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Abstract

We look at composition of (possibly nonterminating) high-level programs over situation calculus action theories. Specifically the problem we look at is as follows: given a library of available ConGolog programs and a target program not in the library, verify whether the target program executions be realized by composing fragments of the executions of the available programs; and, if so, synthesize a controller that does the composition automatically. This kind of composition problems have been investigated in the AI and CS literature, but always assuming finite state settings. Here, instead, we investigate the issue in the context of infinite domains that may go through an infinite number of states as a result of actions. Obviously in this context the problem is undecidable. Nonetheless, by exploiting recent results in the AI literature, we devise a sound and well characterized technique to actually solve the problem.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the composition of possibly nonterminating high-level programs over action theories. We assume:

• an action theory, expressed in the situation calculus [Reiter, 2001], describing how actions affect the state of affairs of the domain of interest;
• a library of available high-level programs over such action theory, expressed in (a significant fragment of) ConGolog [De Giacomo et al., 2000], and which may stand for behavioral descriptions of actual devices (e.g., a controller for an elevator or a coffee delivery robot), the capabilities or logic of some services (e.g., a web-service), or even descriptions of typical operational procedures in the domain (e.g., a business process); and
• a target program over the same action theory that is not in the library, expressed again in ConGolog, which may stand for a behavior of interest that does not directly correspond to any of the available modules.

The problem we investigate is as follows: verify whether, for a given initial configuration of the world, expressed as a possibly infinite database (i.e., a categorical theory), the target program executions can be “realized” by composing fragments of the executions of the available programs so as to mimic the (virtual) transitions (i.e., elementary steps) of the target program at each point in time. If so, synthesize a delegator that does the composition automatically.

1 Notice that ConGolog has already been considered in the context of web-service composition in [McIlraith and Son, 2002], by exploiting procedural abstraction. But the form of composition studied there is profoundly different from the one considered here.

This kind of composition problem has been investigated first in the CS literature, e.g., [Berardi et al., 2003; Traverso and Pistore, 2004; Lustig and Vardi, 2009], and then also in AI, e.g., [De Giacomo and Sardina, 2007; Sardina et al., 2008], but always assuming finite state settings. Here, instead, we investigate the problem in a setting that allows us to consider potentially infinite domains that may go through an infinite number of states as actions are performed.

Specifically, we formally define what it means for a set of ConGolog programs to mimic the transitions of a target program, by using a greatest fixpoint second-order formula based on a suitable adaptation for our context of the formal notion of simulation [Milner, 1971; Sardina et al., 2008].

Obviously, in checking such fixpoint formula over ConGolog programs is undecidable in general. Nonetheless, by exploiting recent ideas in the AI literature [Pirri and Reiter, 1999; Kelly and Pearce, 2007; Claßen and Lakemeyer, 2008], we are able to devise a sound and well characterized procedure to solve the problem. The technique is based on three basic ingredients: (i) computation of the simulation through fixpoint approximates [Tarski, 1955], hoping to be able to compute the fixpoint in a finite number of iterations; (ii) use of the characteristic graphs introduced by Claßen and Lakemeyer [2008], to finitely cope with the potential infinite branching of ConGolog programs (due to ConGolog’s πx.δ construct); and (iii) use of regression [Reiter, 2001] to get formulas that talk only about the initial situation, thus allowing us to drop the action theory and the second-order foundational axioms for situations altogether.

2 A notable exception is [Berardi et al., 2005], where programs were executed over a database which may go through an infinite set of configuration. However, the techniques proposed there were again based on being able, under suitable assumptions, to reduce the setting to a finite state one.
2 Preliminaries

The situation calculus is a logical language specifically designed for representing and reasoning about dynamically changing worlds [Reiter, 2001]. All changes to the world are the result of actions, which are terms in the language. We denote action variables by lower case letters a, action names by capital letters A, and non-variable action terms by α, possibly with subscripts. A possible world history is represented by a term called a situation. The constant S₀ is used to denote the initial situation where no actions have yet been performed. Sequences of actions are built using the function symbol do, such that do(a, s) denotes the successor situation resulting from performing action a in situation s. Relations whose truth values vary from situation to situation are called fluents, and are denoted by predicate symbols taking a situation term as their last argument (e.g., Holding(x, s)).

Within the language, one can formulate action theories that describe how the world changes as the result of the available actions. Here, we concentrate on basic action theories [Pirri and Reiter, 1999; Reiter, 2001]. A basic action theory D is the union of the following disjoint sets: the foundational, domain independent, axioms of the situation calculus (Σ); preconditions stating when actions can be legally performed (Dₚₒₛₛ); successor state axioms describing how fluents change between situations (Dₜₛₛ); unique name axioms for actions (Dₙₛₛ); and axioms describing the initial configuration of the world (Dₛ₀). A special predicate Pos(a, s) is used to state that action a is executable in situation s; preconditions in Dₚₒₛₛ characterize such predicate. In turn, successor state axioms encode the causal laws of the world being modelled; they take the place of the so-called effect axioms, but can also provide a solution to the frame problem. For example, in a music matchbox setting, a song is pending to be played if the it has just been requested, via the matchbox interface, and it is available in some CD, or the song was already pending for playback and the matchbox has not just started playing it.³

\[
Pend(song, do(a, s)) \equiv (a = requestSong(song) \land (\exists cd) InDisk(song, cd)) \lor Pendo(s, s) \land a \neq playBack(song).
\]

Once the dynamical system is modeled as a basic action theory, one can pose queries about its behavior or evolution as logical entailment queries relative to the theory.

High-Level Programs. To represent and reason about complex actions or processes obtained by suitably executing atomic actions, various so-called high-level programming languages have been defined, such as Golog [Levesque et al., 1997], which includes usual structured constructs and constructs for nondeterministic choices, ConGolog [De Giacomo et al., 2000], which extends Golog to accommodate concurrency, and IndiGolog [Sardina et al., 2004], which provides means for interleaving planning and execution.

Here we concentrate on a fragment of ConGolog, which includes most constructs of the language, with the notable exception of (recursive) procedures:

³Here, we implicitly quantify all free variables universally.

Above, α is an action term, possibly with parameters, and φ is situation-suppressed formula, that is, a formula in the language with all situation arguments in fluents suppressed. We denote by φ[s] the situation calculus formula obtained from φ by restoring the situation argument s into all fluents in φ.

Note the presence of nondeterministic constructs, which allow the loose specification of programs by leaving “gaps” that ought to be resolved by the executor. Program δ₁ ∥ δ₂ allows for the nondeterministic choice between programs δ₁ and δ₂; while π.x.δ executes program δ for some nondeterministic choice of a legal binding for variable x (observe that such a choice is, in general, unbounded). δ⁺ performs δ zero or more times. Program δ₁ ∥ δ₂ expresses the concurrent execution (interpreted as interleaving) of programs δ₁ and δ₂.

As an example, consider the nondeterministic controller δmatchbox for a music matchbox that serves users’ requests:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{while True do} \\
&\text{if } \neg \text{Playing} \land (\exists s) \text{Pending}(s) \text{ then} \\
&\text{if } \text{Pending}(s) \land \text{InDisk}(s, disk) \text{ then} \\
&\text{selectSong}(s); \\
&\text{loadDisk}(disk); \\
&\text{playBack}(song) \\
&\text{else wait} \\
&\text{endWhile}
\end{align*}
\]

That is, when the matchbox is idle and there is a song pending to be played, the controller selects a song that has been requested and the CD in which the song is, loads such CD, and starts the playback. When the matchbox is playing a song or there are no pending songs to be played, the device just waits. A full music system is modeled by taking program δmusic = (δmatchbox ∥ δEXO), where δEXO = (πa. Exog(a)?) a* represents the (external) environment, capable of executing any exogenous action (e.g., requestSong(song)) at anytime.

Formally, the semantics of ConGolog is specified in terms of single-steps, using the following two predicates [De Giacomo et al., 2000]: (i) Final(δ, s), which holds if program δ may legally terminate in situation s; and (ii) Trans(δ, s, δ’, s’), which holds if one step of program δ in situation s may lead to situation s’ with δ’ remaining to be executed. The definitions of Trans and Final for the constructs used in this paper are shown below:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Final}(α, s) &\equiv False \\
\text{Final}(φ, s) &\equiv φ[s] \\
\text{Final}(δ₁ ∥ δ₂, s) &\equiv \text{Final}(δ₁, s) \lor \text{Final}(δ₂, s) \\
\text{Final}(δ₁ ∥ δ₂, s) &\equiv \text{Final}(δ₁, s) \lor \text{Final}(δ₂, s) \\
\text{Final}(π.x.δ, s) &\equiv \exists x. \text{Final}(δ, s) \\
\text{Final}(δ⁺, s) &\equiv True \\
\text{Final}(δ₁ ∥ δ₂, s) &\equiv \text{Final}(δ₁, s) \land \text{Final}(δ₂, s)
\end{align*}
\]
Trans(\alpha, s, \delta', s') \equiv s' = do(\alpha, s) \land \text{Poss}(\alpha, s) \land \delta' = \text{True}.

Trans(\phi\delta, s, \delta', s') \equiv \text{False}

Trans(\delta_1; \delta_2, s, \delta', s') \equiv
\text{Trans}(\delta_1, s, \delta_1', s') \land \delta' = \delta_1' \lor
\text{Final}(\delta_1, s) \land \text{Trans}(\delta_2, s, \delta', s')

Trans(\delta_1[\delta_2, s, \delta', s']) \equiv
\text{Trans}(\delta_1, s, \delta_1', s') \lor \text{Trans}(\delta_2, s, \delta', s')

Trans(\pi(x).\delta, s, \delta', s') \equiv \exists x.\text{Trans}(\delta, s, \delta', s')

Trans(\delta^*, s, \delta', s') \equiv \text{Trans}(\delta, s, \delta', s') \land \delta' = \delta^* \lor \delta^*

Trans(\delta_1[\delta_2, s, \delta', s']) \equiv
\text{Trans}(\delta_1, s, \delta_1', s') \land \delta' = \delta_1' \lor \delta_2 \lor
\text{Trans}(\delta_2, s, \delta_2', s') \land \delta' = \delta_1' \lor \delta_2

Following [Clâben and Lakemeyer, 2008], and differently form [De Giacomo et al., 2000], the test construct \phi\delta here does not yield any transition, but it is final when satisfied. In other words, it is a synchronous version of the original test construct (it does not allow interleaving). With this choice, the ConGolog constructs for conditional and while-loop, which are based on synchronous tests, are immediately definable in terms of the other constructs: if \phi then \delta_1 else \delta_2 endIf = \phi \delta_1 \land \neg \phi \delta_2 and while \phi do \delta endWhile = (\phi \delta)^* \lor \neg \phi^?.

Also, in this paper, we shall require that in programs of the form \pi(x).\delta, the variable x occurs in some non-variable action term in \delta, disallowing the occurrence of x only in tests and as an action itself. In this way, \pi(x).\delta acts as a construct for the nondeterministic choices of action parameters. Finally, we assume wlog that each occurrence of the construct \pi(x).\delta in a program uses a unique fresh variable x—no two occurrences of such a construct use the same variable.

Observe that, since we are not considering recursive procedures here, we do not need to resort to a second-order definition of \text{Trans} and \text{Final}, though we still need to consider programs as terms, cf. [De Giacomo et al., 2000].

From now on, we will denote by Axioms the situation calculus action theory D that formalizes the domain of interest plus the axioms for \text{Trans} and \text{Final}.

3 ConGolog Composition

The problem we are interested in is the following. Given a basic action theory, available programs \delta_0^0, \ldots, \delta_0^n, and a target ConGolog program \delta^0, we want to "execute" \delta^0 by concurrently executing \delta_0^1, \ldots, \delta_0^n, while controlling their interleaving in a suitable way. In other words, we provide to the client the ability of writing virtual target programs over a specific domain of interest, but instead of executing such target programs directly, we actually execute programs from a library of available programs in a way that mimics the target.

As an example, consider the target program \delta_t = [(a; b; d; c); h]^* in an environment where, for simplicity, all actions are always possible. Such program is virtual, and assume all we can do is to execute concurrently two available programs at hand, namely, \delta_1 = (a; h \mid c \mid a; b)^* and \delta_2 = (b \mid d; h)^*. It is not difficult to see that, by intelligently scheduling \delta_1 and \delta_2, one can realize any execution of \delta_t. For instance, if \delta_t starts by requesting the execution of action a, then one should execute \delta_1 one step by selecting its first nondeterministic program (a; h); after that \delta_1 may only request action b followed by h, which can be realized by advancing programs \delta_2 first and \delta_1 then; finally, \delta_1 may next either stop, in which case both \delta_1 and \delta_2 can be legally stopped as well, or start again, in which case the two available programs can be restarted. An analogous argument applies when \delta_t happens to request action d initially. What is important to note here is that we do not assume to have control on the way that \delta_t may (virtually) execute, while we do have control on the way the available programs are executed. In other words, we have no control on the interpreter executing \delta_1 and \delta_1's nondeterminism is therefore "devilish," while we have total control on the interpreter executing the concurrent program \delta_1 \ldots \parallel \delta_n, whose nondeterminism is "angelic."

To side-step the issue of offline vs. online execution of programs (cf. Conclusion), we assume here to have complete information on the initial situation, that is, \mathcal{D}_{\alpha_0} is indeed a possibly infinite database. Observe that while this is obviously a simplification it does not help wrt the main difficulty of this setting: programs can be legally nonterminating (they describe processes), and the number of configurations (pairs program-situation) a program goes through is potentially infinite. Indeed, the number of states the domain of interest goes through as actions are performed are infinite and unrestricted, if not by the action theory. Also, the states of the programs can be infinite due to the presence of the \pi(x).\delta construct, which introduces unbounded branching—there are potentially infinitely many possible remaining programs after program \pi(x).a(x): \delta(x) executes its first action a(x), namely, \delta(i) for each possible term i in the domain. This implies that the techniques coming from model checking-based verification and synthesis that have emerged as effective lately, and been used for instance in [Sardina et al., 2008], cannot be applied.

To formally define what it means for a program to "mimic" another one, we rely on the formal notion of simulation [Milner, 1971; Sardina et al., 2008]. In our setting, such a notion can be captured by a second-order formula that makes use of \text{Trans} and \text{Final}. Specifically, we define the predicate Sim(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s) as the largest predicate S satisfying the condition \Theta[S](\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s):

Sim(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s) \equiv
\exists S. (S(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s) \land
\forall \delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s. \Theta[S](\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s)),

where \Theta[S](\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s) stands for the following formula:

S(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s) \rightarrow
\text{Final}(\delta_t, s) \land \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{Final}(\delta_i, s) \land
\forall \delta_t, s. \text{Trans}(\delta_t, s, \delta_t', s') \rightarrow
\bigvee_{i=1}^n [\exists \delta_t', \exists \delta_i, s. \text{Trans}(\delta_t, s, \delta_t', s') \land
\text{Sim}([\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s]).

By Knaster&Tarski Theorem [Tarski, 1955], the predicate Sim has the following notable properties:

Proposition 1. Sim satisfies the condition \Theta, that is,
\forall \delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s. \Theta[Sim](\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s)
is valid. Moreover, every predicate $S$ satisfying the condition $\Theta$ is “smaller” than $Sim$, that is, the following is valid:

$$S(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s) \rightarrow Sim(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s).$$

Intuitively, the formula $Sim(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s)$ says that (i) if the target program $\delta_t$ may legally terminate in $s$, so can all the available programs $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n$; and that (ii) whatever transition the target program $\delta_t$ may make in the current situation $s$, such a transition can be “mimicked” by one of the available programs $\delta_i$ while the other programs remain still, and at the next step the same is true again, and again forever.

Once we have defined $Sim$, it is easy to write a formula that actually returns the “mimicking” transition:

$$SimTrans_1(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s, \delta_t', s', \delta_t') \equiv$$

$$\begin{align*}
& \text{Trans}(\delta_t, s, \delta_t', s') \land \text{Trans}(\delta_i, s, \delta_i', s') \land \\
& Sim(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{t-1}, \delta_t', \delta_{t+1}, \ldots, \delta_n, s').
\end{align*}$$

$SimTrans_1(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s, \delta_t', s', \delta_t')$ says that a target transition from $(\delta_t, s)$ to $(\delta_t', s')$ can be mimicked by legally advancing the $i$-th available program to $\delta_t'$. By the definitions of $Sim$ and $SimTrans$ we get:

**Proposition 2.** The following formula is valid:

$$Sim(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s) \rightarrow$$

$$\left(\forall \delta_t'. s'. Trans(\delta_t, s, \delta_t', s') \rightarrow \left(\forall_{n=1}^{\infty} \exists \delta_t', SimTrans_1(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s, \delta_t', s', \delta_t')\right)\right).$$

Hence, if $Sim(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s)$ is currently true, then we can use the formulas $SimTrans$ to choose in how to mimic the target transitions now, knowing that, in the future, we will be able to continue mimicking the target. This is the base of an interpreter that executes the target program by actually delegating the target transitions to the available programs, thus realizing the composition. The interpreter, or delegator, is shown in Procedure 1.

**Procedure 1 DELEGATOR($\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n$)**

1. if $\neg Sim(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, S_0)$ then fail
2. end if
3. loop
4. if Final($\delta_t$, $s$) then
5. Ask whether to stop
6. if stop then
7. exit
8. end if
9. end if
10. if \begin{align*}
& \exists \delta_t', s'. \text{Trans}(\delta_t, s, \delta_t', s') \\
& \text{Sim}(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s, \delta_t', s', \delta_t')
\end{align*} then
11. Ask $\delta_t'$, $s'$ s.t. $\text{Trans}(\delta_t, s, \delta_t', s')$.
12. Choose $i, \delta_t$ s.t. $\text{SimTrans}(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s, \delta_t', s', \delta_t')$
13. Execute the transition from $(\delta_t, s)$ to $(\delta_t', s')$
14. $\delta_t := \delta_t'$, $s' = s'$, $\delta_t := \delta_t'$
15. end loop

Observe that the choices at line 12 are guaranteed to be possible being $Sim(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, S_0)$ true. Also, observe that, with the assumption of complete information on the initial situation, all checks on formulas consist in formula evaluation, though over a possibly infinite model (cf. Conclusion).

## 4 The Technique

It remains to find means to check for $Sim(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s)$. Notice that this is a hard problem in general even if we have complete information on the initial database. The difficulty is that the interpretation structure to be considered is in general infinite, while direct algorithms to check for simulation work only for finite cases.

In order to tackle the infinite case, we follow an approach inspired by [Pirri and Reiter, 1999; Kelly and Pearce, 2007; Claßen and Lakemeyer, 2008]: reduce the verification of a second-order formula wrt the whole basic action theory, to the verification of a first-order formula that is uniform in the situation argument, which, in turn, can be regressed to a formula that only talks about the initial situation.

In particular, we devise a procedure that extracts a first-order formula that is true on the initial database iff the target program can be simulated by the available programs. Since such a procedure reduces checking a second-order formula to checking a first-order one, it may not terminate in general.

The procedure is based on three ingredients, namely, fixpoint approximates, regression, and programs’ characteristic graphs. We detail each of these ingredients below.

**Sim approximates.** Approximates $Sim_k(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s)$, for $k \geq 0$ say that program $\delta_t$ may be simulated by programs $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n$ in situation $s$ for $k$ steps. Such approximates can be formally defined by induction as follows:

$$Sim_0(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s) \equiv$$

$$\left(Final(\delta_t, s) \rightarrow \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n} Final(\delta_i, s)\right).$$

$$Sim_{k+1}(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s) \equiv$$

$$Sim_k(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s) \land$$

$$\left(\forall \delta_t', s'. \text{Trans}(\delta_t, s, \delta_t', s') \rightarrow \left(\forall_{n=1}^{\infty} \exists \delta_t', SimTrans_1(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s, \delta_t', s', \delta_t')\right)\right).$$

Informally, $Sim_0$ merely requires that whenever program $\delta_t$ is final, so are all programs $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n$; while $Sim_{k+1}$ requires that $\delta_t$ is in $k$-simulation with $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n$ and that every transition of $\delta_t$ can be mimicked by some available program $\delta_i$ and be in $k$-simulation in the resulting next step.

By Knaster&Tarski classical result on fixpoints approximates [Tarski, 1955], we get:

**Proposition 3.** If there exists a $k \geq 0$ such that

$$Sim_k(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s) \equiv Sim_{k+1}(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s),$$

then

$$Sim_k(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s) \equiv Sim(\delta_t, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, s).$$

We observe that while there is no guarantee that a finite $k$ exists for the antecedent of this proposition to hold, if it does exist, then one can use approximates to compute $Sim$.

**Regression.** One of the most important features of basic action theories is the existence of a sound and complete regression mechanism for answering queries about situations resulting from performing a sequence of actions [Pirri and Reiter, 1999; Reiter, 2001]. In a nutshell, the so-called regression
operator $\mathcal{R}^*$ reduces a formula $\phi$ about some future situation to an equivalent formula $\mathcal{R}^*[\phi]$ about the initial situation $S_0$, by basically substituting fluent relations with the right-hand side formula of their successor state axioms.

In this paper, we shall use a simple one-step only variant $\mathcal{R}$ of the standard regression operator $\mathcal{R}^*$ for basic action theories. Let $\phi$ be a situation-suppressed formula and $\alpha$ be a non-variable action term. Then $\mathcal{R}[\phi[do(\alpha, s)]]$ stands for the one-step regression of $\phi$ through action $\alpha$, which is in itself a formula uniform in $s$. It is straightforward to adapt Pirri and Reiter [1999]'s regression theorem to get the following result:

**Theorem 4.** Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a basic action theory, $\phi$ a situation-suppressed formula, and $\alpha$ a non-variable action term. Then

$$\text{Axioms } \models \phi[do(\alpha, s)] \equiv \mathcal{R}[\phi[do(\alpha, s)]].$$  

Furthermore, if $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are ground non-variable action terms, then

$$\text{Axioms } \models \phi[do(\alpha_1, \ldots, do(\alpha_1, S_0), \ldots)] \iff \mathcal{D}_{S_0} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{ana}} \models \mathcal{R}^*\phi[do(\alpha_1, \ldots, do(\alpha_1, S_0), \ldots)].$$  

That is, operator $\mathcal{R}$ reduces a formula about situation $do(\alpha, s)$ to a formula about situation $s$. By several applications of $\mathcal{R}$, hence, one can reduce formulas about future situations of $S_0$ to formulas about the initial situation only, which can then be verified/answered by first-order entailment/evaluation using only the initial database $\mathcal{D}_{S_0}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{ana}}$, a much simpler task.

**Characteristic graphs.** In order to compactly represent all possible configurations a program $\delta^0$ may be in during its execution, we shall use the so-called characteristic graph $G_{\delta^0}$ of $\delta^0$ introduced by Claßen and Lakemeyer [2008]. The nodes $V$ in a characteristic graph $G_{\delta^0}$ are tuples of the form $\langle \delta, \chi \rangle$, stating that $\delta$ is a possible remaining program during $\delta^0$’s execution and $\chi$ characterizes the conditions under which $\delta$ may terminate (i.e., it is final). The initial node is $v_0 = \langle \delta^0, \chi^0 \rangle$. Edges in $G_{\delta^0}$ stand for single transitions between program configurations and are labeled with tuples of the form $\langle \pi \vec{x} : \alpha, \psi \rangle$, where $\alpha$ is a non-variable action term and variables $\vec{x}$ may appear free in $\alpha$ and $\psi$. Roughly speaking, an edge states that a program may evolve into another remaining program when one chooses instantiations for $\vec{x}$ and performs action $\alpha$ in a situation where $\psi$ holds.

Figure 1 depicts the characteristic graph for the music system example of Section 2. The edge from $v_0$ to $v_1$, for instance, represents those transitions in which a requested song is selected for playback. For that to happen, the program requires to pick a song and a compact disk such that the song is currently being requested, it is in the chosen disk, and the matchbox is currently not playing. Under such circumstances, the program may select the song in question, provided the precondition of such action holds, and evolve to node $v_1$. The program may next evolve to node $v_2$ by loading the chosen disk, provided the precondition of the loading action is true. When program is node $v_0$, it executes action wait whenever there is no song requested for playback or the matchbox is currently playing a song. Finally, we observe that in each node, the system program may execute an exogenous actions (e.g., requestSong(song)) and stay in the same node, that is, in the same program configuration.

![Figure 1: Characteristic graph for program $\delta_{\text{music}}$.](image)

Next propositions can be shown by induction on the program structure under the assumption that the variable $x$ from each construct $\pi x.\delta$ used in $\delta$ occurs in an action term of $\delta$.

**Proposition 5.** Given a node $\langle \delta, \chi \rangle$, we have that

$$\text{Axioms } \models \chi[s] \equiv \text{Final}(\delta, s).$$

**Proposition 6.** If $\langle \delta, \chi \rangle \left( \pi x.\delta, \chi' \right)$ is an edge, then

$$\text{Axioms } \models \psi[s] \land \text{Poss}(\alpha, s) \equiv \text{Trans}(\delta, s, \delta', do(\alpha, s)).$$

## 5 The Procedure

Given the target program $\delta^0$ and the available programs $\delta_1^0, \ldots, \delta_n^0$ (wlog we assume that such programs do not share variables) we compute a relation whose tuples have the form $\langle v_1, v_1, \ldots, v_n, \varphi \rangle$ where $v_1, v_1, \ldots, v_n$ are nodes in the characteristic graphs $G_{\delta_1^0}, G_{\delta_2^0}, \ldots, G_{\delta_n^0}$ respectively, and $\varphi$ is a first-order formula. Such tuples intuitively mean that the target program in $v_1$ is simulated by the available programs in $\langle v_1, v_1, \ldots, v_n \rangle$ “iff $\varphi$ holds”.

**Procedure 2 SYMSIM($\delta_1^0, \delta_2^0, \ldots, \delta_n^0$)**

Compute characteristic graphs $G_{\delta_1^0}, G_{\delta_2^0}, \ldots, G_{\delta_n^0}$

$$X := \{ (\langle \delta_1, \chi_1 \rangle, \langle \delta_2, \chi_2 \rangle, \ldots, \langle \delta_n, \chi_n \rangle, x_t \rightarrow \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \chi_i ) | \langle \delta_j, \chi_j \rangle \text{ in } G_{\delta_j^0}, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \}$$

$X_{old} := \emptyset$

while $X \neq X_{old}$ do

$X_{old} := X$

$X := \text{NEXT}[X]$

end while

return $X$

Specifically we compute such a relation through the fixpoint procedure in Procedure 2, where the operator NEXT[X] represents a “one step refinement” of the simulation: it updates the formulas $\varphi$ in the tuples $\langle v_1, v_1, \ldots, v_n, \varphi \rangle$ through

![Diagram 2: Procedure 2 SYMSIM](image)
Theorem 8. Let \(\delta^0, \delta_1^0, \ldots, \delta_n^0\) be ConGolog programs. Assume that the procedure \(\text{SYM SIM}(\delta^0, \delta_1^0, \ldots, \delta_n^0)\) terminates returning the set \(X\). Then, for every ground situation term \(S\):

\[
\text{Axioms} \Rightarrow \text{Sim}(\delta, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, S) \equiv \varphi[S],
\]

where \(\langle \delta, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n, \varphi \rangle \in X\). We then apply Proposition 3.

By considering Theorem 7 together with the soundness and completeness of regression (cf. Theorem 4) we get:

Theorem 9. If \(\text{SYM SIM}(\delta^0, \delta_1^0, \ldots, \delta_n^0)\) terminates, then \(\text{FOLD ELEGA TOR}(\delta, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n)\) terminates, and \(\text{FOLD ELEGA TOR}(\delta, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n)\) is a sound and complete implementation of \(\text{DELEGATOR}(\delta, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n)\).
observe here that if the initial database is finite, then the delegator in Procedure 3, which only requires to evaluate first-order formulas, can be readily implemented using standard relational database technology.

As mentioned, having complete information on the initial situation at runtime allowed us to side-step the issue of offline vs. online executions of high-level programs [Sardina et al., 2004]. Indeed, under complete information of the initial situation the two kinds of execution styles coincide. To extend our approach to deal with incomplete information on the initial situation, more work has to be done. In particular, while the delegators in Procedure 1 and Procedure 3 remain formally well-defined (using entailment instead of formula evaluation), they may not be able to carry out the composition, as they may get stuck by not being able to decide the truth value of a formula. This is a subtle issue, which has been investigated in the context of epistemic feasibility of plans, see e.g., in [Sardina et al., 2004], and which becomes crucial also in our composition context.

The main limitation of the approach proposed here is the lack of (sufficient) conditions guaranteeing termination of procedure SYM SIM. Indeed, finding cases for which we have guarantees of termination of a procedure that eliminates fixpoints (as in this paper, or [Claßen and Lakemeyer, 2008] and [Kelly and Pearce, 2007]) is an interesting research direction for future work.
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