcal{g}(\mathcal{F})$ be a pseudo-bundle of germs of $\mathcal{F}$. By connectedness of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} := [0, \infty)$, any smooth map $\tilde{\gamma} : [0, \infty) \to \Gamma_\mathcal{g}(\mathcal{F})$ has the form

$$\tilde{\gamma}(t) = (\gamma(t), [X(t)]^\mathcal{g}_{\tilde{\gamma}(t)}), \quad t \in [0, \infty),$$

(7)

where $\gamma : [0, \infty) \to M$ is a smooth curve, and where $X : [0, \infty) \to \Gamma_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{F})$ is a smooth function. We will implicitly use the notation of Equation (7) in what follows.

Definition 3.15. Let $(M, \mathcal{F})$ be a singularly foliated manifold. We define the leafwise or F-path category $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F})$ to be the diffeological subspace of $\mathcal{P}(\Gamma_\mathcal{g}(\mathcal{F}))$ consisting of triples $(\gamma, [X]^\mathcal{g}, d)$ for which $X \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$ is some element of the sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ over some open subset $\text{dom}(X) \subset M$ such that

1. $\text{range}(\gamma) \subset \text{dom}(X)$,
2. $X(\gamma(t)) = \dot{\gamma}(t)$ for all $t \in [0, \infty)$, and
3. $[X]_{\gamma(0)}^\mathcal{g} = 0$ and $[X]_{\gamma(t)}^\mathcal{g} = 0$ for all $t \geq d$.

Definition 3.14 is in practice the same as [58 Definition 3.1] given by Garmendia-Villatoro. Note crucially that Definition 3.15 requires strictly more information than just the path in $M$.
- requiring in addition an extension of the tangent field of \( \gamma \) to an open neighbourhood of \( \gamma \). This is so that flows of elements of \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}) \) determine germs of diffeomorphisms defined in open neighbourhoods of their sources. Thus Definition 3.15 may be contrasted with the simpler [47, Definition 3.23] for regular foliations, where such an extension is not explicitly required. In the regular case, the tangent field along a leafwise path can always be canonically extended to a tangent field in an open neighbourhood of the path by using foliated charts.

We end the section by defining what we mean by a holonomy groupoid in the diffeological context. The definition we give here is a mild generalisation of [47, Definition 3.26].

**Definition 3.16.** Let \( \mathcal{X} \) be a diffeological space, and \( \pi_B : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{X} \) and \( \pi_Y : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{X} \) diffeological pseudo-bundles. Let \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) \) be a diffeological subcategory of \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) \). A smooth functor \( T : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) \to \text{Aut}(\pi_B) \) (see Definition 2.10) is called a transport functor if there exists a smooth lifting map

\[
L : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) \times_{\pi_Y \circ s, \pi_B} \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B})
\]

such that \( T \) can be written as the composite

\[
T(\gamma, d)(b) = r \circ L((\gamma, d), b), \quad ((\gamma, d), b) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) \times_{\pi_Y \circ s, \pi_B} \mathcal{B}.
\]

Note that smoothness of \( T \) follows from smoothness of \( L \). If in particular \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}) \) is the leafwise path category of some singularly foliated manifold \((M, \mathcal{F})\), we refer to \( T \) as a leafwise transport functor.

An important consequence of the existence of a transport functor is the existence of an associated groupoid called the holonomy groupoid. This can be seen by the arguments of [47, Proposition 3.27].

**Definition 3.17.** Let \( \mathcal{X} \) be a diffeological space, \( \pi_B : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{X} \) and \( \pi_Y : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{X} \) diffeological pseudo-bundles, and \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) \) a diffeological subcategory of \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) \). If \( T : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) \to \text{Aut}(\pi_B) \) is a transport functor, then the quotient of \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) \) by the equivalence relation generated by the fibres of \( T \) is a diffeological groupoid called the holonomy groupoid associated to \( T \).

4 Singularly foliated bundles and their holonomy groupoids

4.1 Singularly foliated bundles

Singular foliations are generalisations of Lie groupoids and of regular foliations. In each of these special cases, one has a notion of fibre bundle which is compatible with the additional structure - in the case of a Lie groupoid action, the correct notion is that of an equivariant bundle, while for a regular foliation the correct notion is that of a foliated bundle in the sense of Kamber and Tondeur [42]. We give in this section what appears to be the first definition of a fibre bundle compatible with a singular foliation, which simultaneously generalises equivariant and foliated bundles.

First, notice that projectable vector fields on a fibre bundle \( \pi_B : \mathcal{B} \to M \) over a manifold \( M \) do not generally form a sheaf of \( \mathcal{C}_B^{\infty} \)-modules over \( B \). Indeed, if \( X \) is any projectable vector field and \( f \in \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(B) \) is any function which is non-constant along the fibres of \( \pi_B \), then Equation
will in general no longer hold for the vector field \( fX \). Projectable vector fields are, however, closed under multiplication by functions of the form \( f \circ \pi_B \), where \( f \in C^\infty(M) \). Since \( \pi_B \) is an open map, we can formulate the following definition, which will play a crucial role in our definition of singularly foliated bundle.

**Definition 4.1.** Let \( \pi_B : B \to M \) be a fibre bundle. Denote by \( C^\infty_{\text{proj},B} \) the subsheaf

\[
C^\infty_{\text{proj},B}(\mathcal{O}) := \{ f \circ \pi_B \in C^\infty_B(\mathcal{O}) : f \in C^\infty_M(\pi_B(\mathcal{O})) \}
\]

of \( C^\infty_B \), which we call the **sheaf of projectable functions**. We denote by \( \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj},B} \) the sheaf of \( C^\infty_{\text{proj},B} \)-modules

\[
\mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj},B}(\mathcal{O}) := \{ X \in \mathfrak{X}_B(\mathcal{O}) : \text{there is } (\pi_B)_*X \in \mathfrak{X}_M(\pi_B(\mathcal{O})) \text{ with } d\pi_B \circ X = (\pi_B)_*(X) \circ \pi_B \},
\]

which we call the **sheaf of projectable vector fields**.

The pushforward of projectable vector fields can now be characterised in the following sheaf-theoretic fashion.

**Proposition 4.2.** Let \( \pi_B : B \to M \) be a fibre bundle. The pushforward of projectable vector fields induces a morphism \( (\pi_B)_* : (\pi_B)_! \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj},B} \to \mathfrak{X}_M \) of sheaves of \( C^\infty_M \)-modules that preserves the Lie bracket.

**Proof.** Notice first that we have a canonical isomorphism \( C^\infty_M \cong (\pi_B)_! C^\infty_{\text{proj},B} \) of sheaves of rings, obtained simply by sending \( f \in C^\infty_M(\mathcal{O}) \) to \( f \circ \pi_B \in C^\infty_{\text{proj},B}(\mathcal{O}) \) for each open set \( \mathcal{O} \) in \( M \). In this way the \( C^\infty_{\text{proj},B} \)-module structure of \( \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj},B} \) indeed defines a \( C^\infty_M \)-module structure on \( (\pi_B)_! \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj},B} \). The pushforward \( (\pi_B)_* \) of \( X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj},B}(\mathcal{O}) \) to \( (\pi_B)_*(X) \in \mathfrak{X}_M(\mathcal{O}) \) then clearly preserves the associated \( C^\infty_M(\mathcal{O}) \)-module structure for each open set \( \mathcal{O} \), and it is well-known [43, Lemma 3.10] that it also preserves the Lie bracket of vector fields. \( \square \)

Singularly foliated bundles are now defined by **singular partial connections**, which are particularly well-behaved partially-defined right-inverses of the pushforward morphism.

**Definition 4.3.** A **singularly foliated bundle** is a triple \( (\pi_B, \mathcal{F}, \ell) \), where \( \pi_B : B \to M \) is a fibre bundle, \( \mathcal{F} \) is a singular foliation of \( M \), and \( \ell : \mathcal{F} \to (\pi_B)_! \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj},B} \) is a morphism of sheaves of \( C^\infty_M \)-modules which preserves the Lie bracket, and for which the following hold.

1. The morphism \( \ell \) is a **partial right-inverse** to \( (\pi_B)_* \) in the sense that

\[
(\pi_B)_* \circ \ell = \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}},
\]

on the sheaf \( \mathcal{F} \). In particular this implies that \( \ell \) is injective.

2. The morphism \( \ell \) is **complete** in the sense that for any open set \( \mathcal{O} \) in \( M \), any \( X \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O}) \) and any \( x \in \mathcal{O} \), if \( \mathcal{F}^X(x) \) is defined on an interval \( I \subset \mathbb{R} \) then so too is \( \mathcal{F}^{(\pi_B)_!}(b) \) for any \( b \in B_x \).

3. The morphism \( \ell \) is **smooth** in the sense that the induced morphism \( \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}} \to (\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}} \circ (\pi_B)_! \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj},B})_{\text{loc}} \) of diffeological spaces is smooth with respect to the diffeology of Proposition 3.4.
We refer to such a morphism \( \ell \) as a singular partial connection.

We will usually denote a singularly foliated bundle \((\pi_B, \mathcal{F}, \ell)\) by simply \(\pi_B\), with \(\mathcal{F}\) and \(\ell\) assumed unless otherwise stated. Before discussing some examples, let us mention that completeness of \(\ell\) does not automatically follow from \(\ell\) being a partial right inverse to \((\pi_B)^*\). Indeed, it is easy to verify that for any open set \(O \subset M\) and for any \(X \in \mathcal{F}(O)\), we have the relationship

\[
\text{Fl}^X_b(x) = \pi_B(\text{Fl}^b(\ell)(x)), \quad x \in O, \; b \in B_x
\]

between the flows of \(\text{Fl}^X_b(x)\) and \(\text{Fl}^b(\ell)(x)\) wherever they are defined. In particular, that \(\ell\) is a partial right-inverse to \((\pi_B)^*\) implies that for any \(b \in B_x\), the domain of \(\text{Fl}^b(\ell)(x)\) is contained in the domain of \(\text{Fl}^X_b(x)\). The converse, however, does not follow without completeness of \(\ell\), as is easily seen by considering the standard example of \(B = \mathbb{R}^2, \; M = \mathbb{R}\), and with \(\ell : \mathfrak{X}(M) \to \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj}, B}(B)\) defined by

\[
\ell \left( f \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) \right)(x, y) := f(x) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + y^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right)
\]

for \(f \in C^\infty(M)\) and \((x, y) \in B\).

**Example 4.4** (Trivial bundles). If \((M, \mathcal{F})\) is any singularly foliated manifold and \(Q\) is any other manifold, then the trivial bundle \(\pi : M \times Q \to M\) is canonically a singularly foliated bundle. Indeed, with respect to the decomposition \(T(M \times Q) \cong TM \times TQ\), one has the trivial lift \(\ell : \mathfrak{X}_M \to \pi! \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj}, M \times Q}\) defined by the formula

\[
\ell(X) := (\pi^*(X), 0) \in \mathfrak{X}_{M \times Q}(\pi^{-1}(O)) = (\pi_* \mathfrak{X}_{M \times Q})(O)
\]

for all open sets \(O\) in \(M\) and \(X \in \mathfrak{X}_M(O)\). Restricting \(\ell\) to the subsheaf \(\mathcal{F}\) of \(\mathfrak{X}_M\) one obtains a singular partial connection, with both completeness and smoothness being trivial.

**Example 4.5** (Regularly foliated bundles). Suppose that \(\pi_B : B \to M\) is a regularly foliated bundle, in the sense of Kamber-Tondner [42, Definition 2.1] - that is, there exists an involutive subbundle \(T \mathcal{F}_B \subset TB\) which is projected fibrewise-injectively to a subbundle \(T \mathcal{F}_M\) of \(TM\). Involutivity of \(T \mathcal{F}_B\) implies that both \(T \mathcal{F}_B\) and \(T \mathcal{F}_M\) integrate to regular foliations of \(B\) and \(M\) respectively. Now if \(O\) is any open subset of \(M\) and \(X \in \mathcal{F}_M(O)\), then one obtains \(\ell(X) \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj}, B}(\pi_B^{-1}(O))\) whose value at a point \(b \in B\) is the unique vector in \(T_b \mathcal{F}_B\) that is mapped by \(d\pi_B\) to \(X(\pi_B(b))\). Clearly then the resulting morphism \(\ell : \mathcal{F}_M \to (\pi_B)_*: \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj}, B}\) is a singular partial connection in the sense of Definition 4.3. Completeness and smoothness can both be seen by choosing foliated coordinates, in which \(\ell\) is simply given by a trivial lift as in Example 4.4.

Conversely, suppose that \(\mathcal{F}\) is a regular foliation of a manifold \(M\), with leaf dimension \(p\), and that \(\pi_B : B \to M\) is a fibre bundle with a singular partial connection \(\ell : \mathcal{F} \to (\pi_B)_*: \mathfrak{X}_{\text{proj}, B}\). In a foliated chart \(O \cong \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^q\) of \(M\), wherein \(\mathcal{F}(O)\) is the \(C^\infty_M(O)\)-span of vector fields \(\{e_1, \ldots, e_p\}\) that form the standard frame field of \(\mathbb{R}^p\), injectivity of \(\ell\) implies that the vector fields \(\{\ell(e_1), \ldots, \ell(e_p)\}\) span a \(p\)-dimensional subspace of \(T_b \mathcal{F}\) at each point \(b \in \pi_B^{-1}(O)\) which intersects the vertical tangent space at \(b\) only through zero. One thus obtains a smooth \(p\)-
dimensional distribution $T\mathcal{F}_B$ in $B$, and involutivity of $\mathcal{F}$ together with the fact that $\ell$ preserves the Lie bracket implies that $T\mathcal{F}_B$ is involutive. Thus $\pi_B : B \to M$ is a foliated bundle in the sense of Kamber-Tondeur.

**Example 4.6** (Equivariant bundles). Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an $s$-simply connected Lie groupoid (so that the source fibres are simply connected manifolds), with unit space $M$. Denote the Lie algebroid of $\mathcal{G}$ by $A := \ker(ds)|_M$, with anchor map $dr : A \to TM$, and let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the associated sheaf of vector fields of the form $dr \circ \sigma$, where $\sigma$ is an element of the sheaf of sections $\mathcal{A}$ of the Lie algebroid $A$. Let $\pi_B : B \to M$ be a fibre bundle.

If $\mathcal{G}$ acts on $B$, then denote by $B \rtimes \mathcal{G}$ the associated action groupoid \cite{7} Example 2.2, with range and source denoted $r_B$ and $s_B$ respectively. Then the Lie algebroid $A_B := \ker(ds_B)|_B$ associated with the action groupoid $B \rtimes \mathcal{G}$ is isomorphic to $\pi_B^*(A)$. For any open subset $O$ of $M$, the formula

$$\ell(dr \circ \sigma) := dr_B \circ \pi_B^*(\sigma), \quad \sigma \in \mathcal{A}(O)$$

then defines a singular partial connection. Completeness and smoothness are consequences of the fact that $\ell$ is defined in terms of a smooth action of the groupoid $\mathcal{G}$.

Conversely, suppose that $\ell : \mathcal{F} \to (\pi_B)^!\mathcal{X}_{\text{proj},B}$ is a singular partial connection. Let $g \in \mathcal{G}$ have source $x \in M$. Choose a smooth path $g : [0, 1] \to \mathcal{G}$ in $\mathcal{G}_x$ with $g(0) = x$ and $g(1) = g$, and let $X \in \mathcal{F}(O)$ be any vector field extending the tangent field to the curve $t \mapsto g(t) \cdot x \in M$. By completeness of $\ell$, the formula

$$g \cdot b := \text{Fl}_1^{\ell(X)}(b), \quad b \in B_x$$

defines an action of $g$ on $B_x$, which is independent of the choice of path $t \mapsto g(t)$ by involutivity of $\ell$ and by simple connectivity of $\mathcal{G}_x$. Thus $\ell$ defines an action of $\mathcal{G}$ on $B$, under which $\pi_B : B \to M$ is a $\mathcal{G}$-equivariant bundle.

### 4.2 The holonomy groupoids of singularly foliated bundles

One of the key objects in our construction of the holonomy groupoids of a singularly foliated bundle are pseudo-bundles of classes of invariant sections. To define these pseudo-bundles, we need vertical prolongations of projectable vector fields (cf. \cite{1} Definition 1.15)).

**Definition 4.7.** Let $\pi_B : B \to M$ be a fibre bundle, let $X \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{proj}}(B)$, and let $k$ denote any of the symbols $1, \ldots, \infty$, g. The vector field $\mathfrak{v}^k(X)$ on $\Gamma_k(\pi_B)$ defined by

$$\mathfrak{v}^k(X)(x, [\sigma]_t^k) := \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} (x, [\text{Fl}_t^{X} \circ \sigma \circ \text{Fl}_{-t}^{\pi_B}](X)|^k)$$

is called the **vertical** $k$-prolongation of $X$. On $\Gamma_0(\pi_B) = B$, we set $\mathfrak{v}^0(X) := 0$.

For a projectable vector field $X$ on a fibre bundle $\pi_B : B \to M$ and $k \geq 1$, the vertical $k$-prolongation $\mathfrak{v}^k(X)$ is the image of $\mathfrak{p}^k(X)$ under the canonical $(\pi_B^{k-1,k})^*(\mathfrak{v}^{k-1}_{\pi_B})$-valued contact form $\theta^{(k)}$ \cite{44} Chapter 6.3] on $\Gamma_k(\pi_B)$. In local coordinates $(x^i, f^\alpha, f^\alpha_i, \ldots)$, the components of $\theta^{(k)}$ are given by

$$(\theta^{(k)})^\alpha_i = df^\alpha_i - f^\alpha_j dx^j \quad \in B_x.$$
for each $|I| < k$. Thus it is easily checked (cf. Equation (6)) that in coordinates the vertical prolongation of $X = a^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i^j} + b^\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial f^\alpha}$ is given by

$$\text{vp}^k(X) = \sum_{|I|=0}^{k-1} D_I^{(k)}(b^\alpha - a^i f^\alpha) \frac{\partial}{\partial f^\alpha}.$$

The invariant psuedo-bundles of a singularly foliated bundle are now defined as follows.

**Definition 4.8.** Let $\pi_B : B \to M$ be a singularly foliated bundle. A local section $\sigma : O \to B$ of $\pi_B$ is said to be $\mathcal{F}$-invariant if at every point $x \in O$,

$$\text{vp}^k(\ell(X))(x, [\sigma]^k_x) = 0$$

for all $X \in \mathcal{F}(O)$. The $\mathcal{F}$-invariant sections of $\pi_B$ form a sheaf, and for $k = 0, \ldots, \infty, g$ we call the corresponding bundle $\Gamma_k(\pi_B)^\mathcal{F} \subset \Gamma_k(\pi_B)$ of $k$-equivalence classes the $\mathcal{F}$-invariant pseudo-subbundle of $\Gamma_k(\pi_B)$. We denote by $\pi^{k,\mathcal{F}}_B$ the restriction of $\pi^k_B$ to $\Gamma^\mathcal{F}_k(\pi_B)$.

Recall now [47, Definition 2.10] that if $\pi_B : B \to M$ is a regularly foliated bundle, a locally-defined section $\sigma$ of $\pi_B$ is said to be distinguished if, about any point in its image, there exist foliated coordinates $(x_\alpha, y_\alpha, f_\alpha)$, with $x_\alpha$ and $y_\alpha$ denoting the leafwise and transverse coordinates respectively in the base, and with $f_\alpha$ denoting coordinates in the fibre, with respect to which $\sigma = \sigma(y_\alpha)$ is independent of the leafwise coordinates. We denote by $\mathcal{D}_k(\pi_B)$ the diffeological bundle of germs of the sheaf of distinguished sections, and by $\mathcal{D}_k(\pi_B)$ the bundle of jets of distinguished sections. The next proposition says that the $\mathcal{F}$-invariant pseudo-bundles of Definition 4.8 generalise the bundles of distinguished sections appearing in the regular case, and that therefore our constructions recover those of [47] in the regular case. In particular, since distinguished functions of this sort furnish the (local) degree 0 characteristic cohomology classes of regular foliations [15, Example 1], we feel justified in referring to the $\mathcal{F}$-invariant sections of a singularly foliated bundle as its conservation laws.

**Proposition 4.9.** Let $\pi_B : B \to M$ be a regularly foliated bundle, and let $k$ denote any of the symbols $0, \ldots, \infty, g$. Then the diffeological subspace $\Gamma_k(\pi_B)^\mathcal{F}$ coincides with the space $\mathcal{D}_k(\pi_B)$ of classes of distinguished sections.

**Proof.** In foliated coordinates $(x_\alpha, y_\alpha, f_\alpha)$ for $B$, corresponding to leafwise, transverse and fibre coordinates respectively, any element $X \in \mathcal{F}$ is given by some $C^\infty_M$-linear combination

$$X = a^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i^j},$$

while $\ell(X)$ (see Example 4.5) is given by

$$\ell(X) = \pi_B^\mathcal{F}(a^i) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i^j}.$$ 

Thus, in our coordinates $(x_\alpha, y_\alpha, f_\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}^k$, we have simply

$$\text{Fl}^\ell(X)(x_\alpha, y_\alpha, f_\alpha) = (\text{Fl}^X(x_\alpha), y_\alpha, f_\alpha)$$
for small \( t \). It follows immediately that for any smooth function \( \sigma : \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^q \to \mathbb{R}^k \), the curve

\[
t \mapsto (F_t^{\ell(X)} \circ (\text{id} \times \sigma) \circ F_{X,t}^X)(x_\alpha, y_\alpha) = (x_\alpha, y_\alpha, \sigma(F_t^{X}(x_\alpha), y_\alpha))
\]

is constant in \( t \) for all \( X \in \mathcal{F} \) if and only if \( \sigma \) is constant in the \( x \) coordinate. Thus \( \Gamma_k(\pi_B)^{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{D}_k(\pi_B) \) as claimed. \( \square \)

Defining lifting maps and leafwise transport functors for a singularly foliated bundle is now a simple matter of putting our definitions together.

**Theorem 4.10.** Let \( \pi_B : B \to M \) be a singularly foliated bundle. Let \( k \) denote any of the symbols \( 0, \ldots, \infty, g \). Then for each \( (\gamma, [X]^g, d) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}) \) and for each \( (x, [\sigma]^k) \in \Gamma_k(\pi_B)^{\mathcal{F}}, \) the map

\[
t \mapsto (\gamma(t), [F_t^{\ell(X)} \circ \sigma \circ F_{X,t}^X]^k_{(\gamma(t))})
\]

is the unique solution to the initial value problem

\[
\frac{d}{dt} f(t; x, [\sigma]^k) = p^k(\ell(X))(f(t; x, [\sigma]^k)), \quad f(0; x, [\sigma]^k) = (x, [\sigma]^k)
\]

in the diffeological space \( \Gamma_k(\pi_B)^{\mathcal{F}} \) for which \( \pi_B^{\mathcal{F}} \circ f(-; x, [\sigma]^k) = \gamma(-) \). Moreover, the lifting map \( L(\pi_B^{\mathcal{F}}) : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}) \times_{s,\pi_B^{\mathcal{F}}} \Gamma_k(\pi_B)^{\mathcal{F}} \to \mathcal{P}(\Gamma_k(\pi_B)^{\mathcal{F}}) \) defined by

\[
L(\pi_B^{\mathcal{F}})(\gamma, [X]^g, d; x, [\sigma]^k)(t) := (\gamma(t), [F_t^{\ell(X)} \circ \sigma \circ F_{X,t}^X]^k_{(\gamma(t))}), \quad t \in [0, \infty)
\]

is smooth.

Note that the expression on the right hand side of Equation (10) only makes sense by the completeness assumption on the singular partial connection. To prove Theorem 4.10 we require the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.11.** Let \( M \) be a manifold, \( \mathcal{F} \) be a foliation of \( M \), and let \( \tilde{X} : U \to F_{\text{loc}}^{\mathcal{F}} \) be a plot with respect to the diffeology of Proposition 3.7. Let \( (u_0, t_0) \in U \times \mathbb{R} \) be such that \( F_{u_0}^{\pi_B^{\mathcal{F}}}(u_0) \) is defined, and let \( x_0 \) be any element of \( \text{dom}(F_{u_0}^{\pi_B^{\mathcal{F}}}) \). Then there are open neighbourhoods \( U \ni u_0 \) in \( \mathbb{R} \), \( I \ni [0, t_0] \) in \( \mathbb{R} \), and \( \mathcal{O} \ni x_0 \) in \( M \) such that \( F_{u}^{\pi_B^{\mathcal{F}}}(u) \) is defined and contains \( \mathcal{O} \) in its domain for all \( (u, t) \in U \times I \), and such that

\[
I \times U \ni (t, u, x) \mapsto F_{u}^{\pi_B^{\mathcal{F}}}(u)(x) \in M
\]

is smooth.

**Proof.** Let us denote \( t \mapsto F_{u}^{\pi_B^{\mathcal{F}}}(u_0)(x_0) \) by \( t \mapsto \gamma(t) \). By definition of the diffeology on \( F_{\text{loc}}^{\mathcal{F}} \), for each \( 0 \leq t \leq t_0 \) there are open sets \( \mathcal{V}_t \ni u_0 \) and \( \mathcal{O}_t \ni \gamma(t) \) such that \( \mathcal{O}_t \subset \text{dom}(\tilde{X}(u)) \) for all \( u \in \mathcal{V}_t \) and such that \( \mathcal{V}_t \times \mathcal{O}_t \ni (u, x) \mapsto \tilde{X}(u)(x) \in TM \) is smooth. Since \( t_0 \) is finite, we can cover \([0, t_0]\) with finitely many of the \( \mathcal{O}_t \), enumerated by \( t_i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, k \). Defining \( \mathcal{V} := \bigcap_{i=1}^{k} \mathcal{V}_{t_i} \) and \( \mathcal{N} := \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \mathcal{O}_{t_i} \), then we have \( \mathcal{N} \subset \text{dom}(\tilde{X}(u)) \) for all \( u \in \mathcal{V} \) and \( \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{N} \ni (u, x) \mapsto \tilde{X}(u)(x) \in TM \) is smooth. Now we consider the manifold \( \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{N} \), and observe
that $\tilde{X}$ defines a vector field $X$ thereon by the formula

$$X(u,x) := \tilde{X}(u)(x), \quad (u,x) \in V \times N.$$  

In this way, each flow $F_l^{\tilde{X}(u)}(x)$ is the solution to the initial value problem

$$\frac{d}{dt} f(t; u, x) = X(f(t; u, x)), \quad f(0) = (u, x)$$

on $V \times N$. Then by standard theory [43, Theorem 3.7], there exists a maximal open subset $S$ of $\mathbb{R} \times V \times N$ containing $(0, u_0, x_0)$ on which $F_l^{\tilde{X}} : (t, u, x) \mapsto F_l^{\tilde{X}(u)}(x)$ is defined and smooth. Since in particular $S$ contains $(0, u_0, x_0)$ by hypothesis, we can find $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ containing $[0, t_0]$ and open sets $U \subset V$ and $O \subset N$ sufficiently small that $I \times U \times O \subset S$. The result follows.

**Proof of Theorem 4.10** That Equation (8) defines a curve in $\Gamma_k(\pi_B)^F$ follows from the invariance of $F$ under its own flows [2, Proposition 1.6], the $F$-invariance of $\sigma$, and that $\ell$ is bracket preserving. More precisely, given $t \in [0, \infty)$, an open neighbourhood $O$ of $\gamma(t)$ and $Y \in F(O)$, since $\ell$ is bracket preserving we have

$$\ell([X,Y])(F_l^{\ell(X)}(b)) = [\ell(X), \ell(Y)](F_l^{\ell(X)}(b))$$

for all $b \in F_l^{\ell(X)}(O)$. Now, for any $b \in F_l^{\ell(X)}(O)$, with $\pi_B(b) = x'$, the right hand side of Equation (11) is the lift by $\ell$ of the tangent to the curve $r \mapsto (F_l^{\tilde{X}_r}, Y(\tilde{F}_l^{\tilde{X}_r}(x')))$ at $r = 0$, while the left hand side of Equation (11) is the tangent to the curve $r \mapsto (F_l^{\ell(X)_r}, \ell(Y)(F_l^{\ell(X)}(b)))$ at $r = 0$. By uniqueness of flows therefore, we have

$$(F_l^{\ell(X)})_s(\ell(Y)) = \ell((F_l^{X})_s(Y)). \quad (12)$$

For notational simplicity denote $\varphi := F_l^{X}$ and $\ell(\varphi) := F_l^{\ell(X)}$. Then we use Equation (12) to compute

$$\text{up}^k(\ell(Y))(\gamma(t), [\ell(\varphi) \circ \sigma \circ \varphi^{-1}]_{\gamma(t)}) = \frac{d}{ds} \bigg|_{s=0} (\gamma(t), [\ell(Y)](F_l^{\ell(Y)} \circ \sigma \circ \varphi^{-1} \circ F_l^{\ell(X)}))_{\gamma(t)}$$

$$= \frac{d}{ds} \bigg|_{s=0} (\gamma(t), [\ell(Y)](F_l^{\ell(Y)}(\varphi^{-1}(Y))) \circ \sigma \circ F_l^{\ell(X)}(\varphi^{-1}(Y)))_{\gamma(t)})$$

$$= 0$$

by the $F$-invariance of $\sigma$ and since $\varphi_{-1}(Y) \in F$. Therefore Equation (8) does indeed define a curve in $\Gamma_k(\pi_B)^F$. That Equation (8) defines a solution to the initial value problem of Equation (9) follows by definition of the prolongation. Uniqueness follows by uniqueness of the flow.

It remains only to show smoothness of $L(\pi_B)^k(F)$. Let $\varphi_\ell := (\tilde{\gamma}, [\tilde{X}]^{\ell}, \tilde{d}) : U \to \mathcal{P}(F)$ and $\varphi_\ell := (\tilde{x}, [\tilde{X}]^{\ell}) : V \to \Gamma_k(\pi_B)^F$ be plots. We need to show that the map

$$W := U \times_{\varphi_\ell, \pi_B^k(F), \varphi_\ell} V \times \mathbb{R} \ni (u,v,t) \mapsto (\tilde{\gamma}(u)(t), [F_l^{\tilde{X}(u)}] \circ \tilde{d}(v) \circ F_l^{\tilde{X}(u)}(\tilde{d}(v)(0))) \in \Gamma_k(\pi_B)^F$$

is smooth. The map $\tilde{\gamma}$ is already a plot of $\mathcal{P}(M)$ by definition. Recalling that $(\Gamma_{\pi_B})_{\text{loc}}$ denotes
the space of all locally defined sections of \( \pi_B \) equipped with the diffeology of Proposition 5.1, it suffices now to show that the map

\[(u, v, t) \mapsto \kappa(u, v, t) := \left( F^t_{\pi_B}(X(u)) \circ \tilde{\sigma}(v) \circ F^{-t}_{\pi_B}(X(u)) \right) \in (\Gamma_{\pi_B})_{\text{loc}} \]

is smooth. That is, fixing \((u_0, v_0, t_0) \in W\) and \(x_0 \in \text{dom}(\kappa(u_0, v_0, t_0))\), we must find an open neighbourhood \(W\) of \((u_0, v_0, t_0)\) in \(W\) and an open neighbourhood \(O\) of \(x_0\) in \(M\) such that \(O \subset \text{dom}(\kappa(u, v, t))\) for all \((u, v, t) \in W\) and for which the map

\[W \times O \ni (u, v, t, x) \mapsto \kappa(u, v, t)(x) \in B\]

is smooth in the usual sense. We now have the following.

1. Using Lemma 4.11 together with the smoothness of \(\ell\) as a map \(\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}} \to (\pi_B)_*(\mathcal{X}_B)_{\text{loc}}\), we can find open neighbourhoods \(U_1 \ni u_0 \in U\), \(I_1 \ni t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\) and \(O^B \ni \hat{\sigma}(v_0)(F^t_{\pi_B}(X(u_0))(x_0))\) in \(B\) such that \(O^B \subset \text{dom}(F^t_{\pi_B}(X(u)))\) for all \(u \in U_1\) and \(t \in I_1\), and such that \(I_1 \times U_1 \times O^B \ni (t, u, b) \mapsto F^t_{\pi_B}(X(u))(b) \in B\) is smooth.

2. By definition of the diffeology on \((\Gamma_{\pi_B})_{\text{loc}}\), we can find open neighbourhoods \(U_2 \ni u_0\), \(I_2 \ni t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\) and \(O \ni x_0 \in M\) such that \(O \subset \text{dom}(\hat{\sigma}(v_0))\) and \(\hat{\sigma}(v_0)(\hat{\sigma}(v))(O^M) \subset O^B\) for all \(v \in V\), and for which \(\mathcal{V} \times O^M \ni (v, x) \mapsto \hat{\sigma}(v)(x) \in B\) is smooth.

3. Again by Lemma 4.11 we can find open neighbourhoods \(U_2 \ni u_0\), \(I_2 \ni t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\) and \(O \ni x_0 \in M\) such that \(O \subset \text{dom}(F^t_{\pi_B}(X(u)))\) and \(F^t_{\pi_B}(X(u))(O^M) \subset O^M\) for all \(u \in U_2\) and \(t \in I_2\), and such that \(I_2 \times U_2 \times O \ni (t, u, x) \mapsto F^t_{\pi_B}(X(u))(x) \in M\) is smooth.

Finally, therefore, setting \(\mathcal{U} := U_1 \cap U_2\), \(I := I_1 \cap I_2\) and

\[\mathcal{W} := \mathcal{U} \times_{\hat{\sigma} \circ \varphi_{\mathcal{F}}} \mathcal{V} \times I \subset W,\]

we have \(O \subset \text{dom}(\kappa(u, v, t))\) for all \((u, v, t) \in \mathcal{W}\) and \(\mathcal{W} \times O \ni (u, v, t, x) \mapsto \kappa(u, v, t)(x) \in B\) is smooth. \(\square\)

**Definition 4.12.** Let \(\pi_B : B \to M\) be a singularly foliated bundle. Let \(k\) denote any of the symbols \(0, \ldots, \infty, g\). Then the map \(T(\pi_B^k) : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}) \to \text{Aut}(\pi_B^k)\) defined by

\[T(\pi_B^k)(\gamma, [X]^g, d)(x, [\sigma]^k_x) := L(\pi_B^k)(\gamma, [X], d; x, [\sigma]^k_x)(d)\]

is a transport functor called the \(k\)-**transport functor** for \(\pi_B\). The associated holonomy groupoid (see Definition 3.17) is called the \(k\)-**holonomy groupoid** of \(\pi_B\) and denoted \(\mathcal{H}(\pi_B^k)\).

Note that since each holonomy groupoid of Definition 4.12 arises as a quotient of the leafwise path category, every one of them integrates the foliation of the base in the sense of Theorem 2.3.

Finally, we have the following analogue of [47, Theorem 5.15] which relates all of the holonomy groupoids of a singularly foliated bundle.
Theorem 4.13. Let $\pi_B : B \to M$ be a singularly foliated bundle. Then for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there are surjective morphisms $\Pi^{k,g}_B : \mathcal{H}(\pi^{k,g}_B) \to \mathcal{H}(\pi^{k,g}_B)$ and $\Pi^{k,k+1}_B : \mathcal{H}(\pi^{k+1}_B) \to \mathcal{H}(\pi^{k}_B)$ of diffeological groupoids for which $\Pi^{k,g}_B = \Pi^{k,k+1}_B \circ \Pi^{k+1}_B$. Consequently we have a commuting diagram

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
\mathcal{H}(\pi^{k}_B) & \to & \mathcal{H}(\pi^{k+1}_B) & \to & \mathcal{H}(\pi^{0}_B) \\
\Pi^{k}_B & \to & \Pi^{k,k+1}_B & \to & \Pi^{k+1}_B
\end{array}
$$

of diffeological groupoids, which we refer to as the hierarchy of holonomy groupoids for the singularly foliated bundle $\pi_B$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of [47, Theorem 5.15].

4.3 Agreement with the Garmendia-Villatoro construction

We show in this subsection that for certain trivial singularly foliated bundles, the germinal holonomy groupoid of Definition 4.12 coincides with the holonomy groupoid constructed by Garmendia-Villatoro in [58], hence with that of Androulidakis-Skandalis [2]. A key feature of the Garmendia-Villatoro construction is the use of slices.

Definition 4.14. Let $(M, F)$ be a singularly foliated manifold. A slice through a point $x \in M$ is an embedded submanifold $S_x \hookrightarrow M$ such that $T_x S \cap T_x L_x = 0$, and such that $T_y M = T_y S + T_y L_y$ for all $y \in S$.

Given a singularly foliated manifold $(M, F)$, Garmendia and Villatoro attach to each point $x \in M$ a slice $S_x$, and denote by $g \text{Diff}_F(S_x, S_y)$ the set of germs of foliation-preserving diffeomorphisms from $S_x$ to $S_y$. This group admits a subgroup $\exp(I_x F|_{S_x})$ consisting of flows of elements of $F|_{S_x}$ which vanish at $x$. Garmendia and Villatoro then define the groupoid

$$
\text{HT} := \bigsqcup_{x,y \in M} g \text{Diff}_F(S_x, S_y) / \exp(I_x F)
$$

of holonomy transformations. Any element $(\gamma, [X]^g, d) \in \mathcal{P}(F)$ defines an element $\text{Hol}(\gamma, [X]^g, d)$ of HT given on a neighbourhood $U$ of $\gamma(0)$ in $S_{\gamma(0)}$ by germ

$$
\text{Hol}(\gamma, [X]^g, d) := [\text{Fl}_d^{X^g}]_{\gamma(0)}
$$

of the flow of $X$ along the length of $\gamma$. The Garmendia-Villatoro holonomy groupoid is now the diffeological quotient of $\mathcal{P}(F)$ by the fibres of Hol.

Theorem 4.15. Let $(M, F)$ be a singularly foliated manifold of dimension $n$, and suppose that for each $x \in M$ there exists an open neighbourhood $U$ containing $x$ and $F$-invariant $f : U \to \mathbb{R}^n$...
such that \( f(y_1) = f(y_2) \) implies that \( y_1 \) and \( y_2 \) are related by an element of \( \exp(I_x \mathcal{F}) \). Then the holonomy groupoid \( \mathcal{H}(\pi_{M \times \mathbb{R}^n}) \) associated to the trivial singularly foliated bundle \( \pi_{M \times \mathbb{R}^n} : M \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow M \) (see Example 4.4) is equal to the Garmendia-Villatoro holonomy groupoid.

In order to prove Theorem 4.15 we need only show that two elements of the leafwise path space \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}) \) of such a foliation are mapped to the same germ under \( \text{Hol} \) if and only if they are mapped to the same diffeomorphism in \( \text{Aut}(\pi_{M \times \mathbb{R}^n}) \) under the transport functor \( T \) of Definition 4.12. To show that this is true let us discuss the relationship between slices in \((M, \mathcal{F})\) and \( \mathcal{F} \)-invariant local sections of \( M \times \mathbb{R}^n \).

Slices are always found inside certain foliated charts. We recall [6 Proposition 1.3] that if the dimension of the leaf \( L_x \) through \( x \) is \( p \), and if \( S_x \) is a slice through \( x \), then there exists an open neighbourhood \( O \) of \( x \) in \( M \) and a diffeomorphism of foliated manifolds

\[
(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{F} |_{\mathcal{O}}) \cong (\mathbb{R}^p, \mathcal{X}_{\mathbb{R}^p}) \times (S_x, \mathcal{F} |_{S_x}).
\]

In these coordinates, every \( \mathcal{F} \)-invariant section of \( M \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow M \) takes the form

\[
\sigma(x, y) = (x, y, f(y)), \quad (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times S_x,
\]

where \( f : S_x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \) is an \( \mathcal{F} \)-invariant function.

**Proof of Theorem 4.15** Given elements \( (\gamma_i, [X_i]^\mathcal{F}, d_i) \in \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{F}(M), \ i = 1, 2 \), we must show that \( \text{Hol}(\gamma_1, [X_1]^\mathcal{F}, d_1) = \text{Hol}(\gamma_2, [X_2]^\mathcal{F}, d_2) \) if and only if the equality \( T(\pi_{M \times \mathbb{R}^n})(\gamma_1, [X_1]^\mathcal{F}, d_1) = T(\pi_{M \times \mathbb{R}^n})(\gamma_2, [X_2]^\mathcal{F}, d_2) \) holds. Clearly in either case \( \gamma_1 \) and \( \gamma_2 \) must have the same source and range, which we denote by \( x \) and \( y \) respectively, and each \( X_i \) defines a diffeomorphism \( \varphi_i := \text{Fl}_{d_i}^{X_i} \) of some open neighbourhood \( O_x \) of \( x \) onto an open neighbourhood \( O_y \) of \( y \). We may assume that \( O_x \) and \( O_y \) are of the form given in Equation (13) for some slices \( S_x \) and \( S_y \) about \( x \) and \( y \) respectively, where \( S_x \) is mapped by \( \varphi_1 \) onto \( S_y \).

Suppose first that \( \text{Hol}(\gamma_1, [X_1]^\mathcal{F}, d_1) = \text{Hol}(\gamma_2, [X_2]^\mathcal{F}, d_2) \). Then there exists an element \( Z \) of \( I_x \mathcal{F} |_{S_x} \) such that

\[
\varphi_1^{-1}|_{S_y} = \text{Fl}_{1}^{Z} \circ \varphi_2^{-1}|_{S_y},
\]

as maps into \( S_y \). By the arguments of [6 Lemma A.8], we can always assume that \( Z \) may be extended to \( \tilde{Z} \in I_x \mathcal{F} \) defined on \( O_x \) such that \( \varphi_1^{-1} = \text{Fl}_{1}^{\tilde{Z}} \circ \varphi_2^{-1} \) on some open neighbourhood of \( y \). Then for any \( \mathcal{F} \)-invariant section \( \sigma \) defined in an open neighbourhood of \( x \), we have

\[
\sigma \circ \varphi_1^{-1} = \sigma \circ \text{Fl}_{1}^{\tilde{Z}} \circ \varphi_2^{-1} = \sigma \circ \varphi_2^{-1}
\]

and it follows that the \( (\gamma_i, [X_i]^\mathcal{F}, d_i) \) define the same element in \( \mathcal{H}(\pi_{M \times \mathbb{R}^n}) \).

Suppose on the other hand that the \( (\gamma_i, [X_i]^\mathcal{F}, d_i) \) define the same element in \( \mathcal{H}(\pi_{M \times \mathbb{R}^n}) \). Thus for all \( \mathcal{F} \)-invariant functions \( f : S_x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \) we have

\[
(a, b, (f \circ \varphi_1^{-1})(b)) = (a, b, (f \circ \varphi_2^{-1})(b))
\]
for all \((a,b) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times S_y \cong O_y\). By hypothesis then, we can find \(X \in I_x \mathcal{F}\) and \(t \geq 0\) such that
\[
\varphi_1^{-1}(b) = \Phi_t^X \circ \varphi_2^{-1}(b)
\]
for all \(b \in S_y\), hence \(\text{Hol}(\gamma_1, [X]^g, d_1) = \text{Hol}(\gamma_2, [X]^g, d_2)\).

By the Frobenius theorem, the local hypothesis of Theorem 4.15 is always satisfied for any point contained in a regular leaf, and in particular holds for regular foliations. It follows that our construction gives the well-known Winkelnkemper-Phillips holonomy groupoid in the regular case. As we will now describe, while there are important singular foliations for which the hypothesis of Theorem 4.15 holds, there are also simple examples where it does not.

**Example 4.16.** We will say that a singular foliation \((M, \mathcal{F})\) has spherical singularities if for any \(x \in M\) contained in a singular leaf \(L\), there is a slice \(S_x\) through \(x\) for which \(S_x \setminus \{x\}\) is isomorphic as a foliation to punctured Euclidean space with its foliation by spheres. In this case, taking \(f : S_x \to \mathbb{R} \subset \mathbb{R}^n\) to be the radial coordinate with respect to this foliation determines a conserved function about \(x\) of the required type for Theorem 4.15 to hold.

**Example 4.17.** Consider the singular foliation of \(\mathbb{R}^2\) by the orbits of the multiplicative group of positive real numbers. The regular leaves are rays pointing out from the origin, while the singular leaf is the point at the origin. Then the hypotheses of Theorem 4.15 are not satisfied for this foliation - any \(\mathcal{F}\)-invariant function must, in polar coordinates, be independent of the radial coordinate. Since \(f\) must be defined (and smooth) in a neighbourhood of the origin, however, this is only possible if \(f\) is constant.

**Example 4.18.** Consider the foliation of \(\mathbb{R}\) by the vector field \(e^{-\frac{1}{x^2}} \sin(1/x) \partial_x\). Any conserved function \(f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\) must then be constant, and therefore cannot distinguish between leaves.

We will comment more on the potential for generalisation of Theorem 4.15 in Section 6.

### 4.4 Functoriality

In this final section, we show that all of our constructions are functorial for morphisms of singularly foliated bundles. Since our constructions have all been built from germs of sections of such bundles, the correct notion of morphism is one constituted by morphisms of pseudo-bundles. As we will see, our definition generalises that considered by Garmendia-Villatoro [58, Definition 6.11].

**Definition 4.19.** Let \(\pi_{B_1} : B_1 \to M_1\) and \(\pi_{B_2} : B_2 \to M_2\) be singularly foliated bundles. A morphism of \(\pi_{B_1}\) to \(\pi_{B_2}\) consists of a triple \((F,G,f)\), where \(f : M_1 \to M_2\) is a smooth map, \(F : \Gamma_g(\mathcal{F}_1) \to \Gamma_g(\mathcal{F}_2)\) is induced by a morphism of sheaves \(\mathcal{F}_1 \to f^!\mathcal{F}_2\) and \(G : \Gamma_g(\pi_{B_1})^{\mathcal{F}_1} \to \Gamma_g(\pi_{B_2})^{\mathcal{F}_2}\) is a morphism of diffeological pseudo-bundles such that:

1. \(F\) preserves the Lie algebra structure in each fibre,
2. \(G\) is surjective, and
3. Let \( L^i_g \) denote the lifting map for \( \pi_{B_i} \) (see Theorem 4.10), the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
P(F_1) \times_{s,\pi_{B_1}} \Gamma_g(\pi_{B_1})^{F_1} & \xrightarrow{L^1_g} & P(\Gamma_g(\pi_{B_1})^{F_1}) \\
\downarrow P(F) \times G & & \downarrow P(G) \\
P(F_2) \times_{s,\pi_{B_2}} \Gamma_g(\pi_{B_2})^{F_2} & \xrightarrow{L^2_g} & P(\Gamma_g(\pi_{B_2})^{F_2})
\end{array}
\]  

(14)

commutes. Here \( P(F) \) and \( P(G) \) are as in Definition 3.14.

Let us remark that in Definition 4.19 our requirement that \( F \) be induced by a morphism of sheaves \( F_1 \to f^! F_2 \) appears to be necessary, since it is only in this case that the induced map \( P(F) \) on paths can always be guaranteed to send the subspace \( P(\Gamma_g(F_1)) \) to the subspace \( P(\Gamma_g(F_2)) \). Indeed, by Definition 3.15 we require that \( F \) map the section of \( \Gamma_g(F_2) \) over a path \( \gamma \) determined by a single field \( X \in (F_1)_{\text{loc}} \) that extends \( \dot{\gamma} \) to a section of the same sort in \( \Gamma_g(F_2) \), and Example 3.10 shows that this cannot be expected of a general morphism \( \Gamma_g(F_1) \to \Gamma_g(F_2) \).

Recall [58, Section 6] that Garmendia-Villatoro define a morphism of foliated manifolds \((M_i, F_i), i = 1, 2\), to be a pair \((\tilde{F}, f)\) where \( f : M_1 \to M_2 \) is a smooth map, and where \( \tilde{F} : F_1 \to f^! F_2 \) is a morphism of sheaves such that the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
& \tilde{F} & \\
F_1 & \xrightarrow{f^!} & F_2 \\
\downarrow \iota_1 & \downarrow \iota_2 & \\
X_1 & \xrightarrow{df} & f^! X_2
\end{array}
\]  

(15)

commutes. Here \( X_i \) is the sheaf of vector fields on \( M_i \), and \( \iota_i \) the inclusion. By Proposition 3.9 provided that \( \tilde{F} \) is smooth with respect to the functional diffeologies on \((F_1)_{\text{loc}}\) and \((f^! F_2)_{\text{loc}}\) respectively, such an \( \tilde{F} \) induces a morphism \( F : \Gamma_g(F_1) \to \Gamma_g(F_2) \) of diffeological pseudo-bundles covering \( f \). When \( f \) is a submersion, such a morphism \((\tilde{F}, f)\) induces a morphism in the sense of Definition 4.19 of the trivial singularly foliated bundles \( M_i \times Q \to M_i \) for any choice of fibre manifold \( Q \).

**Proposition 4.20.** Let \( Q \) be a manifold, and let \((M_i, F_i), i = 1, 2\), be singularly foliated manifolds. For \( i = 1, 2 \), denote by \( \pi_i : M_i \times Q \to M_i \) the projection onto the first factor, and regard \( \pi_i \) as a singularly foliated bundle in the manner of Example 4.4. Any morphism \((\tilde{F}, f) : (M_1, F_1) \to (M_2, F_2)\) in the sense of Garmendia-Villatoro, with \( f \) submersive, defines a canonical morphism \((F, G, f)\) of the singularly foliated bundles \( \pi_i \).

**Proof.** Denote by \( f^{-1} F_2 \) the submodule of \( X_1 \) generated by vector fields whose image under \( df \) is the pullback by \( f \) of an element of \( F_2 \). By [2, Proposition 1.10], this \( f^{-1} F_2 \) is a foliation of \( M_1 \). As remarked in [58, Example 6.15], since \( f \) is a submersion the commutativity of the diagram (15) implies that \( F_1 \) is a submodule of \( f^{-1} F_2 \), so that \( F \) can be factorised into the composite.
By Proposition[5.8], the sheaf morphisms $\tilde{F}_1$ and $\tilde{F}_2$ induce morphisms $F_1 : \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(F_1) \to \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(f^{-1}F_2)$ and $F_2 : \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(f^{-1}F_2) \to \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(F_2)$ of pseudo-bundles covering $\text{id}_M$ and $f$ respectively. Thus to obtain a morphism of the foliated bundles $\pi_1$, it suffices to construct morphisms $G_1 : \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(\pi_1)F_1 \to \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(\pi_1)f^{-1}(F_2)$ and $G_2 : \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(\pi_1)f^{-1}(F_2) \to \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(\pi_2)F_2$ of pseudo-bundles.

Let us first construct $G_1$. As remarked in the proof of [5.8 Theorem 6.21], since $F_1 \subset f^{-1}(F_2)$, any slice $\tau$ transverse to $F_1$ through a point $x \in M_1$ contains a slice $\tau'$ transverse to $f^{-1}(F_2)$ through $x$. Therefore, recalling that $F_1$-invariant sections $\sigma$ of $\pi_1$ defined in an open neighbourhood of $x$ are in bijective correspondence with $F_1$-invariant functions $\tilde{\sigma} : \tau \to Q$, the formula

$$G_1(x, [\tilde{\sigma}]_2) := (x, [\tilde{\sigma}|_{\tau'}]_2), \quad (x, [\tilde{\sigma}]_2) \in \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(\pi_1)F_1$$

defines the required morphism $G_1 : \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(\pi_1)F_1 \to \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(\pi_1)f^{-1}(F_2)$. Letting $m$ denote the codimension of the leaf of $F_1$ through $x$ as a submanifold of the leaf of $f^{-1}F_2$ through $x$, we can assume that $\tau \cong \tau' \times \mathbb{R}^m$, so that $f^{-1}F_2$-invariant functions on $\tau'$ can be extended trivially to $F_1$-invariant functions on $\tau$. It follows that $G_1$ is fibrewise surjective. Moreover, as remarked in Example [4.4], the singular partial connections for $f^{-1}F_2$ and $F_1$ in the trivial bundle $M_1 \times Q$ are just the restrictions of the canonical lift $\ell : X_{M_1} \to (\pi_1)_!X_{M_1 \times Q}$ to each of $f^{-1}F_2$ and $F_1$ respectively. Since $\tilde{F}_1$ is just the inclusion of a submodule, a routine calculation shows that commutativity of the diagram \ref{commute} is satisfied for the triple $(F_1, G_1, \text{id}_M)$.

Let us now come to $G_2$. Again, as remarked in [5.8 Theorem 6.21], if $\tau$ is a slice transverse to $f^{-1}(F_2)$, then $f(\tau)$ is a slice transverse to $F_2$, and $f|_{\tau} : \tau \to f(\tau)$ is a foliation-preserving diffeomorphism. Therefore the formula

$$G_2(x, [\tilde{\sigma}]_2) := (f(x), [\tilde{\sigma} \circ f^{-1}]_f(x)), \quad (x, [\tilde{\sigma}]_2) \in \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(\pi_1)f^{-1}(F_2)$$

defines the required morphism $G_2 : \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(\pi_1)f^{-1}(F_2) \to \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(\pi_2)F_2$, which is fibrewise surjective since $f|_{\tau}$ is a foliation-preserving diffeomorphism. To show that the diagram \ref{commute} commutes for the triple $(F_2, G_2, f)$, suppose that $(\gamma, [X]_2, d) \in \mathcal{P}(f^{-1}F_2)$ and fix a point $t \in [0, d]$. Then for each slice $\tau$ through $\gamma(t)$, $f|_{\tau}$ is a diffeomorphism onto the slice $f(\tau)$ through $f(\gamma(t))$, and by [5.8 Example 6.14], $F_2(\gamma(t), [X]_{\gamma(t)}, d)$ is given over $f(\tau)$ by $(f(\gamma(t)), [f_*X]_{f(\gamma(t))}, d)$, where $f_*X := df \circ X \circ f^{-1}$. The equation

$$\text{Fl}_t^X \circ f^{-1} = f^{-1} \circ \text{Fl}_t^X$$

on $f(\tau)$ now implies that $[\tilde{\sigma} \circ \text{Fl}_t^X \circ f^{-1}]_{f(\gamma(t))} = [(\tilde{\sigma} \circ f^{-1}) \circ \text{Fl}_t^X]_{f(\gamma(t))}$ for any $f^{-1}F_2$-invariant function $\tilde{\sigma} : \tau \to Q$. It follows that the diagram \ref{commute} commutes for the triple $(F_2, G_2, f)$.

Finally $G := G_2 \circ G_1 : \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(\pi_1)F_1 \to \Gamma_{\tilde{g}}(\pi_2)F_2$ defines a fibrewise-surjective morphism of diffeological pseudo-bundles, and $(F, G, f)$ is the claimed morphism of singularly foliated bundles $\pi_1$ and $\pi_2$. \hfill \Box
Due to the categorical nature of our definitions, functoriality of the holonomy groupoids of singularly foliated bundles with respect to morphisms of singularly foliated bundles is now a simple exercise.

**Theorem 4.21.** Let \( \pi_{B_1} : B_1 \to M_1 \) and \( \pi_{B_2} : B_2 \to M_2 \) be singularly foliated bundles, and let \((F, G, f) : \pi_{B_1} \to \pi_{B_2}\) be a morphism in the sense of Definition 4.19. Then the map \( \phi := \mathcal{P}(F) : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_1) \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_2) \) descends, for each \( k = 0, \ldots, \infty, g \), to a morphism

\[
\phi^k : \mathcal{H}(\pi_{B_1}^{k, \mathcal{F}_1}) \to \mathcal{H}(\pi_{B_2}^{k, \mathcal{F}_2})
\]

of diffeological groupoids, and the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{H}(\pi_{B_1}^{k, \mathcal{F}_1}) \\
\downarrow \phi^k \\
\mathcal{H}(\pi_{B_2}^{k, \mathcal{F}_2}) \\
\downarrow \phi^\infty \\
\mathcal{H}(\pi_{B_1}^{\infty, \mathcal{F}_1}) \\
\downarrow \\
\mathcal{H}(\pi_{B_2}^{\infty, \mathcal{F}_2}) \\
\downarrow \\
\mathcal{H}(\pi_{B_1}^{0, \mathcal{F}_1})
\end{array}
\]

commutes. Here the unlabelled arrows are as in Theorem 4.13. That is, the hierarchy of holonomy groupoids is functorial.

**Proof.** Our first task is to show that the map \( \phi : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_1) \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_2) \) does indeed descend to a well-defined morphism of each quotient. Let \( k \) denote any of the symbols \( 0, \ldots, \infty \) or \( g \). Suppose then that \((\gamma_1, [X_1]^g, d_1)\) and \((\gamma_2, [X_2]^g, d_2)\) in \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_1) \) satisfy

\[
T(\pi_{B_1}^{k, \mathcal{F}_1})(\gamma_1, X_1, d_1)(x, [\sigma]^k_{\mathcal{F}_1}) = T(\pi_{B_1}^{k, \mathcal{F}_1})(\gamma_2, X_2, d_2)(x, [\sigma]^k_{\mathcal{F}_1})
\]

(16) for all \((x, [\sigma]^k_{\mathcal{F}_1})\) in \( \Gamma_k(\pi_{B_1}) \). Then since \((F, G, f)\) is a morphism, the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_1) \times_{\pi_{B_1}} \Gamma_k(\pi_{B_1}) \mathcal{F}_1 & \xrightarrow{L_1^k} & \mathcal{P}(\Gamma_k(\pi_{B_1}) \mathcal{F}_1) \\
\phi \times G \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{P}(G) \\
\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_2) \times_{\pi_{B_2}} \Gamma_k(\pi_{B_2}) \mathcal{F}_2 & \xrightarrow{L_2^k} & \mathcal{P}(\Gamma_k(\pi_{B_2}) \mathcal{F}_2)
\end{array}
\]
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commutes. Therefore, for each \( i = 1, 2 \), we have

\[
T(\pi_{B_2}^{k,F_2})(\phi(\gamma_i, [X_i]^g, d_i))(G(x, [\sigma]^k_x)) = P(G)(L_k(\phi(\gamma_i, [X_i]^g, d_i); G(x, [\sigma]^k_x))(d_i)
= G(T(\pi_{B_1}^{k,F_1})(\gamma_i, [X_i]^g, d_i))(x, [\sigma]^k_x))
\]

for all \((x, [\sigma]^k_x) \in \Gamma_k(\pi_{B_1})\), so surjectivity of \( G \) together with the hypothesis (16) tells us that \( T(\pi_{B_2}^{k,F_2})(\phi(\gamma_1, [X_1]^g, d_1)) = T(\pi_{B_2}^{k,F_2})(\phi(\gamma_2, [X_2]^g, d_2)) \). Therefore \( \phi : \mathcal{P}(F_1) \to \mathcal{P}(F_2) \) does indeed descend to a map \( \phi^k : \mathcal{H}(\pi_{B_1}^{k,F_1}) \to \mathcal{H}(\pi_{B_2}^{k,F_2}) \), whose smoothness follows from that of \( \phi \), and which is a homomorphism by functoriality of \( \phi \).

We have thus proved that each of the diagrams

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{P}(F_1) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathcal{P}(F_2) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{H}(\pi_{B_1}^{k,F_1}) & \xrightarrow{\phi^k} & \mathcal{H}(\pi_{B_2}^{k,F_2})
\end{array}
\]

commutes, where \( \Pi_{B_i}^k \) is the quotient of \( \mathcal{P}(F_i) \) onto \( \mathcal{H}(\pi_{B_i}^{k,F_i}) \). It follows then that for \( l \leq k \), the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{P}(F_1) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathcal{P}(F_2) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{H}(\pi_{B_1}^{l,F_1}) & \xrightarrow{\phi^l} & \mathcal{H}(\pi_{B_2}^{l,F_2})
\end{array}
\]

commutes, and then the result follows by Theorem 4.13.

5 Outlook

In the author’s estimation, there are three primary questions arising from this work that have yet to be answered.

Firstly, an assumption that we have had to impose in Definitions 4.3 and 4.19 is that morphisms of sheaves of smooth sections be smooth with respect to the diffeology of Proposition 3.1. It is far from clear that this assumption is really necessary. That is, it appears possible that any morphism of sheaves of smooth sections is automatically smooth with respect to this diffeology. Indeed, the domain considerations present in Proposition 3.1 are automatically satisfied by maps arising from morphisms of sheaves, and attempts thus far to construct a morphism of sheaves which is not smooth with respect to this diffeology have proved unsuccessful. A proof that any morphism of sheaves of smooth sections is itself diffeologically smooth would allow us to remove these seemingly extraneous assumptions.

Secondly, it is clear from Examples 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 that in many situations, a singular partial connection on a fibre bundle induces a singular foliation of its total space by projectable vector fields. This foliation cannot, however, be expected to meet the requirements of Definition
Indeed, as pointed out in the paragraph prior to Definition 4.1, projectable vector fields are not closed under multiplication by arbitrary smooth functions on the total space. This suggests that Definition 2.1 ought to be relaxed to allow for closure of vector fields under certain subsheaves of the usual sheaf of smooth functions. Such a modification will have no effect on the integration theorem (see [57, Theorem 4.2(e)]). Having relaxed Definition 2.1, a proof that singularly foliated bundles admit foliations of their total spaces will require an understanding of how presheaves of Lie-Rinehart algebras behave under sheafification. This question does not yet appear to have been studied in the literature.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it would be interesting to determine the precise extent to which Theorem 4.15 may be generalised to more poorly-behaved foliations. Ultimately, generalisations of Theorem 4.15 will amount to determining what sorts of local conservation laws are admitted by a singular foliation, which appears to be an extraordinarily subtle problem. Of course, as Examples 4.17 and 4.18 show, the hypotheses of Theorem 4.15 fail to hold even for some relatively simple foliations when one uses only trivial singularly foliated bundles, so we expect that any successful generalisation of Theorem 4.15 will require bundles which are better adapted to whatever local symmetries the foliation in question presents. We remark that in the case of a regular foliation, it is the local conservation laws which distinguish between leaves in the manner of Theorem 4.15 that give rise the well-known Gel’fand-Fuks cohomology of the foliation. Thus we expect that any progress on generalising Theorem 4.15 would also have implications for the construction of Gel’fand-Fuks characteristic classes for singular foliations, which presents an extremely interesting direction for further research.
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