

Decidable Inductive Invariants for Verification of Cryptographic Protocols with Unbounded Sessions

Emanuele D’Osualdo^{1,*} and Felix Stutz^{2,**}

¹ Imperial College London, UK (e.dosualdo@ic.ac.uk)

² Saarland University and MPI-SWS, Germany (fstutz@mpi-sws.org)

Abstract. We develop a theory of decidable inductive invariants for an infinite-state variant of the Applied π -calculus, with applications to automatic verification of stateful cryptographic protocols with unbounded sessions/nonces. Since in the presence of unbounded sessions any trace property becomes undecidable, we focus on (i) *depth-bounded* protocols, a generalisation of a class of infinite-state protocols proposed by D’Osualdo, Ong and Tiu; and (ii) *downward-closed* properties, which include many security properties such as absence of leaks of secrets.

We study the structure of depth-bounded protocols within the framework of ideal completions for well-structured transition systems. Our main contribution is a class of expressions, called *limits*, that are shown sound and complete for representing infinite downward-closed sets of configurations of depth-bounded protocols. We provide direct algorithms to prove that a given limit is an inductive invariant for a protocol. Inductive invariants of this form can be inferred, and represent an independently checkable certificate of correctness. To evaluate whether the approach is viable, we provide a prototype implementation and we report on its performance on some illustrative examples.

1 Introduction

Security protocols are distributed programs that implement secure communication over insecure channels, by using cryptography. Despite currently underpinning virtually every communication over the internet, new flaws that compromise security are routinely discovered in deployed systems. Many of these flaws do not require breaking the cryptographic primitives, but instead exploit mistakes in the logic of their use in the protocol. Our goal is to prove that a protocol will be secure even against any possible attack of an intruder that has full control of the insecure channel, under the assumption of perfect cryptography.

Verification of cryptographic protocols presents many challenges. First, cryptographic primitives need to be modelled algebraically, leading to messages being structured terms which can be constructed and deconstructed according to laws that capture properties of the underlying primitives. For example, a term $e(m)_k$ represents the message m encrypted with some symmetric key k , and is subjected to the law that m can be derived from $e(m)_k$ only if k is known. Moreover, the intruder has control over the network and can remember, intercept, analyse and forge any message sent through insecure channels. To deal with this scenario, the first hard question to answer is “How do we represent the knowledge of the intruder and the messages that can be derived from it?”

* Work by this author was funded by a EU Horizon 2020 Marie Curie Individual Fellowship.

** Work by this author was partially supported by Imperial College London, and the International Max Planck Research School for Computer Science.

Even with a solution to this question, there is a second important challenge to solve. Every session of a protocol introduces new messages and fresh nonces/encryption keys, which are all represented by restricted names νx in the π -calculus. It is important to model them as fresh distinct values since the security of protocols relies on being able to generate fresh unguessable nonces. This leads to the second hard question: “How can we finitely represent and manipulate an infinite state space with unboundedly many distinct names?”

In this paper, we take any algebraic formalisation of the cryptographic primitives as a parameter, and focus on solving this second question: the problem of capturing the possible evolutions of any number of sessions of a protocol, under arbitrary intruder interference.

It is well-known that, in general, in the presence of unbounded sessions, any verification problem becomes undecidable. A number of dedicated automatic verification tools, (e.g. DEEPSEC [9], AVISPA [1], SPEC [26], AKISS [8]) remedy to the obstacle of undecidability by only considering some given finite number sessions n . Usually, n is kept small as these tools do not scale well in the number of sessions. This restriction makes many verification problems decidable, enabling support for powerful classes of equivalence properties and cryptographic primitives, at the price of missing possible attacks.

Other tools, like the popular ProVerif [2], overcome this problem by applying over-approximations (possibly giving false positives) and not guaranteeing termination of the analysis. Others, like Tamarin [19], are not fully automatic and may require non-trivial human insight to construct proofs. When run in automatic mode, Tamarin is not guaranteed to terminate, and there is no characterisation of classes of protocols for which the automatic mode is complete.

We resolve the problem of undecidability by restricting protocols to the class of *depth-bounded* protocols, for which we devise sound and complete algorithms. To gain some intuition on our approach, consider a protocol starting from some initial configuration P_0 . Assume that from P_0 , a new session S can be started between some participants sharing some secret k_0 , reaching the configuration $P_0 \parallel \nu k_0.S(k_0)$. Here, P_0 is still part of the configuration because other parallel sessions can be created, leading to configurations $P_0 \parallel \nu k_0.S(k_0) \parallel \dots \parallel \nu k_n.S(k_n)$ for arbitrary n . Suppose a session $S(k_i)$, once terminated, restarts the same session with a refreshed secret k'_i : we have $\nu k_i.S(k_i) \rightarrow^* \nu k'_i.S(k'_i) \parallel (\nu k_i.R(k_i))$ where $R(k_i)$ is just what remains, say in terms of intruder knowledge, of the session that just terminated. How could we represent the infinite set of reachable configurations? We propose to have expressions L , called limits, that include the syntax of configurations, but additionally have the construct L^ω , which is a finite representation of the infinite set consisting of parallel compositions of arbitrarily many copies of configurations in L . With this notation we could represent the effect of running the session $S(k_i)$ an arbitrary number of times by the limit $L_s = \nu k'_i.S(k'_i) \parallel (\nu k_i.R(k_i))^\omega$. Notice that an instance of this limit contains an arbitrary number of distinct keys k_i . Combining this with the initialisation of sessions by P_0 we get that the configurations reachable from P_0 are all included in the limit $L = P_0 \parallel L_s^\omega$, which has two nested ω .

A natural question is: what are the classes of protocols that can be captured using limits? Our first result is that limits are sound and complete representations of sets of configurations for *depth-bounded* protocols. Intuitively, the depth of a configuration is the maximum length of “chains” of keys: for example, the set of messages $\Gamma_n = \{e(k_1)_{k_2}, e(k_2)_{k_3}, \dots, e(k_{n-1})_{k_n}\}$ “chains” key k_1 to k_2 , k_2 to k_3 and so on, obtaining a chain of length n . In computing depth, we only consider chains that are essential: the set $\Gamma_n \cup \{k_n\}$ for example has depth 1 because it is equivalent to the set $\{k_1, \dots, k_n\}$. The depth of a protocol is the maximum depth of reachable configurations. When there is a bound k on the depth of reachable configurations, we say that the protocol is depth-bounded. It turns out that, for representing sets of configurations of depth at most k , one needs limits with at most k nested ω s. Notably, we obtain this representation result without fixing the set of cryptographic primitives. Instead, our model of protocols is

parametric on the algebraic characterisation of any set of cryptographic primitives, provided it satisfies some simple properties.

To turn this representation result into an analysis algorithm, we study how to automatically manipulate limits, which is not trivial since they represent infinite sets of configurations. First, we establish decidability of inclusion between two limits, through a pumping-lemma style construction. Second, we prove with a similar technique that it is possible to compute, from a limit L , a limit $\widehat{\text{post}}(L)$ that represent all the configurations reachable in one step from configurations in L . With these two building blocks, inclusion and $\widehat{\text{post}}$, one can decide whether a limit L includes all configurations reachable from some P_0 by checking $P_0 \in L$ and $\widehat{\text{post}}(L) \subseteq L$, i.e. L is an *inductive invariant* for P_0 .

We show how to devise a number of analyses on top of the inclusion/ $\widehat{\text{post}}$ algorithms. Our results entail decidability of depth-boundedness (for given bounds), secrecy, and absence of misauthentications. We also show how to automatically infer inductive invariants from a protocol.

Our contributions In this paper we start a systematic study of the structure of cryptographic protocols with unbounded sessions/nonces, by contributing a principled theory of decidable inductive invariants for depth-bounded protocols.

To develop our theory of invariants, we make several technical contributions:

- (1) we generalise the class of depth-bounded processes of D’Osualdo, Ong & Tiu [13], by parametrising it in the choice of cryptographic primitives;
- (2) we prove that a class of expressions we call *limits* is sound and complete to represent downward-closed depth-bounded invariants;
- (3) we show decidability of inductiveness and use it to construct algorithms to decide secrecy and boundedness.

We built a proof-of-concept prototype tool and verified benchmark protocols.

Our approach has a number of notable properties. First, once a suitable inductive invariant has been found, it can be provided as a certificate of correctness that can be independently checked. Second, the search of a suitable invariant can be performed both automatically (with a trade-off between precision and performance) or interactively. Third, supporting unbounded nonces makes it possible to reason about properties like susceptibility to known-plaintext attacks (Section 3.1). Finally, even coarse invariants inferred with our method can be used to prune the search space of other model checking procedures.

Related work Depth boundedness was originally proposed and studied for the pure π -calculus in [20,17]. Our work builds directly on [13], which introduced the depth-bounded restriction for protocols that use symmetric encryption. [13] proves decidability of secrecy for those protocols, using a backwards search algorithm based on the theory of well-structured transition systems [16]. The backwards search has a number of drawbacks: it suffers from combinatorial explosion, is property-driven, which makes it difficult to reuse the result, and is monolithic, which means it cannot be used interactively/incrementally. In this paper, we significantly extend the definition of depth-bounded protocols, by stating the general properties that the cryptographic primitives need to satisfy in order for the decidability results to apply. We carry out a deeper study of the structure of depth-bounded protocols by studying the structure of their ideal completions [15]. By means of a quite general pumping-lemma-style result (Theorem 6) we prove decidability of inductivity of downward-closed invariants. This allows the definition of a *forward* verification algorithm that does not suffer from the above drawbacks, and is a strictly more powerful analysis tool. For example, it can be used to prove both secrecy and depth-boundedness itself (for given bounds). The invariant based approach is also more flexible

in that we could propose more efficient invariant inference algorithms and the invariants themselves can be more easily manipulated as proof certificates or integrated in other proofs.

Our theory of invariants is framed in terms of ideal completions [15], which, to the best of our knowledge, has not been instantiated to cryptographic protocols before. Our decidability proofs introduce substantial new proof techniques to deal with an active intruder while being parametric on the cryptographic primitives. Even stripped of the complexity of handling cryptography, when applied to the simpler case of the pure π -calculus, our results contribute new, more direct and easy to implement algorithms for verifying depth-bounded concurrent systems, compared to e.g. [27].

Manual verification using invariants was pioneered by [23], with a method mechanised in Isabelle/HOL. Our approach could provide automatisisation for some of the invariance lemmas required by the method.

There has been work on proving security properties using type systems [12,10,11]. Types try to capture and generalise common safe usages of cryptographic primitives, and reduce verification to constraints which can be solved efficiently. We speculate that our domain of limits and the associated algorithms could be used to define an expressive class of solvable constraints that could be integrated in type systems.

ProVerif [2] is a popular tool for verification of security protocols with very good support for cryptographic primitives and a variety of security properties, including secrecy. ProVerif applies a number of approximations to translate protocols to Horn clauses. A well-known limitation due to these approximations is the inability to handle protocols with state. Our protocol model supports global state and private channels. In the presence of unbounded/sessions, ProVerif may report false attacks, or may not terminate. Its algorithm is known to terminate if the protocol satisfies a syntactic condition called *tagging* [4]. Our approach does not apply approximations and guarantees termination, for the *semantic* class of depth-bounded protocols, which is incomparable with tagging.

The Tamarin prover [19] is a semi-automatic proof assistant for verification of protocols with unbounded sessions/nonces. It supports any model of cryptographic primitives that can be expressed as subterm convergent rewriting systems, and was recently extended to support XOR [14]. The protocol model is based on multiset rewriting and is very close to our model. The tool may not terminate on a verification task, in which case it is possible to use it in interactive mode and provide human insight to complete a proof. To the best of our knowledge there is no characterisation for a class of protocols on which Tamarin is guaranteed to terminate. Tamarin’s semi-algorithm is a symbolic backward search that uses proof normalisation to solve symbolic constraints on messages. Our theory of invariants can be used to improve Tamarin in two ways: first, our algorithm could be used to prove inductive lemmas automatically; second the automatic inference of invariants could be used to prune the search space either by providing simplifying lemmas, or by applying sound restrictions to the traces.

Outline Section 2 introduces the formal model and our generalisation of depth-bounded protocols. Section 3 presents our main theoretical results. In Section 4 we discuss implementation and optimisations, and report on experiments with our tool. The omitted proofs and definitions can be found in the Appendix.

2 Formal model

We introduce a variant of the Applied π -calculus as our formal model of protocols. Following the Dolev-Yao intruder model, we treat cryptographic primitives algebraically. Let \mathcal{N} be an enumerable set of *names* $a, b, \dots \in \mathcal{N}$, which here will abstractly model data, nonces, and

encryption keys. A signature Σ of *constructors*, is a finite set of symbols f with their arity $\text{ar}(f) \in \mathbb{N}$. The set of messages over Σ , is the smallest set \mathbb{M}^Σ which contains all names, and such that if $f \in \Sigma$ with $\text{ar}(f) = n$ and $M_1, \dots, M_n \in \mathbb{M}^\Sigma$ then $f(M_1, \dots, M_n) \in \mathbb{M}^\Sigma$. We define $\text{size}(a) := 1$, $\text{size}(f(M_1, \dots, M_n)) := 1 + \max\{\text{size}(M_1), \dots, \text{size}(M_n)\}$, and $\text{names}(a) := \{a\}$, $\text{names}(f(M_1, \dots, M_n)) := \text{names}(M_1) \cup \dots \cup \text{names}(M_n)$. Given $X \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\mathbb{M}_s^{\Sigma, X} := \{M \in \mathbb{M}^\Sigma \mid \text{names}(M) \subseteq X, \text{size}(M) \leq s\}$. We write \mathbb{K}^Σ for the set of finite sets of messages, $\mathbb{K}^\Sigma := \wp_f(\mathbb{M}^\Sigma)$; Γ, Γ' and Γ, M stand for $\Gamma \cup \Gamma'$ and $\Gamma \cup \{M\}$ respectively.

A *substitution* is a finite partial function $\theta: \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^\Sigma$; we write $\theta = [M_1/x_1, \dots, M_n/x_n]$, often abbreviated with $[\vec{M}/\vec{x}]$, for the substitution with $\theta(x_i) = M_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. The application of substitution θ to the message M is denoted by $M\theta$, and we extend the notation to sets of messages $\Gamma\theta := \{M\theta \mid M \in \Gamma\}$. A substitution θ is a *renaming* of $X \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ if it is defined on X , injective, and with $\theta(X) \subseteq \mathcal{N}$.

Definition 1 (Intruder model). A derivability relation for a signature Σ , is a relation $\vdash \subseteq \mathbb{K}^\Sigma \times \mathbb{M}^\Sigma$. The pair $\mathbb{I} = (\Sigma, \vdash)$ is an (effective) intruder model if \vdash is a (decidable) derivability relation for Σ , and for all $M, N \in \mathbb{M}^\Sigma$, $\Gamma, \Gamma' \in \mathbb{K}^\Sigma$, $a \in \mathcal{N}$:

$$\begin{aligned} M \vdash M & \quad \text{(Id)} \\ \Gamma \subseteq \Gamma' \wedge \Gamma \vdash M & \implies \Gamma' \vdash M & \quad \text{(Mon)} \\ \Gamma \vdash M \wedge \Gamma, M \vdash N & \implies \Gamma \vdash N & \quad \text{(Cut)} \\ M_1, \dots, M_n \vdash f(M_1, \dots, M_n) & \text{ for every } f \in \Sigma \text{ with } \text{ar}(f) = n & \quad \text{(Constr)} \\ \Gamma\theta \vdash M\theta \iff \Gamma \vdash M & \text{ for any } \theta \text{ renaming of } \text{names}(\Gamma) & \quad \text{(Alpha)} \\ \Gamma, a \vdash M \wedge a \notin \text{names}(\Gamma, M) & \implies \Gamma \vdash M & \quad \text{(Relevancy)} \end{aligned}$$

The knowledge ordering for \mathbb{I} is the relation $\leq_{\text{kn}} \subseteq \mathbb{K}^\Sigma \times \mathbb{K}^\Sigma$ such that $\Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2$ if and only if $\forall M \in \mathbb{M}^\Sigma: \Gamma_1 \vdash M \implies \Gamma_2 \vdash M$. We write $\Gamma_1 \sim_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2$ if $\Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2$ and $\Gamma_2 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_1$.

The first three axioms deal exclusively with what it means to be a deduction relation: what is known can be derived (Id); the more is known the more can be derived (Mon); what can be derived is known (Cut)—interpreted as a deduction rule this is the *CUT* rule. The (Constr) axiom ensures the intruder is able to construct arbitrary messages by composing known messages. The (Alpha) axiom reflects the immateriality of the choice of names; it will justify α -renaming in our calculus. The (Relevancy) axiom will allow us to only consider boundedly many nonces maliciously injected by the intruder, at each step of the protocol.

In the rest of the paper, unless otherwise specified, we fix an arbitrary effective intruder model \mathbb{I} and omit the corresponding superscripts.

Proposition 1. Given $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \in \mathbb{K}^\Sigma$, $\Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2$ if and only if $\forall M \in \Gamma_1: \Gamma_2 \vdash M$. As a consequence, $\text{if}\vdash$ is decidable, so is \leq_{kn} .

Our framework uses the derivability relation as a black box and does not rely on the way it is specified (e.g. with a rewriting system or a deduction system). A common specification format uses constructors (e.g. *enc* for symmetric encryption) and *destructors* (e.g. *dec* for symmetric decryption) and a subterm convergent rewriting system specifying the interaction of the constructors and destructors; for example one would have the rewriting rule $\text{dec}(\text{enc}(m, k), k) \rightarrow m$. Such a rewriting system would lead to a derivability relation over constructor-only terms, where a term M is derivable from Γ if there is a constructor/destructor combination of messages from Γ that rewrites to M . In some cases, messages are considered modulo an equational theory \mathcal{E} , in which case one simply defines a derivability relation that is closed under $=_{\mathcal{E}}$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{M \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash M} \text{ID} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash K}{\Gamma \vdash \text{p}(K)} \text{PUB} \quad \frac{\Gamma, (M, N), M, N \vdash M'}{\Gamma, (M, N) \vdash M'} \text{PL} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M \quad \Gamma \vdash N}{\Gamma \vdash (M, N)} \text{PR} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, \text{e}(M)_K \vdash K \quad \Gamma, \text{e}(M)_K, M, K \vdash N}{\Gamma, \text{e}(M)_K \vdash N} \text{SL} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M \quad \Gamma \vdash K}{\Gamma \vdash \text{e}(M)_K} \text{SR} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, \text{a}(M)_{\text{p}(K)} \vdash K \quad \Gamma, \text{a}(M)_{\text{p}(K)}, M, K \vdash N}{\Gamma, \text{a}(M)_{\text{p}(K)} \vdash N} \text{AL} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M \quad \Gamma \vdash N}{\Gamma \vdash \text{a}(M)_N} \text{AR}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 1. Deduction rules for the derivability relation of \mathbb{I}_{en}

Our results do not assume any particular presentation for the instances of derivability, but in our examples we find it convenient to specify it with a sequent calculus in the style of [25]. This is an alternative to more intuitive natural-deduction-style rules, which has the key advantage of being CUT-free, while admitting CUT. This simplifies considerably the proofs of properties (e.g. Lemma 4) of the intruder model.

Example 1 (Model of Encryption). A model of symmetric and asymmetric encryption can be given using the signature $\Sigma_{\text{en}} = \{(\cdot, \cdot), \text{e}(\cdot), \text{a}(\cdot), \text{p}(\cdot)\}$, where (M, N) pairs messages M and N , $\text{e}(M)_N$ represents the message M encrypted with symmetric key N , $\text{a}(M)_N$ represents the message M encrypted with asymmetric key N , and $\text{p}(K)$ is the public key associated with the private key K . The intruder model for (a)symmetric encryption is the model $\mathbb{I}_{\text{en}} = (\Sigma_{\text{en}}, \vdash)$ where \vdash is defined by the deduction rules in Fig. 1.

Proposition 2. *The model Σ_{en} is an effective intruder model.*

2.1 A calculus for cryptographic protocols

A common approach to model cryptographic primitives is to consider both constructors (e.g. encryption) and destructors (e.g. decryption). Here messages only contain constructors, and “destruction” is represented by pattern matching. Fix a finite signature \mathcal{Q} of process names (ranged over by Q) each of which has a fixed arity $\text{ar}(Q) \in \mathbb{N}$. A protocol specification consists of an initial process P and a finite set Δ of (possibly recursive) definitions of the form $Q[x_1, \dots, x_n] := A$, with $\text{ar}(Q) = n$, where the syntax of P and A follows the grammar:

$$\begin{array}{l}
P ::= \mathbf{0} \mid \nu x.P \mid P \parallel P \mid \langle M \rangle \mid Q[\vec{M}] \quad (\text{process}) \\
A ::= \bar{a}\langle M \rangle \mid a(\vec{x} : M).P \mid A + A \quad (\text{action})
\end{array}$$

We use the vector notation $\vec{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$ for lists of pairwise distinct names. In an action $a(\vec{x} : M).P$, we call $\vec{x} : M$ the *pattern*, and P the *continuation*; processes $Q[\vec{M}]$ are called *process calls*. If $\Gamma = \{M_1, \dots, M_k\}$ is a finite set of messages, then $\langle \Gamma \rangle := \langle M_1 \rangle \parallel \dots \parallel \langle M_k \rangle$. We define $P^0 := \mathbf{0}$ and $P^{n+1} := P \parallel P^n$. For brevity, we assume the special name in is known to the intruder. The internal action τ , is an abbreviation for $\text{in}(x : x)$, for a fresh x . Processes of the form $\langle M \rangle$ or $Q[\vec{a}]$ are called *sequential*. The names \vec{x} are bound in both $\nu \vec{x}.P$ and $\text{in}(\vec{x} : M).P$. We denote the set of free names of a term P with $\text{fn}(P)$ and the set of bound names with $\text{bn}(P)$. As is standard, we require, wlog, that $\text{fn}(P) \cap \text{bn}(P) = \emptyset$. When nesting restrictions $\nu \vec{x}. \nu \vec{y}. P$, we implicitly assume wlog that \vec{x} and \vec{y} are disjoint. We assume there

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\mathbf{Q}_1[\vec{M}_1] \triangleq \bar{c}\langle N[\vec{M}'/\vec{x}] \rangle.P_1 + A_1 \quad \mathbf{Q}_2[\vec{M}_2] \triangleq c(\vec{x} : N).P_2 + A_2}{\mathbf{v}\vec{a}.\langle \Gamma \parallel \mathbf{Q}_1[\vec{M}_1] \parallel \mathbf{Q}_2[\vec{M}_2] \parallel C \rangle \rightarrow_{\Delta} \mathbf{v}\vec{a}.\langle \Gamma \parallel P_1 \parallel P_2[\vec{M}'/\vec{x}] \parallel C \rangle} \text{COMM} \\
\\
\frac{\mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}] \triangleq \bar{c}\langle M \rangle.P + A \quad \Gamma \vdash c}{\mathbf{v}\vec{a}.\langle \Gamma \parallel \mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}] \parallel C \rangle \rightarrow_{\Delta} \mathbf{v}\vec{a}.\langle \Gamma \parallel \langle M \rangle \parallel P \parallel C \rangle} \text{PUBOUT} \\
\\
\frac{\mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}] \triangleq c(\vec{x} : N).P + A \quad \Gamma, \vec{y} \vdash N[\vec{M}'/\vec{x}] \quad \Gamma \vdash c}{\mathbf{v}\vec{a}.\langle \Gamma \parallel \mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}] \parallel C \rangle \rightarrow_{\Delta} \mathbf{v}\vec{a}.\langle \Gamma \parallel \langle \vec{y} \rangle \parallel P[\vec{M}'/\vec{x}] \parallel C \rangle} \text{PUBIN} \\
\\
\frac{P \equiv P' \rightarrow_{\Delta} Q' \equiv Q}{P \rightarrow_{\Delta} Q} \text{STRUCT}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 2. Reduction semantics rules.

is at most one definition for each $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}$, and that for each definition $\mathbf{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_n] := A$, $\text{fn}(A) \subseteq \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. The set \mathbb{P} consists of all processes over an underlying signature \mathcal{Q} .

Structural congruence We write $\overset{\alpha}{\equiv}$ for standard α -equivalence. Structural congruence, \equiv , is the smallest congruence relation that includes $\overset{\alpha}{\equiv}$, and is associative and commutative with respect to \parallel and $+$ with $\mathbf{0}$ as the neutral element, and satisfies the standard laws:

$$\mathbf{v}a.\mathbf{0} \equiv \mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{v}a.\mathbf{v}b.P \equiv \mathbf{v}b.\mathbf{v}a.P \quad P \parallel \mathbf{v}a.Q \equiv \mathbf{v}a.(P \parallel Q) \quad (\text{if } a \notin \text{fn}(P))$$

The second law is called *exchange*, the third *scope extrusion*. Note that the only structural law that modifies the messages is α -equivalence; the axiom (Alpha) ensures that α -equivalence preserves derivability. Every process P is congruent to a process in *standard form*:

$$\mathbf{v}\vec{x}.\langle \langle M_1 \rangle \parallel \dots \parallel \langle M_m \rangle \parallel \mathbf{Q}_1[\vec{N}_1] \parallel \dots \parallel \mathbf{Q}_k[\vec{N}_k] \rangle \quad (\text{SF})$$

where every name in \vec{x} occurs free in some subterm. We write $\text{sf}(P)$ for the standard form of P , which is unique up to α -equivalence, and associativity and commutativity of parallel. We abbreviate standard forms with $\mathbf{v}\vec{x}.\langle \Gamma \parallel Q \rangle$ where all the active messages are collected in Γ , and Q is a parallel composition of process calls. Let $\text{sf}(P)$ be the expression (SF), we define $\text{msg}(P) = \{M_1, \dots, M_m\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k \vec{N}_i$. Thus $\text{msg}(P)$ is the set of messages appearing in a term. When $m = 0, k = 0, \vec{x} = \emptyset$, the expression (SF) is $\mathbf{0}$.

Reduction semantics One can think of standard forms $\mathbf{v}\vec{x}.\langle \Gamma \parallel Q \rangle$ as runtime configurations of the protocol. They capture, at a specific point in time, the current relevant names (which encode nonces/keys/data), the knowledge of the intruder Γ , and the local state of each participant. A sequential term $\mathbf{Q}[\vec{N}]$ represents a single participant in control state \mathbf{Q} with local knowledge of messages \vec{N} .

Principals can communicate through channels; a channel known by the intruder is considered insecure. An input action over an insecure channel can be fired if the intruder can produce any message that matches the action's pattern. An output $\bar{c}\langle M \rangle$ to an insecure channel c leaks message M to the intruder, who can decide to forward it angelically to a corresponding input over c (modelling a honest step) or hijack the communication.

We write $\mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}] \triangleq A$ if $\mathbf{Q}[\vec{x}] := A' \in \Delta$ and $A \overset{\alpha}{\equiv} A'[\vec{M}/\vec{x}]$, up to commutativity and associativity of $+$. The transition relation \rightarrow_{Δ} is defined by the rules in Fig. 2.

$$\begin{aligned}
S[a, b, k_{as}, k_{bs}] &:= \mathbf{in}(n_a : (n_a, b)).\mathbf{vk}.\langle \langle \mathbf{e}(k)_{k_{bs}} \rangle \parallel \langle \mathbf{e}(k)_{(n_a, k_{as})} \rangle \parallel S[a, b, k_{as}, k_{bs}] \rangle \\
A_1[a, b, k_{as}] &:= \tau.\mathbf{vn}_a.\langle \langle (n_a, b) \rangle \parallel A_2[a, b, k_{as}, n_a] \parallel A_1[a, b, k_{as}] \rangle \\
A_2[a, b, k_{as}, n_a] &:= \mathbf{in}(k : \mathbf{e}(k)_{(n_a, k_{as})}).A_3[a, b, k_{as}, k] \\
A_3[a, b, k_{as}, k] &:= \mathbf{in}(n_b : \mathbf{e}(n_b)_k).\langle \langle \mathbf{e}(n_b)_{(k, k)} \rangle \rangle \\
B_1[a, b, k_{bs}] &:= \mathbf{in}(k : \mathbf{e}(k)_{k_{bs}}).\mathbf{vn}_b.\langle \langle \mathbf{e}(n_b)_k \rangle \parallel B_2[a, b, k_{bs}, n_b, k] \parallel B_1[a, b, k_{bs}] \rangle \\
B_2[a, b, k_{bs}, n_b, k] &:= \mathbf{in}(\mathbf{e}(n_b)_{(k, k)}).\mathbf{Secret}[k]
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 3. Formal model of Example 2.

Because of (Relevancy), in Rule `PUBIN` we can assume wlog that \vec{y} includes only names that appear in \vec{M}' . The sets $\text{traces}_\Delta(P) := \{Q_0 \cdots Q_n \mid P \equiv_{\text{kn}} Q_0 \rightarrow_\Delta \cdots \rightarrow_\Delta Q_n\}$ and $\text{reach}_\Delta(P) := \{Q \mid P \rightarrow_\Delta^* Q\}$ collect all the transition sequences from P and the processes reachable from P respectively, given the definitions Δ . When the context makes it unambiguous, we omit Δ .

Remark 1 (Implementable Patterns). Our calculus represents message deconstruction (e.g. decryption) with pattern matching. However, general pattern matching is too powerful: a pattern like $\mathbf{in}(x, k : \mathbf{e}(x)_k)$ would obtain *both* the key k and the plaintext x from an encrypted message! This is only a modelling problem: one should make sure all patterns can be implemented using the cryptographic primitives. Consider a pattern $\vec{x} : M$ and let $Z = \text{names}(M) \setminus \vec{x}$; the pattern is *implementable*, if, for all $\theta : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$, we have $M\theta, Z\theta \vdash y$ for all $y \in \vec{x}$.

Knowledge congruence We introduce a coarser relation than structural congruence that we call *knowledge congruence* $P \equiv_{\text{kn}} Q$, which is the smallest congruence that includes \equiv and such that $\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \equiv_{\text{kn}} \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle$ if $\Gamma_1 \sim_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2$. Knowledge congruence can also be characterised by

$$P_1 \equiv_{\text{kn}} P_2 \iff \text{sf}(P_1) \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}.\langle \langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q \rangle \wedge \text{sf}(P_2) \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}.\langle \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel Q \rangle \wedge \Gamma_1 \sim_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2.$$

Intuitively, modulo derivability, two processes $P \equiv_{\text{kn}} Q$ are indistinguishable to the intruder and to the principals. Formally, if $P \equiv_{\text{kn}} Q$ then the transition systems (P, \rightarrow_Δ) and (Q, \rightarrow_Δ) are isomorphic. We thus close the reduction semantics under knowledge congruence: we add the rule that if $P \equiv_{\text{kn}} P' \rightarrow_\Delta Q' \equiv_{\text{kn}} Q$ then $P \rightarrow_\Delta Q$.

While knowledge congruence captures when two configurations are essentially the same, knowledge embedding formalises the notion of “sub-configuration”.

Definition 2 (Knowledge embedding). *The knowledge embedding relation $P_1 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P_2$ holds if $P_1 \equiv \mathbf{v}\vec{x}.\langle \langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q \rangle$, $P_2 \equiv \mathbf{v}\vec{x}.\mathbf{v}\vec{y}.\langle \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel Q \parallel Q' \rangle$ and $\Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2$.*

Proposition 3. $P_1 \equiv_{\text{kn}} P_2$ if and only if $P_1 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P_2$ and $P_2 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P_1$.

Theorem 1. *Knowledge embedding is a simulation, that is, for all P, P' and Q , if $P \rightarrow Q$ and $P \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P'$ then there is a Q' such that $P' \rightarrow Q'$ and $Q \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} Q'$.*

Example 2. Consider the following toy protocol, given in Alice&Bob notation, meant to establish a new session key K between A and B through a trusted server S :

$$\begin{array}{ll}
(1) A \rightarrow S : N_A, B & (3) B \rightarrow A : \mathbf{e}(K)_{(N_A, K_{AS})}, \mathbf{e}(N_B)_K \\
(2) S \rightarrow B : \mathbf{e}(K)_{(N_A, K_{AS})}, \mathbf{e}(K)_{K_{BS}} & (4) A \rightarrow B : \mathbf{e}(N_B)_{(K, K)}
\end{array}$$

Figure 3 shows the protocol formalised in our calculus. Assume the initial state is

$$P_0 = \nu a, b, k_{as}, k_{bs}. (S[a, b, k_{as}, k_{bs}] \parallel A_1[a, b, k_{as}] \parallel B_1[a, b, k_{bs}] \parallel \langle a, b \rangle).$$

Example 2 is initiated by A_1 which sends some new name n_a to the server; since communication is over an insecure channel, the message is just output without indicating the intended recipient. The server receives the message (or any message the intruder may decide to forge instead) and outputs the fresh key k encrypted with k_{bs} (the long-term key between B and S) and with the pair (n_a, k_{as}) (note the use of non-atomic encryption keys). In the protocol, these two messages are sent to B but we model Example 2 by B_1 which just receives the message relevant to B . The forwarding of $e(k)_{(n_a, k_{as})}$ from S to A is performed by the intruder instead of B in the model.

In the last two steps, modelled by B_2, A_3 , B sends a nonce n_b encrypted with k , to challenge A to prove she knows k , which she does by sending back $e(n_b)_{(k, k)}$. At this point, B is convinced that by encrypting messages with k they will be only accessible to A . We model this by making B_2 transition to $\text{Secret}[k]$ after a successful challenge. We always assume the definition $\text{Secret}[k] := \text{in}(k).\text{Leak}[k]$. A transition to $\text{Leak}[k]$ is only possible when the intruder can derive k so we can check whether the secrecy assertion holds by checking that no reachable process contains a call to $\text{Leak}[k]$.

Notice how A_1 and B_1 spawn both the continuation of the session and (recursively) a process ready to start a new session. This creates the possibility of an unbounded number of sessions, each of which will involve fresh n_a, n_b , and k .

Threat model Our reduction semantics follows the Dolev/Yao attacker model in representing the intruder's interference: the intruder mediates every communication over insecure channels, is able to create new names and analyse and construct messages from all the messages that have been communicated insecurely so far. Threat models that go beyond Dolev/Yao include dishonest participants and compromised old session keys. These aspects are not embedded in the semantics, but can be modelled through the process definitions. If we wanted to model compromised keys in Example 2, for instance, we could modify the definition of B_2 to $B_2[a, b, k_{bs}, n_b, k] := \text{in}(e(n_b)_{(k, k)}).\text{Secret}[k] + \text{in}(e(n_b)_{(k, k)}).\langle k \rangle$ which makes a non-deterministic choice to declare k a secret, or to consider it as old and reveal it. The next example shows how to represent private/public key pairings and a dishonest participant.

Example 3 (Public key scenario). We illustrate a typical modelling pattern by formalising a simple protocol where a server issues a fresh key to two parties encrypting it with their public key. The pairing between private and public keys is represented by processes $K[s, x, pk_x] := \bar{s}\langle x, pk_x \rangle.K[s, x, pk_x]$ which is used as $K[s, a, p(k_a)]$ to advertise the pairing $a, p(k_a)$ between identity a and its public key $p(k_a)$ securely over the private storage channel s (the pairing is trusted). The server non-deterministically picks two identities and their public keys and issues a new session key for them:

$$\begin{aligned} S[s] &:= s(x, pk_x : x, pk_x).(S_1[s, x, pk_x] \parallel S[s]) \\ S_1[s, x, pk_x] &:= s(y, pk_y : y, pk_y).\nu k.(C[x, a(k)_{pk_x}] \parallel C[y, a(k)_{pk_y}]) \end{aligned}$$

where $C[c, m] := \bar{c}\langle m \rangle$. The two principals run the same code, waiting for the issued key $P[x, k_x] := x(k : a(k)_{p(k_x)}).\text{Secret}[k] \parallel P[x, k_x]$. The initial state makes the identities and the public keys public, and includes an intruder identity i with private key k_i which is also

public (i.e. known by the intruder) and from which the public key $\mathfrak{p}(k_i)$ can be derived.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sys} = \nu a, b, k_a, k_b, s. (&\langle a, \mathfrak{p}(k_a), b, \mathfrak{p}(k_b), i, k_i \rangle \\ &\parallel \text{K}[s, a, \mathfrak{p}(k_a)] \parallel \text{K}[s, b, \mathfrak{p}(k_b)] \parallel \text{K}[s, i, \mathfrak{p}(k_i)] \\ &\parallel \text{P}[a, k_a] \parallel \text{P}[b, k_b] \parallel \text{S}[s]) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that there is a legitimate record of the pairing $i, \mathfrak{p}(k_i)$ which every honest party trusts. To model unboundedly many parties one can define $\text{Init}[i, k_i] := \tau.(\text{Sys} \parallel \text{Init}[i, k_i])$ to generate arbitrarily many copies of Sys .

2.2 Depth-Bounded Protocols

We generalise the definition of *depth-bounded protocols*, first introduced in [13]. Our theory of invariants is sound and complete for this class of protocols.

Definition 3 (Depth). *The nesting of restrictions of a term is given by the function*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{nest}_v(\mathbb{Q}[\vec{a}]) &:= \text{nest}_v(\langle M \rangle) := \text{nest}_v(\mathbf{0}) := 0 \\ \text{nest}_v(\nu x.P) &:= 1 + \text{nest}_v(P) \\ \text{nest}_v(P \parallel Q) &:= \max(\text{nest}_v(P), \text{nest}_v(Q)). \end{aligned}$$

The depth of a term is defined as the minimal nesting of restrictions in its knowledge congruence class, $\text{depth}(P) := \min \{\text{nest}_v(Q) \mid Q \equiv_{\text{kn}} P\}$.

Lemma 1. *Every Q is α -equivalent to a process Q' such that $|\text{bn}(Q')| \leq \text{nest}_v(Q)$.*

Consider for example $P = \nu a, b, c. (\langle a \rangle \parallel \langle e(b)_a \rangle \parallel \langle e(c)_b \rangle \parallel \langle c \rangle)$ which has $\text{nest}_v(P) = 3$. The process P is knowledge-congruent to $Q = (\nu a. \langle a \rangle \parallel \nu b. \langle b \rangle \parallel \nu c. \langle c \rangle)$ which has $\text{nest}_v(Q) = 1$; this gives us $\text{depth}(P) = \text{nest}_v(Q) = 1$. Although $\text{bn}(Q) = \{a, b, c\}$, by α -renaming all names to x we obtain $Q' = (\nu x. \langle x \rangle \parallel \nu x. \langle x \rangle \parallel \nu x. \langle x \rangle)$ which has the property $|\text{bn}(Q')| \leq \text{nest}_v(Q) \leq \text{depth}(P)$. More generally, Lemma 1 says that processes of depth k can always be represented by only using at most k unique names, by reusing names in disjoint scopes.

Let $\mathbb{S}_s := \{P \in \mathbb{P} \mid \forall M \in \text{msg}(P): \text{size}(M) \leq s\}$ be the set of processes containing messages of size at most s . The set $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}^X$ is the set of processes of depth at most $k \in \mathbb{N}$, with free names in X , and messages not exceeding size s :

$$\mathbb{D}_{s,k}^X := \{P \in \mathbb{S}_s \mid \text{fn}(P) \subseteq X, \exists Q \in \mathbb{S}_s: Q \equiv_{\text{kn}} P \wedge \text{nest}_v(Q) \leq k\}$$

When starting from some initial process P_0 , every reachable process P has $\text{fn}(P) \subseteq \text{fn}(P_0)$ so X can always be fixed to be $\text{fn}(P_0)$. We therefore omit X from the superscripts to unclutter notation. The set of processes reachable from P while respecting a size bound s is the set $\text{reach}_\Delta^s(P) := \{Q \mid P \cdots Q \in \text{traces}_\Delta(P) \cap \mathbb{S}_s^*\}$.

Definition 4. *For some $s, k \in \mathbb{N}$, we say the process P is (s, k) -bounded (w.r.t. a finite set Δ of definitions) if $\text{reach}_\Delta^s(P) \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{s,k}$, i.e. from P only processes of depth at most k can be reached, in traces respecting the size bound s .*

Note that the two bounds s and k are very different in nature. Bounding the size of the messages restricts the traces that we are going to consider: if some behaviour can only be exhibited by using messages exceeding size s , then that behaviour is ignored. When considering

the rest of the behaviour, we then check if all the reachable processes have depth at most k . If so, the initial process is (s, k) -bounded. This definition has two important implications. First, we are going to only be sound with respect to bugs that can be triggered without using messages that exceed s in size. Second, the property of being (s, k) -bounded is not static. Proving that P is (s, k) -bounded, requires characterising the whole set of reachable processes. Section 3.1 explains how our theory of invariants can prove boundedness.

Example 4. The protocol in Example 2 is $(3, 7)$ -bounded. We defer the proof of this fact to Section 3.6.

Example 5 (Encryption Oracle). The definition $E[k] := \mathbf{in}(x : x).(\langle e(x)_k \rangle \parallel E[k])$ leads to unboundedness as soon as the initial process contains $E[k]$ for some k not known to the intruder, and size bound such that x can match messages of size greater than 1. In such case, the intruder can inject messages (c_i, c_{i+1}) for unboundedly many i , where c_i are intruder-generated nonces. Since k is secret, the resulting reachable configurations would contain “encryption chains” of the form $\nu k. \nu c_1, \dots, c_n. (\langle e(c_1, c_2)_k \rangle \parallel \langle e(c_2, c_3)_k \rangle \parallel \dots \langle e(c_{n-1}, c_n)_k \rangle)$. When such chains appear in a set for unboundedly many $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the set is not depth-bounded. This *encryption oracle* pattern could be considered an anti-pattern because it can be exploited for a chosen-plaintext attack on the key k . The pattern can be usually modified or constrained to obtain a bounded protocol. One option is to limit the verification to only consider traces where x is of size 1. This is a common solution in typed models; for instance, in Tamarin one would specify type $x: \text{fresh}$, achieving the same result of restricting substitutions to only replace nonces for x . Another solution is to modify the input action to $\mathbf{in}(x : e(x)_{sk})$ for some key sk shared between an honest principal and the oracle. In Section 5, we elaborate on extensions of boundedness that can handle the oracle pattern without these patches.

3 Ideal Completions for Security Protocols

Our main technical contributions are the proofs needed to show that (s, k) -bounded protocols form a completion-post-effective class of WSTS, in the sense of [6]. First we outline the significance and applications of this result, and then proceed with the proofs.

3.1 Downward-closed Invariants and Security Properties

Suppose we want to establish that a protocol P fulfills some security requirement. In a typical proof, one needs to establish many intermediate facts about executions of the protocol. For example, part of the argument may hinge on some key k being always unknown to the intruder. This kind of property is an *invariant* of the protocol: it holds at every step of an execution. Formally, an invariant of P (under definitions Δ and size constraint s) is any set of processes that includes $\text{reach}_{\Delta}^s(P)$. For example, k is never leaked to the intruder in executions of the protocol P if the set of processes $\mathcal{S}_k := \{Q \mid \langle k \rangle \not\sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} Q\}$ –i.e. all the processes where k is not public– is an invariant of P . We will focus here on the class of \sqsubseteq_{kn} -downward-closed invariants. Formally, given a set of processes X , its \sqsubseteq_{kn} -downward closure is the set $X \downarrow := \{Q \mid \exists P \in X : Q \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P\}$. A set X is \sqsubseteq_{kn} -downward closed if $X = X \downarrow$. Many properties of interest are naturally downward closed. For example, the set \mathcal{S}_k above is downward-closed as $\langle k \rangle \not\sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} Q$ and $Q' \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} Q$ implies $\langle k \rangle \not\sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} Q'$. Intuitively, if k is secret in Q and $Q' \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} Q$ then k is secret in Q' .

The problem we need to solve is, then, how to show that a given downward-closed set X is an invariant for a given protocol. Formally, that corresponds to checking $X \supseteq \text{reach}_{\Delta}^s(P)$ which, by downward-closure of X , is equivalent to checking $X \supseteq \text{reach}_{\Delta}^s(P) \downarrow$. To prove the

latter inclusion, our strategy is to find an inductive invariant that includes the initial state P and that is included in X . Let $\text{post}_\Delta^s(X) := \{Q' \mid \exists Q \in X, Q \rightarrow Q' \in \mathbb{S}_s\}$ be the set of processes reachable in one step from processes in X . An invariant X is *inductive* if $X \supseteq \text{post}_\Delta^s(X)$, which is equivalent to requiring $X \supseteq \text{post}_\Delta^s(X) \downarrow$ if X is downward-closed. Any inductive invariant that contains the initial process P will include $\text{reach}_\Delta^s(P)$. To turn this proof strategy into an algorithm, we need three ingredients:

1. a recursively enumerable finite representation of downward-closed sets,
2. a way to decide inclusion between two downward-closed sets, given their representation,
3. an algorithm (called $\widehat{\text{post}}_\Delta^s$) to compute, given the finite representation of a downward-closed set D , the finite representation of $\text{post}_\Delta^s(D) \downarrow$.

Unfortunately, downward-closed sets cannot be finitely represented in general, especially if one considers unbounded sessions/nonces. We will show, however, that we can devise solutions to all three items above for downward-closed subsets of $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}$, under a mild restriction on the intruder model.

Solving problems 1 to 3 amounts to proving that $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}$ admits a *post-effective ideal completion* in the sense of [15,6]. Before moving to the proofs, we give some examples of applications. Suppose we provide solutions for problems 1 to 3 above for $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}$. Then we can decide if the reachable configurations satisfy any given downward-closed property, by adapting the enumeration scheme presented in [6].

Theorem 2. *Given a property $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, and a protocol P with definitions Δ , we write $P, \Delta \models^s \mathcal{D}$ if $\text{reach}_\Delta^s(P) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. If $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{s,k}$ is downward-closed, then $P, \Delta \models^s \mathcal{D}$ is decidable.*

Proof. The algorithm runs two semiprocedures, Prover and Refuter, in parallel. The first procedure, Prover, enumerates all the downward-closed subsets I of $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}$. For each I , Prover checks if (a) $P \in I$, (b) I is inductive, and (c) $I \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. If we find such a set I , then we have proven $\text{reach}_\Delta^s(P) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, and the overall algorithm can terminate returning “True”. The second procedure, Refuter, enumerates all $Q \in \text{reach}_\Delta^s(P)$ and checks if $Q \notin \mathcal{D}$, in which case the overall algorithm can terminate returning “False”.

When $P, \Delta \models^s \mathcal{D}$ holds, then, in the worst case, Prover will eventually consider the finite representation of $\text{reach}_\Delta^s(P) \downarrow$, which satisfies checks (a) to (c) above. In the case where $P, \Delta \models^s \mathcal{D}$ does not hold, Refuter would eventually find a reachable process not in \mathcal{D} . In either case, the algorithm terminates with the correct answer.

The above algorithm can be used to prove the following security properties.

Deciding (s, k) -boundedness The set $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}$ is itself downward-closed, so we can decide if P is (s, k) -bounded, by deciding $P, \Delta \models^s \mathbb{D}_{s,k}$.

Deciding control-state reachability and secrecy Control-state reachability asks whether there is an execution of the protocol which reaches a process containing a process call $Q[\dots]$ for some given Q . Secrecy can be reduced to control-state reachability by introducing a definition $\text{Secret}[m] := \text{in}(m).\text{Leak}[m]$ (for a special process identifier Leak with no definition). In the definition of the protocol one can call $\text{Secret}[m]$ to mark some message m as a secret, and secrecy corresponds to asking control-state (un)reachability for Leak .

If P is (s, k) -bounded, control-state reachability for Q from P , can be decided by $P, \Delta \models^s \mathcal{D}_Q$, where \mathcal{D}_Q is the (downward-closed) subset of $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}$ of processes that do not contain calls to Q . Notice that, when P is arbitrary, the algorithm checks (s, k) -boundedness and control-state reachability at the same time.

Absence of misauthentication A misauthentication happens when a principal a believes she shares a secret n with b but b believes she shares the secret n with some other entity c . To check this situation can never arise, we can produce the process $\text{Auth}[a, b, n]$ when a believes to share the secret n with b . Absence of misauthentication can be decided by $P, \Delta \models^s \mathcal{A}$ where

$$\mathcal{A} = \{ Q \in \mathbb{D}_{s,k} \mid \forall a, b, c, n. (\text{Auth}[a, b, n] \parallel \text{Auth}[b, c, n]) \not\sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} Q \}.$$

Susceptibility to known-plaintext attacks The task of guessing a symmetric key is made much easier if it is possible for the attacker to have access to an arbitrarily large number of known messages encrypted with the same key k . We can model this situation by asking whether $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \exists Q \in \text{reach}_{\Delta}^s(P): R^n \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} Q$ (\dagger) where $R = \text{vm}.\langle m \parallel \langle e(m)_k \rangle \rangle$. If (\dagger) holds for P then the intruder does have access to an unbounded supply of known messages m encrypted with the same key k . Interestingly, the property becomes meaningful only when considering unbounded number of nonces. Condition (\dagger) is equivalent to $\text{reach}_{\Delta}^s(P) \downarrow \supseteq \{R^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \downarrow$. If we find a downward-closed inductive invariant I for P , such that $I \not\supseteq \{R^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \downarrow$, then we can be sure that (\dagger) does not hold, and P is not susceptible to known-plaintext attacks on k . We can therefore semi-decide (\dagger) by enumerating all candidate I . Contrary to the previous algorithms, we are not able to provide a Refuter procedure (we conjecture the problem is undecidable).

Notice how, in all the cases above, if the protocol is found to satisfy the property, the algorithm can output an inductive invariant acting as an independently checkable certificate of correctness and providing the foundations to prove further properties.

The presented algorithms rely on expensive enumeration schemes, which are mainly a theoretical device to prove decidability. In a more practical setting, the candidate invariants can be supplied by the user and refined interactively, avoiding the need for the enumeration of Prover, or they can be inferred as we describe in Section 4.

3.2 Bounded processes are well-quasi-ordered

We will construct finite representations of downward-closed invariants by making use of the algebraic structure of the quasi-order $(\mathbb{D}_{s,k}, \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}})$. A relation $\sqsubseteq \subseteq S \times S$ over some set S is a *quasi-order* (qo) if it is reflexive and transitive. An infinite sequence s_0, s_1, \dots of elements of S is called *good* if there are two indexes $i < j$ such that $s_i \sqsubseteq s_j$. The sequence is called *bad* if it is not good. When the qo (S, \sqsubseteq) has no bad sequences it is called a *well quasi order* (wqo). In [13] it is shown that $(\mathbb{D}_{s,k}, \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}})$ is a wqo, when considering the intruder model \mathbb{I}_{en} . We refine the result, and generalise it to arbitrary intruder models.

We prove $(\mathbb{D}_{s,k}, \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}})$ is a wqo for any intruder model, by showing a correspondence between processes in $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}$ and finitely-labelled forests of height at most k , which we represent as nested multisets.

Multisets We say a function $\mu: X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is finite-support if its support $\text{supp}(\mu) := \{x \mid \mu(x) > 0\}$, is finite. Given a set X , the multisets over X , $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, are the finite-support functions from X to \mathbb{N} . Assume (X, \sqsubseteq) is a quasi order; its *multiset extension* is the quasi order $\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{M}}$ over $\mathcal{M}(X)$ defined as follows; for two multisets $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, $\mu_1 \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{M}} \mu_2$ holds just if there is an injective function $f: \text{supp}(\mu_1) \rightarrow \text{supp}(\mu_2)$ such that for each $x \in \text{supp}(\mu_1)$, we have $x \sqsubseteq f(x)$ and $\mu_1(x) \leq \mu_2(f(x))$. When X is a finite set ordered by equality, $\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{M}}$ coincides with multiset inclusion. If (X, \sqsubseteq) is a wqo then $(\mathcal{M}(X), \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a wqo [15].




Fig. 4. Forest encoding of P . Restrictions at nesting level k are renamed canonically to x_{2-k} .

Forests We define a domain of forests $\mathbb{F}_{s,k}^X$ with sequential processes in $\mathcal{B}_s(X)$ as leaves:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_s(X) &:= \{Q[\vec{M}] \mid Q \in \mathcal{Q}, \text{ar}(Q) = |\vec{M}|, \vec{M} \subseteq \mathbb{M}_s^X\} \cup \mathbb{M}_s^X \\ \mathbb{F}_{s,0}^X &:= \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}_s(X)) \\ \mathbb{F}_{s,k+1}^X &:= \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}_s(X) \uplus \mathbb{F}_{s,k}^{X \cup \{x_{k+1}\}}) \quad (\text{assuming } x_{k+1} \notin X) \end{aligned}$$

The set $\mathcal{B}_s(X)$ contains all sequential processes of $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}^X$. In the base case, forests of height 0, $\mathbb{F}_{s,0}^X$ is simply a multiset of sequential processes. Forests of height $k+1$ are represented in $\mathbb{F}_{s,k+1}^X$ by a multiset of sequential processes and of subforests of height k .

For any given $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and finite $X \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{B}_s(X)$ is a finite set and thus forms a wqo with equality. With $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{F}}$ (forest embedding) we denote the qo over $\mathbb{F}_{s,k}^X$ defined as follows: on $\mathbb{F}_{s,0}^X$ it coincides with the multiset extension of equality on $\mathcal{B}_s(X)$; on $\mathbb{F}_{s,k+1}^X$ it coincides with the multiset extension of the disjoint union of equality on $\mathcal{B}_s(X)$, and the forest embedding on $\mathbb{F}_{s,k}^{X \cup \{x_{k+1}\}}$. By iterating the result on multisets, we obtain that for any $s, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and finite $X \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, $(\mathbb{F}_{s,k}^X, \sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{F}})$ is a wqo.

The function $\mathcal{F}[\cdot]_k$, transforms a process P with $\text{nest}_v(P) \leq k$ into its forest encoding, that is a forest that faithfully represents the structure of P .

Definition 5 (Forest encoding). We define the function $\mathcal{F}[\cdot]_k$ which transforms a process P with $\text{nest}_v(P) \leq k$ into a forest:

$$\mathcal{F}[[P]]_k := \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } P = \mathbf{0} \\ \{P\} & \text{if } P \text{ is sequential} \\ \{\mathcal{F}[[Q[x_k/x]]]_{k-1}\} & \text{if } P = vx.Q \\ \mathcal{F}[[Q_1]]_k \oplus \mathcal{F}[[Q_2]]_k & \text{if } P = Q_1 \parallel Q_2 \end{cases}$$

assuming $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \cap (\text{bn}(P) \cup \text{fn}(P)) = \emptyset$; when this assumption is not met because of bound names, we implicitly α -rename the term before applying the definition. When $\text{nest}_v(P) > k$, $\mathcal{F}[[P]]_k$ is undefined.

Figure 4 illustrates forest encodings. The forests in $\mathbb{F}_{s,k}^Y$ have sequential processes as leaves (with messages have size smaller than s), and free names $Y \uplus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$. Lemma 1 is used to only have to use k distinct bound names: this makes the forests finitely labelled.

Lemma 2. If $Q \in \mathbb{S}_s^Y$ and $\text{nest}_v(Q) \leq k$, then $\mathcal{F}[[Q]]_k \in \mathbb{F}_{s,k}^Y$.

Lemma 3. Assume $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathbb{S}_s^Y$ with $\text{nest}_v(Q_1) \leq k$ and $\text{nest}_v(Q_2) \leq k$. Then $\mathcal{F}[[Q_1]]_k \sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{F}} \mathcal{F}[[Q_2]]_k$ implies $Q_1 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} Q_2$.

Theorem 3. For every finite $Y \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ and $s, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\mathbb{D}_{s,k}^Y, \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}})$ is a wqo.

Proof. Let P_1, P_2, \dots be an infinite sequence of processes in $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}^Y$. By definition, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a process $Q_i \in \mathbb{S}_s$ such that $Q_i \equiv_{\text{kn}} P_i$ and $\text{nest}_v(Q_i) \leq k$, which implies by Lemma 2 that $\mathcal{F}[\llbracket Q_i \rrbracket_k] \in \mathbb{F}_{s,k}^Y$. The sequence $\mathcal{F}[\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket_k], \mathcal{F}[\llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket_k], \dots$ must then be a good sequence since $(\mathbb{F}_{s,k}^Y, \sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{F}})$ is a wqo. Therefore, there are $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i < j$, such that $\mathcal{F}[\llbracket Q_i \rrbracket_k] \sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{F}} \mathcal{F}[\llbracket Q_j \rrbracket_k]$, which by Lemma 3 implies $Q_i \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} Q_j$. We therefore have $P_i \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P_j$ which proves that the sequence P_1, P_2, \dots is good.

3.3 Limits and Ideal Decompositions

In this section, we exploit the wqo structure of $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}$ to provide a finite representation for its downward-closed sets. Let (S, \sqsubseteq) be a qo. A set $D \subseteq S$ is an *ideal* if it is downward-closed and directed, i.e. for all $x, y \in D$ there is a $z \in D$ such that $x \sqsubseteq z$ and $y \sqsubseteq z$. We write $\text{Idl}(S)$ for the set of ideals of S . It is well-known that in a well-quasi-order, every downward-closed set is equal to a canonical minimal finite union of ideals, its *ideal decomposition*. To represent downward-closed sets of $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}$ we will only need to provide finite representations of its ideals. We represent ideals using *limits*, which have the same syntax as processes augmented with a construct ${}^{-\omega}$ to represent processes with arbitrary number of parallel components.

Definition 6 (Limits). We call limits the terms L formed according to the grammar:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L} \ni L &::= \mathbf{0} \mid (R_1 \parallel \dots \parallel R_n) \\ R &::= B \mid B^\omega \\ B &::= \langle M \rangle \mid \mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}] \mid \mathbf{v}x.L \end{aligned}$$

Definition 7 (Denotation of limits). The denotation of L is the set $\llbracket L \rrbracket := [L] \downarrow$ where:

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{0}] &:= \{\mathbf{0}\} \\ [\langle M \rangle] &:= \{\langle M \rangle\} \\ [\mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}]] &:= \{\mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}]\} \\ [\mathbf{v}x.L] &:= \{\mathbf{v}x.P \mid P \in [L]\} \\ [L_1 \parallel L_2] &:= \{(P_1 \parallel P_2) \mid P_1 \in [L_1], P_2 \in [L_2]\} \\ [B^\omega] &:= \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{(P_1 \parallel \dots \parallel P_n) \mid \forall i \leq n : P_i \in [B]\} \end{aligned}$$

We call the processes in $\llbracket L \rrbracket$ instances of L . Define $\text{nest}_v(L)$ to be as nest_v on processes with the addition of the case $\text{nest}_v(L^\omega) := \text{nest}_v(L)$. It is easy to check that for each $P \in \llbracket L \rrbracket$, $\text{depth}(P) \leq \text{nest}_v(L)$. We write $\mathbb{L}_{s,k}^X$ for the set of limit expressions L with free names in X that have $\text{nest}_v(L) \leq k$ and do not contain messages of size exceeding s . We often omit X and understand it is a fixed finite set of names.

We now prove that each denotation of a limit is an ideal, and every ideal is a denotation of some limit, i.e. $\text{Idl}(\mathbb{D}_{s,k}) = \llbracket \mathbb{L}_{s,k} \rrbracket$. This makes finite unions of limits a sound and complete representation of downward-closed sets of $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}$.

To better manipulate limits, we introduce the n -th grounding $[L]^n$ of a limit L , defined in Fig. 5. Grounding can be thought as replacing each ${}^{-\omega}$ with ${}^{-n}$; e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} [(\mathbf{v}x.\langle x \rangle \parallel (\mathbf{v}y.\mathbf{Q}[x, y])^\omega)^\omega]^2 &= (\mathbf{v}x.\langle x \rangle \parallel (\mathbf{v}y.\mathbf{Q}[x, y]) \parallel (\mathbf{v}y.\mathbf{Q}[x, y])) \\ &\quad \parallel (\mathbf{v}x.\langle x \rangle \parallel (\mathbf{v}y.\mathbf{Q}[x, y]) \parallel (\mathbf{v}y.\mathbf{Q}[x, y])) \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4. For every $L \in \mathbb{L}_{s,k}$, the set $\llbracket L \rrbracket$ is an ideal of $(\mathbb{D}_{s,k}, \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}})$.

$$[L]^n := \begin{cases} L & \text{if } L \text{ is sequential or } \mathbf{0} \\ \lceil L_1 \rceil^n \parallel \lceil L_2 \rceil^n & \text{if } L = L_1 \parallel L_2 \\ \mathbf{v}x.(\lceil L' \rceil^n) & \text{if } L = \mathbf{v}x.L' \\ (\lceil B \rceil^n)^n & \text{if } L = B^\omega \end{cases} \quad L \otimes n := \begin{cases} L & \text{if } L \text{ is sequential or } \mathbf{0} \\ L_1 \otimes n \parallel L_2 \otimes n & \text{if } L = L_1 \parallel L_2 \\ \mathbf{v}x.(L' \otimes n) & \text{if } L = \mathbf{v}x.L' \\ (B \otimes n)^n \parallel B^\omega & \text{if } L = B^\omega \end{cases}$$

Fig. 5. The grounding $\lceil - \rceil^n : \mathbb{L}_{s,k} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_{s,k}$ and extension $- \otimes n : \mathbb{L}_{s,k} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_{s,k}$ operations on limits.

Theorem 5. *Every ideal in $\text{Idl}(\mathbb{D}_k \cap \mathbb{S}_s)$ is the denotation of some limit $L \in \mathbb{L}_{s,k}$.*

The idea of the proof is to use the forest encoding $\mathcal{F}[\lceil - \rceil]$ to apply known facts about the ideal completion for multisets to our setting. We take an ideal of $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}$ and show it corresponds to a downward closed set of $\mathbb{F}_{s,k}$, via forest encoding. For multisets, we know exactly how to represent ideals [15], i.e. \otimes -products. These products are expressions that can be translated to limits.

3.4 Decidability of Inclusion

We have established that we can finitely represent downward-closed sets of $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}$ using limits. Now we turn to decidability of inclusion between downward-closed sets. We will make use of the following well-known property of ideals: for any D, D_1, D_2 ideals of a wqo, $D \subseteq D_1 \cup D_2 \iff D \subseteq D_1$ or $D \subseteq D_2$. Assume we are given the ideal decomposition of two downward-closed sets $D_1 = I_1 \cup \dots \cup I_n$ and $D_2 = J_1 \cup \dots \cup J_m$. We have $D_1 \subseteq D_2$ if and only if for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, there is a $1 \leq j \leq m$, such that $I_i \subseteq J_j$. As a consequence, it suffices to show that inclusion of ideals is decidable.

We extend structural congruence to limits in the obvious way, with laws for parallel and restriction analogous to the process case, and the addition of the law $\langle M \rangle^\omega \equiv \langle M \rangle$. It is easy to check that $L \equiv L'$ implies $\llbracket L \rrbracket = \llbracket L' \rrbracket$. We can define a standard form for limits: every limit is structurally congruent to a limit of the form $\mathbf{v}\vec{x}.(\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel \prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{Q}_i[\vec{M}_i] \parallel \prod_{j \in J} B_j^\omega)$ where every name in \vec{x} occurs free at least once in the scope of the restriction, and for all $j \in J$, B_j is also in standard form. When we write $\text{sf}(L) \stackrel{\circ}{=} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}.(\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel Q \parallel R)$ we imply that Q is a parallel composition of process calls $\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{Q}_i[\vec{M}_i]$ (in which case we write $|Q|$ for $|I|$) and R is a parallel composition of iterated limits $\prod_{j \in J} B_j^\omega$.

The absorption axiom The decidability proof hinges on a characterisation of inclusion that requires an additional hypothesis on the intruder model.

Definition 8 (Absorbing intruder). *Fix an intruder model $\mathbb{I} = (\Sigma, \vdash)$. Let \vec{x} and \vec{y} be two lists of pairwise distinct names, Γ be a finite set of messages, and $\Gamma' = \Gamma[\vec{y}/\vec{x}]$. Moreover, assume that $\text{names}(\Gamma) \cap \vec{y} = \emptyset$. We say \mathbb{I} is absorbing if, for all messages M with $\text{names}(M) \subseteq \text{names}(\Gamma)$, we have that $\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash M$ if and only if $\Gamma \vdash M$.*

Lemma 4. \mathbb{I}_{en} is absorbing.

For the rest of the paper, we assume an absorbing intruder model.

The absorption axiom has a technical definition, which becomes more intuitive if understood in the context of limits of the form $L = (\mathbf{v}\vec{x}.(\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel Q))^\omega$. Imagine comparing the difference in knowledge between $\lceil L \rceil^1$ and $\lceil L \rceil^2$: we have $\text{sf}(\lceil L \rceil^2) \stackrel{\circ}{=} (\mathbf{v}\vec{x}. \mathbf{v}\vec{x}'.(\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel \langle \Gamma' \rangle \parallel Q \parallel Q'))$, where $\Gamma' = \Gamma[\vec{x}'/\vec{x}]$. The absorption axiom tells us that if we want to check whether a process $\mathbf{v}\vec{x}. \langle M \rangle$ is embedded in $\text{sf}(\lceil L \rceil^2)$, we only need to check if M is derivable from Γ and we can ignore Γ' . In other words, we only need to check if $\mathbf{v}\vec{x}. \langle M \rangle$ is embedded in $\lceil L \rceil^1$.

We are now ready to prove our main result: a small model property that shows decidability of limit inclusion. Let us present the intuition first with a simple example. To manipulate limits with ω s, we introduce a variant of grounding called the n -th extension $L \otimes n$, defined in Fig. 5. An extension $L \otimes n$ produces a new limit with each sublimit B^ω unfolded n times, while also keeping the sublimit B^ω . Note that extension does not alter semantics: $\llbracket L \rrbracket = \llbracket L \otimes n \rrbracket$. Now consider the simpler problem of deciding inclusion when one of the limits is a single process P , i.e. deciding if $P \in \llbracket L \rrbracket$. Take $P = \nu a, b. (\langle e(a)_b \rangle \parallel A[b])$ and $L = (\nu x. (\langle x \rangle \parallel A[x]))^\omega$. Suppose we replicate the ω twice, obtaining the equivalent limit $L \otimes 2 \equiv \nu x_0, x_1. (\langle x_0 \rangle \parallel A[x_0] \parallel \langle x_1 \rangle \parallel A[x_1] \parallel L)$. The idea is that we can match P against the fixed part of $L \otimes 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} P \equiv_{\text{kn}} \nu x_0, x_1. (\langle e(x_0)_{x_1} \rangle \parallel A[x_1]) &\sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \nu x_0, x_1. (\langle e(x_0)_{x_1} \rangle \parallel A[x_0] \parallel A[x_1]) \\ &\sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \nu x_0, x_1. (\langle x_0 \rangle \parallel \langle x_1 \rangle \parallel A[x_0] \parallel A[x_1]) \in L \otimes 2 \end{aligned}$$

The first observation is therefore that if we can find some m such that P is embedded in the fixed part of $L \otimes m$, we have proven $P \in \llbracket L \rrbracket$. To turn this into an algorithm, we need to prove that there exists an n so that if we failed to embed P in the fixed part of $L \otimes m$, for any $m \leq n$ then P is not going to embed in $L \otimes m'$ for every m' , and therefore $P \notin \llbracket L \rrbracket$. In other words, we need to know that after some threshold n , there is no point trying with bigger extensions. Take for example $P = \nu x, y. (\text{B}[x, y] \parallel \text{B}[y, x])$ and $L = (\nu x, y. \text{B}[x, y])^\omega$. We can try and embed P into $L \otimes 2$ but we would fail as the fixed part expands to $\nu x_0, y_0. \text{B}[x_0, y_0] \parallel \nu x_1, y_1. \text{B}[x_1, y_1]$. It is easy to see that expanding further would not introduce new patterns in the fixed part of the limit which would help embed P .

Theorem 6 formalises and generalises this intuition to the general problem of inclusion between two arbitrary limits L_1 and L_2 : it proves that the threshold for expansion is the number of fixed restrictions of L_1 plus the number of fixed process calls of L_1 , plus one; and it makes use of the absorption axiom to prove the threshold is sound even in the presence of knowledge.

Theorem 6 (Characterisation of Limits Inclusion). *Let L_1 and L_2 be two limits, such that $\text{sf}(L_1) \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \nu \vec{x}_1. (\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel \prod_{i \in I} B_i^\omega)$, and let $n = |\vec{x}_1| + |Q_1| + 1$. Then:*

$$\llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket L_2 \rrbracket \iff \begin{cases} \text{sf}(L_2 \otimes n) \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \nu \vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2. (\langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel Q_2 \parallel R_2) \text{ and } \Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2 & \text{(A)} \\ \llbracket \langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel \prod_{i \in I} B_i \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel R_2 \rrbracket & \text{(B)} \end{cases}$$

Theorem 7. *Given $L_1, L_2 \in \mathbb{L}$ it is decidable whether $\llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket L_2 \rrbracket$.*

Proof. Theorem 6 leads to a recursive algorithm. Given L_1 and L_2 , one computes $\text{sf}(L_1)$ and $\text{sf}(L_2 \otimes n)$. For every α -renaming that makes condition (A) hold, one checks condition (B) (recursively). If no renaming makes both true then the inclusion does not hold. In the recursive case, there are fewer occurrences of ω in the limit on the left, eventually leading to the case where L_1 has no occurrence of ω , and only condition (A) needs to be checked.

Example 6 (Limit inclusion). Consider the following two limits:

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &= \nu x_1. ((\nu x_2. (\langle e(x_2)_{x_1} \rangle \parallel A[x_2] \parallel A[x_1]))^\omega) \\ L_2 &= \nu y_1, y_3. (\langle y_3 \rangle \parallel A[y_3]^\omega \parallel (\nu y_2. (\langle y_2 \rangle \parallel A[y_2]))^\omega) \end{aligned}$$

We prove that $\llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket L_2 \rrbracket$ by applying the recursive algorithm from Theorem 7. By Theorem 6, here the threshold for expansion is $n = 2$, but we will try with $n = 1$. In case we succeed, the inclusion holds. If not, we might have to increase n up to 2. This results in

$$\begin{aligned} L_2 \otimes 1 &= \nu y_1, y_3. (\langle y_3 \rangle \parallel A[y_3] \parallel A[y_3]^\omega \parallel (\nu y_2. (\langle y_2 \rangle \parallel A[y_2]))^\omega \parallel (\nu y_2. (\langle y_2 \rangle \parallel A[y_2]))) \\ &\equiv_{\text{kn}} \nu y_1, y_2, y_3. (\langle y_3 \rangle \parallel \langle y_2 \rangle \parallel A[y_2] \parallel A[y_3] \parallel A[y_3]^\omega \parallel (\nu y_2. (\langle y_2 \rangle \parallel A[y_2]))^\omega) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
L &= \nu a, b, k_{as}, k_{bs}. (\langle a, b \rangle \parallel A_1[a, b, k_{as}]^\omega \parallel B_1[a, b, k_{bs}]^\omega \parallel S[a, b, k_{as}, k_{bs}]^\omega \parallel L_1^\omega) \\
L_1 &= \nu n_a. (\langle n_a \rangle \parallel A_2[a, b, k_{as}, n_a] \parallel L_2^\omega) \\
L_2 &= \nu k. (\langle e(k)_{(a, k_{as})} \rangle \parallel \langle e(k)_{(b, k_{as})} \rangle \parallel \langle e(k)_{(n_a, k_{as})} \rangle \parallel \langle e(k)_{k_{bs}} \rangle \parallel \text{Secret}[k]^\omega \parallel A_3[a, b, k_{as}, k]^\omega \parallel L_3^\omega) \\
L_3 &= \nu n_b. (\langle e(n_b)_{(k, k)} \rangle \parallel \langle e(n_b)_k \rangle \parallel B_2[a, b, k_{bs}, n_b, k])
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 6. An inductive invariant for Example 2.

To try and match the fixed part of L_1 with $L_2 \otimes 1$, we could α -rename x_1 to y_1 . This works for (A) but the remaining goal (B) cannot be shown as it does not hold because we cannot derive $\langle e(x_2)_{y_1} \rangle$ from the knowledge on the right-hand side:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\llbracket \nu x_2. (\langle e(x_2)_{y_1} \rangle \parallel A[x_2] \parallel A[x_1]) \rrbracket \not\subseteq \\
&\quad \llbracket \langle y_3 \rangle \parallel \langle e(y_{22})_{y_3} \rangle \parallel A[x_1]^\omega \parallel (\nu y_2. (\langle e(y_2)_{y_3} \rangle \parallel A[y_2]))^\omega \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing the α -renaming $[x_1/y_3]$ leaves us instead with:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\llbracket \nu x_2. (\langle e(x_2)_{y_3} \rangle \parallel A[x_2] \parallel A[x_1]) \rrbracket \subseteq \\
&\quad \llbracket \langle y_3 \rangle \parallel \langle e(y_{22})_{y_3} \rangle \parallel A[x_1]^\omega \parallel (\nu y_2. (\langle e(y_2)_{y_3} \rangle \parallel A[y_2]))^\omega \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

which holds. It suffices to expand the latter limit by 1 and choose the renaming $[x_2/y_2]$. Then, $e(x_1)_{x_2} \leq_{\text{kn}} x_1, x_2$ holds and the process calls match. Note that it is crucial to keep $A[x_1]^\omega$ on the right side.

3.5 Computing Post-Hat

The last result we need is the decidability of a function $\widehat{\text{post}}_\Delta^s(L)$ which, given a limit L , returns a finite set of limits $\{L_1, \dots, L_n\}$ such that $\text{post}_\Delta^s(\llbracket L \rrbracket) \downarrow = \llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \cup \dots \cup \llbracket L_n \rrbracket$. The challenge is representing all the possible successors of processes in $\llbracket L \rrbracket$ without having to enumerate $\llbracket L \rrbracket$. The key idea hinges again on the absorption axiom: we observe that to consider all possible process calls that may cause a transition, it is enough to unfold each ω in L by some bounded number b . Any transition taken from further unfoldings will give rise to successors that are congruent to some of the ones already considered.

The bound b used in extending a limit, is defined as a function of the process definitions and the intruder model. The arity of a pattern $\vec{x} : M$ is $|\vec{x}|$. Given a set of definitions Δ , $\beta(\Delta)$ is the maximum arity of patterns in Δ . The function $\gamma(\mathbb{I})$ returns the maximum arity of the constructors in the signature of \mathbb{I} .

Definition 9 ($\widehat{\text{post}}$). Let $b = \beta(\Delta) \cdot \gamma(\mathbb{I})^{s-1} + 1$ and $\text{sf}(L \otimes b) = \nu \vec{x}. (\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel Q \parallel R)$,

$$\widehat{\text{post}}_\Delta^s(L) := \{ \nu \vec{y}. (\langle \Gamma' \rangle \parallel Q' \parallel R) \mid \nu \vec{x}. (\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel Q) \rightarrow_\Delta \nu \vec{y}. (\langle \Gamma' \rangle \parallel Q') \in \mathbb{S}_s \}$$

Theorem 8. $\widehat{\text{post}}_\Delta^s(L) = \{L_1, \dots, L_n\} \implies \text{post}_\Delta^s(\llbracket L \rrbracket) \downarrow = \llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \cup \dots \cup \llbracket L_n \rrbracket$.

3.6 Example

The limit L in Fig. 6 represents an inductive invariant for Example 2, under size bound 3. It can be proven invariant by checking that $\widehat{\text{post}}_\Delta^3(L)$ is included in L . The invariant certifies that any process in $\llbracket L \rrbracket$ is $(3, 7)$ -bounded (note $\text{nest}_\nu(L) = 7$) and satisfies secrecy. This applies to

the initial process of Example 2 as $P_0 \in \llbracket L \rrbracket$. In fact, L^ω is also inductive, proving boundedness and secrecy for any process in $(P_0)^\omega$. Since $\llbracket \text{vk}.\langle \text{vx}.\langle x, e(x)_k \rangle \rangle^\omega \rrbracket \not\subseteq \llbracket L^\omega \rrbracket$, L^ω provides proof that the protocol is not susceptible to known-plaintext attacks. The invariant L was automatically inferred from P_0 using our prototype tool.

4 Algorithmic Aspects and Evaluation

In Section 3 we laid down the foundations for a theory of invariants for depth-bounded protocols. The algorithms presented in Section 3.1 have, however, very high complexity; in this section we summarise strategies that can be employed to obtain more efficient algorithms.

The algorithms for inclusion and $\widehat{\text{post}}$ can be used to check inductiveness given a candidate invariant. This leaves open the question of how to efficiently enumerate candidate invariants. An initial answer can be found in [28] which presents a framework for widening operators on ideal completions. It is not difficult to design a widening operator for bounded protocols inspired by the widening for the depth-bounded π -calculus of [28]. The basic observation is that from a sequence of transitions $P_1 \rightarrow^* P_2$ with $P_1 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P_2$, one can deduce that the same sequence can be simulated from P_2 (by Theorem 1) obtaining a P_3 with $P_2 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P_3$ and so on. One can then analyse the embedding between P_1 and P_2 , justified by $P_1 \equiv_{\text{kn}} \text{vx}.\langle \langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q \rangle$, $P_2 \equiv_{\text{kn}} \text{vx}.\langle \langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q \parallel P \rangle$ extrapolate the difference P and accelerate the sequence of transitions by constructing the limit $\text{vx}.\langle \langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q \parallel P^\omega \rangle$. The widening can be extended to limits. The end product is a finite union of limits which is inductive by construction. This procedure is still very computationally intensive: many inclusion checks are needed and the exploration of transitions can be costly. To obtain a more practical algorithm, we devised two techniques: inductiveness checks through “incorporation”, and a coarser widening.

Consider the inductiveness check $\llbracket \widehat{\text{post}}_\Delta^s(L) \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket L \rrbracket$ implemented by checking that, for each transition considered by $\widehat{\text{post}}$ the resulting limit L' is included by L . We observe that L' and L will share the context of the transition: L can be rewritten to $C[\text{Q}[\vec{M}]]$ and L' to $C[P]$ for some P . To prove inclusion of $C[P]$ in $C[\text{Q}[\vec{M}]]$ it is then sufficient to show that P is embedded in $C[\text{Q}[\vec{M}]]$. We call this check an *incorporation* of P in C . See the Appendix for an example. Although incomplete in general, incorporation can prove inductiveness in many practical examples.

Incorporation improves the performance of inductiveness dramatically. There are cases, however, where the incorporation check fails on inductive invariants. Consider for example an inductive invariant represented by the union of two incomparable limits L_1, L_2 . Suppose that for some $P \in \llbracket L_1 \rrbracket$ there is P' with $P \rightarrow P' \in \llbracket L_2 \rrbracket \setminus \llbracket L_1 \rrbracket$. Then, incorporation of P' in L_1 would fail. To side-step this problem we replace union of limits with parallel composition: $\llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \cup \llbracket L_2 \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket L_1 \parallel L_2 \rrbracket$ by downward closure of $\llbracket - \rrbracket$. Using this over-approximation, we can try to aim for an inductive invariant which consists of exactly one limit, and for which the incorporation check suffices. The over-approximation is incomplete: there are protocols for which there are only inductive invariants consisting of unions of incomparable limits.

Evaluation We built a proof-of-concept prototype tool implementing limit inclusion, inductivity check, incorporation and a coarse widening. Currently, the tool only supports symmetric encryption, but we plan to add support for asymmetric encryption, signatures and hashing. The sourcecode and all the test protocol models are available at <https://bitbucket.org/bordaigor1/lemma9>. We summarise our experiments in Table 1. The times are taken by running the tool with Python 2.7, z3-solver v4.8, 8GB RAM, Intel CPU i5, on Linux.

The tool is instructed to compute, using the widening, an invariant for the provided model, under given message size assumptions. When an invariant can be found, it represents a proof

Table 1. Experimental results. Columns: **Inference** of invariant fully automatic (F) or interactive (I); Check of inductiveness; **Secrecy** proved (✓), not holding (×), not modelled (◦).

Name	Infer	C	S	Name	Infer	C	S	Name	Infer	C	S
Ex.2	5.0s F	2.0s	✓	NHS	5.0s F	1.5s	◦	YAH	10.3s F	3.2s	◦
OR	4.2s F	2.1s	◦	NHSs	6.8s F	1.7s	✓	YAHs1	14.1s F	2.9s	✓
ORl	44.9s F	4.4s	×	NHSr	60.2s I	10.9s	×	YAHs2	11.0s F	2.3s	✓
ORa	27.3s I	7.4s	◦	KSL	37.6s F	11.2s	✓	YAHlk	11.6s I	16.3s	✓
ORs	16.7s F	3.0s	✓	KSLR	187.9s F	36.3s	✓	ARPC	0.5s F	0.2s	✓

that the model is depth-bounded. If the model encodes secrecy (with the pattern explained in Section 3.1) if the inferred invariant is leak-free, secrecy is also proven. We model a number of well-known protocols under various threat scenarios (e.g. with or without leak of old keys). For any example containing a problematic encryption oracle pattern (see Example 5) we constrain the input message of the oracle to be a nonce (message of size 1). With the exception of NHSr, ORa and YAHlk, all the invariants were obtained fully automatically. For YAHlk we had to combine two widened limits (the timing is the sum of the time spent computing each limit); for NHSr and ORa we had to tweak a partially widened limit manually to make it inductive. To simulate using invariants as correctness certificates, for each example we re-checked them for inductiveness.

The Needham-Schröder protocol [21] is modelled with and without secrecy (NHS/NHSs). The NHSr version models leaks of old session keys, which leads to a replay attack (and hence the invariant is leaky). We provide four models of the Otway-Rees protocol [22]. OR does not model secrecy and is used to prove the protocol depth-bounded. ORl models secrecy but the inferred invariant contains a genuine leak, which is the result of a known type-confusion attack. The attack substitutes a composite message for some input x that is (wrongly) assumed to be a nonce by a principal. ORa models authentication and the invariant shows the genuine misauthentication based on this attack. ORs models the same situation with the assumption that x is of size one; with this assumption the inferred invariant is not leaky.

ARPC models Lowefis modified BAN concrete ARPC protocol [18] (we model succ(-) with pair(-,-)). We modelled the Kehne-Schönwälder-Landendörfer protocol [18], as modified by Lowe, with (KSLR) and without (KSL) re-authentication.

We produced four models of the Yahalom protocol [7]. Our first model (YAH) does not model secrecy and is used to establish depth-boundedness. The protocol has a type-confusion attack (similar to the case of Otway-Rees) which does not lead to a leak of a secret. This is modelled in YAHs1. We rule out this type-confusion by adding a size assumption in YAHs2. YAHlk is a variant where an additional fresh nonce is exchanged at the beginning of each session, which makes the protocol secret even when old session keys can be leaked, a property entailed by the inferred invariant.

Limitations Although in our examples we used (a)symmetric encryption, our framework is parametric on the intruder model. Indeed, Definition 1 supports models of many other cryptographic primitives such as signatures, hashing, XOR. The current limitation of our framework with respect to more powerful primitives, such as the notoriously difficult XOR or Diffie-Hellman exponentiation, is given by the (s, k) -bounded restriction: protocols like Diffie-Hellman Key Exchange, as modelled in our calculus, is not depth-bounded. At the core of the issue is the encryption oracle pattern presented in Example 5. We are currently investigating extensions of the class of (s, k) -bounded protocols that accommodate safe uses of encryption oracles. The

main idea is that, while oracles can be used by the intruder to create unbounded chains, these chains may never be inspected by principals, and thus are effectively irrelevant. To weed out irrelevant chains we can make the intruder *lazy*: instead of generating full messages matching a pattern in a transition, the intruder synthesizes a *symbolic* message which is specified only up to what is needed to make it match the pattern. Pattern variables will be bound to symbolic messages that can later be instantiated only if any principal will be able to pattern match on them. Developing a theory of symbolic messages for depth-bounded invariants is a topic of future research.

Another limitation of the depth-bounded class is that it does not support protocols where principals form a linked-list/ring topology of arbitrary size, like the recursive protocol of [23, §6]. Since such topologies of fixed size can be supported, a possible extension is to parametrise the models with the number n of nodes of the topology and study decidability of parametrised depth-bounded systems.

5 Conclusions and Future work

This paper presented a principled first step in understanding automatic verification of cryptographic protocols without bounding the number of sessions/nonces. We studied the algebraic structure of depth-bounded protocols under absorbing intruder models, and proven decidability of inductiveness of downward-closed sets. On the practical side, we implemented an inductiveness checker in a proof-of-concept tool. The current version can be used interactively to construct candidate invariants, also with the help of a coarse widening. Our plan is to improve the widening by implementing a refinement loop that iteratively refines an initial coarse invariant candidate, until one is found that proves the desired properties.

We can show that \sqsubseteq_{kn} is NP-complete for \mathbb{I}_{en} [24] and in general for any intruder model that has polynomially decidable \leq_{kn} . From a theoretical perspective it would be interesting to determine precise complexity bounds for inclusion, for general intruder models.

Depth boundedness does limit the class of protocols we can verify with our techniques, and a primary goal of future work is to relax and generalise this class. Another direction for further improvement is extending the class of supported properties. In particular, we plan to study how invariants can be used to automatically prove diff-equivalence [3] without bounding sessions/nonces.

Finally, we intend to explore ways in which our invariants can be integrated in existing tools such as ProVerif and Tamarin. For instance, Tamarin performs a backwards search to find possible attacks. Our invariants could provide a pruning technique to avoid exploring paths that are unreachable from the initial state. Similar combinations of forward and backward search has been shown to improve performance dramatically for analyses of infinite-state systems such as Petri nets [5].

Acknowledgments We would like to thank Alwen Tiu and Roland Meyer for the useful feedback.

References

1. Armando, A., Basin, D.A., Boichut, Y., Chevalier, Y., Compagna, L., Cuéllar, J., Drielsma, P.H., Héam, P., Kouchnarenko, O., Mantovani, J., Mödersheim, S., von Oheimb, D., Rusinowitch, M., Santiago, J., Turuani, M., Viganò, L., Vigneron, L.: The AVISPA tool for the automated validation of internet security protocols and applications. In: CAV. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 3576, pp. 281–285. Springer (2005)
2. Blanchet, B.: Modeling and verifying security protocols with the applied pi calculus and proverif. *Foundations and Trends in Privacy and Security* **1**(1-2), 1–135 (2016)
3. Blanchet, B., Abadi, M., Fournet, C.: Automated verification of selected equivalences for security protocols. *J. Log. Algebr. Program.* **75**(1), 3–51 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlap.2007.06.002>
4. Blanchet, B., Podelski, A.: Verification of cryptographic protocols: tagging enforces termination. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **333**(1-2), 67–90 (2005)
5. Blondin, M., Finkel, A., Haase, C., Haddad, S.: Approaching the coverability problem continuously. In: TACAS. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 9636, pp. 480–496. Springer (2016)
6. Blondin, M., Finkel, A., McKenzie, P.: Handling infinitely branching well-structured transition systems. *Inf. Comput.* **258**, 28–49 (2018)
7. Burrows, M., Abadi, M., Needham, R.M.: A logic of authentication. In: SOSP’89. pp. 1–13. ACM (1989)
8. Chadha, R., Cheval, V., Ştefan Ciobăcă, Kremer, S.: Automated verification of equivalence properties of cryptographic protocols. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.* **17**(4), 23:1–23:32 (2016)
9. Cheval, V., Kremer, S., Rakotonirina, I.: DEEPSEC: deciding equivalence properties in security protocols theory and practice. In: IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. pp. 529–546. IEEE Computer Society (2018)
10. Chrétien, R., Cortier, V., Delaune, S.: Decidability of trace equivalence for protocols with nonces. In: CSF’15. pp. 170–184. IEEE Computer Society (2015)
11. Cortier, V., Grimm, N., Lallemand, J., Maffei, M.: A type system for privacy properties. In: ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security. pp. 409–423. ACM (2017)
12. Dahl, M., Kobayashi, N., Sun, Y., Hüttel, H.: Type-based automated verification of authenticity in asymmetric cryptographic protocols. In: ATVA. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 6996, pp. 75–89. Springer (2011)
13. D’Osualdo, E., Ong, L., Tiu, A.: Deciding secrecy of security protocols for an unbounded number of sessions: The case of depth-bounded processes. In: CSF. pp. 464–480. IEEE Computer Society (2017)
14. Dreier, J., Hirschi, L., Radomirovic, S., Sasse, R.: Automated unbounded verification of stateful cryptographic protocols with exclusive OR. In: CSF. pp. 359–373. IEEE Computer Society (2018)
15. Finkel, A., Goubault-Larrecq, J.: Forward analysis for WSTS, part I: completions. In: STACS. LIPIcs, vol. 3, pp. 433–444 (2009)
16. Finkel, A., Schnoebelen, P.: Well-structured transition systems everywhere! *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **256**(1-2), 63–92 (2001)
17. Hüchting, R., Majumdar, R., Meyer, R.: Bounds on mobility. In: CONCUR. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 8704, pp. 357–371. Springer (2014)
18. Lowe, G.: Some new attacks upon security protocols. In: Ninth IEEE Computer Security Foundations Workshop, March 10 - 12, 1996, Dromquinna Manor, Kenmare, County Kerry, Ireland. pp. 162–169. IEEE Computer Society (1996)
19. Meier, S., Schmidt, B., Cremers, C., Basin, D.A.: The TAMARIN prover for the symbolic analysis of security protocols. In: CAV. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 8044, pp. 696–701. Springer (2013)
20. Meyer, R.: On boundedness in depth in the π -calculus. In: Ausiello, G., Karhumäki, J., Mauri, G., Ong, C.H.L. (eds.) IFIP TCS. IFIP, vol. 273, pp. 477–489. Springer (2008)
21. Needham, R.M., Schroeder, M.D.: Using encryption for authentication in large networks of computers. *Commun. ACM* **21**(12), 993–999 (1978)
22. Otway, D.J., Rees, O.: Efficient and timely mutual authentication. *Operating Systems Review* **21**(1), 8–10 (1987)
23. Paulson, L.C.: The inductive approach to verifying cryptographic protocols. *Journal of Computer Security* **6**(1-2), 85–128 (1998)

24. Stutz, F.: Decidable Inductive Invariants for Verification of Cryptographic Protocols with Unbounded Sessions. Master's thesis, Saarland University (2019)
25. Tiu, A., Goré, R., Dawson, J.E.: A proof theoretic analysis of intruder theories. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* **6**(3) (2010)
26. Tiu, A., Nguyen, N., Horne, R.: SPEC: an equivalence checker for security protocols. In: APLAS. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 10017, pp. 87–95 (2016)
27. Wies, T., Zufferey, D., Henzinger, T.A.: Forward analysis of depth-bounded processes. In: FoSSaCS. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 6014, pp. 94–108. Springer (2010)
28. Zufferey, D., Wies, T., Henzinger, T.A.: Ideal abstractions for well-structured transition systems. In: VMCAI'12'. *LNCS*, vol. 7148, pp. 445–460. Springer (2012)

Appendix

A Proof of Proposition 2

Rule ID implies (Id); it is easy to check that any derivation for $\Gamma \vdash M$ is also a derivation (of same depth) for $\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash M$, which implies (Mon); (Cut) is a consequence of the admissibility of the CUT rule proven in [25]. The \neg_{R} rules directly entail (Constr). All rules are invariant under renamings so (Alpha) holds. (Relevancy) can be proven by a straightforward induction on the depth of derivations. Since the premises in every rule involve only sub-terms of the consequence, derivability is decidable.

B Proof of Proposition 3

The “only if” direction is trivial. The “if” direction is proved as follows. Let $\text{sf}(P_i) \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \nu \vec{x}_i. (\langle \Gamma_i \rangle \parallel Q_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. It is easy to check that $P_1 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P_2$ if and only if $\Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2$, $\vec{x}_2 = \vec{x}_1 \vec{y}_2$ for some \vec{y}_2 , and $Q_2 = Q_1 \parallel Q'_2$ for some parallel composition of process calls Q'_2 . Similarly, $P_2 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P_1$ if and only if $\Gamma_2 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_1$, $\vec{x}_1 = \vec{x}_2 \vec{y}_1$, and $Q_1 = Q_2 \parallel Q'_1$ for some \vec{y}_1, Q'_1 . We get $\Gamma_1 \sim_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2$, $x_1 = x_2$ and $Q_1 = Q_2$ as required to prove $P_1 \equiv_{\text{kn}} P_2$.

C Auxiliary results

C.1 Properties of Knowledge

Lemma 5. *Let $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma \in \mathbb{K}$ be such that $\Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2$. Then, $\Gamma, \Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma, \Gamma_2$.*

Proof. Let $\Gamma_1 = \{M_1, \dots, M_n\}$. We have to show that for all N , if $\Gamma, \Gamma_1 \vdash N$ then $\Gamma_2 \vdash N$. We apply (Cut) n times obtaining

$$\frac{\Gamma, \Gamma_2, (\Gamma_1 \setminus M_n) \vdash M_n \quad \Gamma, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash N \quad \text{CUT}}{\dots} \quad \vdots \quad \text{CUT}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, \Gamma_2, M_1 \vdash M_2 \quad \Gamma, \Gamma_2, M_1, M_2 \vdash N \quad \text{CUT}}{\Gamma, \Gamma_2, M_1 \vdash N} \quad \text{CUT}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, \Gamma_2 \vdash M_1 \quad \Gamma, \Gamma_2, M_1 \vdash N \quad \text{CUT}}{\Gamma, \Gamma_2 \vdash N} \quad \text{CUT}$$

From $\Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2$ we have $\forall i \leq n: \Gamma_2 \vdash M_i$, which implies, by (Mon), all the left-most premises. By (Mon), from $\Gamma, \Gamma_1 \vdash N$ we know $\Gamma, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash N$, which completes the derivation showing $\Gamma, \Gamma_2 \vdash N$.

Corollary 1. *Let $\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \in \mathbb{K}$ be such that $\Delta_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Delta_2$ and $\Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2$. Then, $\Delta_1, \Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Delta_2, \Gamma_2$.*

Proof. Easy corollary of Lemma 5: $\Gamma_1, \Delta_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2, \Delta_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2, \Delta_2$.

Lemma 6. $\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel \langle \Gamma \rangle \equiv_{\text{kn}} \langle \Gamma \rangle$, for all $\Gamma \in \mathbb{K}$.

C.2 Properties of \sqsubseteq_{kn}

Corollary 2. *Let $\Gamma \in \mathbb{K}$ and $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{P}$ with $\text{sf}(P_i) = \nu \vec{x}_i. (\langle \Gamma_i \rangle \parallel Q_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $P_1 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P_2$. Then, $\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel P_1 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel P_2$.*

Lemma 7. *Let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{P}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $P_1 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P_2$, then $P_1^n \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P_2^n$.*

Lemma 8. *For any $L \in \mathbb{L}$, and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $(\lceil L^\omega \rceil^n)^m \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \lceil L^\omega \rceil^{m*n}$.*

C.3 Properties of grounding

Lemma 9. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lceil L \rceil^n \in \llbracket L \rrbracket$.

Lemma 10. For every $n \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lceil L \rceil^n \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \lceil L \rceil^m$.

Lemma 11. For every $P \in \llbracket L \rrbracket$ there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $P \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \lceil L \rceil^n$.

Lemma 12. $\llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket L_2 \rrbracket \iff \forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \exists m \in \mathbb{N}: \lceil L_1 \rceil^n \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \lceil L_2 \rceil^m$.

C.4 Properties of extension

Lemma 13. For every $L \in \mathbb{L}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\llbracket L \rrbracket = \llbracket L \otimes n \rrbracket$.

Lemma 14. For every $L \in \mathbb{L}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lceil L \rceil^n = \lceil L \otimes n \rceil^0$.

D Soundness and Completeness of Limits

D.1 Proof of Lemma 3

First we strengthen the statement: we can prove that if $\mathcal{F}\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket_k \sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{F}} \mathcal{F}\llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket_k$ then $\text{sf}(Q_1) = \mathbf{v}\vec{y}.R$ and $\text{sf}(Q_2) = \mathbf{v}\vec{y}.\mathbf{v}\vec{z}.(R \parallel R')$, which clearly implies $Q_1 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} Q_2$.

We proceed by induction on k . The base case is a special case of the induction step, so let us consider the latter first. Assume $\text{nest}_v(Q_1), \text{nest}_v(Q_2) \leq k+1$ and $\varphi_1 = \mathcal{F}\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket_{k+1} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{F}} \mathcal{F}\llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket_{k+1} = \varphi_2$, and let $B = \text{supp}(\varphi_1) \cap \mathcal{B}_Y(s)$ and $C = \text{supp}(\varphi_1) \setminus B$ (note that $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{s,k}^{Y \cup \{x_{k+1}\}}$). Then, by definition, there is an injective function $f: \text{supp}(\varphi_1) \rightarrow \text{supp}(\varphi_2)$ such that for each $P \in B$, $P = f(P)$ and $\varphi_1(P) \leq \varphi_2(P)$; moreover, for each $\varphi \in C$, $\varphi \sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{F}} f(\varphi)$ and $\varphi_1(\varphi) \leq \varphi_2(\varphi)$. By definition of $\mathcal{F}\llbracket - \rrbracket$ we know that each $\varphi \in C$ is the forest encoding $\mathcal{F}\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket_k$ for some subterm (α -equivalent to) $\mathbf{v}x_{k+1}.P_\varphi$ of Q_1 with $\text{nest}_v(P_\varphi) \leq \text{nest}_v(Q_1) - 1 \leq k$. Similarly for Q_2 we have $f(\varphi) = \mathcal{F}\llbracket P_{f(\varphi)} \rrbracket_k$ for some subterm $\mathbf{v}x_{k+1}.P_{f(\varphi)}$ with $\text{nest}_v(P_{f(\varphi)}) \leq \text{nest}_v(Q_2) - 1 \leq k$. We can therefore apply the induction hypothesis and get $\varphi \sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{F}} f(\varphi)$ implies that $\text{sf}(P_\varphi) = \mathbf{v}\vec{y}_\varphi.R_\varphi$ and $\text{sf}(P_{f(\varphi)}) = \mathbf{v}\vec{y}_\varphi.\mathbf{v}\vec{z}_\varphi.(R_\varphi \parallel R'_\varphi)$. As a consequence of this and of $\varphi_1(\varphi) \leq \varphi_2(\varphi)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &\equiv_{\text{kn}} \left(\prod_{P \in B} P^{\varphi_1(P)} \parallel \prod_{\varphi \in C} (\mathbf{v}x_{k+1}.\mathbf{v}\vec{y}_\varphi.R_\varphi)^{\varphi_1(\varphi)} \right) \\ Q_2 &\equiv_{\text{kn}} \left(\prod_{P \in B} P^{\varphi_1(P)} \parallel \prod_{\varphi \in C} (\mathbf{v}x_{k+1}.\mathbf{v}\vec{y}_\varphi.\mathbf{v}\vec{z}_\varphi.(R_\varphi \parallel R'_\varphi))^{\varphi_1(\varphi)} \parallel R' \right) \end{aligned}$$

which clearly entails the claim, by application of α -renaming and scope extrusion to get the two standard forms. In the base case, $C = \emptyset$ from which the claim follows straightforwardly.

D.2 Proof of Theorem 4

We want to prove that for every $L \in \mathbb{L}_{s,k}$, we have $\llbracket L \rrbracket \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{s,k}$ and $\llbracket L \rrbracket$ is \sqsubseteq_{kn} -downward closed and directed.

Clearly $\llbracket L \rrbracket \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{s,k}$ since every $P \in \llbracket L \rrbracket$ has $\text{nest}_v(P) \leq \text{nest}_v(L) \leq k$ and its active messages are the messages of L up to renaming (which does not alter size).

$\llbracket L \rrbracket$ is downward closed by definition. Proving that $\llbracket L \rrbracket$ is directed requires showing that for each $P_1, P_2 \in \llbracket L \rrbracket$, there is $Q \in \llbracket L \rrbracket$ such that $P_1 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} Q$ and $P_2 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} Q$. Such Q can be constructed by applying Lemma 11 to P_1 and P_2 , obtaining n_1 and n_2 such that $P_i \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \lceil L \rceil^{n_i}$, for $i = 1, 2$. Then $Q = \lceil L \rceil^{\max(n_1, n_2)}$ is the required process by Lemma 10.

D.3 Proof of Theorem 5

The idea of the proof is to use the forest encoding $\mathcal{F}[-]$ to apply known facts about the ideal completion for multisets to our setting. We take an ideal of $\mathbb{D}_{s,k}$ and show it corresponds to a downward closed set of $\mathbb{F}_{s,k}$, via forest encoding. For multisets we know exactly how to represent ideals [15], i.e. \otimes -products. These products are expressions that can be readily seen as limits. Let us recall the result on multisets first and then proceed with the proof.

Let X be a wqo with a finite representation of ideals $\mathbb{I}(X)$. Then we can finitely represent ideals of $\mathcal{M}(X)$ by expressions of the form

$$p = I_1^{\otimes} \odot \cdots \odot I_n^{\otimes} \odot J_1^? \odot \cdots \odot J_m^?$$

where $I_i, J_j \in \mathbb{I}(X)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m$. When $n, m = 0$ we write $p = \epsilon$. Such expressions are called \otimes -products. Their denotations are the ideals of $\mathcal{M}(X)$, via the map

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \epsilon \rrbracket &:= \{\emptyset\} & \llbracket p_1 \odot p_2 \rrbracket &:= \{\mu_1 \oplus \mu_2 \mid \mu_1 \in \llbracket p_1 \rrbracket, \mu_2 \in \llbracket p_2 \rrbracket\} \\ \llbracket I^{\otimes} \rrbracket &:= \mathcal{M}(\llbracket I \rrbracket) & \llbracket I^? \rrbracket &:= \{\{x\} \mid x \in \llbracket I \rrbracket\} \cup \{\emptyset\} \end{aligned}$$

In a wqo, downward closed sets are finite unions of ideals, so any downward closed set of $\mathcal{M}(X)$ can be described as the union of the denotation of finitely many \otimes -products. For the details³ see [15].

Another well-known property of ideals we are going to use is the following. Let D be a downward closed set, then the following are equivalent:

- (1) D is an ideal;
- (2) for all downward closed sets $D_1, D_2 \subseteq X$,
if $D \subseteq D_1 \cup D_2$ then $D \subseteq D_1$ or $D \subseteq D_2$;
- (3) for all downward closed sets $D_1, D_2 \subseteq X$,
if $D = D_1 \cup D_2$ then $D = D_1$ or $D = D_2$.

Now we turn to our theorem. Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{s,k}$, we define

$$\mathcal{F}\llbracket D \rrbracket_k := \{\mathcal{F}\llbracket P \rrbracket \mid P \in D, \text{nest}_v(P) \leq k\}.$$

By definition, $\mathcal{F}\llbracket D \rrbracket_k \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{s,k}$.

We also define the opposite mapping, from forests to processes in the expected way. Let $\varphi \in \mathbb{F}_{s,k}^X$, $B(\varphi) := \text{supp}(\varphi) \cap \mathcal{B}_s(X)$ and $C(\varphi) := \text{supp}(\varphi) \setminus B(\varphi)$. Then

$$\mathcal{P}\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_k := \left(\prod_{P \in B(\varphi)} P^{\varphi(P)} \parallel \prod_{\psi \in C(\varphi)} (\mathbf{v}x_k \cdot \mathcal{P}\llbracket \psi \rrbracket_{k-1})^{\varphi(\psi)} \right)$$

Since when $k = 0$, $C(\varphi) = \emptyset$, the expression is well-defined. We have $\mathcal{P}\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_k \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{s,k}$ and⁴ $\mathcal{F}\llbracket \mathcal{P}\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_k \rrbracket_k = \varphi$ and $\mathcal{P}\llbracket \mathcal{F}\llbracket Q \rrbracket_k \rrbracket_k \equiv Q$ (when defined).

Lemma 15. *For any \sqsubseteq_{kn} -downward closed $D \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{s,k}$, $\mathcal{F}\llbracket D \rrbracket_k$ is $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{F}}$ -downward closed.*

Proof. First note that for each $P \in D$ there is a $Q \equiv_{\text{kn}} P$ in D such that $\mathcal{F}\llbracket Q \rrbracket \in \mathcal{F}\llbracket D \rrbracket_k$.

Towards a contradiction, assume there is a forest $\varphi \in \mathbb{F}_{s,k}$ such that there is a $\psi \in \mathcal{F}\llbracket D \rrbracket_k$ with $\varphi \sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{F}} \psi$ but $\varphi \notin \mathcal{F}\llbracket D \rrbracket_k$. We know that $\psi = \mathcal{F}\llbracket P \rrbracket_k$ for some $P \in D$. From Lemma 3 we can derive that $\mathcal{P}\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_k \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P$. But since D is downward closed, $\mathcal{P}\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_k \in D$, which contradicts the assumption that $\varphi \notin \mathcal{F}\llbracket D \rrbracket_k$.

³ here we use a variation of \otimes -products that can be seen equivalent to the one in [15] by using $(C_1 \cup C_2)^{\otimes} = C_1^{\otimes} \odot C_2^{\otimes}$.

⁴ Note the implicit α -renaming in the application of $\mathcal{F}[-]$.

Proof of Theorem 5 We prove, by induction on k , that $\text{Idl}(\mathbb{D}_{s,k}^X) \subseteq \llbracket \mathbb{L}_{s,k} \rrbracket$. Again, the base case is a special case of the induction step. Let $k > 0$ and $D \in \text{Idl}(\mathbb{D}_{s,k}^X)$; By induction hypothesis, we can assume that the ideals of $\mathbb{D}_{s,k-1}^X$ are described by limits in $\mathbb{L}_{s,k-1}^X$. Since D is downward closed, by Lemma 15, $\mathcal{F}[D]_k \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{s,k}^X$ is downward closed as well, and thus is the finite union of some ideals of $\mathbb{F}_{s,k}^X$. Now we have,

$$\text{Idl}(\mathbb{F}_{s,k}^X) = \text{Idl}\left(\mathcal{M}\left(\mathcal{B}_s(X) \uplus \mathbb{F}_{s,k}^{X \cup \{x_{k+1}\}}\right)\right)$$

so we can represent $\text{Idl}(\mathbb{F}_{s,k}^X)$ with \otimes -products over $\mathcal{B}_s(X) \uplus \mathbb{L}_{s,k}^{X \cup \{x_{k+1}\}}$. Let p_1, \dots, p_n be such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \llbracket p_i \rrbracket = \mathcal{F}[D]_k$. From each p_i we can obtain a limit L_{p_i} by replacing:

1. \odot with \parallel ;
2. each $B^?$ with B and each B^\otimes with B^ω , if $B \in \mathcal{B}_s(X)$;
3. each $L^?$ with $\forall x_k.L$ and each L^\otimes with $(\forall x_k.L)^\omega$, if $L \in \mathbb{L}_{s,k}^{X \cup \{x_{k+1}\}}$.

We now show that $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \llbracket L_{p_i} \rrbracket$. It is important to remember that $\llbracket p_i \rrbracket$ are $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{F}}$ -ideals while $\llbracket L_{p_i} \rrbracket$ are \sqsubseteq_{kn} -ideals. One can show, by induction on the structure of p_i , that $Q \in \llbracket L_{p_i} \rrbracket$ if and only if $Q \equiv Q'$ for some $Q' \in \mathcal{P}[\llbracket p_i \rrbracket]$. It then follows that $\llbracket L_{p_i} \rrbracket = \{Q \mid \exists \varphi \in \llbracket p_i \rrbracket : Q \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \mathcal{P}[\varphi]\}$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} D &= \{Q \mid \exists \varphi \in \mathcal{F}[D] : Q \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \mathcal{P}[\varphi]\} \\ &= \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{Q \mid \exists \varphi \in \llbracket p_i \rrbracket : Q \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \mathcal{P}[\varphi]\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \llbracket L_{p_i} \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

We thus established that $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \llbracket L_{p_i} \rrbracket$. Since D is an ideal and each $\llbracket L_{p_i} \rrbracket$ is downward closed, we have that $D = \llbracket L_{p_j} \rrbracket$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$.

E Proof of Lemma 4

Let \vec{x} and \vec{y} be two lists of pairwise distinct names, $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{M}^{\Sigma_{\text{en}}}$ be a finite set of messages, and $\Gamma' = \Gamma[\vec{y}/\vec{x}]$. Moreover, assume that $\text{names}(\Gamma) \cap \vec{y} = \emptyset$. We have to show that, for all messages M with $\text{names}(M) \subseteq \text{names}(\Gamma)$, we have that $\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash M$ if and only if $\Gamma \vdash M$.

The \Leftarrow direction is a direct consequence of (Mon). For the other direction, let $\sigma = [\vec{y}/\vec{x}]$ and $\sigma' = [\vec{x}/\vec{y}]$, so $N\sigma' \in \Gamma$ if and only if $N \in \Gamma'$. Note that $\Gamma\sigma' = \Gamma'\sigma' = \Gamma$. Moreover, if $\text{names}(M) \subseteq \text{names}(\Gamma)$, $M = M\sigma'$ because, by assumption, $\text{names}(\Gamma) \cap \vec{y} = \emptyset$.

We proceed by induction on the depth of the derivation for $\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash M$. We assume the statement holds for derivations of depth d and do a case analysis on the last rule applied in the $(d+1)$ -deep derivation for $\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash M$.

Rule Id: $M \in \Gamma \cup \Gamma'$. If $M \in \Gamma$ we are done. Otherwise, if $M \in \Gamma'$, we have $M\sigma' \in \Gamma$ but $M = M\sigma'$ so $M \in \Gamma$.

Rule Pl: $(N_1, N_2) \in \Gamma \cup \Gamma'$ and $\frac{\Gamma, \Gamma', N_1, N_2 \vdash M}{\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash M}$.

We then have two cases:

Case $(N_1, N_2) \in \Gamma$. We can transform the d -deep derivation for $\Gamma, \Gamma', N_1, N_2 \vdash M$ into a derivation for $\Gamma, N_1, N_2, \Gamma', N_1\sigma, N_2\sigma \vdash M$ of the same depth, by (Mon). Since $M \subseteq \text{names}(\Gamma, N_1, N_2) = \text{names}(\Gamma)$ and by definition $\Gamma', N_1\sigma, N_2\sigma = (\Gamma, N_1, N_2)\sigma$, we can apply the induction hypothesis, obtaining $\Gamma, N_1, N_2 \vdash M$ which proves $\Gamma \vdash M$ by application of Rule Pl.

Case $(N_1, N_2) \in \Gamma'$. From $\Gamma, \Gamma', N_1, N_2 \vdash M$ we get $(\Gamma, \Gamma', N_1, N_2)\sigma' \vdash M\sigma'$ by (Alpha). Since we have $\Gamma\sigma' = \Gamma'$ and $M\sigma' = M$, we can infer that $\Gamma, N_1\sigma', N_2\sigma' \vdash M$ which proves, together with $(N_1\sigma', N_2\sigma') \in \Gamma$, that $\Gamma \vdash M$ by application of Rule P_L .

Rule S_L : $e(N)_K \in \Gamma \cup \Gamma'$ and $\frac{\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash K \quad \Gamma, \Gamma', N, K \vdash M}{\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash M}$.

We distinguish two cases:

Case $e(N)_K \in \Gamma$. Then $\text{names}(K) \subseteq \text{names}(\Gamma)$ and by induction hypothesis we have $\Gamma \vdash K$. We also have $\text{names}(N) \subseteq \text{names}(\Gamma)$, by definition $(\Gamma, N, K)\sigma = \Gamma', N\sigma, K\sigma$ and $\text{names}(M) \subseteq \text{names}(\Gamma, N, K)$. We can transform the d -deep derivation for $\Gamma, \Gamma', N, K \vdash M$ into a derivation for $\Gamma, N, K, \Gamma', N\sigma, K\sigma \vdash M$ with the same depth, so by induction hypothesis we obtain $\Gamma, N, K \vdash M$. By applying Rule S_L to $\Gamma \vdash K$ and $\Gamma, N, K \vdash M$ we obtain $\Gamma \vdash M$.

Case $e(N)_K \in \Gamma'$. Then by (Alpha), $\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash K$ implies $\Gamma\sigma', \Gamma'\sigma' \vdash K\sigma'$. Since $\Gamma\sigma' = \Gamma$ and $\Gamma'\sigma' = \Gamma'$ we have $\Gamma \vdash K\sigma'$. Similarly, $\Gamma, \Gamma', N, K \vdash M$ implies $\Gamma, N\sigma', K\sigma' \vdash M\sigma'$. Since $M\sigma' = M$, we have $\Gamma, N\sigma', K\sigma' \vdash M$, which in conjunction with $\Gamma \vdash K\sigma'$ and $e(N\sigma')_{K\sigma'} \in \Gamma$, proves $\Gamma \vdash M$ by application of Rule S_L .

Rule A_L : Analogous to the case of Rule S_L .

Rule P_R : $M = (N_1, N_2)$ and $\frac{\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash N_1 \quad \Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash N_2}{\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash M}$.

We have $\text{names}(N_1), \text{names}(N_2) \subseteq \text{names}(\Gamma)$ so we can apply the induction hypothesis to the two premises and get $\Gamma \vdash N_1$ and $\Gamma \vdash N_2$, which proves $\Gamma \vdash M$ by Rule P_R .

Rule S_R : Analogous to the case of Rule P_R .

Rule A_R : Analogous to the case of Rule P_R . □

F Proof of Characterisation of Limits Inclusion

For any limit L with standard form $v\vec{x}.(\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel Q \parallel \prod_{i \in I} B_i^\omega)$, we call Γ and Q non-iterated, also fixed, components while B_i for $i \in I$ are iterated components.

We recall the statement: Let L_1 and L_2 be two limits, with $\text{sf}(L_1) \stackrel{\circ}{=} v\vec{x}_1.(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel \prod_{i \in I} B_i^\omega)$, and let $n = |\vec{x}_1| + |Q_1| + 1$. Then:

$$\llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket L_2 \rrbracket \iff \begin{cases} \text{sf}(L_2 \otimes n) \stackrel{\circ}{=} v\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2.(\langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel Q_2 \parallel R_2) \text{ and } \Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2 & \text{(A)} \\ \llbracket \langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel \prod_{i \in I} B_i \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel R_2 \rrbracket & \text{(B)} \end{cases}$$

F.1 Conditions (A) and (B) Are Sound for Inclusion

Lemma 16 (Soundness). *If conditions (A) and (B) hold, then $\llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket L_2 \rrbracket$.*

Proof. Given that (A) and (B) hold, it suffices to show that

$$\forall n_1 \in \mathbb{N}, \exists n_2 \in \mathbb{N}. \llbracket L_1 \rrbracket^{n_1} \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \llbracket L_2 \otimes n \rrbracket^{n_2}$$

by Lemmas 12 and 13. Let n_1 be an arbitrary number. With $R_1 := \prod_{i \in I} B_i^\omega$, we have $\llbracket \text{sf}(L_1) \rrbracket^{n_1} = v\vec{x}_1.(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel \llbracket R_1 \rrbracket^{n_1})$ and $\text{sf}(\llbracket L_2 \otimes n \rrbracket^0) \stackrel{\circ}{=} v\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2.(\langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel Q_2)$ by (A).

We show that $v\vec{x}_1.(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel \llbracket R_1 \rrbracket^{n_1}) \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} v\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2.(\langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel Q_2 \parallel \llbracket R_2 \rrbracket^{n_2})$ for some n_2 . Condition (A) induces a knowledge order for both fixed parts. Condition (B) gives rise to some

relation between the iterated components we will exploit. This relation is captured in the following fact. For some α -renaming in (A) and some n_2 :

$$\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel [R_1]^{n_1} \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel [R_2]^{n_2} \quad (*)$$

Prior to proving (*), we show that this fact and (A) suffice to prove our goal. With $\text{sf}([R_i]^{n_i}) = \mathbf{v}\vec{y}_i \cdot (\Gamma_{R_i}^{n_i} \parallel Q'_i)$, we call $\Gamma_{R_i}^{n_i}$ the knowledge of $[R_i]^{n_i}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Because of (*), we can choose \vec{y}_2 so that $\vec{y}_2 = \vec{y}_1, \vec{z}_2$ and there is no need to rename for the embedding anymore. Equipped with this abbreviation, the knowledge of the left hand side ($\mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1 \cdot (\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel [R_1]^{n_1})$) is $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_{R_1}^{n_1})$ while $\Gamma_2, \Gamma_{R_2}^{n_2}$ is the knowledge of the right hand side $\mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2 \cdot (\langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel Q_2 \parallel [R_2]^{n_2})$. This is also exactly the knowledge contained in $(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel [R_1]^{n_1})$ respectively $(\langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel [R_2]^{n_2})$, hence $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_{R_1}^{n_1} \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2, \Gamma_{R_2}^{n_2}$ by (*). It remains to take care of names and process calls for the embedding. Condition (A) already takes care of non-iterated names and process calls. With our assumption (*), we obtain

$$\mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1 \cdot (\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel \langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel [R_1]^{n_1}) \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2 \cdot (\langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel Q_2 \parallel \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel [R_2]^{n_2}).$$

Both parts are knowledge congruent to our goal's sides by Lemma 6 which proves the goal.

It remains to show that (*), i.e. $(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel [R_1]^{n_1}) \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} (\langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel [R_2]^{n_2})$ for some n_2 . We start with (B) and apply Lemma 12 so that we know that for every $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel [\prod_{i \in I} B_1]^{n_1} \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel [R_2]^m$. By Lemma 7, we multiply on both sides:

$$(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel [\prod_{i \in I} B_1]^{n_1})^{n_1} \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} (\langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel [R_2]^m)^{n_1}.$$

By Lemma 6, we pull the messages out of both replications:

$$\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel ([\prod_{i \in I} B_1]^{n_1})^{n_1} \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel ([R_2]^m)^{n_1}.$$

We continue on both sides individually. On the left, we omit messages for simplicity as we already know that $\Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2$.

$$([\prod_{i \in I} B_1]^{n_1})^{n_1} = (\prod_{i \in I} [B_1]^{n_1})^{n_1} = [R_1]^{n_1}.$$

While we use Lemma 8 and Corollary 2 on the right in order to obtain that:

$$\langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel ([R_2]^m)^{n_1} \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel [R_2]^{n_1 \cdot m}$$

Combining both paths leads to: $\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel [R_1]^{n_1} \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel [R_2]^{n_1 \cdot m}$. By choosing $n_2 = n_1 \cdot m$, the claim follows.

F.2 Conditions (A) and (B) Are Complete for Inclusion

Lemma 17 (Completeness). *If $\llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket L_2 \rrbracket$, then conditions (A) and (B) hold.*

For this proof we are assuming the intruder model is absorbing. Before we give the proof, we need some auxiliary definitions and results.

Corollary 3. *Let \vec{x} and \vec{y} be two lists of pairwise distinct names, Γ, Γ_1 be two finite sets of messages, and $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma_1[\vec{y}/\vec{x}]$. Moreover, assume that $\text{names}(\Gamma_1) \cap \vec{y} = \emptyset$ and $\text{names}(\Gamma) \cap \vec{y} = \emptyset = \text{names}(\Gamma) \cap \vec{x}$. Then, for all messages M with $\text{names}(M) \subseteq \text{names}(\Gamma, \Gamma_1)$, we have that $\Gamma, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash M$ if and only if $\Gamma, \Gamma_1 \vdash M$.*

Proof. The direction from right to left is obvious. For the reverse direction, it is equivalent to show that $\Gamma, \Gamma_1, \Gamma, \Gamma_2 \vdash M$. Now, $\Gamma, \Gamma_1 = (\Gamma, \Gamma_2)[\vec{y}/\vec{x}]$. The claim follows by the assumption that the intruder is absorbing (Definition 8).

Lemma 18. *Let L, L' be two limits such that $L \equiv L'$. Then for every $n \in \mathbb{N} : \lceil L \rceil^n \equiv \lceil L' \rceil^n$.*

Proof. The proof is a straightforward structural induction on L .

We introduce a refinement of grounding and a function folding the right hand side but preserving the knowledge embedding. The (n, k, m) -th grounding takes a limit and unfolds each ω n times for the outer k nested levels of ω , and m times for the inner ones.

Definition 10 (Step-indexed grounding). *For a limit L in standard form, we define the (n, k, m) -th grounding of L to be the process $\lceil L \rceil^{n,k,m}$ recursively:*

$$\lceil L \rceil^{n,k,m} := \begin{cases} L & \text{if } L \text{ is sequential or } \mathbf{0} \\ \lceil L_1 \rceil^{n,k,m} \parallel \lceil L_2 \rceil^{n,k,m} & \text{if } L = L_1 \parallel L_2 \\ \mathbf{v}x.(\lceil L' \rceil^{n,k,m}) & \text{if } L = \mathbf{v}x.L' \\ (\lceil B \rceil^{n,k-1,m})^n & \text{if } L = B^\omega \wedge k > 0 \\ (\lceil B \rceil^m)^m & \text{if } L = B^\omega \wedge k = 0 \end{cases}$$

Definition 11 (ω -height). *For a limit L , we define the ω -height as follows:*

$$\omega\text{-height}(L) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } L \text{ is sequential or } \mathbf{0} \\ \max(\omega\text{-height}(R_1), \dots, \omega\text{-height}(R_n)) & \text{if } L = R_1 \parallel \dots \parallel R_n \\ \omega\text{-height}(L') & \text{if } L = \mathbf{v}x.L' \\ \omega\text{-height}(B) + 1 & \text{if } L = B^\omega \end{cases}$$

Lemma 19. *Let L be a limit and $m, n, k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $k \geq \omega\text{-height}(L)$, then $\lceil L \rceil^{n,k,m} = \lceil L \rceil^n$.*

Proof. The parameter k only decreases when recursing into a limit under ω . If $k \geq \omega\text{-height}(L)$ the last case of the definition will never apply, which makes the definition coincide with the one of n -grounding.

The idea of the following parametrised function is to fold an m -grounding to an n -grounding up to a certain ω -height k of the limit. Since we want to be very specific about the domains, we define some sets of groundings.

Definition 12 (Set of groundings). *Let $L \in \mathbb{L}$ and $m, n, k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

We define the following two sets of processes:

- $\mathcal{R}_L^m := \{\lceil \text{sf}(L) \rceil^m\}$
- $\mathcal{R}_L^{n,k,m} := \{\lceil \text{sf}(L) \rceil^{n,k,m}\}$

Definition 13. *Let L be a limit in recursive standard form and $m, k, n \in \mathbb{N}$. The function $\Phi_{k,L}^{n,m} : \mathcal{R}_L^m \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_L^{n,k,m}$ and is parametrised in all four variables.*

$$\Phi_{k,L}^{n,m}(P) := \begin{cases} P & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \mathbf{v}\vec{x}.(\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel Q \parallel \prod_{j \in J} (\Phi_{k,L_j}^{n,m}(\lceil L_j^\omega \rceil^m)) & \text{if } k > 0 \text{ and } P = \mathbf{v}\vec{x}.(\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel Q \parallel \prod_{j \in J} L_j^\omega) \\ (\Phi_{k-1,L}^{n,m}(\lceil L \rceil^m))^n & \text{if } k > 0 \text{ and } P = \lceil L^\omega \rceil^m \end{cases}$$

We may omit the parameters n and m in the following if obvious from context as they do not change over the process of folding.

Lemma 20 (Folding is sound wrt. knowledge embedding). *Let L_1, L_2 be two limits in standard form $L_i = \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_i.(\langle \Gamma_i \rangle \parallel Q_i \parallel R_i)$ with $n = |\vec{x}_1| + |Q_1| + 1$. If there is a $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m > n$ and $\lceil L_1 \rceil^0 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \lceil L_2 \rceil^m$, then $\forall k : \lceil L_1 \rceil^0 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \Phi_{k, L_2}^{n, m}(\lceil L_2 \rceil^m)$.*

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on k .

For $k = 0$, the claim trivially follows as $\Phi_{0, L_2}^{n, m}(\lceil L_2 \rceil^m) = \lceil L_2 \rceil^m$ by the assumption that $\lceil L_1 \rceil^0 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \lceil L_2 \rceil^m$ holds.

For the induction step, we assume that $\lceil L_1 \rceil^0 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \Phi_{k, L_2}^{n, m}(\lceil L_2 \rceil^m)$ and prove

$$\lceil L_1 \rceil^0 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \Phi_{k+1, L_2}^{n, m}(\lceil L_2 \rceil^m).$$

By definition of folding, both $\Phi_{k, L}(\lceil L_2 \rceil^m)$ and $\Phi_{k+1, L}(\lceil L_2 \rceil^m)$ are folding in exactly the same way up to the k -th recursive calls, i.e. calls in which k decreases. This means that up to the calls to $\Phi_{0, L'}$ and $\Phi_{1, L'}$, both $\Phi_{k, L}(\lceil L_2 \rceil^m)$ and $\Phi_{k+1, L}(\lceil L_2 \rceil^m)$ will have constructed the same context $C[-, \dots, -]$ around these final calls. We thus characterise $A = \Phi_{k, L_2}^{n, m}(\lceil L_2 \rceil^m)$, and $B = \Phi_{k+1, L_2}^{n, m}(\lceil L_2 \rceil^m)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= C[\Phi_{0, F_1^\omega}^{n, m}(F_1^\omega), \dots, \Phi_{0, F_j^\omega}^{n, m}(F_j^\omega)] \\ &= C[\lceil F_1 \rceil^m, \dots, \lceil F_j \rceil^m] = C[(\lceil F_1 \rceil^m)^m, \dots, (\lceil F_j \rceil^m)^m] \\ B &= C[\Phi_{1, F_1^\omega}^{n, m}(F_1^\omega), \dots, \Phi_{1, F_j^\omega}^{n, m}(F_j^\omega)] = C[(\lceil F_1 \rceil^m)^n, \dots, (\lceil F_j \rceil^m)^n] \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $L_1 = \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1.(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel R_1)$ and hence $\lceil L_1 \rceil^0 = \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1.(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q_1)$. By assumption, we have

$$\mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1.(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q_1) \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \Phi_{k, L_2}^{n, m}(\lceil L_2 \rceil^m) = A \quad (1)$$

and want to prove that

$$\mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1.(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q_1) \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \Phi_{k+1, L_2}^{n, m}(\lceil L_2 \rceil^m) = B. \quad (2)$$

Intuitively, we have to find a way to preserve the knowledge embedding from (1) when removing some branches in the holes of the context to get from A to B . Let us show what A and B look like explicitly with their context:

$$\begin{aligned} A &\equiv \mathbf{v}\vec{c}.(\langle \Gamma_c \rangle \parallel Q_c \parallel D) && \text{with } D = (\lceil F_1 \rceil^m)^m \parallel \dots \parallel (\lceil F_j \rceil^m)^m \\ B &\equiv \mathbf{v}\vec{c}.(\langle \Gamma_c \rangle \parallel Q_c \parallel E) && \text{with } E = (\lceil F_1 \rceil^m)^n \parallel \dots \parallel (\lceil F_j \rceil^m)^n \end{aligned}$$

We call Γ_c the knowledge of the context.

Our goal is to show that reducing the number of iterations in each of D 's parallel components does not affect the knowledge embedding described in (i) and thereby obtain (ii). Let us first consider names and process calls. We can split $\lceil L_1 \rceil^0$ in the following way: $\lceil L_1 \rceil^0 = \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1.(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q_1) = \mathbf{v}\vec{y}. \mathbf{v}\vec{z}.(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q_y \parallel Q_z)$ where $\vec{y} \subseteq \vec{c}$ and $Q_y \subseteq Q_c$. The intention is to distinguish names and process calls that are already matched in the context. This is why we do not require all process calls that are only using names from \vec{y} to be in Q_y but some of them might be in Q_z . The goal follows with the following claim immediately.

Claim I: In every hole of context $C[-, \dots, -]$, we can reduce the number of branches to at most n , i.e. for every $1 \leq l \leq j$ we can have a grounding $\lceil F_l \rceil^n$ instead of $\lceil F_l \rceil^m$.

Proof of Claim I. Towards a contradiction, assume that there is a hole in which we cannot remove $m - n$ branches. W.l.o.g. let $[L_l]^m$ for $1 \leq l \leq j$ be the sublimit in this hole. There might be three reasons for this: names, process calls and knowledge.

Considering the names and process calls, we know that $|\vec{x}_1| + |Q_1| < n$ by definition and hence $|\vec{z}| + |Q_z| < n$. Now, we investigate the components that \vec{z} and Q_z are matched to. In the worst case, all of them are mapped to this hole but we still delete $m - n$ branches that are not used to match the names \vec{z} . For the process calls in Q_z , we have to distinguish two cases. First, if a process call uses any name from \vec{z} , it is fine as we will leave them anyway. Second, if a process call does not use any name from \vec{z} , it is fine to delete this branch as there will be enough copies in the remaining branches to cover this process call.

It remains to reason about knowledge. We make the knowledge of D , i.e. the one having budget k , explicit: $\text{sf}(D) = \text{v}\vec{a}.(\Gamma_m \parallel \dots)$ and factor out the knowledge from sublimit $[F_l]^m$: $\Gamma_m = \Gamma'_m, \Gamma_{l,m}$ so that $\Gamma_{l,m}$ was the knowledge obtained through $[F_l]^m$. For knowledge, we have to prove that $\Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_c, \Gamma'_m, \Gamma_{l,n}$. By Proposition 1, we need to prove that for every message $M \in \Gamma_1$, $\Gamma_c, \Gamma'_m, \Gamma_{l,n} \vdash M$ given that $\Gamma_c, \Gamma'_m, \Gamma_{l,m} \vdash M$. The idea now is to reduce the knowledge from $\Gamma_{l,m}$ to $\Gamma_{l,n}$ by Corollary 3, which is a corollary of the absorbing intruder. Let us define $\Gamma'_{c,m} = \Gamma_c, \Gamma'_m$ indicating the context of the hole we are considering. As m might be bigger than $2n$, we have to iterate the process of reducing the number of branches. Hence, we generalise the notation of $\Gamma_{l,m}$ and $\Gamma_{l,n}$ in the following way: $([F_l]^m)^i \equiv \text{v}\vec{a}_i.(\langle \Gamma_{l,i} \rangle \parallel \dots)$.

Claim II: $\forall m > n, \Gamma_{l,m} \vdash M \implies \Gamma_{l,m-1} \vdash M$.

Proof of Claim II. For convenience, we rename $\Gamma_{l,i}$ to Λ_i . The main observation is that we can split the knowledge Λ_m into Λ_{m-1} and a remainder Λ' . We can choose a branch which does not use names from \vec{z} to contribute to Λ' . Since we know that $n \geq 1$, we know that $m > 1$ by assumption. Therefore, we can split Λ_{m-1} again and obtain the knowledge stemming from one branch which we call Λ'' . Let us recall the assumption and goal after these rewriting steps: Given that

$$\Gamma'_{c,m}, \Lambda_{m-2}, \Lambda', \Lambda'' \vdash M \quad (3)$$

holds, we want to prove that $\Gamma'_{c,m}, \Lambda_{m-2}, \Lambda'' \vdash M$. Let \vec{w}' and \vec{w}'' be the names only used in Λ' and Λ'' respectively so that:

$$\vec{w}' \cap \vec{w}'' = \emptyset \text{ and } \text{names}(\Gamma'_{c,m}, \Lambda_{m-2}) \cap \vec{w}' = \emptyset = \text{names}(\Gamma'_{c,m}, \Lambda_{m-2}) \cap \vec{w}'' \quad (4)$$

Λ' and Λ'' have been obtained from a branch of the same sublimit, so we can infer that

$$\Lambda'' = \Lambda'[\vec{w}''/\vec{w}']. \quad (5)$$

Notice that $\vec{w}' \cap \vec{z} = \emptyset$ by the fact how we have chosen the branch for Λ' . Furthermore, $\vec{w}' \cap \vec{y} = \emptyset$ by $\vec{y} \subseteq \vec{c}$. Combining these observations, we get that $\vec{x}_1 \cap \vec{w}' = \emptyset$. By the fact that $M \in \Gamma_1$, we have $\text{names}(M) \subseteq \text{names}(\Gamma_1) \subseteq \vec{x}_1$. Therefore, $\text{names}(M) \cap \vec{w}' = \emptyset$ which implies that

$$\text{names}(M) \subseteq \text{names}(\Gamma'_{c,m}, \Lambda_{m-2}, \Lambda'') \quad (6)$$

Facts (3) to (6) fulfil the conditions for Corollary 3, resulting in $\Gamma'_{c,m}, \Lambda_{m-2}, \Lambda'' \vdash M$ which reads $\Gamma'_{c,m}, \Lambda_{m-1} \vdash M$ when folding back which is the goal of Claim II. By this, we have shown that we can remove $m - n$ branches which leads to a contradiction which is why Claim I holds. As $[F_l]^m$ was chosen arbitrarily, we have shown that we can remove $m - n$ branches in every hole of the context $C[-, \dots, -]$ which concludes this proof.

Corollary 4. Let L_1, L_2 be two limits with $\text{sf}(L_1) = \text{v}\vec{x}_1.(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel R_1)$ and $\llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket L_2 \rrbracket$. Then, $\text{sf}(L_2 \otimes n) \stackrel{\circ}{=} \text{v}\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2.(\langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel Q_2 \parallel R_2)$ and $\Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2$. for $n = |\vec{x}_1| + |Q_1| + 1$.

Proof. First, we show that $\lceil \text{sf}(L_1) \rceil^0 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \lceil L_2 \rceil^n$. By $\llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket L_2 \rrbracket$, we know that there is an m so that $\lceil \text{sf}(L_1) \rceil^0 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \lceil L_2 \rceil^m$ by Lemma 12. From Lemma 20, we obtain that $\lceil \text{sf}(L_1) \rceil^0 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \Phi_{k, L_2}^{n, m}(\lceil L_2 \rceil^m)$ for every k . Substituting $\omega\text{-height}(L_2)$ for k leads to $\Phi_{\omega\text{-height}, L_2}^{n, m}(\lceil L_2 \rceil^m)$. This is $\lceil L_2 \rceil^n$ by Lemma 19. Using this knowledge embedding, we get $\lceil L_2 \rceil^n \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2. (\langle I_2 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel Q_2)$ with $\Gamma_1 \leq_{\text{kn}} \Gamma_2$. With Lemma 14, we observe that $\lceil L_2 \rceil^n = \lceil L_2 \otimes n \rceil^0$. By this, the claim follows as $\lceil - \rceil^0$ just omits the iterated parts, i.e. R_2 , from $\text{sf}(L_2 \otimes n)$.

Lemma 21 (Necessary Conditions for Inclusion). *Let L_1 and L_2 be two limits, with $\text{sf}(L_1) \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1. (\langle I_1 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel R_1)$ with $R_1 = \prod_{i \in I} B_i^\omega$, and let $n = |\vec{x}_1| + |Q_1| + 1$. Given that the inclusion $\llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket L_2 \rrbracket$, both conditions (A) and (B) hold.*

Proof. For (A), the claim follows by Corollary 4 which implicitly gives a renaming for L_2 .

For (B), we want to show that $\llbracket \langle I_1 \rangle \parallel \prod_{i \in I} B_i \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket \langle I_2 \rangle \parallel R_2 \rrbracket$.

Let $N_i = \langle I_i \rangle \parallel R_i$. It is straightforward to see that $\llbracket \langle I_1 \rangle \parallel \prod_{i \in I} B_i \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket$. This is why it is enough to show that $\llbracket N_1 \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket N_2 \rrbracket$ by transitivity.

Towards a contradiction, we assume that for all possible renaming so that (A) is satisfied, $\llbracket N_1 \rrbracket \not\subseteq \llbracket N_2 \rrbracket$. By Lemma 12,

$$\exists m'_1, \forall m_1 \geq m'_1, \forall m_2. \llbracket N_1 \rrbracket^{m_1} \not\sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \llbracket N_2 \rrbracket^{m_2}. \quad (7)$$

First, knowledge could break the embedding. Let us define

$$\text{sf}(\lceil N_i \rceil^{m_i}) = \mathbf{v}y_i. (\Gamma_i \parallel \Gamma'_i \parallel Q'_i).$$

Notice that $\text{names}(\Gamma_i) \cap y_i = \emptyset$. There might be two reasons why the knowledge embedding does not hold.

First, the embedding breaks because of knowledge. This is impossible as Γ_1, Γ'_1 and Γ_2, Γ'_2 represent the knowledge of groundings of the two limits L_1 and L_2 as their top level knowledge is replicated in (B). Therefore, the inclusion $\llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket L_2 \rrbracket$ would also break which is a contradiction.

Second, names or process calls can hence be the only reasons why the knowledge embedding $\llbracket N_1 \rrbracket^{m_1} \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \llbracket N_2 \rrbracket^{m_2}$ does not hold for any m_2 . We will derive a contradiction by choosing $n_1 = 2 \cdot \max(|\vec{x}_2| + |Q_2| + 1, m'_1)$. We incorporate $\lceil R_1 \rceil^{n_1}$ into $\text{sf}(L_1)$: $\lceil \text{sf}(L_1) \rceil^{n_1} = \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1. (\Gamma_1 \parallel Q_1 \parallel \lceil R_1 \rceil^{n_1})$. Recall that $\lceil \text{sf}(L_2 \otimes n) \rceil^{m_2} \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2. (\langle I_2 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel Q_2 \parallel \lceil R_2 \rceil^{m_2})$. By the size of n_1 , at least half of the names and process calls of $\lceil R_1 \rceil^{n_1}$ have to be covered by $\lceil R_2 \rceil^{m_2}$ as the non-iterated part \vec{x}_2 and Q_2 cannot do more than half. But by definition $\frac{n_1}{2} \geq m'_1$ so $\forall m_2, \lceil R_1 \rceil^{\frac{n_1}{2}} \not\sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \lceil R_2 \rceil^{m_2}$ as knowledge cannot be the reason for (7) to break. Altogether, this entails that there is a n_1 such that for all m_2 :

$$\begin{aligned} \lceil \text{sf}(L_1) \rceil^{n_1} &= \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1. (\Gamma_1 \parallel Q_1 \parallel \lceil R_1 \rceil^{n_1}) \\ &\not\sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2. (\langle I_2 \rangle \parallel Q_1 \parallel Q_2 \parallel \lceil R_2 \rceil^{m_2}) \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \lceil \text{sf}(L_2 \otimes n) \rceil^{m_2} \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 13, this implies that $\lceil L_1 \rceil^{n_1} \not\sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \lceil L_2 \rceil^{m_2}$ for every m_2 . In turn, this entails that $\llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \not\subseteq \llbracket L_2 \rrbracket$ by Lemma 12 which is a contradiction.

F.3 Correctness of $\widehat{\text{post}}$

Definition 14 ($\beta(\Delta)$ and b). *Let Δ be a set of definitions. We define $\beta(\Delta)$ and $\gamma(\mathbb{I})$ as follows:*

$$\beta(\Delta) := \max\{ |\vec{x}| \mid (\mathbf{Q}[\vec{y}] := A + \mathbf{in}(\vec{x} : M).P + A') \in \Delta \}$$

$$\gamma(\mathbb{I}) := \max\{ \text{ar}(f) \mid f \in \Sigma \} \text{ with } \mathbb{I} = (\Sigma, \vdash)$$

then $b := \beta(\Delta) \cdot \gamma(\mathbb{I})^{s-1} + 1$.

Recall the definition of $\widehat{\text{post}}$ from Definition 9. Let $\text{sf}(L \otimes b) = \mathbf{v}\vec{x}.(\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel Q \parallel R)$, then

$$\widehat{\text{post}}_{\Delta}^s(L) := \{ \mathbf{v}\vec{y}.(\langle \Gamma' \rangle \parallel Q' \parallel R) \mid \mathbf{v}\vec{x}.(\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel Q) \rightarrow_{\Delta} \mathbf{v}\vec{y}.(\langle \Gamma' \rangle \parallel Q') \in \mathbb{S}_s \}$$

Corollary 5 (Post of Expansion is enough). *Let L be a limit and $P \in \llbracket L \rrbracket$. Then, for every $P_1 \in \text{post}(P)$, there is a $P_2 \in \text{post}(\llbracket L \rrbracket^n)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $P_1 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P_2$.*

Proof. As $P \in \llbracket L \rrbracket$, we know that there is a $n' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $P \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \llbracket L \rrbracket^{n'}$ by Lemma 11. We choose this n' to be n . We have that $P \rightarrow P_1$ and $P \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \llbracket L \rrbracket^n$. As \sqsubseteq_{kn} is a simulation (Theorem 1), we know that there is a P_2 so that $\llbracket L \rrbracket^n \rightarrow P_2$ and $P_1 \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} P_2$.

Let us recall the theorem we want to prove: for all $L \in \mathbb{L}_{s,k}$,

$$\widehat{\text{post}}_{\Delta}^s(L) = \{L_1, \dots, L_n\} \implies (\text{post}(\llbracket L \rrbracket) \cap \mathbb{S}_s) \downarrow = \llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \cup \dots \cup \llbracket L_n \rrbracket.$$

Proof (Proof of Theorem 8). We assume that $\widehat{\text{post}}_{\Delta}^s(L) = \{L_1, \dots, L_n\}$ and prove the set equality by inclusion in both directions.

First, we show that $(\text{post}(\llbracket L \rrbracket) \cap \mathbb{S}_s) \downarrow \supseteq \llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \cup \dots \cup \llbracket L_n \rrbracket$. It suffices to show that $\llbracket L_j \rrbracket \subseteq (\text{post}(\llbracket L \rrbracket) \cap \mathbb{S}_s) \downarrow$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. We choose j arbitrarily and prove the latter statement. By definition, we know that L_j stems from at least one transition in the non-iterated part of $\text{sf}(L \otimes b) = \mathbf{v}\vec{x}.(\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel Q \parallel R)$. W.l.o.g. let $P_1 := \mathbf{v}\vec{x}.(\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel Q) \rightarrow_{\Delta} \mathbf{v}\vec{y}.(\langle \Gamma' \rangle \parallel Q') =: P_2$ be this transition in \mathbb{S}_s . Hence, $L_j = \mathbf{v}\vec{y}.(\langle \Gamma' \rangle \parallel Q' \parallel R)$. By Lemma 13, $\llbracket L \rrbracket = \llbracket L \otimes b \rrbracket$ and therefore $\llbracket \mathbf{v}\vec{x}.(\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel Q \parallel R) \rrbracket^n = \mathbf{v}\vec{x}.(\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel Q \parallel \llbracket R \rrbracket^n) \in \llbracket L \rrbracket$ for every n . Because of $P_1 \rightarrow P_2$, we know that $\llbracket \mathbf{v}\vec{x}.(\langle \Gamma \rangle \parallel Q \parallel R) \rrbracket^n \rightarrow \llbracket \mathbf{v}\vec{y}.(\langle \Gamma' \rangle \parallel Q' \parallel R) \rrbracket^n$. This is why $\llbracket L_j \rrbracket^n = \llbracket \mathbf{v}\vec{y}.(\langle \Gamma' \rangle \parallel Q' \parallel R) \rrbracket^n \in \text{post}(\llbracket L \rrbracket)$ for every n . With Lemma 11, we know that for every $P \in \llbracket L_j \rrbracket$, there is a m so that $P \sqsubseteq_{\text{kn}} \llbracket L_j \rrbracket^m$. By downward-closure, we infer that $P \in (\llbracket \text{post}(L) \rrbracket \cap \mathbb{S}_s) \downarrow$.

Second, we show that $(\text{post}(\llbracket L \rrbracket) \cap \mathbb{S}_s) \downarrow \subseteq \llbracket L_1 \rrbracket \cup \dots \cup \llbracket L_n \rrbracket$. Let $\llbracket L \rrbracket^b$ has standard form: $\text{sf}(\llbracket L \rrbracket^b) \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1.(\Gamma_1 \parallel Q[\vec{M}'] \parallel C_1)$. By Corollary 5, it suffices to consider only successors of groundings of L . Therefore, let $b < m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\text{sf}(\llbracket L \rrbracket^m) \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2.(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel Q[\vec{M}'] \parallel C_2)$. We consider the three different reduction rules that can be fired starting from this grounding:

- a principal is waiting for some message on a private channel which is derivable and the pattern can be matched by Γ
- a principal would like to send a message on some private channel which can be derived from the environment
- one principal sends a message on a private channel to another principal

We split the parts into three paragraphs.

Public Private Channel, Message Input We have $Q[\vec{M}'] := a(\vec{p} : N).P_1 + A$ for some private channel a and action A . W.l.o.g. we derive the message which is matched using some fresh intruder names $\vec{c} : \Gamma_1, \vec{c} \vdash N[\vec{M}'/\vec{x}]$ and the channel name a can be derived by assumption: $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash a$. Overall, we get the following transition:

$$\llbracket L \rrbracket^m \xrightarrow[\vec{p} \rightarrow \vec{M}']{Q[\vec{M}'] = a(\vec{p} : N).P_1 + A} \underbrace{\mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \vec{c}.(\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel \langle \vec{c} \rangle \parallel P_1[\vec{M}'/\vec{p}] \parallel C_2)}_{Q' \in \text{post}^s(L)}$$

where the annotations explicitly state which process call and action was used with which substitution. We want to show that we can have the same reduction in $\llbracket L \rrbracket^b$. We do so by using

the Φ function as in Lemma 20 to relate the difference between iterating k times and $k + 1$ times.

Claim I: For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\exists \vec{y}_k, \Delta_k, D_k$ such that

$$\Phi_{k,L}^{b,n}(\llbracket L \rrbracket^n) \xrightarrow[\vec{p} \rightarrow \vec{M}']{\text{Q}[\vec{M}] = a(\vec{p}.N).P_1 + A} \text{v} \vec{y}_k, \vec{c}.(\langle \Delta_k \rangle \parallel \langle \vec{c} \rangle \parallel P_1[\vec{M}'/\vec{p}'] \parallel D_k) \quad (8)$$

with $\Delta_k, \vec{c} \vdash N[\vec{M}'/\vec{p}']$ and $\Delta_k, \vec{c} \vdash a$.

Proof of Claim I by induction on k : For the base case in which $k = 0$, the claim holds by assumption. For the induction step, we assume that (8) holds for k and we prove it for $k + 1$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 20, we use a multi-hole context $C[-, \dots, -]$ to distinguish between having budget k or $k + 1$. Let F_1, \dots, F_j be j limits and $C[-, \dots, -]$ a multi-hole context so that:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{k,L}^{b,n}(\llbracket L \rrbracket^n) &\equiv C[\Phi_{0,F_1^\omega}^{b,n}(F_1^\omega), \dots, \Phi_{0,F_j^\omega}^{b,n}(F_j^\omega)] = C[\llbracket F_1^\omega \rrbracket^n, \dots, \llbracket F_j^\omega \rrbracket^n] \\ &= C[(\llbracket F_1 \rrbracket^n)^n, \dots, (\llbracket F_j \rrbracket^n)^n] = A \\ \Phi_{k+1,L}^{b,n}(\llbracket L \rrbracket^n) &\equiv C[\Phi_{1,F_1^\omega}^{b,n}(F_1^\omega), \dots, \Phi_{1,F_j^\omega}^{b,n}(F_j^\omega)] \\ &= C[(\llbracket F_1 \rrbracket^n)^b, \dots, (\llbracket F_j \rrbracket^n)^b] = B \end{aligned}$$

We want to show that it suffices to have b copies of F_l for any $1 \leq l \leq j$. Since $\text{Q}[\vec{M}]$ also occurs in $\text{sf}(\llbracket L \rrbracket^b)$, it is trivial to keep the process call which is reduced. It remains to argue that the same redex is enabled in B. Towards a contradiction: Assume that there is a hole in which b copies are not sufficient. W.l.o.g. let L_l be the limit in this hole.

We did not explicitly single out the message $N[\vec{M}'/\vec{p}']$ but only the substitution $[\vec{M}'/\vec{p}']$ for the continuation since the substitution is solely determining the successor.

We know that A 's knowledge is Δ_k and factor out the knowledge from sublimit $\llbracket F_l \rrbracket^m$: $\Delta_k = \Delta'_k, \Delta_{l,m}$ so that $\Delta_{l,m}$ was the knowledge obtained through $\llbracket F_l \rrbracket^m$. We want to prove that $\Delta'_k, \Delta_{l,m}, \vec{c} \vdash N[\vec{M}'/\vec{p}'] \implies \Delta'_k, \Delta_{l,b}, \vec{c} \vdash N[\vec{M}'/\vec{p}']$ where $\Delta_{l,b}$ denotes the knowledge obtained through $\llbracket F_l \rrbracket^b$ respectively.

Now, we consider the different names used in $N[\vec{M}'/\vec{p}']$. It is straightforward to see that $\text{names}(N) \subseteq \vec{x}_1$. Recall the definition of b :

$$b := \beta(\Delta) \cdot \gamma(\mathbb{I})^{s-1} + 1$$

By this, we know that $\beta(\Delta) \geq |\vec{p}'|$ and hence $b \geq |\vec{p}'| \cdot \gamma(\mathbb{I})^{s-1} + 1$. Intuitively, this ensures that there are enough distinct names for every single parameter in the parameter list as well as for channel a as the size determines the maximum depth of the syntax tree of a message. As $\text{names}(\vec{p}') < b$, we can remove at least $m - b$ branches without losing names used in \vec{p}' or channel name a . Therefore, we can assume that $\text{names}(N[\vec{M}'/\vec{p}']) \cup \{a\} \subseteq \vec{x}_1$. The idea is to reduce the knowledge from $\Delta_{l,m}$ to $\Delta_{l,b}$ by Corollary 3, which is a corollary of the absorbing intruder. As m might be bigger than $2b$, we have to iterate the process of reducing the number of branches. Hence, we generalise the notation of $\Delta_{l,m}$ and $\Delta_{l,b}$ in the obvious way: $(\llbracket F_l \rrbracket^m)^i \equiv \text{v} \vec{a}_i.(\Delta_{l,i} \parallel \dots)$.

Claim II: For all $m > b$,

$$(\Delta_{l,m} \vdash N[\vec{M}'/\vec{p}'] \wedge \Delta_{l,m} \vdash a) \implies (\Delta_{l,m-1} \vdash N[\vec{M}'/\vec{p}'] \wedge \Delta_{l,m-1} \vdash a).$$

Proof of Claim II. For convenience, we rename $\Delta_{l,i}$ to A_i . The main observation is that we can split the knowledge A_m into A_{m-1} and a remainder A' . We can choose a branch which

does not use names from \vec{x}_1 to contribute to Λ' . Since we know that $n \geq 1$, we know that $m > 1$ by assumption. Therefore, we can split Λ_{m-1} again and obtain the knowledge stemming from one branch which we call Λ'' . Let us recall the assumption and goal after these rewriting steps: Given that

$$\Delta'_k, \Lambda_{m-2}, \Lambda', \Lambda'' \vdash N[\vec{M}/\vec{p}] \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta'_k, \Lambda_{m-2}, \Lambda', \Lambda'' \vdash a \quad (9)$$

holds, we want to prove that $\Delta'_k, \Lambda_{m-2}, \Lambda'' \vdash N[\vec{M}/\vec{p}]$ and $\Delta'_k, \Lambda_{m-2}, \Lambda'' \vdash a$. Let \vec{w}' and \vec{w}'' be the names only used in Λ' and Λ'' respectively so that:

$$\vec{w}' \cap \vec{w}'' = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \text{names}(\Gamma'_{c,m}, \Lambda_{m-2}) \cap \vec{w}' = \emptyset = \text{names}(\Gamma'_{c,m}, \Lambda_{m-2}) \cap \vec{w}'' \quad (10)$$

Λ' and Λ'' have been obtained from a branch of the same sublimit, so we can infer that

$$\Lambda'' = \Lambda'[\vec{w}''/\vec{w}']. \quad (11)$$

Notice that $\vec{w}' \cap \vec{x}_1 = \emptyset$ by the fact how we have chosen the the branch for Λ' . Because of $\text{names}(N[\vec{M}/\vec{p}]) \cup \{a\} \subseteq \vec{x}_1$, we can infer that $(\text{names}(N[\vec{M}/\vec{p}]) \cup \{a\}) \cap \vec{w}' = \emptyset$ which implies that

$$\text{names}(N[\vec{M}/\vec{p}]) \cup \{a\} \subseteq \text{names}(\Delta'_k, \Lambda_{m-2}, \Lambda'') \quad (12)$$

Facts (9) to (12) fulfil the conditions for Corollary 3 resulting in $\Delta'_k, \Lambda_{m-2}, \Lambda'' \vdash N[\vec{M}/\vec{p}]$ and $\Delta'_k, \Lambda_{m-2}, \Lambda'' \vdash a$ which reads $\Delta'_k, \Lambda_{m-1} \vdash N[\vec{M}/\vec{p}]$ and $\Delta'_k, \Lambda_{m-1} \vdash a$ respectively when folding back which is the goal of Claim II.

In turn, this concludes the proof of Claim I.

Instantiating the statement of Claim I with $k > \omega\text{-height}(L)$ shows that this transition is still enabled in $\lceil L \rceil^b$. We prove that the same holds for transitions enabled by the remaining reduction rules.

Public Private Channel, Message Output Recall that $\text{sf}(\lceil L \rceil^m) \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2. (\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel \mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}] \parallel C_2)$. We have $\mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}] := \bar{a}\langle M \rangle.P_1 + A$ for some private channel a and action A . The channel name a can be derived by assumption: $\Gamma_1 \vdash a$. Overall, we get the following transition:

$$\lceil L \rceil^m \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}] = \bar{a}\langle M \rangle.P_1 + A} \underbrace{\mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \vec{c}. (\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel \langle M \rangle \parallel P_1 \parallel C_1)}_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \text{post}^s(L)}$$

and the channel name a can be derived by assumption: $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash a$. We want to show that we can have the same reduction in $\lceil L \rceil^b$. We sketch the proof that this transition is still enabled as it is analogous to the first proof. We start with an analogous claim.

Claim I: In every hole of context $C[-, \dots, -]$, we can reduce the number of branches to at most n , i.e. for every j we can have a grounding $\lceil F_j \rceil^n$ instead of $\lceil F_j \rceil^m$. for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\exists \vec{y}_k, \Delta_k, D_k : \Phi_{k,L}^{b,n}(\lceil L \rceil^n) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}] = \bar{a}\langle M \rangle + A} \mathbf{v}\vec{y}_k. (\langle \Delta_k \rangle \parallel P_1 \parallel \langle M \rangle \parallel D_k) \\ \text{with } \Delta_k \vdash a$$

It is obvious to see that the side condition is subsumed by (8) which we have used in the first case and hence the proof could be proceeded in the same way.

Private Channel, Two Participants For the last case, we consider:

$$\text{sf}(\lceil L \rceil^m) \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2. (\langle \Gamma_1 \rangle \parallel \langle \Gamma_2 \rangle \parallel \mathbf{Q}_1[\vec{M}_1] \parallel \mathbf{Q}_2[\vec{M}_2] \parallel C_2) \text{ with} \\ \mathbf{Q}_1[\vec{M}_1] \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \bar{c}\langle N[\vec{M}'/\vec{x}] \rangle.P_1 + A_1 \\ \mathbf{Q}_2[\vec{M}_2] \stackrel{\alpha}{=} c(\vec{x} : N).P_2 + A_2$$

The resulting transition looks as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1.\mathbf{v}\vec{x}_2(\langle I_1 \rangle \parallel \langle I_2 \rangle \parallel \mathbf{Q}_1[\vec{M}_1] \parallel \mathbf{Q}_2[\vec{M}_2] \parallel C_2) \\ & \quad \rightarrow_{\Delta} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1.\vec{x}_2(\langle I_1 \rangle \parallel \langle I_2 \rangle \parallel P_1 \parallel P_2[\vec{M}'/\vec{x}] \parallel C_2) \end{aligned}$$

There are no side conditions on derivability in this case so we only have to ensure that all possible combinations of $\vec{c}(N[\vec{M}'/\vec{x}]).P_1$ and $c(\vec{x} : N).P_2$ can occur. As both actions could stem from the same process call, it suffices to have an expansion factor greater or equal to 2. This only poses restrictions on β and γ . By definition of b , we need to ensure that $\beta(\Delta) \cdot \gamma(\mathbb{I})^{s-1} \geq 1$. As argued before, considering $s < 2$ is unreasonable since it would be impossible to have encryptions in this setting. Hence, even if $\gamma(\mathbb{I})$ was 0, $\gamma(\mathbb{I})^{s-1} \geq 1$ for reasonable s . If $\beta(\Delta) < 1$, it is 0 and hence the transition we consider would be impossible. We therefore can assume that $\beta(\Delta) > 0$. Hence, we know that $b \geq 2$ and this suffices to have a congruent transition in $\lceil L \rceil^b$.

We now turn back to our general goal and know that all kinds of transitions are enabled in $\lceil L \rceil^b$. Consider the extension $L \otimes b$ of limit L whose standard form we choose to resemble the correlation with $\lceil L \rceil^b$: $\text{sf}(L \otimes b) \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1.(\langle I_1 \rangle \parallel \mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}] \parallel C_1 \parallel R_1)$. By the definition of $\widehat{\text{post}}(L)$, we know that

$$L' := \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1.(\langle I_1 \rangle \parallel P_1[\vec{M}/\vec{p}] \parallel C_1 \parallel R_1) \in \widehat{\text{post}}(L).$$

Recall that $Q' = \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \vec{c}.(\langle I_1 \rangle \parallel \langle I_2 \rangle \parallel \langle \vec{c} \rangle \parallel P_1[\vec{M}'/\vec{p}] \parallel C_1)$ was the successor of $\lceil L \rceil^m$ from the beginning. It remains to show that $Q' \in \llbracket L' \rrbracket$. As before for $L \otimes b$, we relate the standard form of $L \otimes m$ to $\lceil L \rceil^m$ and get the following:

$$\text{sf}(L \otimes m) \stackrel{\alpha}{=} \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2.(\langle I_1 \rangle \parallel \langle I_2 \rangle \parallel \mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}] \parallel C_2 \parallel R_2)$$

By Lemma 13, we have that $\llbracket L \otimes m \rrbracket = \llbracket L \otimes b \rrbracket$ and taking one step hence leads to

$$\begin{aligned} K' & := \llbracket \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \vec{c}.(\langle I_1 \rangle \parallel \langle I_2 \rangle \parallel \langle \vec{c} \rangle \parallel P_1[\vec{M}'/\vec{p}] \parallel C_2 \parallel R_2) \rrbracket \\ & = \llbracket \mathbf{v}\vec{x}_1.(\langle I_1 \rangle \parallel \langle \vec{c} \rangle \parallel P_1[\vec{M}'/\vec{p}] \parallel C_1 \parallel R_1) \rrbracket =: L' \end{aligned}$$

As $Q' \in K'$, it also holds that $Q' \in L'$ which concludes this proof.

G Example of Incorporation

Consider the limit $L = \mathbf{v}y. \left((\mathbf{v}x. (A[x] \parallel B[y, x]^\omega))^\omega \right)$. To compute $\widehat{\text{post}}$ we consider the limit $L \otimes 1 = \mathbf{v}y. \left((\mathbf{v}x. (A[x] \parallel B[y, x] \parallel B[y, x]^\omega)) \parallel (\mathbf{v}x. (A[x] \parallel B[y, x]^\omega))^\omega \right)$ and assume

$$A[x] \rightarrow \mathbf{v}z. (A[z] \parallel B[y, z]) \parallel B[y, x] = P.$$

Then, $\widehat{\text{post}}$ will contain the limit $L' = C[P]$ for $C[\bullet] = \mathbf{v}y. \left((\mathbf{v}x. (\bullet \parallel B[y, x] \parallel B[y, x]^\omega)) \parallel (\mathbf{v}x. (A[x] \parallel B[y, x]^\omega))^\omega \right)$. Since we are trying to prove inclusion between L and $L' = C[P]$, and L is equivalent to $L \otimes 1 = C[A[x]]$, it seems likely that the inclusion could be proven by matching C with C in the two limits, and by matching P in $L \otimes 1$. Intuitively:

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{v}y. \left((\mathbf{v}x. (\color{red}{A[x]} \parallel B[y, x] \parallel \underbrace{B[y, x]^\omega}_{\text{blue}})) \parallel (\mathbf{v}x. (A[x] \parallel B[y, x]^\omega))^\omega \right) \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \mathbf{v}y. \left((\mathbf{v}x. (\underbrace{\color{blue}{\mathbf{v}z. (A[z] \parallel B[y, z])}}_{\text{blue}} \parallel \underbrace{B[y, x]}_{\text{blue}} \parallel B[y, x] \parallel B[y, x]^\omega)) \parallel (\mathbf{v}x. (A[x] \parallel B[y, x]^\omega))^\omega \right) \end{array}$$

where the part in blue is P and the context C is the part in black. The arrows indicate the sublimits that can be further unfolded to show the inclusion of $C[P]$.

Formally, we want to check that $\forall L' \in \widehat{\text{post}}_{\Delta}^s(L) : \llbracket L' \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket L \rrbracket$. By construction, $L' = C[P]$ for some context C such that $L \otimes b = C[\mathbf{Q}[\vec{M}]]$. Then, if we can find P in the fixed part of $\text{sf}(L \otimes n)$, conditions (A) and (B) of Theorem 6 are automatically satisfied because of the shared context C .