

On Session Typing, Probabilistic Polynomial Time, and Cryptographic Experiments (Long Version)

Ugo Dal Lago Giulia Giusti

Abstract

A system of session types is introduced as induced by a Curry Howard correspondence applied to Bounded Linear Logic, then extending the obtained type system with probabilistic choice operators and ground types. The resulting system satisfies the expected properties, like subject reduction and progress, but also unexpected ones, like a polynomial bound on the time needed to reduce processes. This makes the system suitable for modelling experiments and proofs from the so-called computational model of cryptography.

1 Introduction

Session types [27, 21, 28] are a typing discipline capable of regulating the interaction between the parallel components in a concurrent system in such a way as to *prevent* phenomena such as deadlock or livelock, at the same time *enabling* the parties to interact following the rules of common communication protocols. In the twenty-five years since their introduction, session types have been shown to be a flexible tool, being adaptable to heterogeneous linguistic and application scenarios (see, e.g., [41, 9, 29, 15]). A particularly fruitful line of investigation concerns the links between session-type disciplines and Girard’s linear logic [23]. This intimate relationship, known since the introduction of session types, found a precise formulation in the work of Caires and Pfenning on a Curry-Howard correspondence between session types and intuitionistic linear logic [10], which has been developed in multiple directions [42, 43, 40, 17]. In Caires and Pfenning’s type system, proofs of intuitionistic linear logic become type derivations for terms of Milner’s π -calculus. Noticeably, typable processes satisfy properties (e.g. progress and deadlock freedom) which do not hold for untyped processes.

Process algebras, and in particular algebras in the style of the π -calculus, have been used, among other things, as specification formalisms for cryptographic protocols in the so-called *symbolic* (also known as *formal*) model of cryptography, i.e. in the model, due to Dolev and Yao [22], in which aspects related to computational complexity and probability theory, themselves central to the *computational* model, are abstracted away: strings become symbolic expressions, adversaries are taken as having arbitrary computing power, and nondeterminism replaces probabilism in regulating the interaction between the involved parties. This includes π -calculus dialects akin to the applied π -calculus [2], or the spi-calculus [3].

Is it possible to model cryptographic protocols by way of process algebras in the so-called computational model *itself*? A widely explored path in this direction consists in the so-called *computational soundness* results for symbolic models, which have been successfully proved in the realm of process algebras [1, 16]. In computationally sound symbolic models, any computational attack can be simulated by a symbolic attack, this way proving that whenever a protocol is secure in the latter, it must be secure in the former, too. If one is interested in calculi precisely and fully capturing the computational model, computational soundness is not enough, i.e., one wants a model capturing all *and only* the computational adversaries. And indeed, there have been some attempts to define process algebras able to faithfully capture the computational model by way of operators for probabilistic choice and constraints on computational complexity [38]. The literature, however, is much sparser than for process algebras in symbolic style. We believe that

this is above all due to the fact that the contemporary presence of probabilistic evolution and the intrinsic nondeterminism of process algebras leads to complex formal systems which are hard to reason about.

This paper shows that session typing can be exploited for the sake of designing a simple formal system in which, indeed, complexity constraints and probabilistic choices can be both taken into account, this way allowing for the modelling of cryptographic experiments. At the level of types, we build on the approach by Caires and Pfenning, refining it through the lenses of Bounded Linear Logic, a logical system which captures polynomial time complexity in the sequential setting [24, 26] at the same time allowing for a high degree of intensional expressivity [19]. At the level of processes, we enrich proof terms with first-order function symbols computing probabilistic polytime functions, namely the basic building blocks of any cryptographic protocol. This has two consequences: process evolution becomes genuinely probabilistic, while process terms and types are enriched so as to allow for the exchange of strings, this way turning the calculus to an applied one. From a purely definitional perspective, then, the introduced calculus, called π DIBLL, is relatively simple, and does not significantly deviate from the literature, being obtained by mixing well-known ingredients in a novel way. The calculus π DIBLL is introduced in Section 3 below.

Despite its simplicity π DIBLL is on the one hand capable of expressing some simple cryptographic experiments, and on the other hand satisfies some strong meta-theoretical properties. This includes type soundness, which is expected, and can be spelled out as *subject reduction* and *progress*, but also a polynomial bound on the length of reduction sequences, a form of *reachability* property which is essential for our calculus to be considered a model of cryptographic adversaries. All this is described in Section 4.

As interesting as they are, these properties are not by themselves sufficient for considering π DIBLL a proper calculus for computational cryptography. What is missing, in fact, is a way to capture computational indistinguishability, in the sense of the computational model [32, 25]. Actually, this is where the introduced calculus shows its peculiarities with respect to similar calculi from the literature, and in particular with respect to the CCS-style calculus by Mitchell and Scedrov [38]. Indeed, π DIBLL typable processes enjoy a confluence property which cannot hold for untyped processes. The latter, in turn, implies that firing internal actions on any typable process results in a *unique* distribution of processes, all of them ready to produce an observable action. This makes relational reasoning handier. We in particular explore observational equivalence in Section 5, then showing how this can be of help in a simple experiment-based security proof in Section 6.

2 A Bird's Eye View on Cryptographic Experiments and Sessions

In this section, we introduce the reader to cryptographic experiments, and we show how they and the parties involved can be conveniently modelled as session-typed processes. We will also hint at how relational reasoning could be useful in supporting proofs of security. We will do all this by way of an example, namely the one of private key encryption schemes and security against passive adversaries. We will try to stay self-contained, and the interested reader can check textbooks [32] for more details or for the necessary cryptographic preliminaries. As examples we recall the following notions

Definition 2.1 (Negligible Function). A function f from the natural numbers to the non-negative real numbers is negligible iff for every positive polynomial p there is an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all natural numbers $n > N$ it holds that $f(n) < 1/p(n)$.

Definition 2.2 (Probabilistic Polynomial Time (PPT) Algorithm). A probabilistic algorithm A is called PPT iff there exists a polynomial p which is an upper limit to the computational complexity of A regardless of the probabilistic choices made by the latter.




Figure 1: The Indistinguishability Experiment

Since the running time of any cryptographic algorithm has to be polynomially bounded w.r.t. the *value* of the security parameter n , the latter is passed in unary (i.e. as 1^n) to the algorithm, so that n is also a lower bound to the *length* of the input.

A private-key encryption scheme is a triple of algorithms $\Pi = (\text{Gen}, \text{Enc}, \text{Dec})$, the first one responsible for key generation, the latter two being the encryption and decryption algorithms, respectively. When could we say that such a scheme Π is *secure*? Among the many equivalent definitions in the literature, one of the handiest is the one based on indistinguishability, which is based on the experiment PrivK^{adv} reported in Figure 1a exactly in the form it has in [32]. As the reader may easily notice, the experiment is nothing more than a randomized algorithm interacting with both the adversary A and the scheme Π . The interaction between PrivK^{adv} and the adversary A can be put in evidence by switching to a language for processes, see Figure 1b. The process PRIVK_{Π} communicates with the adversary through the channel adv and outputs the result of its execution to the channel exp . Apart from the fact that the adversary has been factored out, the process is syntactically very similar to the experiment PrivK^{adv} . Actually, we could have made the interaction between PRIVK and Π explicit by turning the latter into a process interacting with the former through a dedicated channel.

The interaction between an adversary ADV and PRIVK_{Π} can be modelled through the parallel composition operator, i.e., by studying the behaviour of $ADV \mid \text{PRIVK}_{\Pi}$. As we will soon see, we would like the aforementioned parallel composition to output **true** on the channel exp with probability very close to $\frac{1}{2}$, and this is indeed what cryptography actually prescribes [32]. We should not, however, be too quick to proclaim the problem solved. What, for example, if ADV communicates with PRIVK_{Π} in a way different from the one prescribed by the experiment, e.g. by *not* passing two strings to it, thus blocking the interaction? Even worse, what if PRIVK_{Π} becomes the parallel composition $\text{PRIVK} \mid \Pi$ and ADV cheats on the communication by intercepting the messages exchanged between Π and PRIVK ? These scenarios are of course very interesting from a security viewpoint, but we are not interested at those here: the only thing ADV is allowed to do is to send the two messages and to use its internal computational capabilities to guess the value b the experiment produces.

How to enforce all this at the level of processes? Actually, this is what session types are good for! It would be nice, for example, to be able to type the two processes above as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
adv : \mathbb{S}[p] \otimes \mathbb{S}[p] \otimes (\mathbb{S}[p] \multimap \mathbb{B}) \vdash \text{PRIVK}_{\Pi} :: exp : \mathbb{B} \\
\vdash ADV :: adv : \mathbb{S}[p] \otimes \mathbb{S}[p] \otimes (\mathbb{S}[p] \multimap \mathbb{B})
\end{aligned}$$

where \mathbb{B} is the type of booleans and $\mathbb{S}[p]$ is the type of strings of length p . Moreover, we would like

to somehow force a restriction νadv to be placed next to the parallel composition $ADV \mid PRIVK_{\Pi}$, so as to prescribe that ADV can only communicate with the experiment, and not with the outside world. Finally, we would like ADV to range over processes working in polynomial time. All this is indeed taken care of by our session type discipline as introduced in Section 3.

But now, would it be possible to not only *express* simple cryptographic situations, but also to *prove* some security properties about them from within the realm of processes? As already mentioned, this amounts to requiring that for every efficient adversary (i.e. for every PPT algorithm) A it holds that $\Pr[\text{PrivK}_{A,\Pi}^{adv}(n)] \leq \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon(n)$, where ε is negligible. In the realm of processes, this becomes the following equation

$$\nu adv.(PRIVK_{\Pi} \mid ADV) \sim FAIRFLIP_{exp} \quad (1)$$

where $FAIRFLIP_{exp}$ behaves like a fair coin outputting its value on the channel exp , and \sim expresses approximate equivalence as induced by negligible functions. Making all this formal is nontrivial for at least three reasons:

- First of all, the statement only holds for *efficient* adversaries. The relation \sim , however specified, must then take this constraint into account.
- Secondly, the relation \sim only holds in an approximate sense, and the acceptable degree of approximation crucially depends on n , the so-called security parameter. This is due to negligibility, without which cryptography would be essentially vacuous.
- Finally, the computational security of Π can at the time of writing be proved only based on *assumptions*, e.g. that one-way functions or pseudorandom generators exist. In other words, Equation (1) only holds in a conditional sense, and cryptographic proofs have to be structured accordingly.

The calculus πDIBLL successfully addresses all these challenges, as we are going to show in the rest of this paper.

3 Processes and Session Typing

This section is devoted to introducing πDIBLL , a variation on πDILL [10] in which a polynomial constraint on the replicated processes is enforced following the principles of Bounded Linear Logic [24]. For the sake of properly representing cryptographic protocols in the computational model, πDIBLL is also equipped with indexed ground types and a notion of probabilistic choice.

3.1 Preliminaries

Preliminary to the definition of the πDIBLL session type system are three concepts, namely polynomials, probability distributions and indexed ground types. Let us start this section introducing polynomials.

Definition 3.1 (Polynomials). *Polynomial variables* are indicated with metavariables like n and m , and form a set \mathcal{PV} . *Polynomials expressions* are built from natural number constants, polynomial variables, addition and multiplication. A polynomial p depending on the polynomial variables $\bar{n} = n_1, \dots, n_k$ is sometime indicated as $p(n_1, \dots, n_k)$ and abbreviated as $p(\bar{n})$. Such a polynomial is said to be a \mathcal{V} -polynomial whenever all variables in the sequence \bar{n} are in $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{PV}$. If $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{PV}$, any map $\rho : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is said to be a \mathcal{V} -substitution, and the natural number obtained by interpreting any variable $m \in \mathcal{V}$ occurring in a \mathcal{V} -polynomial p with $\rho(m)$ is indicated just as $p(\rho)$. If \mathcal{V} is a singleton $\{n\}$, the substitution mapping n to the natural number i is indicated as ρ_i , and \mathcal{V} is indicated, abusing notation, with n . The set of polynomial variables occurring in any polynomial p is indicated as $\text{vars}(p)$, and this definition will be silently extended to other kinds of syntactic objects like terms and types.

Distributions play a crucial role in probability theory and represent the likelihood of observing an element from given set. In this paper, they will be the key ingredient in giving semantics to types and processes.

Definition 3.2 (Probability Distributions). A *probability distribution* on the finite set A is a function $\mathcal{D} : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{[0,1]}$ such that: $\sum_{v \in A} \mathcal{D}(v) = 1$. A probability distribution is often indicated by way of the notation $\{v_1^{r_1}, \dots, v_m^{r_m}\}$ (where v_1, \dots, v_m are distinct elements of A), which stands for the distribution \mathcal{D} such that $r_i = \mathcal{D}(v_i)$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Given a probability distribution \mathcal{D} on A , its *support* $S(\mathcal{D}) \subseteq A$ contains precisely those elements of A to which \mathcal{D} attributes a strictly positive probability. The set of all probability distributions on a set A is indicated as $\mathcal{D}(A)$.

In the computational model, the agents involved exchange binary strings. We keep the set of ground types slightly more general, so as to treat booleans as a separate type. As a crucial step towards dealing with polytime constraints, the type of strings is indexed by a polynomial, which captures the length of binary strings inhabiting the type.

Definition 3.3 (Ground Types). *Ground types* are expressions generated by the grammar $B ::= \mathbb{B} \mid \mathbb{S}[p]$, where p is a polynomial expression. A \mathcal{V} -ground type is a ground type B such that all polynomial variables occurring in it are taken from \mathcal{V} , and as such can be given a semantics in the context of a \mathcal{V} -substitution $\rho: \llbracket \mathbb{B} \rrbracket_\rho = \{0, 1\}$, $\llbracket \mathbb{S}[p] \rrbracket_\rho = \{0, 1\}^{p(\rho)}$.

The concrete nature of any ground type $\mathbb{S}[p(\bar{n})]$ is only known when the polynomial variables in \bar{n} , which stand for so-called security parameters, are attributed a natural number value. For reasons of generality, we actually allow more than one security parameter, even if cryptographic constructions almost invariably need only one of them.

3.2 Terms

Terms are expressions which are *internally* evaluated by processes, the result of this evaluation having a ground type and being exchanged between the different (sub)processes.

Function Symbols. We work with a set \mathcal{F} of *function symbols*, ranged over by metavariables like f and g . In the context of this paper, it is important that function symbols can be evaluated in probabilistic polynomial time, and this can be achieved by taking function symbols from a language guaranteeing the aforementioned complexity bounds [36, 20]. Each function symbol $f \in \mathcal{F}$ comes equipped with:

- A type *typeof*(f) having the form $B_1, \dots, B_m \rightarrow C$ where the B_i and C are $\{n\}$ -ground types.
- A family $\llbracket f \rrbracket = \{\llbracket f \rrbracket_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of functions giving semantics to f such that $\llbracket f \rrbracket_i$ goes from $\llbracket B_1 \rrbracket_{\rho_i} \times \dots \times \llbracket B_m \rrbracket_{\rho_i}$ to $\mathcal{D}(\llbracket C \rrbracket_{\rho_i})$, where *typeof*(f) is $B_1, \dots, B_m \rightarrow C$.
- We assume each function symbol f to be associated with an n -polynomial *comof*(f) bounding the complexity of computing f , in the following sense: there must be a PPT algorithm *algof*(f) which, on input 1^i and a tuple t in $\llbracket B_1 \rrbracket_{\rho_i} \times \dots \times \llbracket B_m \rrbracket_{\rho_i}$ returns in time at most *comof*(f)(ρ_i) each value $x \in \llbracket C \rrbracket_{\rho_i}$ with probability $\llbracket f \rrbracket_i(t)(x)$, where *typeof*(f) = $B_1, \dots, B_m \rightarrow C$.

Term Syntax and Semantics. Finally, we are able to define terms and values, which are expressions derivable in the following grammars:

$$a, b, c ::= v \mid f_p(v_1, \dots, v_n) \quad v, w ::= z \mid \text{true} \mid \text{false} \mid s.$$

Here f is a function symbol, p is a polynomial, **true** and **false** are the usual boolean constants, s is any binary string, and z is a *term variable* taken from a set \mathcal{TV} disjoint from \mathcal{PV} . Terms

are assumed to be well-typed according to an elementary type system which will be defined later. Reduction rules between terms and distributions of values are given only for terms which are closed with respect to both term variables and polynomial variables. Here are the rules

$$\frac{}{v \hookrightarrow \{v^1\}} \quad \frac{}{f_i(v_1, \dots, v_m) \hookrightarrow \llbracket f \rrbracket_i(v_1, \dots, v_m)}$$

3.3 Processes

It is finally time to introduce the process terms of $\pi\mathbf{DIBLL}$, which as already mentioned are a natural generalization of those of $\pi\mathbf{DILL}$ [10].

Definition 3.4 (Process Syntax). Given an infinite set of names, the set of processes, indicated with metavariables like P and Q is defined by the following grammar:

$$P, Q ::= 0 \mid P \mid Q \mid (\nu y) P \mid x\langle y \rangle.P \mid x(y).P \mid [x \leftarrow v] \mid \mathbf{let} \ x = a \ \mathbf{in} \ P \mid x.P \mid !x(y).P \mid x.\mathbf{inl}; P \mid x.\mathbf{inr}; P \mid x.\mathbf{case}(P, Q) \mid \mathbf{if} \ v \ \mathbf{then} \ P \ \mathbf{else} \ Q$$

where x, y are channel names from a set \mathcal{CV} such that $\mathcal{TV} \subseteq \mathcal{CV}$, a is a term and v is a value.

The operators used in the process syntax have the following meaning:

- The process 0 is the *inactive process*, that is a terminated process.
- The process $P \mid Q$ is the *parallel composition* between two processes, in which P and Q interact with each other and with the context.
- The *name restriction* operator is used to make the name of a process private. In other words, $(\nu y) P$ can be seen as the process that assigns a new name (different from any names possibly used by any other process in the context) and proceeds according to P .
- $x\langle y \rangle.P$ is the *output process* that sends the channel y on x and then proceeds according to P .
- $x(y).P$ is the *input process* that receives a channel z on x and then proceeds according to P where the name y is replaced by z .
- $[x \leftarrow v]$ is the *output process of a value* responsible for sending to the channel x the value v .
- $x.P$ is the *value input process* and it receives a value through the channel x , which is then substituted in the process P .
- $\mathbf{let} \ x = a \ \mathbf{in} \ P$ is the *term's evaluation process* where channel x in the process P assumes the values obtained from the evaluation of the term a .
- $!x(y).P$ is the *replicated process or persistent process*. It performs the input operation an arbitrary number of times.
- The *binary choice operator* provides two labels in which the first involves the execution of the process P , whereas the second executes the process Q . The $x.\mathbf{case}(P, Q)$ process gives the choice between two processes denoted by P and Q .
- The process $x.\mathbf{inl}; P$ is the process that selects the first label provided by a binary choice operation and then proceeds according to P .
- The process $x.\mathbf{inr}; P$ is the process that selects the second label provided by a binary choice operation and then proceeds according to P .
- The process $\mathbf{if} \ v \ \mathbf{then} \ P \ \mathbf{else} \ Q$ is a *conditional*. Observe that the value v can be either true, false, or a variable.

For any process P , we denote the set of free names of P by $fn(P)$ which is defined by induction (on the process syntax) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
fn(x) &= \{x\} \\
fn(0) &= \emptyset \\
fn(P \mid Q) &= fn(P) \cup fn(Q) \\
fn((\nu y) P) &= fn(P) \setminus \{y\} \\
fn(x(y).P) &= fn(x) \cup fn(y) \cup fn(P) \\
fn(x(y).P) &= fn(x) \cup fn(P) \setminus \{y\} \\
fn([x \leftarrow v]) &= fn(x) \\
fn(\text{let } x = a \text{ in } P) &= fn(x) \cup fn(P) \\
fn(x.P) &= fn(P) \setminus \{x\} \\
fn(!x(y).P) &= fn(x) \cup fn(P) \setminus \{y\} \\
fn(x.\text{inl}; P) &= fn(x) \cup fn(P) \\
fn(x.\text{inr}; P) &= fn(x) \cup fn(P) \\
fn(x.\text{case}(P, Q)) &= fn(x) \cup fn(P) \cup fn(Q) \\
fn(\text{if } v \text{ then } P \text{ else } Q) &= fn(P) \cup fn(Q)
\end{aligned}$$

The grammar of processes we have just introduced is perfectly adequate to represent the process $PRIVK_{\Pi}$ as from Figure 1b.

3.4 Process Reduction

Process reduction in πDIBLL is intrinsically probabilistic, and as such deserves to be described with some care.

Definition 3.5 (Structural Congruence). Structural congruence \equiv is the least congruence on processes satisfying the following axioms:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\nu x) (P \mid (\nu y) (Q \mid R)) &\equiv (\nu y) ((\nu x) (P \mid Q) \mid R) && x \notin fn(R) \wedge y \notin fn(P) \\
(\nu x) (P \mid (\nu y) (Q \mid R)) &\equiv (\nu y) (Q \mid (\nu x) (P \mid R)) && x \notin fn(Q) \wedge y \notin fn(P) \\
P \equiv_{\alpha} Q &\Rightarrow P \equiv Q \\
P &\equiv (\nu x) (P \mid 0) && x \notin fn(P)
\end{aligned}$$

The reduction relation between processes is *not* a plain binary relation anymore, and instead puts a process P in correspondence with a *distribution* \mathcal{D} of processes, namely an object in the form $\{P_1^{r_1}, \dots, P_m^{r_m}\}$, where the P_i are processes and the r_i are positive real numbers summing to 1. We write $P \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ in this case.

The reduction rules for processes are defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{x(y).Q \mid x(u).P \rightarrow \{Q \mid P\{y/u\}^1\}}{\quad} \quad \frac{x(y).Q \mid !x(u).P \rightarrow \{Q \mid P\{y/u\} \mid !x(u).P^1\}}{\quad} \\
\frac{x.\text{inl}; P \mid x.\text{case}(Q, R) \rightarrow \{P \mid Q^1\}}{\quad} \quad \frac{x.\text{inr}; P \mid x.\text{case}(Q, R) \rightarrow \{P \mid R^1\}}{\quad} \\
\frac{Q \rightarrow \{Q_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}}{P \mid Q \rightarrow \{P \mid Q_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}} \quad \frac{P \rightarrow \{Q_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}}{(\nu y) P \rightarrow \{(\nu y) Q_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}} \\
\frac{P \equiv P' \quad P' \rightarrow \{Q_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I} \quad Q_i \equiv Q'_i \text{ where } i \in I}{P \rightarrow \{Q_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}} \\
\frac{v \hookrightarrow \{val^1\}}{[x \leftarrow v] \mid x.Q \rightarrow \{Q\{val/x\}^1\}} \quad \frac{a \hookrightarrow \{v_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}}{\text{let } x = a \text{ in } P \rightarrow \{P\{v_i/x\}^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}} \\
\frac{}{\text{if true then } P \text{ else } Q \rightarrow \{P^1\}} \quad \frac{}{\text{if false then } P \text{ else } Q \rightarrow \{Q^1\}}
\end{array}$$

3.5 Type System

Traditionally, session typing serves the purpose of guaranteeing safety properties, like the absence of deadlocks. In this paper, however, they also enforce some bounds on the complexity of the reduction process, and as such have to be made more restricted.

Types. First of all, let us introduce the language of types, which is defined as follows:

$$A, B ::= 1 \mid A \multimap B \mid !_p A \mid A \otimes B \mid A \oplus B \mid A \& B \mid \mathbb{B} \mid \mathbb{S}[p]$$

where:

- 1 is the type of an empty or terminated session channel. A process offering to communicate via a session channel typed this way simply synchronizes with another process through it without exchanging anything.
- $A \multimap B$ is the type of a session channel x through which a message carrying another channel with type A is received. After performing this action, the underlying process behaves according to B on the same channel x .
- $!_p A$ is the type for a replicated process which can be used as a server to generate a limited number p of new sessions with type A . In other words, $!_p A$ is the type of a process which offers to open p new sessions of type A , where p is a \mathcal{V} -polynomial used to limit the number of copies of a replicated process.
- $A \otimes B$ is the type of a session channel x through which a message carrying another channel with type A is sent. After performing this action, the underlying process behaves according to B on the same channel x .
- $A \oplus B$ is the type of a selection session. More precisely, it is the type of a channel on which a process either sends a special message *inl* and performs according to A or sends a special message *inr* and performs according to B . This corresponds to an internal choice.
- The type $A \& B$ can be assigned to a channel x on which the underlying process offers the possibility of choosing between proceeding according to A or to B , both on x . This corresponds to an external choice.
- \mathbb{B} is the base type for boolean values denoted by: *true* and *false*.
- $\mathbb{S}[p]$ is the base type for binary strings with polynomial length.

Type Environments. The *type environment* is divided into the following three parts:

- Δ is the linear part of the type environment, it contains assignments $x : A$ where x is the name of a channel typed by A . These channels can be used only once. Formally, Δ is defined by induction as follows

$$\Delta := \cdot \mid \Delta, x : A$$

where x is the name of a linear channel, and A is a type.

- The unrestricted part of the type environment, denoted by Γ , contains assignments $x_p : A$ where x is the name of an unrestricted channel indexed by the polynomial p and typed by A . Such channels can be used a polynomial number of times, this limitation is denoted by p . Formally, Γ is defined by induction as follows

$$\Gamma := \cdot \mid \Gamma, x_p : A$$

where x is the name of an unrestricted channel which can be used a maximum of p times, and A is a session type.

- The third and last part Θ contains assignments $x : A$ where x is a variable for terms and A is the base type associated with that variable. Formally, Θ is defined by induction as follows

$$\Theta := \cdot \mid \Theta, x : A$$

where x is a variable for terms, and A is a ground type.

Unrestricted environment have to be manipulated with great care while typing processes, in particular in all binary typing rules. This requires the introduction of a (partial) binary operation \boxplus on unrestricted type environments and a partial order relation \sqsubseteq , which are defined as follows:

Definition 3.6 (\boxplus Operation). The \boxplus operation takes as input two unrestricted type environments, Γ_1 and Γ_2 , and outputs an unrestricted type environment Γ such that: for all unrestricted channels $x_{s(\bar{n})} \in \Gamma$ there exists two polynomials $q(\bar{n})$ and $r(\bar{n})$ so that $x_{q(\bar{n})} \in \Gamma_1$ and $x_{r(\bar{n})} \in \Gamma_2$, and these polynomials are such that $s(\bar{n}) = q(\bar{n}) + r(\bar{n})$.

Definition 3.7 (\sqsubseteq Relation). Given two unrestricted type environment $\Gamma = \{x_1 \ p_1(\bar{n}) : A_1, \dots, x_m \ p_m(\bar{n}) : A_m\}$ and $\Phi = \{x_1 \ q_1(\bar{n}) : A_1, \dots, x_m \ q_m(\bar{n}) : A_m\}$ then $\Gamma \sqsubseteq \Phi$ if and only if $p_i(\bar{n}) \leq q_i(\bar{n})$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

Lemma 3.8 (\sqsubseteq is a Partial Order Relation). \sqsubseteq is a partial order relation between unrestricted type environments.

Type Judgments. A *type judgment* is an expression in the form

$$\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\mathcal{V}} P :: z : C$$

where Γ, Δ, Θ are the three aforementioned portions of the type environment, and P is a process offering a session of type C along the channel z . Polynomials can occur in type environments and types, and \mathcal{V} serves to declare all variables which might occur in those polynomials. As in π **DILL**, we assume that all channels and variables declared in Γ, Δ , and Θ are distinct and different from z .

Typing Rules. The minimal set of typing rules for terms, whose judgments are in the form $\Theta \vdash^{\mathcal{V}} a : B$, is defined in Figure 2.

$$\frac{\text{vars}(B), \text{vars}(\Theta) \subseteq \mathcal{V}}{\Theta, z : B \vdash^{\mathcal{V}} z : B} [Var]$$

$$\frac{\text{vars}(\Theta) \subseteq \mathcal{V}}{\Theta \vdash^{\mathcal{V}} \text{true} : \mathbb{B}} [Bool1] \quad \frac{\text{vars}(\Theta) \subseteq \mathcal{V}}{\Theta \vdash^{\mathcal{V}} \text{false} : \mathbb{B}} [Bool2]$$

$$\frac{|s| \leq p \quad \text{vars}(\Theta), \text{vars}(p) \subseteq \mathcal{V}}{\Theta \vdash^{\mathcal{V}} s : \mathbb{S}[p]} [String]$$

$$\frac{\text{typeof}(f) = B_1, \dots, B_m \rightarrow C \quad \Theta \vdash^{\mathcal{V}} v_i : B_i \{n \leftarrow p\} \quad \text{vars}(p) \subseteq \mathcal{V}}{\Theta \vdash^{\mathcal{V}} f_p(v_1, \dots, v_m) : C \{n \leftarrow p\}} [Fun]$$

Figure 2: Typing rules for terms

Typing rules for processes are in Figure 3.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, x:1; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: T} [T1L] \quad \frac{}{\Gamma; \cdot; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} 0 :: x:1} [T1R] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma; \Delta, y:A, x:B; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, x:A \otimes B; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} x(y).P :: T} [T \otimes L] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma_1 \boxplus \Gamma_2 \sqsubseteq \Gamma \quad \Gamma_1; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: y:A \quad \Gamma_2; \Delta'; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} Q :: x:B}{\Gamma; \Delta, \Delta'; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} (\nu y) x\langle y \rangle.(P \mid Q) :: x:A \otimes B} [T \otimes R] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma_1 \boxplus \Gamma_2 \sqsubseteq \Gamma \quad \Gamma_1; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: y:A \quad \Gamma_2; \Delta', x:B; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} Q :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, \Delta', x:A \multimap B; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} (\nu y) x\langle y \rangle.(P \mid Q) :: T} [T \multimap L] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma; \Delta, y:A; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: x:B}{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} x(y).P :: x:A \multimap B} [T \multimap R] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma_1 \boxplus \Gamma_2 \sqsubseteq \Gamma \quad \Gamma_1; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: x:A \quad \Gamma_2; \Delta', x:A; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} Q :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, \Delta'; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} (\nu x) (P \mid Q) :: T} [T_{cut}] \\
\\
\frac{p * \Gamma_1 \boxplus \Gamma_2 \sqsubseteq \Gamma \quad \Gamma_1; \cdot; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: y:A \quad \Gamma_2, u_p:A; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} Q :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} (\nu u) (!u(y).P \mid Q) :: T} [T_{cut!}] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, u_p:A; \Delta, y:A; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: T}{\Gamma, u_{p+1}:A; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} (\nu y) u\langle y \rangle.P :: T} [T_{copy}] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, u_p:A; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, x: !_p A; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P\{x/u\} :: T} [T!_p L] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma; \cdot; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} Q :: y:A}{p * \Gamma; \cdot; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} !x(y).Q :: x: !_p A} [T!_p R] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma; \Delta, x:A; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: T \quad \Gamma; \Delta, x:B; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} Q :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, x:A \oplus B; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} x.\text{case}(P, Q) :: T} [T \oplus L] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: x:A}{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} x.\text{inl}; P :: x:A \oplus B} [T \oplus R_1] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: x:B}{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} x.\text{inr}; P :: x:A \oplus B} [T \oplus R_2] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma; \Delta, x:A; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, x:A \& B; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} x.\text{inl}; P :: T} [T \& L_1] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma; \Delta, x:B; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, x:A \& B; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} x.\text{inr}; P :: T} [T \& L_2] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} P :: x:A \quad \Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} Q :: x:B}{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} x.\text{case}(P, Q) :: x:A \& B} [T \& R]
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta, x : \mathbb{S}[p] \vdash^v Q :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, x : \mathbb{S}[p]; \Theta \vdash^v x.Q :: T} [TSL] \\
\\
\frac{\Theta \vdash^v v : \mathbb{S}[p]}{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^v [x \leftarrow v] :: x : \mathbb{S}[p]} [TSR] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta, x : \mathbb{B} \vdash^v Q :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta, x : \mathbb{B}; \Theta \vdash^v x.Q :: T} [TBL] \\
\\
\frac{\Theta \vdash^v v : \mathbb{B}}{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^v [x \leftarrow v] :: x : \mathbb{B}} [TBR] \\
\\
\frac{\Theta \vdash^v a : B \quad \Gamma; \Delta; \Theta, x : B \vdash^v P :: T}{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^v \text{let } x = a \text{ in } P :: T} [T_{term_eval}] \\
\\
\frac{\Theta \vdash^v v : \mathbb{B} \quad \Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^v P :: x : A \quad \Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^v Q :: x : A}{\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^v \text{if } v \text{ then } P \text{ else } Q :: x : A} [T_{if_then_else}]
\end{array}$$

Figure 3: Typing rules for processes

3.6 Operational Semantics

Due to the introduction of function symbols into the calculus we obtain processes that can exchange values with different probabilities defined by the semantics of these function symbols. Consequently, the operational semantics turns out to be probabilistic and it is obtained through a complete redefinition of the operational semantic rules of the original calculus. Let us consider the definition of probability distribution discussed in Definition 3.2 and the notion of *Probabilistic Transition System (PLTS)* defined as follows

Definition 3.9 (Probabilistic Labeled Transition System). A Probabilistic Labeled Transition System (PLTS) on a set of labels A is a couple $PTS = (Q, \rightarrow)$ where:

- Q is a nonempty set of states
- $\rightarrow \subseteq Q \times A \times D(Q)$ is a transition relation. Given a transition $(q, \mu, \{q_1^{r_1}, \dots, q_m^{r_m}\}) \in \rightarrow$:
 - q is called root;
 - $\mu \in A$ is the label of the transition;
 - $\{q_1^{r_1}, \dots, q_m^{r_m}\}$ is a probability distribution on the states of Q .

Transition labels are given by:

$$\alpha = \tau \mid \overline{x\langle y \rangle} \mid x(y) \mid \overline{(\nu y)x\langle y \rangle} \mid x.inl \mid x.inr \mid \overline{x.inl} \mid \overline{x.inr} \mid x(val) \mid \overline{x\langle val \rangle}$$

where x, y are channels, val is a value and τ denotes an internal action. As in the work of Caires and Pfenning [10], we denote by $s(\alpha)$ the subject of α (e.g. x in $\overline{(\nu y)x\langle y \rangle}$). The transition system for the calculus is a triple $(\mathcal{P}, A, \rightarrow)$, where \mathcal{P} is the set of processes of the calculus and $\rightarrow \subseteq \mathcal{P} \times A \times D(\mathcal{P})$ is the minimal relationship defined by inference rules in Figure 4.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{P \xrightarrow{\alpha} \{Q_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}}{(\nu y) P \xrightarrow{\alpha} \{(\nu y) Q_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}} \text{ (RES)} \quad \text{with } y \notin \text{fn}(\alpha) \\
\\
\frac{P \xrightarrow{\alpha} \{Q_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}}{P \mid R \xrightarrow{\alpha} \{Q_i \mid R^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}} \text{ (PAR)} \quad \text{with } \text{bn}(\alpha) \cap \text{fn}(R) = \emptyset \\
\\
\frac{P \xrightarrow{\bar{\alpha}} \{P^1\} \quad Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} \{Q^1\}}{P \mid Q \xrightarrow{\tau} \{P^1 \mid Q^1\}} \text{ (COM)} \\
\\
\frac{P \xrightarrow{(\nu y) x(y)} \{P^1\} \quad Q \xrightarrow{x(y)} \{Q^1\}}{P \mid Q \xrightarrow{\tau} \{(\nu y) P^1 \mid Q^1\}} \text{ (CLOSE)} \quad \text{with } y \in \text{fn}(Q) \\
\\
\frac{P \xrightarrow{x(y)} \{Q^1\}}{(\nu y) P \xrightarrow{(\nu y) x(y)} \{Q^1\}} \text{ (OPEN)} \\
\\
\frac{}{x(y).P \xrightarrow{x(y)} \{P^1\}} \text{ (OUT)} \quad \frac{}{x(y).P \xrightarrow{x(w)} \{P\{w/y\}^1\}} \text{ (IN)} \\
\\
\frac{}{!x(y).P \xrightarrow{x(w)} \{P\{w/y\} \mid !x(y).P^1\}} \text{ (REP)} \\
\\
\frac{}{x.\text{inl}; P \xrightarrow{x.\text{inl}} \{P^1\}} \text{ (LOUT)} \quad \frac{}{x.\text{inr}; P \xrightarrow{x.\text{inr}} \{Q^1\}} \text{ (ROUT)} \\
\\
\frac{}{x.\text{case}(P, Q) \xrightarrow{x.\text{inl}} \{P^1\}} \text{ (LIN)} \quad \frac{}{x.\text{case}(P, Q) \xrightarrow{x.\text{inr}} \{Q^1\}} \text{ (RIN)} \\
\\
\frac{v \hookrightarrow \{val^1\}}{[x \leftarrow v] \xrightarrow{x(val)} 0} \text{ (OUT_value)} \quad \frac{v \hookrightarrow \{val^1\}}{x.P \xrightarrow{x(val)} \{P\{val/x\}^1\}} \text{ (IN_value)} \\
\\
\frac{a \hookrightarrow \{v_1^{r_1}, \dots, v_m^{r_m}\}}{\text{let } x = a \text{ in } P \xrightarrow{\tau} \{P\{v_1/x\}^{r_1}, \dots, P\{v_m/x\}^{r_m}\}} \text{ (EVAL_term)} \\
\\
\frac{}{\text{if true then } P \text{ else } Q \xrightarrow{\tau} \{P^1\}} \text{ (IF_true)} \quad \frac{}{\text{if false then } P \text{ else } Q \xrightarrow{\tau} \{Q^1\}} \text{ (IF_false)}
\end{array}$$

Figure 4: Operational semantics rules

4 Safety and Reachability

In this section we will prove some properties about the transition system induced by the reduction relation \rightarrow , as introduced in Section 3.4. Before delving into the details, a couple of remarks are in order. Although the relation \rightarrow is defined for arbitrary processes, we will be concerned with the reduction of typable *closed* processes namely those processes which can be typed under *empty* Θ and \mathcal{V} . In fact, reducing processes in which term variables occur free does not make sense when reduction is supposed to model computation (as opposed to equational reasoning), like here. When Θ or \mathcal{V} are empty, we simply omit them from the underlying typing judgment. Reduction being probabilistic, it is convenient to introduce some other reduction relation, all derived from \rightarrow :

Definition 4.1 (Auxiliary Reduction Relations). We first of all define a relation \mapsto on plain processes by stipulating that $P \mapsto R$ iff $P \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and $R \in S(\mathcal{D})$. We also need another reduction relation \Rightarrow as the monadic lifting of \rightarrow , thus a relation on process distributions:

$$\frac{R_i \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_i \text{ for every } i \in I}{\{R_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I} \Rightarrow \sum_{i \in I} r_i \cdot \mathcal{E}_i}$$

Finally, it is convenient to put in relation any process P with the distribution of *irreducible* processes to which P evaluates:

$$\frac{P \text{ is irreducible}}{P \Rightarrow \{P^1\}} \qquad \frac{P \rightarrow \{R_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I} \quad R_i \Rightarrow \mathcal{E}_i \text{ for every } i \in I}{P \Rightarrow \sum_{i \in I} r_i \cdot \mathcal{E}_i}$$

The relation \mapsto is perfectly sufficient to capture the qualitative aspects of the other reduction relations, e.g., if $P \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ then for every $R \in S(\mathcal{D})$ it holds that $P \mapsto R$. Indeed, in the rest of this section we will be concerned with \mapsto , only.

4.1 Subject Reduction

The property of Subject Reduction is the minimal requisite one asks to a type system, and says that types are preserved along reduction. In $\pi\mathbf{DIBLL}$, as in $\pi\mathbf{DILL}$, this property holds:

Theorem 4.2 (Subject Reduction). *If $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P :: z : C$ and $P \mapsto R$, then it holds that $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash R :: z : C$.*

Following [10], this property can be proved by carefully inspecting how P can be reduced to R , which can happen as a result of either communication between two subprocesses of P , the evaluation of a term occurring inside P , or the firing of a conditional construction. Many cases have to be analysed, some of them not being present in $\pi\mathbf{DILL}$. When proving subject reduction, one constantly work with type derivations. As in Caires and Pfenning's paper, we will use a linear and textual notation for type derivation, called proof terms, allowing for more compact description. More details on proof terms and their use in the subject reduction theorem can be found in [10]. Subject reduction is proved by closely following the path traced by Caires and Pfenning [10]; as a consequence, we proceed quite quickly, concentrating our attention on the differences with their proof:

- First, some cases of the subject reduction theorem in $\pi\mathbf{DILL}$ must be modified in such a way that they take into account the polynomial limitation introduced into the calculus. For example, the preservation lemmas related to replicated processes must be modified as follows:

Lemma 4.3. *Assume*

1. $\Gamma_1; \cdot \vdash D \rightsquigarrow P :: y : A$
2. $\Gamma_2, u_p : A; \Delta \vdash E \rightsquigarrow Q :: z : C$ with $Q \xrightarrow{(\nu u) u(y)} \{Q' \ 1\}$

Then

1. $\text{cut}^{\text{!}p} (D) (u.E) \equiv \equiv F$ for some F
2. $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash F \rightsquigarrow R :: z : C$ with $p * \Gamma_1 \boxplus \Gamma_2 \sqsubseteq \Gamma$ for some $R \equiv (\nu u) !u(x).P \mid (\nu y) (P\{y/x\} \mid Q')$

Lemma 4.4. *Assume*

1. $\Gamma_1; \cdot \vdash D \rightsquigarrow P :: x : A$
2. $\Gamma_2, u_p : A; \Delta \vdash E \rightsquigarrow Q :: z : C$ with $Q \xrightarrow{(\nu u) u(y)} \{Q' \ 1\}$

Then

1. $cut^{!p} (D) (u.E) \equiv \equiv cut^{!r} (D) (u.F)$ for some F
2. $\Gamma_2, u_r : A; \Delta \vdash F \rightsquigarrow R :: z : C$ for some $R \equiv (\nu y) (P\{y/x\} \mid Q')$

with $r = p$ or $r = p - 1$.

- Secondly, it is necessary to prove a preservation lemma relating to the action of input and output of a value which is defined as follows

Lemma 4.5. *Assume*

1. $\Gamma_1; \Delta_1 \vdash D \rightsquigarrow P :: x : G$ with $P \xrightarrow{x\langle val \rangle} \{P'^1\}$
2. $\Gamma_2; \Delta_2, x : G \vdash E \rightsquigarrow Q :: z : C$ with $Q \xrightarrow{x\langle val \rangle} \{Q'\{val/x\}^1\}$

Then

1. $cut (D) (x.E) \equiv \equiv F$ for some F
2. $\Gamma; \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash F \rightsquigarrow R :: z : C$ with $\Gamma_1 \boxplus \Gamma_2 \sqsubseteq \Gamma$ for some $R \equiv (\nu x) (P' \mid Q'\{val/x\})$

with $G ::= \mathbb{B} \mid \mathbb{S}[p]$

- Finally, in the proof by induction of the Theorem 4.2 it is also necessary to consider the cases relating to the term's evaluation process and the conditional process.

4.2 Progress

The type system $\pi\mathbf{DIBLL}$ also enforces a global progress property. Following [10] we define a *live* function for any process P as follows

Definition 4.6. For any process P

$$live(P) \text{ iff } P \equiv (\nu \bar{n}) (\pi.Q \mid R) \text{ for some } \pi.Q, R, \bar{n}$$

where $\pi.Q$ is a non replicated guarded process.

The progress property formalized in theorem 4.7 is proved by closely following the path traced by Caires and Pfenning [10].

Theorem 4.7 (Progress). *Let $\cdot; \cdot \vdash D \rightsquigarrow P :: x : 1$ then either P is terminated, P is a composition of replicated processes or there exists Q such that $P \mapsto Q$.*

As in Caires and Pfenning [10], the theorem 4.7 follows as a corollary from two auxiliary lemmas that have been modified in order to be adapted to the $\pi\mathbf{DIBLL}$ calculus. In particular, the inversion lemma that relates types with action labels is defined as follows

Lemma 4.8. *Let $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash D \rightsquigarrow P :: z : C$. If $live(P)$ then there is a Q such that either*

1. $P \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and $Q \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D})$, or
2. $P \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{D}$ and $Q \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D})$ for α where $s(\alpha) \in (z, \Gamma, \Delta)$. More: if $C = !_p A$ for some A then $s(\alpha) \neq z$

Moreover, the lemma that characterizes the typing of non live processes is modified as follows

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash D \rightsquigarrow P :: z : C$. If not $live(P)$ then*

1. $C = 1$ or $C = !_p C'$ for some p and C'

2. $(x : A_i) \in \Delta$ implies $A_i = 1$ or there is B_i with $A_i =!_{p_i} B_i$
3. $C =!_p C'$ implies $P \equiv (\nu \bar{x}) (!z(y).R' \mid R)$

The main differences respect to the proof given by Caires and Pfenning concern the polynomial limitation of the exponential type and the new constructs introduced into the syntax of the calculus.

4.3 Polytime Soundness

As already mentioned in the Introduction, Subject Reduction is not the only property one is interested in proving about reduction in π DIBLL. In fact, the latter has been designed to guarantee polynomial bounds on reduction time, as prescribed by the computational model of cryptography. But what do we mean by that, exactly? What is the underlying parameter on which the polynomial depends? In cryptography, computation time must be polynomial on the value of the so called *security parameter* which, as we hinted at already, is modelled by an element of \mathcal{V} . As a consequence, what we are actually referring to are bounds *parametric* on the value of the polynomial variables which P mentions in its type judgments, i.e. the \mathcal{V} in

$$\Gamma; \Delta \vdash^{\mathcal{V}} P :: z : C \quad (2)$$

Doing so, we have to keep in mind that process reduction is only defined on *closed* processes. We can thus proceed in three steps:

- We can first of all assign a \mathcal{V} -polynomial $\mathbf{W}(\pi)$ to every type derivation π with conclusion mentioning \mathcal{V} . This is done by induction on the structure of π .
- We then prove that for closed type derivations, $\mathbf{W}(\cdot)$ strictly decreases along process reduction, at the same time taking the cost of each reduction step into account. In other words, if π is closed and types P where $P \mapsto Q$, then a type derivation ξ for Q can be found such that $\mathbf{W}(\pi) \geq \mathbf{W}(\xi) + k$, where k is the cost of the reduction leading P to Q . (In most cases k is set to be 1, the only exception being the evaluation of a `let` operator, which might involve the evaluation of costly functions.)
- Finally, the previous two points must be proved to interact well, and this is done by showing that for every type derivation π with conclusion in the form (2) and for every \mathcal{V} -substitution ρ , there is a type derivation $\pi\rho$ with conclusion

$$\Gamma\rho; \Delta\rho \vdash P\rho :: z : C\rho$$

such that, crucially, $\mathbf{W}(\pi\rho) = \mathbf{W}(\pi)\rho$. In other words, the weight functor on type derivations commutes well with substitutions.

Altogether, this allows us to reach the following:

Theorem 4.10 (Polytime Soundness). *For every derivation π typing P there is a polynomial p_π such that for every substitution ρ , if $P\rho \mapsto^* Q$, then the overall computational cost of the aforementioned reduction is bounded by $p_\pi(\rho)$.*

We can thus claim that, e.g., every process ADV such that

$$\vdash^n ADV :: c : \mathbb{S}[p] \otimes \mathbb{S}[p] \otimes (\mathbb{S}[p] \multimap \mathbb{B})$$

can actually be evaluated in probabilistic polynomial time, since out of it one can type the processes R_0, R_1, R_{fun} computing the three components in ADV 's type. Moreover, since \mathcal{F} can be made large enough to be complete for PPT (see, e.g., [20]), one can also claim that all probabilistic (first-order) polytime behaviours can be captured from within π DIBLL.

5 Typable Processes and Their Probabilistic Behaviour

The properties we proved in the last section, although remarkable, are agnostic to the probabilistic nature of π DIBLL. It is now time to investigate the genuinely quantitative aspects of the calculus.

5.1 Confluence

It might seem weird that confluence can be proved for a calculus in which internal probabilistic choice is available. In fact, there are *two* forms of nondeterministic evolution π DIBLL processes can give rise to, the first one coming from the presence of terms which can evolve probabilistically, the second one instead due, as in π DILL, to the presence of parallel composition, itself offering the possibility of concurrent interaction. Confluence is meant to address the latter, not the former. More specifically, we would like to prove that whenever a typable process P evolves towards two distinct distributions \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} , the latter can be somehow unified.

Given two distributions of processes $\mathcal{D} = \{P_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}$ and $\mathcal{E} = \{Q_j^{r_j}\}_{j \in J}$, let us define the abbreviation $\mathcal{D} \mid \mathcal{E}$ for the distribution $\{P_i \mid Q_j^{r_i \cdot r_j}\}_{i \in I, j \in J}$ and the abbreviation $(\nu x) \mathcal{D}$ for the distribution $\{(\nu x) P_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}$. Furthermore, it is useful to introduce a transition relation on process distribution based on the transition relation of the PLTS (see Definition 3.9):

Definition 5.1 (Transition Relation on Process Distribution). Given a distribution $\mathcal{D} = \{R_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}$ and an action β , then we define $\xRightarrow{\beta}$ as the monadic lifting of $\xrightarrow{\beta}$, thus a relation on process distributions:

$$\frac{R_i \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{E}_i \text{ for every } i \in I}{\{R_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I} \xRightarrow{\beta} \sum_{i \in I} r_i \cdot \mathcal{E}_i}$$

In order to render the proof simpler, the confluence property can be defined on the operational semantics, defined in Section 3.6, as follows:

Theorem 5.2 (Confluence Theorem). *If $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P :: T$ and $\mathcal{D} \xleftarrow{\alpha} P \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{E}$ then one of the following conditions hold:*

1. $\alpha = \beta = \tau$ and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{E}$
2. $\exists a. s(\alpha) = s(\beta) = a$
3. there is \mathcal{F} such that $\mathcal{D} \xRightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{F} \xleftarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{E}$


Proof. By induction on the proof that $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P :: T$.

- **Case T_{cut} :** $P = (\nu x) (P_1 \mid P_2)$

In case of parallel composition between two processes there are several sub-cases to consider:

- Sub-case $P_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{H}_1$ and $P_1 \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{H}_2$

We are in case 3. By inductive hypothesis on P_1 there exists \mathcal{Z} such that $\mathcal{H}_1 \xRightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{Z} \xleftarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{H}_2$ and by case 1 of theorem 5.3 on $P = (\nu x) (P_1 \mid P_2)$ we have that $(\nu x) (P_1 \mid P_2) \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\nu x) (\mathcal{H}_1 \mid P_2)$ and $(\nu x) (P_1 \mid P_2) \xrightarrow{\beta} (\nu x) (\mathcal{H}_2 \mid P_2)$.



where $\mathcal{D} \xRightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{E} \xRightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{F}$ can be proved as follows


$$\frac{\frac{\langle \text{By inductive hypothesis} \rangle}{\mathcal{H}_1 \xRightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{Z}} \text{ (PAR)}}{\mathcal{H}_1 \mid P_2 \xRightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{Z} \mid P_2} \text{ (RES)}}{\mathcal{D} = (\nu x) (\mathcal{H}_1 \mid P_2) \xRightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{F} = (\nu x) (\mathcal{Z} \mid P_2)} \text{ (RES)}$$

$$\frac{\frac{\langle \text{By inductive hypothesis} \rangle}{\mathcal{H}_2 \xRightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{Z}} \text{ (PAR)}}{\mathcal{H}_2 \mid P_2 \xRightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{Z} \mid P_2} \text{ (RES)}}{\mathcal{E} = (\nu x) (\mathcal{H}_2 \mid P_2) \xRightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{F} = (\nu x) (\mathcal{Z} \mid P_2)} \text{ (RES)}$$

– Sub-case $P_2 \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{H}_1$ and $P_2 \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{H}_2$
Symmetric to the previous case.

– Sub-case $P_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{D}'$ and $P_2 \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{E}'$

This is the sub-case where P_1 and P_2 evolve separately and don't communicate with each other, so we are in case 3. By case 1 of theorem 5.3 on $P = (\nu x) (P_1 \mid P_2)$ we have that $(\nu x) (P_1 \mid P_2) \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\nu x) (\mathcal{D}' \mid P_2)$ and by case 2 of theorem 5.3 we have that $(\nu x) (P_1 \mid P_2) \xrightarrow{\beta} (\nu x) (P_1 \mid \mathcal{E}')$.



where $\mathcal{D} \xRightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{E} \xRightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{F}$ can be proved as follows


$$\frac{\frac{\langle \text{By hypothesis} \rangle}{P_2 \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{E}'} \text{ (PAR)}}{\mathcal{D}' \mid P_2 \xRightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{E}'} \text{ (RES)}}{\mathcal{D} = (\nu x) (\mathcal{D}' \mid P_2) \xRightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{F} = (\nu x) (\mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{E}')} \text{ (RES)}$$

$$\frac{\frac{\langle \text{By hypothesis} \rangle}{P_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{D}'} \text{ (PAR)}}{P_1 \mid \mathcal{E}' \xRightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{E}'} \text{ (RES)}}{\mathcal{E} = (\nu x) (P_1 \mid \mathcal{E}') \xRightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{F} = (\nu x) (\mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{E}')} \text{ (RES)}$$

– Sub-case $P_1 \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} \mathcal{D}'$ and $P_2 \xrightarrow{\gamma} \mathcal{E}'$:


This is the sub-case where P_1 and P_2 communicate with each other.

* If $\alpha = \beta = \tau$ and we are in case 1, then by case 3 of theorem 5.3 we have that $\mathcal{D}' = \{S^1\}$, $\mathcal{E}' = \{T^1\}$, $s(\gamma) = x$ and $(\nu x) (P_1 | P_2) \xrightarrow{\tau} \{(\nu x) (S | T)^1\} = (\nu x) (\mathcal{D}' | \mathcal{E}')$, so P_1 and P_2 communicate with each other on channel x .



where $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{E} = (\nu x) (\mathcal{D}' | \mathcal{E}')$.

* If $\alpha = \tau$ and $\beta \neq \tau$ and we are in case 3, then by case 3 of theorem 5.3 we have that $s(\gamma) = x$ and $(\nu x) (P_1 | P_2) \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu x) (\mathcal{D}' | \mathcal{E}')$. But $\beta \neq \tau$ so we have also that $P_2 \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{G}$ and by case 2 of theorem 5.3 holds that $(\nu x) (P_1 | P_2) \xrightarrow{\beta} (\nu x) (P_1 | \mathcal{G})$. Furthermore, by inductive hypothesis on P_2 we have that there exists \mathcal{Z} such that $\mathcal{E}' \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{Z} \xleftarrow{\gamma} \mathcal{G}$.



where $\mathcal{D} \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{F}$ can be proved as follows

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{<By inductive hypothesis>} \\
 \hline
 \mathcal{E}' \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{Z} \\
 \hline
 \mathcal{D}' | \mathcal{E}' \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{D}' | \mathcal{Z} \quad (\text{PAR}) \\
 \hline
 \mathcal{D} = (\nu x) (\mathcal{D}' | \mathcal{E}') \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{F} = (\nu x) (\mathcal{D}' | \mathcal{Z}) \quad (\text{RES})
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{<By hypothesis>} \\
 \hline
 \frac{P_1 \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} \mathcal{D}'}{P_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{D}'} \quad \frac{\text{<By inductive hypothesis>}}{\mathcal{G} \xrightarrow{\gamma} \mathcal{Z}} \\
 \hline
 P_1 | \mathcal{G} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{D}' | \mathcal{Z} \quad (\text{COM}) \\
 \hline
 \mathcal{E} = (\nu x) (P_1 | \mathcal{G}) \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{F} = (\nu x) (\mathcal{D}' | \mathcal{Z}) \quad (\text{RES})
 \end{array}$$

* If $\beta = \tau$ and $\alpha \neq \tau$ then the proof is symmetric to the previous case.

• Case $T_{cut'}$: $P = (\nu u) (!u(y).P_1 | P_2)$

In this case we have to consider the cases in which P_2 contains output operations on channel u (cases of interaction between $T_{cut'}$ and T_{copy}), so the cases where $!u(y).P_1 \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} \mathcal{D}'$ and $P_2 \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} \mathcal{E}'$.

– If $\alpha = \beta = \tau$ and we are in case 1, then by case 2 of theorem 5.4 on $(\nu u) (!u(y).P_1 | P_2)$ we have that $!u(y).P_1 \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} \{S^1\} = \mathcal{D}'$, $P_2 \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} \{T^1\} = \mathcal{E}'$, $s(\gamma) = u$ and

$(\nu u) (!u(y).P_1 \mid P_2) \xrightarrow{\tau} \{(\nu u) (S \mid T)^1\} = (\nu u) (\mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{E}')$, so $!u(y).P_1$ and P_2 communicate with each other on channel u .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & P = (\nu u) (!u(y).P_1 \mid P_2) & \\ \swarrow \tau & & \searrow \tau \\ \mathcal{D} = \{(\nu u) (S \mid T)^1\} & & \mathcal{E} = \{(\nu u) (S \mid T)^1\} \end{array}$$

where $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{E} = (\nu u) (\mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{E}')$.

- If $\alpha = \tau$ and $\beta \neq \tau$ and we are in case 3, then by case 2 of theorem 5.4 on $(\nu u) (!u(y).P_1 \mid P_2)$ we have that $!u(y).P_1 \xrightarrow{\gamma} \{S^1\} = \mathcal{D}'$, $P_2 \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} \{T^1\} = \mathcal{E}'$, $s(\gamma) = u$ and $(\nu u) (!u(y).P_1 \mid P_2) \xrightarrow{\tau} \{(\nu u) (S \mid T)^1\} = (\nu u) (\mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{E}')$. But $\beta \neq \tau$ so we have also that $P_2 \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{G}$ and by case 1 of theorem 5.4 holds that $(\nu u) (!u(y).P_1 \mid P_2) \xrightarrow{\beta} (\nu u) (!u(y).P_1 \mid \mathcal{G})$. Furthermore, by inductive hypothesis on P_2 we have that there exists \mathcal{Z} such that $\mathcal{E}' = \{T^1\} \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{Z} \xleftarrow{\bar{\gamma}} \mathcal{G}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & P = (\nu u) (!u(y).P_1 \mid P_2) & \\ \swarrow \tau & & \searrow \beta \\ \mathcal{D} = \{(\nu u) (S \mid T)^1\} = (\nu u) (\mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{E}') & & \mathcal{E} = (\nu u) (!u(y).P_1 \mid \mathcal{G}) \\ \searrow \beta & & \swarrow \tau \\ \mathcal{F} = (\nu u) (S \mid \mathcal{Z}) = (\nu u) (\mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{Z}) & & \end{array}$$


where $\mathcal{D} \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{F}$ can be proved as follows

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{<By inductive hypothesis>} \\ \hline \mathcal{E}' \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{Z} \\ \hline \mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{E}' \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{Z} \quad (\text{PAR}) \\ \hline \mathcal{D} = (\nu u) (\mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{E}') \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{F} = (\nu u) (\mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{Z}) \quad (\text{RES}) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{<By hypothesis>} \\ \hline !u(y).P_1 \xrightarrow{\gamma} \{S^1\} = \mathcal{D}' \quad \text{<By inductive hypothesis>} \\ \hline !u(y).P_1 \xrightarrow{\gamma} \mathcal{D}' \quad \mathcal{G} \xrightarrow{\bar{\gamma}} \mathcal{Z} \\ \hline !u(y).P_1 \mid \mathcal{G} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{Z} \quad (\text{COM}) \\ \hline \mathcal{E} = (\nu u) (!u(y).P_1 \mid \mathcal{G}) \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{F} = (\nu u) (\mathcal{D}' \mid \mathcal{Z}) \quad (\text{RES}) \end{array}$$


- Case $T \otimes L$ and $T \multimap R$: $P = x(y).P_1$
The only action that P can perform is the input action on channel x , so we are in case 2 where x is the channel such that $s(\alpha) = s(\beta) = x$.
- Case $T \otimes R$ and $T \multimap L$: $P = (\nu y) x(y).(P_1 \mid P_2)$
The only action that P can perform is the output action on channel x , $\overline{(\nu y) x(y)}$, so we are in case 2 where x is the channel such that $s(\alpha) = s(\beta) = x$.
- Case $T \oplus L$ and $T \& R$: $P = x.\text{case}(P_1, P_2)$

- *Sub-case* $\alpha = \beta = x.inl$:
So we are in case 2 where x is the channel such that $s(\alpha) = s(\beta) = x$.
- *Sub-case* $\alpha = \beta = x.inr$:
Equal to the previous sub-case.
- Case $T \oplus R_1$ and $T\&L_1$: $P = x.inl; P_1$
The only action that P can perform is the selection action $\overline{x.inl}$, so we are in case 2 where x is the channel such that $s(\alpha) = s(\beta) = x$.
- Case $T \oplus R_2$ and $T\&L_2$: $P = x.inr; P_1$
Equal to the previous case.
- Case TSL and TBL : $P = x.P_1$
The only action that P can perform is the input action on channel x , so we are in case 2 where x is the channel such that $s(\alpha) = s(\beta) = x$.
- Case TSR and TBR : $P = [x \leftarrow a]$
The only action that P can perform is the output action on channel x , so we are in case 2 where x is the channel such that $s(\alpha) = s(\beta) = x$.
- Case $T!_pR$: $P = !u(y).P_1$
The only action that P can perform is the input action on channel u , so we are in case 2 where u is the channel such that $s(\alpha) = s(\beta) = u$.
- Case T_{copy} : $P = (\nu y) u(y).P_1$
The only action that P can perform is the input action on channel u , so we are in case 2 where u is the channel such that $s(\alpha) = s(\beta) = u$.
- Case T_{term_eval} : $P = \text{let } x = a \text{ in } P_1$
The only action that P can perform is τ , so we are in case 1 because $\alpha = \beta = \tau$. Suppose that $\llbracket a \rrbracket = \{v_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}$, so we have that:



where $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{E}$.

- Case $T_{if_then_else}$: $P = \text{if } v \text{ then } P_1 \text{ else } P_2$
The only action that P can perform is τ , so we are in case 1 because $\alpha = \beta = \tau$.
- *Sub-case* $\llbracket v \rrbracket = \{\text{true}^1\}$



where $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{E}$.

- *Sub-case* $\llbracket v \rrbracket = \{\text{false}^1\}$
Symmetric to the previous sub-case.

□

Note that the cases relating to linear and exponential cut require the analysis of several sub-cases, to make the proof more readable these sub-cases have been proved in the following two lemmas:

Lemma 5.3. *If $\Gamma; \Delta_1, x : A \vdash P :: T, \Gamma; \Delta_2 \vdash Q :: T$ and $(\nu x) (P \mid Q) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{R}$, then one of the following cases holds:*

1. $P \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{R} = (\nu x) (\mathcal{S} \mid Q)$
2. $Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{R} = (\nu x) (P \mid \mathcal{S})$
3. $\alpha = \tau, P \xrightarrow{\bar{\beta}} \mathcal{S}, Q \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R} = (\nu x) (\mathcal{S} \mid \mathcal{T})$ and $s(\beta) = x$

Proof. By cases on the proof of $(\nu x) (P \mid Q) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{R}$.

- Case (PAR) applied to P:

In this case P and Q don't communicate with each other but P performs action α and reduces to \mathcal{S} , so we are in case 1 and we can prove $(\nu x) (P \mid Q) \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\nu x) (\mathcal{S} \mid Q)$ as follows

$$\frac{\frac{\langle \text{Depends on } P \rangle}{\frac{P \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{S}}{P \mid Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{S} \mid Q} \text{ (PAR)}}}{(\nu x) (P \mid Q) \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\nu x) (\mathcal{S} \mid Q)} \text{ (RES)}$$

and $s(\alpha) \neq x$ for rule (RES).

- Case (PAR) applied to Q:

We are in case 2 and the proof is symmetric to the previous case.

- Case (COM):

In this case P and Q communicate with each other, so we are in case 3 and we can prove $(\nu x) (P \mid Q) \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu x) (\mathcal{S} \mid \mathcal{T})$ as follows

$$\frac{\frac{\langle \text{Depends on } P \rangle}{P_1 \xrightarrow{\bar{\beta}} \mathcal{S}} \quad \frac{\langle \text{Depends on } Q \rangle}{P_2 \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{T}}}{\frac{P_1 \mid P_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{S} \mid \mathcal{T}}{(\nu x) (P_1 \mid P_2) \xrightarrow{\tau} (\nu x) (\mathcal{S} \mid \mathcal{T})} \text{ (RES)}} \text{ (COM)}$$

We just have prove that $s(\beta) = x$, so we have to prove that P and Q communicate with each other on channel x . This is true because, due to the restriction, we have that x is the only linear channel shared between P and Q and consequently it represents the only channel through which P and Q can communicate. □

Lemma 5.4. *If $\Gamma_1; \cdot \vdash P :: y : A, \Gamma_2, u_p : A; \Delta \vdash Q :: T$ and $(\nu u) (!u(y).P \mid Q) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{R}$, then one of the following cases holds:*

1. $Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{R} = (\nu u) (!u(y).P \mid \mathcal{S})$
2. $\alpha = \tau, !u(y).P \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{S}, Q \xrightarrow{\bar{\beta}} \mathcal{T}, s(\beta) = u$ and $\mathcal{R} = (\nu u) (\mathcal{S} \mid \mathcal{T})$

Proof. By cases on the proof of $(\nu u) (!u(y).P \mid Q) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{R}$.

- Case (*PAR*) applied to Q :

In this case $!u(y).P$ and Q don't communicate with each other but Q performs an action α and reduces to \mathcal{S} , so we are in case 1 and we can prove $(\nu u) (!u(y).P \mid Q) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{R}$ as follows

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\langle \text{Depends on } Q \rangle}{Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{S}}}{!u(y).P \mid Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} !u(y).P \mid \mathcal{S}} \text{ (PAR)}}{(\nu u) (!u(y).P \mid Q) \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\nu u) (!u(y).P \mid \mathcal{S})} \text{ (RES)}$$

and $s(\alpha) \neq x$ for rule (*RES*).

- Case (*COM*):

In this case $!u(y).P$ and Q communicate with each other, so we are in case 2. Note that the only action that $!u(y).P$ can perform is the input action on channel u , so $\beta = u(w)$. Consequently, Q must necessarily contain an output action on channel u , $\bar{\beta} = (\nu w) u(w)$, and Q reduces to \mathcal{S} . If $\beta = u(w)$ and $\bar{\beta} = (\nu w) u(w)$ then $s(\beta) = u$, so $!u(y).P$ and Q communicate with each other on channel u . We can prove $(\nu u) (!u(y).P \mid Q) \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\nu u) (\mathcal{T} \mid \mathcal{S})$ as follows

$$\frac{\text{(REP)} \frac{\frac{}{!u(y).P \xrightarrow{u(w)} \{P\{w/y\} \mid !u(y).P^1\} = \mathcal{T}}{\frac{\langle \text{Depends on } Q \rangle}{Q \xrightarrow{(\nu w) u(w)} \mathcal{S}} \text{ (COM)}}}{!u(y).P \mid Q \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{T} \mid \mathcal{S}} \text{ (RES)}}{(\nu u) (!u(y).P \mid Q) \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\nu u) (\mathcal{T} \mid \mathcal{S})} \text{ (RES)}$$

□

In other words, while probabilistic evolution coming from terms is unavoidable, the choice of how to reduce a typable process does not matter, in the spirit of what happens in sequential languages like the λ -calculus. Notice, however, that confluence holds in a very strong sense here, i.e., case 3 of the Theorem 5.2 has the flavour of the so-called diamond property.

Among the corollaries of confluence, one can prove that the way a typable process is reduced is irrelevant as far as the resulting distribution is concerned:

Corollary 1 (Strategy Irrelevance). *If $\Gamma; \Delta \vdash P :: T$ and $\mathcal{D} \Leftarrow P \Rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, then $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{E}$.*

In order to prove Corollary 1 we need to introduce some auxiliary notions related to reduction trees and then demonstrate something about them. Given a process P , we define a reduction tree as follows

Definition 5.5 (Reduction Tree). A Reduction Tree with root P is either:

- P itself
- A triple (P, α, \mathcal{D}) where \mathcal{D} is a distribution of reduction trees, such that $P \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{E}$ and for every $R \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{E})$ there is $T_R \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D})$ with root R and $\mathcal{D}(T_R) = \mathcal{E}(R)$.

Given a reduction tree T we can extend it by adding a reduction tree R to each leaf of T .

To adequately model the corollary by using the notion of reduction tree, we need to consider the reduction trees which are silent and normal, they are defined as follows

Definition 5.6 (Silent Reduction Tree). A reduction tree is silent if the only action occurring in it is τ .

Definition 5.7 (Silent and Normal Reduction Tree). A silent reduction tree is normal iff any leaf P of it is such that P cannot perform the τ -action.

Furthermore, we need a notion of kleene equivalence on reduction trees which is defined by induction as follows

Definition 5.8 (Kleene Equivalence on Reduction Trees). Two silent reduction trees T and R are kleene-equivalent if $\llbracket T \rrbracket = \llbracket R \rrbracket$, where the function $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ on a silent reduction tree is defined by induction as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket P \rrbracket &= \{P^1\} \\ \llbracket (P, \tau, \mathcal{E} = \{R_j^{r_j}\}_{j \in J}) \rrbracket &= \sum_{j \in J} \mathcal{E}(R_j) \cdot \llbracket R_j \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

Note that the output of $\llbracket T \rrbracket$ is the probability distribution of leaf processes reachable from a silent reduction tree T .

Finally, Corollary 1 follows directly from the following theorem on silent and normal reduction trees

Theorem 5.9. *Any two silent and normal reduction trees rooted at P are kleene-equivalent.*

Proof. We cannot prove the statement directly. Rather, we prove a strengthening of it, as follows

For every pair of silent reduction tree T and R rooted at P , we can extend T and R into Q and S respectively, in such a way that $\llbracket Q \rrbracket = \llbracket S \rrbracket$. Moreover, the height of Q and S is the same.

Let n be the height of T and m the height of R . By induction on $n + m$:

- *Base case $n + m = 0$:*

If $n + m$ is equal to 0, then we have that P is an inert process, $T = R = P$ and $n = m = 0$. So, if we take $Q = T$ and $S = R$ then we have that $\llbracket Q \rrbracket = \llbracket S \rrbracket = \{P^1\}$ and the height of Q and S is the same and equal to 0.

- *Inductive case $n + m$ with $n, m > 0$:*

Let us consider $T = (P, \tau, \mathcal{G})$ and $R = (P, \tau, \mathcal{H})$. In this case we have to consider two different sub-cases:

- If $P \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{D} = \{U_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}$, T and R are reduction trees such that for every $U_i \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D})$ there is:

- * $T_{U_i} \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\mathcal{G}(T_{U_i}) = \mathcal{D}(U_i)$
- * $R_{U_i} \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{H}(R_{U_i}) = \mathcal{D}(U_i)$

then we have that $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{H}$ and $T = R$. So, we take $Q = T$ and $S = R$ and we have that $\llbracket Q \rrbracket = \llbracket S \rrbracket$ and the height of Q and S is the same, both hold because $Q = S$.

- If $\mathcal{E} = \{V_j^{r_j}\}_{j \in J} \xleftarrow{\tau} P \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{D} = \{U_i^{r_i}\}_{i \in I}$, T and R are reduction trees such that:

- * for every $U_i \in \mathcal{D}$ there is a reduction tree T_{U_i} such that $T_{U_i} \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{D}(U_i) = \mathcal{G}(T_{U_i})$, where the height of T_{U_i} is equal to $n - 1$.
- * for every $V_j \in \mathcal{E}$ there is a reduction tree R_{V_j} such that $R_{V_j} \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{E}(V_j) = \mathcal{H}(R_{V_j})$, where the height of R_{V_j} is equal to $m - 1$.


By confluence we have that there exists \mathcal{F} such that $\mathcal{D} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{F} \xleftarrow{\tau} \mathcal{E}$. So, there exists a distribution of reduction trees \mathcal{Z} such that:

$$\mathcal{G}' = \{T_{U_i}^{r_i}\}_{i \in I} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{Z} = \{Z_k^{r_k}\}_{k \in K} \xleftarrow{\tau} \{R_{V_j}^{r_j}\}_{j \in J} = \mathcal{H}'$$

where the height of the reduction trees in \mathcal{Z} are equal to 0.

Let us consider the reduction trees $T_{U_i} = (U_i, \tau, \mathcal{G})$ with height equal to $n - 1$ and $T'_{U_i} = (U_i, \tau, \mathcal{Z})$ with height equal to 1.

Let us consider the reduction trees $R_{V_j} = (V_j, \tau, \mathcal{H})$ with height equal to $m - 1$ and $R'_{V_j} = (V_j, \tau, \mathcal{Z})$ with height equal to 1.



By inductive hypothesis on each pair T_{U_i} and T'_{U_i} with $i \in I$, we can:

- * Extend T_{U_i} by adding a reduction tree with height 1 to each leaf of T_{U_i} , obtaining Q_{1i} with height $(n-1)+1$.
- * Extend T'_{U_i} by adding a reduction tree with height $n-1$ to each leaf of T'_{U_i} , obtaining S_{1i} with height $(n-1)+1$.


in such a way that $\llbracket Q_{1i} \rrbracket = \llbracket S_{1i} \rrbracket$ and the height of Q_{1i} and S_{1i} is the same and equal to $(n-1)+1$.

By inductive hypothesis on each pair R_{V_j} and R'_{V_j} with $j \in J$, we can:

- * Extend R_{V_j} by adding a reduction tree with height 1 to each leaf of R_{V_j} , obtaining Q_{2j} with height $(m-1)+1$.
- * Extend R'_{V_j} by adding a reduction tree with height $m-1$ to each leaf of R'_{V_j} , obtaining S_{2j} with height $(m-1)+1$.

in such a way that $\llbracket Q_{2j} \rrbracket = \llbracket S_{2j} \rrbracket$ and the height of Q_{2j} and S_{2j} is the same and equal to $(m-1)+1$.

Let us consider the reduction trees Z_{1k} with height $n-1$ and Z_{2k} with height $m-1$ rooted at W_k .




By inductive hypothesis on each pair Z_{1k} and Z_{2k} with $k \in K$, we can:

- * Extend Z_{1k} by adding a reduction tree with height $m-1$ to each leaf of Z_{1k} , obtaining Q_{3k} with height $(m-1)+(n+1)$.
- * Extend Z_{2k} by adding a reduction tree with height $n-1$ to each leaf of Z_{2k} , obtaining S_{3k} with height $(m-1)+(n+1)$.

in such a way that $\llbracket Q_{3k} \rrbracket = \llbracket S_{3k} \rrbracket$ and the height of Q_{3k} and S_{3k} is the same and equal to $(m-1)+(n-1)$.

Let us consider the distribution of reduction trees $\mathcal{X} = \{X_{k_1}^{r_{k_1}}\}_{k_1 \in K_1}$ which is reached by Q_{1i} after performing n τ -actions, and the distribution of reduction trees $\mathcal{X}' = \{X'_{k_1}{}^{r_{k_1}}\}_{k_1 \in K_1}$ which is reached by S_{1i} after performing n τ -actions. Fixed $k_1 \in K_1$, the reduction trees in \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}' are rooted at the same processes because we have that $\llbracket Q_{1i} \rrbracket = \llbracket S_{1i} \rrbracket$ for every $i \in I$. Note that the height of X_{k_1} is equal to 0 and the height of X'_{k_1} is equal to $m-1$.

Symmetrically for the distributions reached by Q_{2j} and S_{2j} , we have $\mathcal{Y} = \{Y_{k_2}^{r_{k_2}}\}_{k_2 \in K_2}$ and $\mathcal{Y}' = \{Y'_{k_2}{}^{r_{k_2}}\}_{k_2 \in K_2}$ such that the height of Y_{k_2} is equal to 0 and the height of Y'_{k_2} is equal to $n-1$.



By inductive hypothesis on each pair X_{k_1} and X'_{k_1} with $k_1 \in K_1$, we can:


- * Extend X_{k_1} by adding a reduction tree with height $m - 1$ to each leaf of X_{k_1} , obtaining Q_{4k_1} with height $m - 1$.
- * Extend X'_{k_1} by adding a reduction tree with height 0 to each leaf of X'_{k_1} , obtaining S_{4k_1} with height $m - 1$.

in such a way that $\llbracket Q_{4k_1} \rrbracket = \llbracket S_{4k_1} \rrbracket$ and the height of Q_{4k_1} and S_{4k_1} is the same and equal to $m - 1$.

By inductive hypothesis on each pair Y_{k_2} and Y'_{k_2} with $k_2 \in K_2$, we can:


- * Extend Y_{k_2} by adding a reduction tree with height $n - 1$ to each leaf of Y_{k_2} , obtaining Q_{5k_2} with height $n - 1$.
- * Extend Y'_{k_2} by adding a reduction tree with height 0 to each leaf of Y'_{k_2} , obtaining S_{5k_2} with height $n - 1$.

in such a way that $\llbracket Q_{5k_2} \rrbracket = \llbracket S_{5k_2} \rrbracket$ and the height of Q_{5k_2} and S_{5k_2} is the same and equal to $n - 1$.



By construction of Q_{4k_1} and S_{4k_1} we have that $Q_{4k_1} = S_{4k_1}$ for every $k_1 \in K_1$. Symmetrically, $Q_{5k_2} = S_{5k_2}$ for every $k_2 \in K_2$.

In conclusion, we have that $Q_{4k_1} = S_{4k_1}$ can perform $m - 1$ τ -actions and reach $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_{6e}^{r_e}\}_{e \in E}$, and $Q_{5k_2} = S_{5k_2}$ can perform $n - 1$ τ -actions and reach $\mathcal{S} = \{S_{6e}^{r_e}\}_{e \in E}$.



We have that the height of Q_{6e} and S_{6e} is the same and equal to 0 and $\llbracket Q_{6e} \rrbracket = \llbracket S_{6e} \rrbracket$ because $\llbracket Q_{3k} \rrbracket = \llbracket S_{3k} \rrbracket$.

□

5.2 Relational Reasoning

Strategy irrelevance has a very positive impact on the definition of techniques for relational reasoning on typed processes. In this section, we are concerned precisely with introducing a form of observational equivalence, which turns out to have the shape one expects it to have in the realm of sequential languages. This is a simplification compared to similar notions from the literature on process algebras for the computational model of cryptography [38].

When defining observation equivalence, we want to dub two processes as being equivalent when they behave *the same* in *any environment*. We thus have to formalize environments and observable behaviours. The former, as expected, is captured through the notion of a *context*, which here takes the form of a term in which a single occurrence of the hole $[\cdot]$ is allowed to occur *in linear position* (i.e. outside the scope of the any replication).

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}[\cdot] ::= & [\cdot] \mid \mathcal{C}[\cdot] \mid Q \mid P \mid \mathcal{C}[\cdot] \mid (\nu y) \mathcal{C}[\cdot] \mid x\langle y \rangle. \mathcal{C}[\cdot] \mid x(y). \mathcal{C}[\cdot] \mid \\
& x.\mathcal{C}[\cdot] \mid x.\text{inl}; \mathcal{C}[\cdot] \mid x.\text{inr}; \mathcal{C}[\cdot] \mid x.\text{case}(\mathcal{C}[\cdot], Q) \mid x.\text{case}(P, \mathcal{C}[\cdot]) \mid \\
& \text{let } x = a \text{ in } \mathcal{C}[\cdot] \mid \text{if } v \text{ then } \mathcal{C}[\cdot] \text{ else } Q \mid \text{if } v \text{ then } P \text{ else } \mathcal{C}[\cdot]
\end{aligned}$$

On top of contexts, it is routine to give a type system deriving judgments in the form

$$\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} \mathcal{C}[(\Xi; \Psi; \Phi \vdash^{\vee} \cdot :: T)] :: U$$

guaranteeing that whenever a process P is such that $\Xi; \Psi; \Phi \vdash^{\vee} P :: T$, it holds that $\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\vee} \mathcal{C}[P] :: U$.

Talking about observations, what we are interested in observing here is the *probability* of certain very simple events. For example, in Section 2 we hint at the fact that the experiment PrivK^{eav} can be naturally modelled as a process offering a channel carrying just a boolean value. This will very much inform our definition, which we will now give. Suppose that $\vdash^{\vee} P :: x : \mathbb{B}$. After having instantiated P through a substitution $\rho : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, some internal reduction steps turn $P\rho$ into a (unique) distribution \mathcal{D} of irreducible processes, and the only thing that can happen at that time is that a boolean value b is produced in output along the channel x . We write $P \downarrow_x^{\rho} b$ for this probabilistic event, itself well defined thanks to Theorem 4.10, Corollary 1 (which witness the existence and unicity of \mathcal{D} , respectively), and Theorem 4.7.

Finally, we are ready to give the definition of observational equivalence.

Definition 5.10 (Observational Equivalence). Let P and Q two processes such that $\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\mathcal{V}} P, Q :: T$. We say that P and Q are observationally equivalent iff for every context $\mathcal{C}[\cdot]$ such that $\vdash^{\mathcal{V}} \mathcal{C}[(\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\mathcal{V}} \cdot :: T)] :: x : \mathbb{B}$, there is a negligible function $\varepsilon : (\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{[0,1]}$ such that for every ρ it holds that $|\Pr[\mathcal{C}[P] \downarrow_x^\rho v] - \Pr[\mathcal{C}[Q] \downarrow_x^\rho v]| \leq \varepsilon(\rho)$. In that case we write $\Gamma; \Delta; \Theta \vdash^{\mathcal{V}} P \cong Q :: T$, or just $P \cong Q$ if this does not cause any ambiguity.

Proving pairs of processes to be observationally equivalent is notoriously hard, due to the presence of a universal quantification over all contexts. However, the fact π **DIBLL** enjoys confluence facilitates the task. In particular, we can prove certain pairs of processes to be observationally equivalent, and this will turn out to be very useful in the next section. The first equation we can prove is the commutation of input prefixes and the **let** construct:

$$x(y).\mathbf{let} z = t \mathbf{in} P \cong \mathbf{let} z = t \mathbf{in} x(y).P \quad (3)$$

In order to do this we have to introduce some auxiliary notions:

- \mathcal{D}_{let} Distribution is the distribution obtained by fully evaluating $\mathbf{let} z = t \mathbf{in} P$.
- P_{in}^{let} stand for $\mathbf{let} z = t \mathbf{in} x(y).P$.
- P_{let}^{in} stand for $x(y).\mathbf{let} z = t \mathbf{in} P$.
- A τ -normal process N is a process that cannot perform the τ -action.

Given P_{in}^{let} and P_{let}^{in} we define the following relation on process distribution:

Definition 5.11. Given two processes P_{in}^{let} and P_{let}^{in} , the two distributions \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} are $\mathcal{D} \stackrel{P_{in}^{let}, P_{let}^{in}}{\approx} \mathcal{E}$ iff there are contexts $\mathcal{C}_1[\cdot], \dots, \mathcal{C}_n[\cdot], \mathcal{B}_1[\cdot], \dots, \mathcal{B}_m[\cdot]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} &= \{\mathcal{C}_1[P_{in}^{let}]^{r_1}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n[P_{in}^{let}]^{r_n}\} + q_1 \cdot \mathcal{B}_1[\mathcal{D}_{let}] + \dots + q_m \cdot \mathcal{B}_m[\mathcal{D}_{let}] + \mathcal{F} \\ \mathcal{E} &= \{\mathcal{C}_1[P_{let}^{in}]^{r_1}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n[P_{let}^{in}]^{r_n}, \mathcal{B}_1[P_{let}^{in}]^{q_1}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_m[P_{let}^{in}]^{q_m}\} + \mathcal{F} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the commutation of input prefixes and the let construct is proved as follows

Lemma 5.12. $\mathbf{let} z = t \mathbf{in} x(y).P \cong x(y).\mathbf{let} z = t \mathbf{in} P$ where $y \notin FV(t)$

Proof.

- Given P_{in}^{let} and P_{let}^{in} , let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be the distributions such that $\mathcal{D} \stackrel{P_{in}^{let}, P_{let}^{in}}{\approx} \mathcal{E}$.
- By theorem 5.13, we can reduce the two distributions \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} , whose processes that compose them have bool type, in such a way that

$$\mathcal{D} \xrightarrow{\tau}^* \mathcal{G} \quad \mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\tau}^* \mathcal{H} \quad \mathcal{G} \stackrel{P_{in}^{let}, P_{let}^{in}}{\approx} \mathcal{H}$$

- By Subject Reduction Theorem (see Theorem 4.2) we know also that the reduction between processes preserves types, being the reduction between distribution based on the reduction between processes then we have that \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} are typed by bool.
- The distributions \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} are typed by bool so they can perform the output action on the channel with the same probability of obtaining true and false, so we can conclude that $\mathbf{let} z = t \mathbf{in} x(y).P \cong x(y).\mathbf{let} z = t \mathbf{in} P$.

□

Lemma 5.13. Given P_{in}^{let} and P_{let}^{in} , let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be the distributions such that $\mathcal{D} \stackrel{P_{in}^{let}, P_{let}^{in}}{\approx} \mathcal{E}$, then we can reduce \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} into \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} such that:

$$\mathcal{G} \stackrel{P_{in}^{let}, P_{let}^{in}}{\approx} \mathcal{H}$$

Proof.

- By definition we have that \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} are in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D} &= \{\mathcal{C}_1[P_{in}^{let}]^{r_1}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n[P_{in}^{let}]^{r_n}\} + q_1 \cdot \mathcal{B}_1[\mathcal{D}_{let}] + \dots + q_m \cdot \mathcal{B}_m[\mathcal{D}_{let}] + \mathcal{F} \\ \mathcal{E} &= \{\mathcal{C}_1[P_{let}^{in}]^{r_1}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n[P_{let}^{in}]^{r_n}, \mathcal{B}_1[P_{let}^{in}]^{q_1}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_m[P_{let}^{in}]^{q_m}\} + \mathcal{F}\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_1[\cdot], \dots, \mathcal{C}_n[\cdot], \mathcal{B}_1[\cdot], \dots, \mathcal{B}_m[\cdot]$ are contexts.

- Let us show now that all the elements in the support of the two distributions which are not in normal form and can be evaluated (not necessarily in normal form) so as to obtain the distributions \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} that we need. Let us distinguish a few cases:

- All the elements in the support of \mathcal{F} which are not in a normal form can be rewritten and we thus obtain that $\mathcal{F} \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ for a certain distribution \mathcal{P} .
- Now, $\mathcal{C}_i[P_{in}^{let}] \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D})$ cannot be τ -normal and, based on where it can be reduced, we distinguish two sub-cases:

- * We can have a τ -reduction inside the context \mathcal{C}_i , and in this case we have $\mathcal{R}_1^i, \dots, \mathcal{R}_n^i, r_1^i, \dots, r_n^i$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}_i[P_{in}^{let}] &\xrightarrow{\tau} \sum_{j=1}^n r_j^i \cdot \mathcal{R}_j^i[P_{in}^{let}] \\ \mathcal{C}_i[P_{let}^{in}] &\xrightarrow{\tau} \sum_{j=1}^n r_j^i \cdot \mathcal{R}_j^i[P_{let}^{in}]\end{aligned}$$

- * The only τ -reduction available in $\mathcal{C}_i[P_{in}^{let}]$ is the one in P_{in}^{let} , but then we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}_i[P_{in}^{let}] &\xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{C}_i[\mathcal{D}_{let}] \\ \mathcal{C}_i[P_{let}^{in}] &\equiv \mathcal{C}_i[P_{let}^{in}]\end{aligned}$$

- Again, $\mathcal{B}_i[\mathcal{D}_{let}]$ cannot be τ -normal but the processes in the support of \mathcal{D}_{let} are τ -normal, being all inputs. Then, we can distinguish two sub-cases:
 - * We can have a τ -reduction inside \mathcal{B}_i , and in this case we can proceed as above
 - * We can have that \mathcal{B}_i passes a value to the processes in \mathcal{D}_{let} , in this case, however, there is a distribution \mathcal{Q}_{let} such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}_i[\mathcal{D}_{let}] &\xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{B}_i[\mathcal{Q}_{let}] \\ \mathcal{B}_i[P_{let}^{in}] &\xrightarrow{\tau}^* \mathcal{B}_i[\mathcal{Q}_{let}]\end{aligned}$$

We can do that because when P_{let}^{in} receive a value as a input then it can behave exactly as P_{in}^{let} .

- Putting everything together, we see that \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} can indeed be found.

□

As innocuous as it seems, the Equation 3 is not validated by, e.g., probabilistic variations on bisimilarity, being (essentially) the classic counterexample to the coincidence of the latter and trace equivalence.

Furthermore, an equation scheme which can be easily proved to be sound for observational equivalence is the one induced by so-called *Kleene-equivalence*. Formally, Kleene-equivalence is defined as follows

Definition 5.14 (Kleene-equivalence). Two processes, P and Q are kleene equivalent if $\llbracket P \rrbracket = \llbracket Q \rrbracket$, where the function $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ on processes is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket N \rrbracket &= \{N^1\} \\ \llbracket P \rrbracket &= \sum_{j \in J} r_j \cdot \llbracket R_j \rrbracket \quad \text{if } P \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{E} = \{R_j^{r_j}\}_{j \in J} \end{aligned}$$

In order to prove that if P and Q are Kleene equivalent then $P \cong Q$, we have to introduce a new relation on process distributions and then proving something about it. Specifically, the relation on process distributions is defined as follows

Definition 5.15 (Relation on Process Distributions). Given two processes P and Q , two distributions \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} are $\mathcal{D} \stackrel{P,Q}{\approx} \mathcal{E}$ iff there are contexts $\mathcal{C}_1[\cdot], \dots, \mathcal{C}_n[\cdot]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} &= \{\mathcal{C}_1[P]^{r_1}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n[P]^{r_n}\} + \mathcal{F} \\ \mathcal{E} &= \{\mathcal{C}_1[Q]^{r_1}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n[Q]^{r_n}\} + \mathcal{F} \end{aligned}$$

The property we want to prove on the latter relationship between process distributions is formalized as follows

Lemma 5.16. *If P and Q are kleene equivalent and $\mathcal{D} \stackrel{P,Q}{\approx} \mathcal{E}$ then \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} can be reduced into \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} respectively such that \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} are τ -normal distributions and $\mathcal{G} \stackrel{P,Q}{\approx} \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof.

- By definition 5.15 we have that \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} are distributions in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} &= \{\mathcal{C}_1[P]^{r_1}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n[P]^{r_n}\} + \mathcal{F} \\ \mathcal{E} &= \{\mathcal{C}_1[Q]^{r_1}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n[Q]^{r_n}\} + \mathcal{F} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_1[\cdot], \dots, \mathcal{C}_n[\cdot]$ are contexts.

- Let us consider the elements $\mathcal{C}_i[P] \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D})$ with $i \in I$ which are not τ -normal. If $\{\mathcal{C}_i[P]\}_{i \in I}$ are not τ -normal, then they can perform all τ -actions and $\mathcal{D} \xrightarrow{\tau}^* \mathcal{G}$ where \mathcal{G} is a τ -normal process distribution which has the following form:

$$\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{C}_k[P]^{r_k}\}_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} - I} + \mathcal{O}$$

where \mathcal{O} contains \mathcal{F} and all the processes to which the $\{\mathcal{C}_i[P]\}_{i \in I}$ have been reduced to.

- The same reasoning can be applied to \mathcal{E} , obtaining $\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\tau}^* \mathcal{H}$ where \mathcal{H} is a τ -normal process distribution which has the following form:

$$\mathcal{H} = \{\mathcal{C}_h[Q]^{r_h}\}_{h \in \{1, \dots, n\} - J} + \mathcal{S}$$

where \mathcal{S} contains \mathcal{F} and all the processes to which the elements $\mathcal{C}_j[Q] \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{E})$ with $j \in J$, which are not τ -normal, have been reduced to.

- By hypothesis we have that P and Q are kleene equivalent, so we have that $\llbracket P \rrbracket = \llbracket Q \rrbracket$, this means that $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{S}$. We have also that $\{1, \dots, n\} - I = \{1, \dots, n\} - J$ because the contexts in $\mathcal{C}_1[\cdot], \dots, \mathcal{C}_n[\cdot]$ which are not τ -normal are the same in both cases. So, by definition 5.15, we can conclude that $\mathcal{G} \stackrel{P,Q}{\approx} \mathcal{H}$.

□

Now we are ready to prove the main property as follows

Lemma 5.17. *If P and Q are kleene equivalent, then $P \cong Q$.*

Proof.

- By kleene equivalence (see 5.14) between P and Q we can say that for all contexts $\mathcal{C}[\cdot]$ we have that $\{\mathcal{C}[P]^1\} \stackrel{P,Q}{\approx} \{\mathcal{C}[Q]^1\}$.
- We can reduce the two distributions $\{\mathcal{C}[P]^1\}$ and $\{\mathcal{C}[Q]^1\}$, whose processes that compose them have bool type, to a τ -normal form by lemma 5.16 in such a way that

$$\{\mathcal{C}[P]^1\} \xRightarrow{\tau}^* \mathcal{G} \quad \{\mathcal{C}[Q]^1\} \xRightarrow{\tau}^* \mathcal{H} \quad \mathcal{G} \stackrel{P,Q}{\approx} \mathcal{H}$$

- By theorem 4.2 we know also that the reduction between processes preserves types, being the reduction between distribution based on the reduction between processes then we have that \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} are typed by bool.
- The distributions \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} are typed by bool and τ -normal therefore they can only perform the output action on the channel with the same probability of obtaining true and false, so we can conclude that $P \cong Q$.

□

An equation in which the approximate nature of observational equivalence comes into play is the following one:

$$x.[y \leftarrow x] \cong x.\text{let } z = \text{rand in let } b = \text{eq}(x, z) \text{ in if } b \text{ then } [y \leftarrow x] \text{ else } [y \leftarrow z]$$

The two involved processes, both offering a session on y having type $\mathbb{S}[n]$ by way of a session with the same type on x , behave the same, except on *one* string z chosen at random.

6 A Simple Cryptographic Proof

In this section, we put relational reasoning at work on the simple example we introduced in Section 2. More specifically, we will show that the notion of observational equivalence from Section 5.2 is sufficient to prove Equation 1 where \sim is taken to be the non-contextual version of observational equivalence. We will do that for an encryption scheme Π_g such that Enc is based on a pseudorandom generator g , i.e. Enc returns on input a message m and a key k the ciphertext $xor(m, g(k))$. When can such a function g be said to be pseudorandom? This happens when the output of g is indistinguishable from a truly random sequence of the same length. This, in turn, can be spelled out as the equation

$$OUTPR_g \cong OUTR \tag{4}$$

where $OUTR$ is a process outputting a random string of polynomial length of a channel out , while $OUTPR_g$ is a process outputting a *pseudorandom* such string produced according to g .

We now want to prove, given (4), that (1) holds, the latter now taking the following form:

$$\nu \text{adv} . (\text{PRIVK}_\Pi \mid \text{ADV}) \sim \text{FAIRFLIP}_{exp}$$

Following the textbook proof of this result (see, e.g., [32]), we can structure the proof as a construction, out of ADV , of a distinguisher D_{ADV} having type $out : \mathbb{S}[p] \vdash^n D_{ADV} :: exp : \mathbb{B}$ such that the following two equations hold:

$$\nu \text{out} . (\text{OUTPR}_G \mid D_{ADV}) \sim \nu \text{adv} . (\text{PRIVK}_\Pi \mid \text{ADV}) \tag{5}$$

$$\nu \text{out} . (\text{OUTR} \mid D_{ADV}) \sim \text{FAIRFLIP} \tag{6}$$

Actually, the construction of D_{ADV} is very simple, being it the process $\nu adv.(PRIVKEYK_{OTP} \mid ADV)$, where OTP is the so-called one-time pad encryption scheme, and $PRIVKEYK_{OTP}$ is the process obtained from $PRIVK_{OTP}$ by delegating the computation of the key to a subprocess:

$PRIVKEYK_{OTP} :$ <input <math=""/> m_0 from adv ; <input <math=""/> m_1 from adv ; let $b = flipcoin()$ in <input <math=""/> k from out ;	let $c = xor(k, m_b)$ in output c to adv ; <input <math=""/> g from adv ; let $r = eq(g, b)$ in output r to exp ;
---	---

By construction, and using some of the equations we mentioned in Section 5, one can prove that $PRIVK_{\Pi_g} \cong \nu out.(OUTPR_g \mid PRIVKEYK_{OTP})$, from which by congruence of \cong one derives Equation (5):

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu out.(OUTPR_G \mid D_{ADV}) &\equiv \nu out.(OUTPR_G \mid (\nu adv.(PRIVKEYK_{\Pi} \mid ADV))) \\
&\equiv \nu adv.(\nu out.(OUTPR_G \mid PRIVKEYK_{\Pi}) \mid ADV) \\
&\sim \nu adv.(PRIVK_{\Pi} \mid ADV).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $PRIVK_{OTP} \cong \nu out.(OUTR \mid PRIVKEYK_{OTP})$, one can similarly derive that

$$\nu out.(OUTR_g \mid D_{ADV}) \sim \nu adv.(PRIVK_{OTP} \mid ADV).$$

It is well known, however, that the OTP encryption scheme is perfectly secure, which yields Equation (6).

7 Conclusion

Contributions. In this paper, we show how the discipline of session types can be useful in modelling and reasoning about cryptographic experiments. The use of sessions, in particular, allows to resolve the intrinsic nondeterminism of process algebras without the need for a scheduler, thus simplifying the definitional apparatus. The keystone to that is a confluence result, from which it follows that the underlying reduction strategy (i.e. the scheduler) does not matter: the distribution of irreducible processes one obtains by reducing a typable process is unique. The other major technical results about the introduced system of session types are a polynomial bound on the time necessary to reduce any typable process, together with a notion of observational equivalence through which it is possible to faithfully capture computational indistinguishability, a key notion in modern cryptography.

Future Work. This work, exploratory in nature, leaves many interesting problems open. Currently, the authors are investigating the applicability of $\pi\mathbf{DIBLL}$ to more complex experiments than that considered in Section 6. In particular, the ability to build higher-order sessions enables the modelling of adversaries which have access to an oracle, but also of experiments involving such adversaries. As an example, an *active* adversary $ACTADV$ to an encryption scheme would have type

$$\vdash^n ACTADV :: c : !_q(\mathbb{S}[p] \multimap \mathbb{S}[p]) \multimap \mathbb{S}[p] \otimes \mathbb{S}[p] \otimes (\mathbb{S}[p] \multimap \mathbb{B})$$

reflecting the availability of an oracle, modelled as a server for the encryption function, which can crucially be accessed only a polynomial amount of times. Being able to capture *all* those adversaries within our calculus seems feasible, but requires extending the grammar of processes with an iterator combinator. On the side of relational reasoning, notions of equivalence are being studied which are sound with respect to observational equivalence, that is, included in it, at the same time being handier and avoiding any universal quantification on all contexts. The use of logical relations or bisimulation, already known in $\pi\mathbf{DILL}$ [10] can possibly be adapted to

π **DIBLL**, but does not allow to faithfully capture linearity, falsifying equations (like (3)) which are crucial in concrete proofs. As a consequence, we are considering forms of trace equivalence and distribution-based bisimilarity [18], since the latter are known to be fully abstract with respect to (linear) observational equivalence, in presence of effects.

Related Work. We are certainly not the first to propose a formal calculus in which to model cryptographic constructions and proofs according to the computational model. The so called Universal Composability model (UC in the following), introduced by Canetti more than twenty years ago [11, 12], has been the subject of many investigations aimed at determining if it is possible to either simplify it or to capture it by way of a calculus or process algebra (e.g. [13, 34, 33, 5]). In all the aforementioned works, a tension is evident between the need to be expressive, so as to capture UC proofs, and the need to keep the model simple enough, masking the details of probability and complexity as much as possible. π **DIBLL** is too restrictive to capture UC in its generality, but on the other hand it is very simple and handy. As for the approaches based on process algebras, it is once again worth mentioning the series of works due to Mitchell et al. and based, like ours, on a system of types derived from Bounded Linear Logic [35, 37, 38]. As already mentioned, the main difference is the absence of a system of behavioural types such as session types, which forces the framework to be complex, relying on a further quantification on probabilistic schedulers, which is not needed here. Another very interesting line of work is the one about imperative calculi, like the one on which tools like **EasyCrypt** are based [7, 6]. Recently, there have been attempts at incepting some form of probabilistic behaviour into session types, either by allowing for probabilistic internal choice in multiparty sessions [4], or by enriching the type system itself, by making it quantitative in nature [31]. The system π **DIBLL** is certainly more similar to the former, in that randomization does not affect the type structure but only the process structure. This design choice is motivated by our target applications, namely cryptographic experiments, in which randomization affects *which* strings protocols and adversaries produce, rather than their high-level behaviour. Indeed, our calculus is closer in spirit to some previous work on cryptographic constructions in λ -calculi [39] and logical systems [30], although the process algebraic aspects are absent there. Finally, session types have also been used as an handy tool guaranteeing security properties like information flow or access control (see, e.g., [14, 8]), which are however different from those we are interested at here.

References

- [1] Martín Abadi, Ricardo Corin, and Cédric Fournet. Computational secrecy by typing for the pi calculus. In *Proc. of APLAS 2006*, volume 4279 of *LNCS*, pages 253–269. Springer, 2006.
- [2] Martín Abadi and Cédric Fournet. Mobile values, new names, and secure communication. In *Proc. of POPL 2001*, pages 104–115. ACM, 2001.
- [3] Martín Abadi and Andrew D. Gordon. A calculus for cryptographic protocols: The spi calculus. *Inf. Comput.*, 148(1):1–70, 1999.
- [4] Bogdan Aman and Gabriel Ciobanu. Probabilities in session types. In *Proc. of FROM 2019*, volume 303 of *EPTCS*, pages 92–106, 2019.
- [5] Manuel Barbosa, Gilles Barthe, Benjamin Grégoire, Adrien Koutsos, and Pierre-Yves Strub. Mechanized proofs of adversarial complexity and application to universal composability. In *Proc. of CCS 2021*, pages 2541–2563. ACM, 2021.
- [6] Gilles Barthe, Thomas Espitau, Benjamin Grégoire, Justin Hsu, Léo Stefanescu, and Pierre-Yves Strub. Relational reasoning via probabilistic coupling. In *Proc. of LPAR 2015*, volume 9450 of *LNCS*, pages 387–401. Springer, 2015.

- [7] Gilles Barthe, Cédric Fournet, Benjamin Grégoire, Pierre-Yves Strub, Nikhil Swamy, and Santiago Zanella Béguelin. Probabilistic relational verification for cryptographic implementations. In *Proc. of POPL 2014*, pages 193–206. ACM, 2014.
- [8] Massimo Bartoletti, Iliaria Castellani, Pierre-Malo Deniérou, Mariangiola Dezani-Ciancaglini, Silvia Ghilezan, Jovanka Pantovic, Jorge A. Pérez, Peter Thiemann, Bernardo Toninho, and Hugo Torres Vieira. Combining behavioural types with security analysis. *J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program.*, 84(6):763–780, 2015.
- [9] Laura Bocchi, Tzu-Chun Chen, Romain Demangeon, Kohei Honda, and Nobuko Yoshida. Monitoring networks through multiparty session types. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 669:33–58, 2017.
- [10] Luís Caires and Frank Pfenning. Session types as intuitionistic linear propositions. In *Proc. of CONCUR 2010*, pages 222–236. Springer, 2010.
- [11] Ran Canetti. Universally composable security: A new paradigm for cryptographic protocols. In *Proc. of FOCS 2001*, pages 136–145. IEEE Computer Society, 2001.
- [12] Ran Canetti. Universally composable security. *J. ACM*, 67(5):28:1–28:94, 2020.
- [13] Ran Canetti, Alley Stoughton, and Mayank Varia. Easyuc: Using easycrypt to mechanize proofs of universally composable security. In *Proc. of CSF 2019*, pages 167–183. IEEE, 2019.
- [14] Sara Capecchi, Iliaria Castellani, Mariangiola Dezani-Ciancaglini, and Tamara Rezk. Session types for access and information flow control. In *Proc. of CONCUR 2010*, volume 6269 of *LNCS*, pages 237–252. Springer, 2010.
- [15] David Castro-Perez, Raymond Hu, Sung-Shik Jongmans, Nicholas Ng, and Nobuko Yoshida. Distributed programming using role-parametric session types in go: statically-typed endpoint apis for dynamically-instantiated communication structures. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 3(POPL):29:1–29:30, 2019.
- [16] Hubert Comon-Lundh, Masami Hagiya, Yusuke Kawamoto, and Hideki Sakurada. Computational soundness of indistinguishability properties without computable parsing. In *Proc. of ISPEC 2012*, volume 7232 of *LNCS*, pages 63–79. Springer, 2012.
- [17] Ugo Dal Lago and Paolo Di Giamberardino. On session types and polynomial time. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 26(8):1433–1458, 2016.
- [18] Ugo Dal Lago and Francesco Gavazzo. Resource transition systems and full abstraction for linear higher-order effectful programs. In *Proc. of FSCD 2021*, volume 195 of *LIPICs*, pages 23:1–23:19.
- [19] Ugo Dal Lago and Martin Hofmann. Bounded linear logic, revisited. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 6(4), 2010.
- [20] Ugo Dal Lago, Sara Zuppiroli, and Maurizio Gabbriellini. Probabilistic recursion theory and implicit computational complexity. *Sci. Ann. Comput. Sci.*, 24(2):177–216, 2014.
- [21] Ornela Dardha, Elena Giachino, and Davide Sangiorgi. Session types revisited. *Information and Computation*, 256:253–286, 2017.
- [22] Danny Dolev and Andrew Yao. On the security of public key protocols. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 29(2):198–208, 1983.
- [23] Jean-Yves Girard. Linear logic. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 50:1–102, 1987.
- [24] Jean-Yves Girard, Andre Scedrov, and Philip J Scott. Bounded linear logic: a modular approach to polynomial-time computability. *Theoretical computer science*, 97(1):1–66, 1992.

- [25] Oded Goldreich. *Foundations of Cryptography: Volume 1*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [26] Martin Hofmann and Philip J. Scott. Realizability models for bll-like languages. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 318(1-2):121–137, 2004.
- [27] Kohei Honda. Types for dyadic interaction. In *Proc. of CONCUR 1993*, pages 509–523. Springer, 1993.
- [28] Hans Hüttel, Ivan Lanese, Vasco T Vasconcelos, Luís Caires, Marco Carbone, Pierre-Malo Deniérou, Dimitris Mostrous, Luca Padovani, António Ravara, Emilio Tuosto, et al. Foundations of session types and behavioural contracts. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 49(1):1–36, 2016.
- [29] Atsushi Igarashi, Peter Thiemann, Yuya Tsuda, Vasco T. Vasconcelos, and Philip Wadler. Gradual session types. *J. Funct. Program.*, 29:e17, 2019.
- [30] Russell Impagliazzo and Bruce M. Kapron. Logics for reasoning about cryptographic constructions. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 72(2):286–320, 2006.
- [31] Omar Inverso, Hernán C. Melgratti, Luca Padovani, Catia Trubiani, and Emilio Tuosto. Probabilistic analysis of binary sessions. In *Proc. of CONCUR 2020*, volume 171 of *LIPICs*, pages 14:1–14:21, 2020.
- [32] Jonathan Katz and Yehuda Lindell. *Introduction to modern cryptography*. CRC press, 2020.
- [33] Ralf Küsters, Max Tuengerthal, and Daniel Rausch. The IITM model: A simple and expressive model for universal composability. *J. Cryptol.*, 33(4):1461–1584, 2020.
- [34] Kevin Liao, Matthew A. Hammer, and Andrew Miller. Ilc: a calculus for composable, computational cryptography. In *Proc. of PLDI 2019*, pages 640–654. ACM, 2019.
- [35] Patrick Lincoln, John C. Mitchell, Mark Mitchell, and Andre Scedrov. Probabilistic polynomial-time equivalence and security analysis. In *Proc. of FM 1999*, volume 1708 of *LNCS*, pages 776–793. Springer, 1999.
- [36] John C. Mitchell, Mark Mitchell, and Andre Scedrov. A linguistic characterization of bounded oracle computation and probabilistic polynomial time. In *Proc. of FOCS 1998*, pages 725–733. IEEE Computer Society, 1998.
- [37] John C. Mitchell, Ajith Ramanathan, Andre Scedrov, and Vanessa Teague. Probabilistic polynomial-time process calculus and security protocol analysis. In *Proc. LICS 2001*, pages 3–5. IEEE Computer Society, 2001.
- [38] John C. Mitchell, Ajith Ramanathan, Andre Scedrov, and Vanessa Teague. A probabilistic polynomial-time process calculus for the analysis of cryptographic protocols. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 353(1-3):118–164, 2006.
- [39] David Nowak and Yu Zhang. A calculus for game-based security proofs. In *Proc. of RPROVSEC 2010*, volume 6402 of *LNCS*, pages 35–52. Springer, 2010.
- [40] Jorge A Pérez, Luís Caires, Frank Pfenning, and Bernardo Toninho. Linear logical relations and observational equivalences for session-based concurrency. *Information and Computation*, 239:254–302, 2014.
- [41] Paula Severi, Luca Padovani, Emilio Tuosto, and Mariangiola Dezani-Ciancaglini. On sessions and infinite data. In Alberto Lluch-Lafuente and José Proença, editors, *Proc. of COORDINATION 2016*, volume 9686 of *LNCS*, pages 245–261. Springer, 2016.

- [42] Bernardo Toninho, Luís Caires, and Frank Pfenning. Dependent session types via intuitionistic linear type theory. In *Proc. ACM Principles and practices of declarative programming 2011*, pages 161–172, 2011.
- [43] Philip Wadler. Propositions as sessions. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 47(9):273–286, 2012.