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Abstract

The formal analysis of security protocols is a challenging field, with various approaches being studied nowadays. The famous Burrows-Abadi-Needham Logic was the first logical system aiming to validate security protocols. Combining ideas from previous approaches, in this paper we define a complete system of dynamic epistemic logic for modeling security protocols. Our logic is implemented, and few of its properties are verified, using the theorem prover Lean.

1 Introduction

This paper presents DELP, a dynamic epistemic logic for analysing security protocols. In order to define our logic, we combine the epistemic approach to authentication from [5], the expectation semantics from [8] and the operational semantics for security protocols from [7].

The system DELP is an epistemic logic. Its syntax and its deductive system follow specific ideas from [5] and general definitions for dynamic epistemic logic from [9]. We prove that our system is complete with respect to an expectation semantics introduced in [8] but, in our setting, the "expectation" represents the adversary knowledge as in [7]. Moreover, we’ve implemented or logic DELP in the theorem prover Lean, and we used the Lean implementation for testing the strength of our approach. Consequently, using Lean: (i) we define translations in DELP for few inference rules of the Burrows-Abadi-Needham (BAN) logic [4] and we proved their soundness, (ii) we defined the Needham-Schroeder authentication protocol as a theory in DELP and we verified few security claims.

Section 2 presents the Needham-Schroder security protocol and recalls the formal approaches from [5], [8] and [7]. In Section 3 we define the system DELP and we prove its properties. Section 4 contains the Lean implementation of DELP. Few deduction rules of the BAN Logic are defined in DELP and their soundness is proved using the Lean implementation. In Section 5 we study the Needham-Schroeder authentication protocol using DELP and its Lean implementation. The last section contains conclusions and further developments.
2 Preliminaries: formal analysis of security protocols

A security protocol is defined as a set of rules and conventions that determine the exchange of messages between two or more agents in order to implement a security service. The protocol must be unambiguous and must allow the description of several roles, so that an agent can perform a certain role at a certain protocol round. An example of a security protocol, which we will mention and use in this paper, is the Needham-Schroeder protocol.

2.1 The Needham-Schroeder security protocol

The protocol specification for three agents is as follows:

\[ A \rightarrow S : A, B, N_a \]
\[ S \rightarrow A : \{N_a, B, K_{ab}, \{K_{ab}, A\}_K_a\}_K_{as} \]
\[ A \rightarrow B : \{K_{ab}, A\}_K_{as} \]
\[ B \rightarrow A : \{N_b\}_K_{ab} \]
\[ A \rightarrow B : \{N_b - 1\}_K_{ab} \]

A step-by-step description of the protocol is:

1. Alice initiates the connection with the Server, sending who she is, with whom she wants to communicate and a nonce (number once generated);
2. the Server sends - encrypted with the common key between A and S - the nonce generated by A, the identity of B and the communication key between A and B, to which is added a message that only B can decrypt (being encrypted with the communication key between B and S), which contains the communication key shared by A and B; in this way, A cannot read the message sent by S to B;
3. A sends B the message that it could not decrypt, received from the Server;
4. B decrypts the message, and sends A a nonce encrypted with the common key between A and B;
5. A receives B’s message, decrypts it, and resends it, applying a simple function to it - in this case, it decrements it. This step is useful in two situations: it is a first protection on a reply attack and it shows that the agents are still alive in the session.

2.2 BAN Logic

We will briefly present the BAN logic, based on [4]. The mathematical system contains the following sets: a set of participating agents in communication protocol sessions - named, generally, using capital letters of the beginning of the alphabet (A, B, ...), a set of keys - named, generally, \( K_{a,b} \) for the public key between agents A and B, \( K_a \) for A’s public key and \( K_a^{-1} \) for A’s secret key, and
a set of messages - named, generally, using capital letters of the end of the alphabet (X, Y, ...). An encrypted message is denoted by writing \{X\}_k, meaning that the message X is encrypted with the key k.

The specific formulas introduced in BAN logic are the following:

- **P \equiv X**: the agent P believes the message X;
- **P \triangleright X**: the agent P sees or receives X;
- **P \sim X**: the agent P once said or sends X;
- **P \Rightarrow X**: the agent P controls X or have jurisdiction over X;
- **\#(X)**: X is a number once generate (a nonce);
- **P_k \leftrightarrow Q**: the agents P and Q shares the communication key k;
- **k \mapsto P**: k is P’s public key;
- **\{X\}_k**: X is encrypted with the key k;
- **\langle X \rangle Y**: X is encrypted with the common secret Y.

In the sequel we recall only two deductions rules, we refer to [4] for the full deduction system.

The **Message Meaning Rule**, formally defined by

\[
\frac{P \equiv Q \quad K \leftrightarrow P \quad P \triangleright \{X\}_K}{P \equiv Q \sim X}
\]

(1)

can be read as follows: if agent P believes that he has a communication key K with agent Q, and agent P receives a message X encrypted under K, then P believes that the encrypted message was sent by Q.

The **Jurisdiction** rule, formally defined by

\[
\frac{P \equiv Q \Rightarrow X \quad P \equiv Q \equiv X}{P \equiv X}
\]

(2)

can be read as follows: if agent P believes that agent Q has jurisdiction over a message X and, furthermore, agent P believes that Q believes X, then P believes X.

2.3 An approach based on epistemic logic

In this subsection, we recall the main ideas from [5], and we refer to [9] for a comprehensive presentation of dynamic epistemic logic.

In this paper, there are defined K (the set of communication keys), N (the set of nonces), T (the set of plain texts) and \( \Phi \) (the set of formulas). The BNF specification of the language is:

\[
s ::= s \mid x
\]

\[
m ::= t \mid k \mid n \mid i \mid (m_1, m_2) \mid \{m\}_k \mid \varphi
\]

\[
\varphi ::= p \mid sent_i(s) \mid recei_i(s) \mid extract_i(m) \mid \neg \varphi \mid \varphi_1 \land \varphi_2 \mid Ki \varphi \mid \Box \varphi \mid \Diamond \varphi \mid [m] = s \mid s \sqsubseteq s' \mid Pr_i(\varphi) \geq \alpha
\]
where \( p \) is an atomic formula, \( i \) is an arbitrary agent, \( m \) is an arbitrary message, \( t \in T, k \in K, n \in N, \alpha \in [0,1] \) a probability, \( s \) a string, \( x \) a variable over strings and \( \varphi \in \Phi \).

For semantics, the models are

\[
I = (R, \pi, C, \{\mu_C\}_{C \in C})
\]

where \( R \) is a protocol rounds system, \( \pi \) is an evaluation function, \( C \) is a partition of \( R \), and for every \( C \in C \), the measure \( \mu_C \) is the distribution probability over rounds in \( C \). The inductive interpretation of formulas in these models are:

\[
(I, r, m) \models p \iff \pi(r(m))(p) \text{ is true}
\]

\[
(I, r, m) \models \neg \varphi \iff (I, r, m) \not\models \varphi
\]

\[
(I, r, m) \models \varphi_1 \land \varphi_2 \iff (I, r, m) \models \varphi_1 \text{ and } (I, r, m) \models \varphi_2
\]

\[
(I, r, m) \models K_i \varphi \iff \text{for all } (r', m') \sim_i (r, m), \text{we have } (I, r', m') \models \varphi
\]

\[
(I, r, m) \models \bigcirc \varphi \iff (I, r, m+1) \models \varphi
\]

\[
(I, r, m) \models \bigBox \varphi \iff \text{for all } m' \geq m, (I, r, m') \models \varphi
\]

\[
(I, r, m) \models \Pr_i(\varphi) \geq \alpha \iff \mu_{r,m,i}(\{(r', m') \mid (I, r', m') \models \varphi\} \cap K_i(r, m) \cap C(r)) \geq \alpha
\]

\[
(I, r, m) \models \exists x \varphi \iff \text{exists } s \text{ string}, (I, r, m) \models \varphi[s/x]
\]

### 2.4 An approach based on operational semantics

From [7], the main point of interest is the terms deduction system. In this formal system we have terms (roles, messages, keys and nonces), variables over \( \text{Var} \), \( \text{Fresh} \) and \( \text{Role} \) sorts, functions symbols (in \( \text{Func} \)), the protocols specifications and a labeled transition system for the execution of the protocols.

Having \( \Gamma \) a knowledge set, the term deduction rules are:

- if \( t \in \Gamma \), then \( \Gamma \vdash t \);
- \( \Gamma \vdash t_1 \) and \( \Gamma \vdash t_2 \) if and only if \( \Gamma \vdash (t_1, t_2) \);
- if \( \Gamma \vdash t \) and \( \Gamma \vdash k \), then \( \Gamma \vdash \{t\}_k \);
- if \( \Gamma \vdash \{t\}_k \) and \( \Gamma \vdash k^{-1} \), then \( \Gamma \vdash t \);
- if \( \Gamma \vdash t_i, 1 \leq i \leq n \), then \( \Gamma \vdash f(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n) \), where \( f \) is a function symbol of \( \text{Func} \), with the arity \( n \).

### 2.5 An approach based on expectation models

In this subsection, we will present the main results of [8], that we will use in the next section to prove the completeness theorem of our system.

In this paper there are introduced two sets, \( I \) - the set of agents and \( P \) - the set of formulas. For interpreting formulas there are used Kripke models, \( \mathcal{M} = (S, \sim, V) \), where \( S \) is the set of accessible world, \( \sim \) is the accessibility relation between worlds and \( V \) is the evaluation function, \( V : P \to \mathcal{P}(S) \).
There are an action set - \( \Sigma \) - and a language of observations - \( \mathcal{L}_{obs} \). The BNF form of the actions’ grammar is:

\[
\pi ::= \delta \mid \varepsilon \mid a \mid \pi \cdot \pi \mid \pi + \pi \mid \pi^*
\]  

(3)

where \( \delta \) is an empty set of observations, \( \varepsilon \) is the empty string and \( a \in \Sigma \).

The observations set is denoted by \( \mathcal{L}(\pi) \) and is inductively defined as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{L}(\delta) &= \emptyset \\
\mathcal{L}(\varepsilon) &= \{ \varepsilon \} \\
\mathcal{L}(a) &= \{ a \} \\
\mathcal{L}(\pi \cdot \pi') &= \{ wv \mid w \in \mathcal{L}(\pi) \text{ and } v \in \mathcal{L}(\pi') \} \\
\mathcal{L}(\pi + \pi') &= \mathcal{L}(\pi) \cup \mathcal{L}(\pi') \\
\mathcal{L}(\pi^*) &= \{ \varepsilon \} \cup \bigcup_{n>0} (\mathcal{L}(\pi \cdots \pi)) 
\end{align*}
\]  

(4-9)

An epistemic model defined with this observations is an epistemic expectation model. Then the temporal model is called ET model. Let \( \sim \) be an epistemic expectation model. The observations set is denoted by \( \mathcal{L}(\pi) \) for which \( \mathcal{L}(\pi) \neq \emptyset \). The logical formulas are defined using the following BNF description:

\[
\varphi ::= p \mid \neg \varphi \mid \varphi \land \psi \mid K_i \varphi \mid [\pi] \varphi 
\]  

(10)

where \( p \in P \), \( i \in I \) and \( \pi \in \mathcal{L}_{obs} \).

An important result from this paper is the bisimilarity. A binary relation \( R \) between two epistemic expectations models \( \mathcal{M} = (S, \sim, V, Exp) \) and \( \mathcal{N} = (S', \sim', V', Exp') \) is called bisimilarity if for every \( s \in S \) and \( s' \in S' \), if we have \( (s, s') \in R \), then:

- **Propositional invariance**: \( V(s) = V'(s') \)
- **Observation invariance**: \( \mathcal{L}(Exp(s)) = \mathcal{L}(Exp(s')) \)
- **Zig**: \( s \sim t \iff \exists t' \in N \) such that \( s' \sim' t' \) and \( tRt' \)
- **Zag**: \( s' \sim' t' \in N \) \( \iff \exists t \in M \) such that \( s \sim t \) and \( tRt' \)

The article also introduce the **bisimilarity invariance** for two epistemic states \( \mathcal{M}, s \) and \( \mathcal{N}, s' \), the following two statements are equivalent:

\[
\begin{align*}
&i) \mathcal{M}, s \leftrightarrow \mathcal{N}, s' \quad (15) \\
&ii) \text{for all } \varphi: \mathcal{M}, s \models \varphi \iff \mathcal{N}, s' \models \varphi
\end{align*}
\]  

(16)

**Updated models.** Let \( w \) be an observation over \( \Sigma \), and \( \mathcal{M} = (S, \sim, V, Exp) \) an epistemic expectation model. Then the **updated** model is denoted with \( \mathcal{M}_w = (S', \sim', V', Exp') \), where \( S' = \{ s \mid \mathcal{L}(Exp(s) - w) \neq \emptyset \}, \sim' = \sim \mid S' \times \{ s \mid \mathcal{L}(Exp(s) - w) \neq \emptyset \} \times S' \), \( V' = V \mid S' \) and \( Exp'(s) = Exp(s) - w \), where \( \pi - w = \{ v \mid wv \in \mathcal{L}(\pi) \} \).

**Temporal models.** Let \( \mathcal{M} = (S, \sim, V, Exp) \) be an epistemic expectation model. Then the temporal model is called ET(\( \mathcal{M} \)) and is defined as \( ET(\mathcal{M}) = (H, \rightarrow a, \sim', V') \), where \( H = \{ (s, w) \mid s \in S, w = \varepsilon \text{ or } w \in \mathcal{L}(Exp(s)) \} \), \( (s, w) \rightarrow a \)}
(t, v) \iff s = t and v = wa, a \in \Sigma, (s, w) \sim t (t, v) \iff s \sim t and w = v and 
p \in V(s, w) \iff p \in V(s).

Using temporal models, it is proved in this paper that \( M, s \models \varphi \iff ET(M), (s, \varepsilon) \models_{EPDL} \varphi \), so the system is complete by the completeness of dynamic epistemic logic.

3 Delp - Dynamic Epistemic Logic for Protocols

In order to define our system, we firstly recall the dynamic epistemic logic [9].

Dynamic epistemic logic is a dynamic logic [6] to which is added the knowledge operator \( K \) from epistemic logic. There are two sets, \( \Pi \), the set of programs, and \( \Phi \), the set of formulas, with \( \Pi_0 \) - set of atomic programs, and \( \Phi_0 \) - set of atomic formulas. The language is described using the following BNF:

\[
\varphi ::=: p \mid \neg \varphi \mid \varphi \rightarrow \varphi \mid K_{i} \varphi \mid [\alpha] \varphi \tag{17}
\]

where \( p \in \Phi_0 \), \( \varphi \in \Phi \), \( i \) is an arbitrary agent and \( \alpha \in \Pi \).

The evaluation models are Kripke models \( M = (R, \sim, V) \), where \( R \) is the finite set of accessible worlds, \( \sim \) is the accessibility relationship between worlds, and \( V \) is the evaluation from dynamic logic: for a formula \( \varphi \in \Phi \), \( V(\varphi) \subseteq R \), and for a program \( \alpha \in \Pi \), \( V(\pi) \subseteq R \times R \).

Interpretation of formulas in this models are inductively defined as:

\[
M, s \models p \iff v \in V(s) \tag{18}
\]

\[
M, s \models \varphi \wedge \psi \iff M, s \models \varphi \text{ and } M, s \models \psi \tag{19}
\]

\[
M, s \models \neg \varphi \iff M, s \not\models \varphi \tag{20}
\]

\[
M, s \models K_{i} \varphi \iff \text{for all } t \text{ such that } s \sim t, \text{ we have } M, t \models \varphi \tag{21}
\]

\[
M, s \models [\alpha] \varphi \iff \text{for all } t \in R \text{ such that } (s, t) \in V(\alpha), \text{ we have } M, t \models \varphi \tag{22}
\]

We also have the following operators for programs:

\[
V(\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2) = V(\alpha_1) \cup V(\alpha_2) \tag{23}
\]

\[
V(\alpha_1; \alpha_2) = V(\alpha_1) \circ V(\alpha_2) \tag{24}
\]

\[
V(\alpha^*) = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} V(\alpha)^n \tag{25}
\]

The deductive system contains all instances of propositional tautologies to which are added the following axioms:

\[
K_{\alpha}(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (K_{\alpha} \varphi \rightarrow K_{\alpha} \psi) \tag{26}
\]

\[
K_{\alpha} \varphi \rightarrow \varphi \tag{27}
\]

\[
K_{\alpha} \varphi \rightarrow K_{\alpha} K_{\alpha} \varphi \tag{28}
\]

\[
\neg K_{\alpha} \varphi \rightarrow K_{\alpha} \neg K_{\alpha} \varphi \tag{29}
\]

\[
[\alpha](\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow ([\alpha] \varphi \rightarrow [\alpha] \psi) \tag{30}
\]

\[
[\alpha](\varphi \wedge \psi) \leftrightarrow [\alpha] \varphi \wedge [\alpha] \psi \tag{31}
\]

\[
[\alpha \cup \beta] \varphi \leftrightarrow [\alpha] \varphi \wedge [\alpha] \psi \tag{32}
\]

\[
[\alpha; \beta] \varphi \leftrightarrow [\alpha][\beta] \varphi \tag{33}
\]
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Deductive rules are *modus ponens*, *generalization* from dynamic logic and *necessity* from epistemic logic:

\[
\begin{align*}
(MP) & \frac{\varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi} \\
(GEN) & \frac{\varphi}{[\alpha]\varphi} \\
(NEC) & \frac{\varphi}{K_i\varphi}
\end{align*}
\]

This system is named *PA*-system in [9], and it is proved that is sound and complete, from *Dynamic Epistemic Logic*, [9, p. 187-188].

### 3.1 DELP

In this subsection we define *DELP*, a logic based on dynamic epistemic logic, enriched with a set of actions collected during the execution of the protocol and a grammar for messages, together with a system of deduction for knowledge based on actions.

#### 3.1.1 Syntax

Let *Agent* be the set of agents and let *Func* be a set of (encryption) functions. We consider the sets *Φ* and *Π* like in dynamic epistemic logic, with *Φ*₀ the set of atomic formulas, and *Π*₀ defined by

\[
\Pi_0 := \{ \text{sent}_i, \text{recv}_i \} | i \in \text{Agent} \tag{34}
\]

The elements of *Π*₀ are *protocols actions*.

In the following we define *messages* and *formulas*.

In a security protocol, a message contains clear texts, keys, *nonces*, and agents identities. The possible operations are messages concatenation and messages encryption. Following [7], the grammar for messages is:

\[
\mu ::= \text{text}(\mu) | \text{key}(\mu) | \text{nonce}(\mu) | \text{agent}(i) \tag{35} \\
| (\mu, \mu) | \{\mu\}_\mu | f(\mu, \ldots, \mu) \tag{36}
\]

where \(i \in \text{Agent}\) and \(f \in \text{Func}\). In the sequel we will use \(t\) for texts, \(k\) for keys, \(n\) for nonces and \(i\) for agents. Based on [7], we define the following deductive system on messages:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{nonce}(m) & \text{key}_{k}(i, j) & \mu_1, \mu_2 \\
\text{key}_{k}(j, i) & (\mu_1, \mu_2) \\
\{t\}_k & t & \{t\}_k \\
\{t\}_k & t & f(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n) \\
t & k & t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n \\
k & t & f(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n)
\end{array}
\]  

Finally, we are able to define the *DELP* formulas:

\[
\varphi ::= p | \neg \varphi | \varphi \rightarrow \varphi | K_i\varphi | [\alpha]\varphi | @\mu \tag{38}
\]

Note that our formulas are the usual formulas of dynamic epistemic logic with protocol actions instead of programs, endowed with the @-operator which converts a message into a formula.
3.1.2 Semantics

The models that we use are Kripke models like in dynamic epistemic logic, \( M = (R, \sim, V) \) which we extend with \( \text{Exp} \) set, a knowledge set with information collected from protocol rounds.

**Definition 1.** Let \( M = (R, \sim, V, \text{Exp}) \) be a DELP model, where

1. \( R \) is the finite set of accessible worlds (protocol rounds);
2. \( \sim := \bigcup_{i \in \text{Agent}} \sim_i \) represents the accessibility relationship between worlds, based on epistemic relation;
3. \( V \) is the evaluation function from dynamic logic: \( V(\varphi) \subseteq R \) for any \( \varphi \in \Phi \), and \( V(\alpha) \subseteq R \times R \), for any \( \alpha \in \Pi \);
4. \( \text{Exp} \) is the knowledge set: for any \( s \in R \), \( \text{Exp}(s) \) represents the set of all knowledge inferred up to \( s \)-th round of the protocol.

Having this models, we can interpret \( \circ \mu \) formula as:

\[
M, s \models \circ \mu \iff \mu \in \text{Exp}(s) \tag{39}
\]

The other formulas have the interpretation from the dynamic epistemic logic:

\[
M, s \models p \iff v \in V(s) \tag{40}
\]

\[
M, s \models \varphi \land \psi \iff M, s \models \varphi \text{ and } M, s \models \psi \tag{41}
\]

\[
M, s \models \neg \varphi \iff M, s \not\models \varphi \tag{42}
\]

\[
M, s \models K_i \varphi \iff \text{for all } t \text{ such that } s \sim_i t, \text{ we have } M, t \models \varphi \tag{43}
\]

\[
M, s \models [\alpha] \varphi \iff \text{for all } t \in R \text{ such that } (s, t) \in V(\alpha), \text{ we have } M, t \models \varphi \tag{44}
\]

3.1.3 Deductive system

The deductive system contains all instances of propositional tautologies to which are added the following axioms from dynamic epistemic logic:

\[
K_a(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (K_a \varphi \rightarrow K_a \psi) \tag{45}
\]

\[
K_a \varphi \rightarrow \varphi \tag{46}
\]

\[
K_a \varphi \rightarrow K_a K_a \varphi \tag{47}
\]

\[
\neg K_a \varphi \rightarrow K_a \neg K_a \varphi \tag{48}
\]

\[
[\alpha](\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow ([\alpha] \varphi \rightarrow [\alpha] \psi) \tag{49}
\]

\[
[\alpha] (\varphi \land \psi) \leftrightarrow [\alpha] \varphi \land [\alpha] \psi \tag{50}
\]

\[
[\alpha \cup \beta] \varphi \leftrightarrow [\alpha] \varphi \land [\alpha] \psi \tag{51}
\]

\[
[\alpha; \beta] \varphi \leftrightarrow [\alpha][\beta] \varphi \tag{52}
\]

In addition, we have the following three specific axioms:

\[
@\{m\}_k \land @\text{key}_k(i, j) \rightarrow [send_i @m \lor [send_j @m \tag{53}
\]

\[
[send_i @m \lor [recv_j @m \rightarrow K_i @m \tag{54}
\]

\[
@\text{key}_k(i, j) \rightarrow K_i @k \lor K_j @k \tag{55}
\]

We specify the following observations on the axioms introduced for DELP, apart from those in dynamic epistemic logic.
Observation 1. The first specific axiom of the system represents an axiom of honesty of the participating agents; its need is highlighted in the modeling of the BAN logic: if there is an encrypted message with the communication key $k$, and the communication key $k$ is a key known to the agents $i$ and $j$, then the message is transmitted by only one of them.

Observation 2. The second axiom is necessary to have a correspondence between states: if the agent $i$ performs an action within the protocols (sends or receives a message), then he knows the message. If the message is encrypted, even if $i$ receives, for example, $\{m\}_k$, it will be able to infer just $K_i@\{m\}_k$, and not $K_i@m$.

Observation 3. The third axiom is an axiom for modeling symmetric key protocols: if the $k$ key is a communication key between $i$ and $j$, then each of them knows it.

The soundness of this system is given by the soundness of the dynamic epistemic logic [9, p. 187-188], and all that remains for us to prove is the soundness of the specific axioms.

Lemma 1. Axiom $@\{m\}_k \land @\text{key}_k(i,j) \rightarrow [\text{send}_i]@m \lor [\text{recv}_j]@m$ is sound.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M} = (R, \sim, V, \text{Exp})$ be a DELP model and $s \in R$ an arbitrary state. Then

$\mathcal{M}, s \models @\{m\}_k \land @\text{key}_k(i,j) \iff \{m\}_k \in \text{Exp}(s)$ and $\text{key}_k(i,j) \in \text{Exp}(s)$

From the messages deduction rules we have that $m \in \text{Exp}(s)$. If $m$ exists in state $s$, then exists a state $t$ such that $(s,t) \in V(\text{send}_i)$, or $(s,t) \in V(\text{send}_j)$. \[\square\]

Lemma 2. Axiom $[\text{send}_i]@m \lor [\text{recv}_i]@m \rightarrow K_i@m$ is sound.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M} = (R, \sim, V, \text{Exp})$ be a DELP model and $s \in R$ an arbitrary state. Then

$\mathcal{M}, s \models [\text{send}_i]@m \iff \text{ for all } t \text{ such that } (s,t) \in V(\text{send}_i), \mathcal{M}, t \models @m$

i.e. $m \in \text{Exp}(t)$. In protocol rounds, the state $t$ is accessible from $s$ through one of the actions, so that either $m \in \text{Exp}(t)$, or $m \in \text{Exp}(t')$, where $(s,t') \in V(\text{recv}_i)$. \[\square\]

Lemma 3. Axiom $@\text{key}_k(i,j) \rightarrow K_i@m \lor K_j@m$ is sound.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M} = (R, \sim, V, \text{Exp})$ be a DELP model and $s \in R$ an arbitrary state. Then

$\mathcal{M}, s \models @\text{key}_k(i,j) \iff \text{key}_k(i,j) \in \text{Exp}(s)$

From the messages deduction rules, we have that $\text{key}_k(j,i) \in \text{Exp}(s)$, so the conclusion is immediate. \[\square\]
3.1.4 Completeness

To prove the completeness of DELP, we use the results from dynamic epistemic logic and the results from [8].

**Definition 2. [Restricted model]** Let \( \mu \) be a message and \( \mathcal{M} = (R, \sim, V, \text{Exp}) \) a DELP model. Then, the **restricted model** is defined as

\[
\mathcal{M}|_{\mu} = (R', \sim', V', \text{Exp}')
\]

where \( R' = \{s \mid \text{Exp}(s) - \mu \neq \emptyset\} \), \( \sim' = \sim |_{R' \times R'} \), \( V' = V|_{R'} \), and \( \text{Exp}'(s) = \text{Exp}(s) - \mu \).

**Definition 3. [Temporal model]** Let \( \mathcal{M} = (R, \sim, V, \text{Exp}) \) be a DELP model. We define

\[
\mathcal{ET}(\mathcal{M}) = (H, \rightarrow, \sim', V')
\]

where

- \( H = \{(s, m) \mid s \in R, m \in \text{Exp}(s)\} \);
- \( (s, m) \rightarrow (s', m') \) if and only if \( s = s' \) and \( m \rightarrow m' \);
- \( (s, m) \sim' (s', m') \) if and only if \( s \sim s' \) and \( m \equiv m' \) where \( \equiv \) is the logic equivalence;
- \( p \in V'(s, m) \) if and only if \( p \in \text{V}(s) \)

Having \( \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{ET}(\mathcal{M}) \) a temporal model, we inductively define the following interpretation of formulas:

\[
\mathcal{N}, w \models p \iff p \in \text{V}(w) \tag{56}
\]
\[
\mathcal{N}, w \models \neg \varphi \iff \mathcal{N}, w \not\models \varphi \tag{57}
\]
\[
\mathcal{N}, w \models \varphi \land \psi \iff \mathcal{N}, w \models \varphi \text{ and } \mathcal{N}, w \models \psi \tag{58}
\]
\[
\mathcal{N}, w \models K_i \varphi \iff \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{N}, \text{ if } w \sim_i v, \text{ then } \mathcal{N}, v \models \varphi \tag{59}
\]
\[
\mathcal{N}, w \models [\alpha] \varphi \iff \text{for all } \mu \in \text{Exp}(\alpha), w \rightarrow v \text{ implies } \mathcal{N}, v \models \varphi \tag{60}
\]

**Definition 4. [Bisimilarity]** Based on [8, Def. 11], we have that the binary relation \( \rho \subseteq \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{N} \), for two DELP models \( \mathcal{M} = (R, \sim, V, \text{Exp}) \) and \( \mathcal{N} = (R', \sim', V', \text{Exp}') \) is called bisimilarity if for any \( v \in R \) and \( v' \in R' \), if we have \( v \rho v' \), then:

**Propositional invariance**

\[
\text{V}(v) = \text{V}'(v') \tag{61}
\]

**Observation invariance**

\[
\text{Exp}(v) = \text{Exp}(v') \tag{62}
\]

**Zig** \( v \sim_i w \in \mathcal{M} \implies \text{exists } w' \in \mathcal{N} \) such that \( v' \sim_i w' \text{ and } w \rho w' \)

**Zag** \( v' \sim_i w' \in \mathcal{N} \implies \text{exists } w \in \mathcal{M} \) such that \( v \sim_i w \text{ and } w \rho w' \)
Theorem 1. [Bisimilarity invariance] For two DELP states \( M, v \) and \( N, v' \), the following two statements are equivalent:

(i) \( M, v \leftrightarrow N, v' \) \hspace{1cm} (65)

(ii) for all \( \varphi: M, v \models \varphi \iff N, v' \models \varphi \) \hspace{1cm} (66)

The proof is the same as [8, Prop. 12].

Theorem 2. [Completeness] Let \( M = (R, \sim, V, Exp) \) be a DELP model, \( \varepsilon \) the initial knowledge and \( \varphi \in \Phi \) a formula. Then

\[ M, v \models \varphi \iff ET(M), (s, \varepsilon) \models \varphi \] \hspace{1cm} (67)

Proof. We follow the proof from [8, Prop. 14]. The boolean and epistemic cases are immediate from the temporal model construction. For \( \varphi := [\alpha]\psi \) we assume that \( M, v \models [\alpha]\psi \), but \( ET(M), (v, \varepsilon) \not\models [\alpha]\psi \). Then, exists \( m \in Exp(v) \) such that \( ET(M), (v, m) \not\models \psi \). From the construction of \( ET(M) \), the definition of worlds is \( H = \{(s, m) \mid s \in R, m \in Exp(s)\} \), so \( m \in Exp(v) \). But \( m \) is a message, then exists the restricted model \( M|_m \). From bisimilarity, we have that \( ET(M|_m), (v, \varepsilon) \) is bisimilar with \( ET(M), (v, m) \). Then \( ET(M|_m), (v, \varepsilon) \models \neg\psi \). From the induction hypothesis, we have \( M, v \models \neg\psi \), which contradicts \( M, v \models [\alpha]\psi \).

We have that the DELP system is complete.

4 Implementation in Lean

In this section we will present the implementation of our system in Lean [1] prover assistant based on [2], and then we will prove the correctness of BAN deduction rules in DELP.

4.1 Language

To implement DELP, we have the following inductive types:

1. For messages:

```
inductive message (\sigma : \text{N}) : \text{Type} 
| null : \text{fin} \ \sigma \rightarrow \text{message} 
| nonc : \text{message} \rightarrow \text{message} 
| keys : \text{message} \rightarrow \text{message} \rightarrow \text{message} \rightarrow \text{message} 
| encr : \text{message} \rightarrow \text{message} \rightarrow \text{message} 
| decr : \text{message} \rightarrow \text{message} \rightarrow \text{message} 
| tupl : \text{message} \rightarrow \text{message} \rightarrow \text{message} 
```

2. For programs:

```
inductive program (\sigma : \text{N}) : \text{Type} 
| skip : \text{program} 
| secv : \text{program} \rightarrow \text{program} \rightarrow \text{program} 
| reun : \text{program} \rightarrow \text{program} \rightarrow \text{program} 
| send : \text{message} \ \sigma \rightarrow \text{program} 
| recv : \text{message} \ \sigma \rightarrow \text{program} 
```
3. For formulas:

```haskell
  inductive form (σ : N) : Type
  | atom : fin σ → form
  | botm : form
  | impl : form → form → form
  | know : message σ → form → form
  | prog : program σ → form → form
  | mesg : message σ → form
  | and : form → form → form
  | or : form → form → form
```

We make the following notations:

```haskell
notation p '→' q := form . impl p q
notation 'ι' 'µ' := form . mesg µ
notation p '∧' q := form . and p q
notation p '∨' q := form . or p q
notation 'K' m ',' p := form . know m p
notation '[α]' ϕ := form . prog α ϕ
notation '·' := {}
notation Γ '∪' p := set . insert p Γ
notation m '||' n := message . tupl m n
notation '{m '}' k := message . encr m k
```

4.2 Deductive system

We define the following context, a set Γ of statements:

```haskell
  def ctx (σ : N) : Type := set (form σ)
```

The deductive system is:

```haskell
  inductive proof (σ : N) : ctx σ → form σ → Prop
  | ax { Γ } { p } (h : p ∈ Γ) : proof Γ p
  | kand { Γ } { i : message σ } { p q : form σ } : proof Γ
      (((K i, p) ∧ (K i, q)) → (K i, (p ∧ q)))
  | ktruth { Γ } { i : message σ } { ϕ : form σ } : proof Γ
      ((K i, ϕ) → ϕ)
  | kdist { Γ } { i : message σ } { ϕ ψ : form σ } : proof Γ
      (((K i, (ϕ → ψ)) → ((K i, ϕ) → (K i, ψ)))
  | progrdistr { Γ } { α : program σ } { ϕ ψ : form σ } : proof Γ
      (([α](ϕ → ψ) → ([α]ψ → [α]ψ))
  | pdtruth { Γ } { α : program σ } { ϕ : form σ } : proof Γ
      (([α]ϕ) → ϕ)
  | honestyright { Γ } { m k i j : message σ } : proof Γ
      (((ι (k.keys i j)) ∧ (ι (∧ m k)) → ([send j]ι m)))
```
4.3 BAN Rules Verification

In order to be able to verify the correctness of the BAN rules, we translate them into our logic. We use the following correspondence:

1. formula $i \equiv m$ is translated as $K_i @ m$ and it means $i$ knows $m$ in current state;
2. formula $i \triangleright m$ means that $i$ receives $m$ and is translated as $[\text{recv}_i] @ m$;
3. formula $i \parallel m$ is translated as $[\text{send}_i] @ m$;
4. formula $i \Rightarrow m$ means that $i$ has jurisdiction over $m$, so the agent knows $m$ and $m$ is true: $K_i @ m \rightarrow @ m$;
5. formula $i \leftrightarrow j$ is translated as $@ \text{key}_k(i, j)$;
6. formula $(m)$ is translated as $@ \text{nonce}(m)$.

Now, we can prove that the translations in DELP of the most important BAN inference rules (according to halpern2017epistemic) are sound. In the sequel, using Lean, we give the proofs only for the Message Meaning rule and for the Jurisdiction rule, few other rules are analysed in the Appendix.

**Lemma 4.** The Message Meaning rule for shared key is a correct rule in the DELP system.

$$i \equiv j \leftrightarrow i \equiv m$$

Proof. We will prove this using Lean.

**lemma** MMSK_is_correct $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}$ $\{ m k i j : \text{message} \}$ $\{ \Gamma : \text{ctx} \sigma \}$ $: (\sigma - \Gamma \vdash (K i, (\iota (K \text{keys} i j)))) \land ([\text{recv} i](\iota \{ m \} k))$ $\rightarrow (\sigma - \Gamma \vdash (K i, ([\text{send} j](\iota m)))) :=$
A much easier demonstration is for the jurisdiction rule, because it uses the $K$ operator distributivity over implication:

**Lemma 5.** Jurisdiction rule is a correct rule in DELP system.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Proof.} & \quad \text{We will prove this using Lean.} \\
\text{Lemma } & \text{ JR_is_correct (} \sigma : \mathbb{N} \text{) } \{ \text{ m i j : message } \sigma \} \{ \Gamma : \text{ctx } \sigma \} \\
& : \quad (\sigma - \Gamma \vdash (K i, (K j, \iota m) \rightarrow (\iota m)) \land (K i, K j, \iota m)) \rightarrow (\sigma - \Gamma \vdash K i, \iota m) := \\
& \quad \lambda h, \text{mp} \\
& \quad (\text{mp kdist } \$ \text{ andleft } h) \\
& \quad (\text{andright } h).
\end{align*}
\]

5 **Needham-Schroeder** protocol implementation in Lean

In this section we will analyze the Needham-Schroeder protocol and we will implement the specification in Lean, in order to prove some security properties. We recall the exchange of messages in Needham-Schroeder protocol:

\[
\begin{align*}
A & \rightarrow S : A, B, N_a \\
S & \rightarrow A : \{N_a, B, K_{ab}, \{K_{ab}, A\}_{K_a}\}_{K_a} \\
A & \rightarrow B : \{K_{ab}, A\}_{K_b} \\
B & \rightarrow A : \{N_b\}_{K_{ab}} \\
A & \rightarrow B : \{N_b - 1\}_{K_{ab}}
\end{align*}
\]

5.1 **Protocol description in Lean**

In this subsection we will formalize the specification in DELP and then we will implement every DELP formula in Lean.

First step: initialization

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda h, \text{ kgen} \\
\$ \text{mp honestyright} \\
\$ \text{mp ktruth} \\
\$ \text{mp kand} \\
\$ \text{andintro} \\
\quad \text{(andleft } h) \\
\quad \text{(mp knowreceive } \$ \text{ andright } h).
\end{align*}
\]
The initial knowledge of agents are:

\[ K_A(@N_A \land @key_{K_{AS}}(A,S)) \]  \hspace{1cm} (68)

\[ K_S(@key_{K_{AS}}(A,S) \land @key_{K_{BS}}(B,S) \land @key_{K_{AB}}(A,B)) \]  \hspace{1cm} (69)

\[ K_B(@key_{K_{BS}}(B,S)) \]  \hspace{1cm} (70)

In Lean we have:

\[
\text{axiom NSinit } (\sigma : N) \{ \Gamma : \text{ctx } \sigma \} \{ A B S Na Kab Kas Kbs : \text{message } \sigma \}
: \sigma - \Gamma \vdash (K A, ((\iota Na) \land (\iota Kas.\text{keys A S})))
\land (K S, ((\iota Kas.\text{keys A S}) \land (\iota Kbs.\text{keys B S}) \land (\iota Kab.\text{keys A B})))
\land (K B, (\iota Kbs.\text{keys B S})).
\]

\[
\text{First round: exchange of messages between A and S}
\]

In DELP we have:

\[ [send_A][recv_S]@N_A \] \hspace{1cm} (71)

with the corresponding Lean implementation:

\[
\text{axiom N1AtoS } (\sigma : N) \{ \Gamma : \text{ctx } \sigma \} \{ A S Na : \text{message } \sigma \}
: \sigma - \Gamma \vdash [send A][recv S](\iota Na).
\]

\[
\text{Second round: exchange of messages between S and A}
\]

\[ [send_S][recv_A](\iota \{Na\}K_{AS} \land \iota \{key_{K_{AB}}(A,B)\}K_{AS}) \] \hspace{1cm} (72)

\[ \land \iota \{\{key_{K_{AB}}(A,B)\}K_{BS}\}K_{AS} \]

\[
\text{axiom N2StoA } (\sigma : N) \{ \Gamma : \text{ctx } \sigma \} \{ A B S Na Kab Kas Kbs : \text{message } \sigma \}
: \sigma - \Gamma \vdash [send S][recv A](\iota \{Na\}Kas)
\land (\iota \{(Kab.\text{keys A B})Kas\})
\land (\iota \{(Kab.\text{keys A B})Kbs\}Kas)).
\]

\[
\text{Third round: exchange of messages between A and B}
\]

This is the last round we can formalize using DELP system at the moment. For the next two round, we need a more expressive system, that can model both the knowledge and belief. However, up to this point we can prove that \( K_{ab} \) is a common secret between \( A \) and \( B \), but we cannot prove the mutual authentication of these two agents.

\[ [send_A][recv_B]@\{key_{K_{AB}}(A,B)\}K_{BS} \]  \hspace{1cm} (73)
5.2 Verifying security properties of Needham-Schroeder

In order to prove some security properties, we must prove the following lemma that we will use further.

**Lemma 6.** Let $\Gamma$ be a set of statements, $i$ and $j$ two agents and $\varphi$ a formula. Then $\Gamma \vdash [send_i] [recv_j] \varphi$ implies $\Gamma \vdash K_j \varphi$.

**Proof.** We will prove this lemma using Lean.

```
lemma recv_imp_knowledge (σ : N) (Γ : ctx σ) { i j : message σ} { ϕ : form σ} :
    (σ-Γ ⊢ [send i][recv j]ϕ) → (σ-Γ ⊢ K_j ϕ) :=
  λ h, mp knowreceivef
  $ mp ktruth
  $ mp knowsendf h.
```

We can prove that the agent $A$ knows the communication key between $A$ and $B$.

**Theorem 3.** In Needham-Schroeder protocol, the agent $A$ knows the communication key between $A$ and $B$.

**Proof.** We will prove this theorem using Lean.

```
theorem A_knows_Kab (σ : N) { Γ : ctx σ } { A B S Na Kab Kas Kbs : message σ} :
    σ-Γ ⊢ K_A, (Kab . keys A B) :=
  kgen
  $ mp pdtruth
  $ mp honestyright
  $ andintro
    (mp ktruth $ A_knows_Kas A B S Na Kab Kas Kbs)
    (mp ktruth $ A_knows_Kab_encrypted_Kas A B S Na Kab Kas Kbs).
```

In a similar way, we can prove that also $B$ knows the communication key between $A$ and $B$.

**Theorem 4.** In Needham-Schroeder protocols, the agent $B$ knows the communication key between $A$ and $B$.

**Proof.** We will prove this theorem using Lean.
We have now that $K_{ab}$ is a common secret between $A$ and $B$, but we cannot prove that we also have a mutual authentication. We know that $K_A@key_{K_{ab}}(A, B) \land K_B@key_{K_{ab}}(A, B)$, but we don’t know if $K_AK_B@key_{K_{ab}}(A, B)$ and $K_BK_A@key_{K_{ab}}(A, B)$.

6 Conclusion and further work

Our work so far shows that DELP is a good candidate for modelling and analysing security protocols. We are aiming to define a system that has a rigorous theoretical development, all proofs being certified using the Lean implementation.

At this stage we’ve already noticed that further refinements are needed, we only mention two: so far we used "knowledge" operators but, in order to increase our system expressiveness, we would like to model the epistemic "trust"; we also consider adding a temporal behaviour, in order to be able to model the property of freshness) since, currently, we use a weaker variant, namely the uniqueness on the system (nonce). Last but not least, we consider the option of adding the probabilistic interpretation, initially presented in [5].

On the implementation side in Lean, we will add the proof for the completeness theorem and we will keep all the theoretical results automatically verified for any subsequent modification.
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Appendix

The following translations of the BAN inference rules in \textit{DELP} are sound:

- **Belief and components rule**

\[
\frac{i \equiv j \sim (m, m')} {i \equiv j \sim m}
\]

1. \textbf{lemma} BC (\(\sigma : N\)) \{ m \ m' \ i \ j : \text{message} \ \sigma \} \{ \Gamma : \text{ctx} \ \sigma \} 
2. \quad (\sigma-\Gamma \vdash K i, \text{send} j(\iota \ m \mid m')) \rightarrow (\sigma-\Gamma \vdash K i, \text{send} j(\iota m)) :=
3. \quad \text{assume} \ h0 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash K i, \text{send} j(\iota m \mid m'),
4. \quad \text{have} \ h1 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash (K i, \text{send} j(\iota m \mid m')) \rightarrow ((\text{send} j(\iota m \mid m')) h0),
5. \quad \text{from} \ @ktruth \ \sigma \Gamma \ i (\text{send} j(\iota m \mid m')),
6. \quad \text{have} \ h2 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash (\text{send} j(\iota m \mid m')) h1 h0,
7. \quad \text{have} \ h3 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash (\text{send} j(\iota m \mid m')) \rightarrow (\iota m \mid m'),
8. \quad \text{from} \ @pctruth \ \sigma \Gamma \ (\text{send} j) (\iota m \mid m'),
9. \quad \text{have} \ h4 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash (\iota m \mid m'),
10. \quad \text{from} \ @mp \ \sigma \Gamma \ (\text{send} j(\iota m \mid m')) (\iota m \mid m') h3 h2,
11. \quad \text{have} \ h5 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash (\iota m),
12. \quad \text{from} \ @messageleft \ \sigma \Gamma \ m \ m' \ h4,
13. \quad \text{have} \ h6 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash (\text{send} j(\iota m)),
14. \quad \text{from} \ @mp \ \sigma \Gamma \ (\iota m) (\iota m) h5,
15. \quad \text{show} \ \sigma-\Gamma \vdash K i, \text{send} j(\iota m),
16. \quad \text{from} \ @kgen \ \sigma \Gamma \ (\text{send} j(\iota m)) i \ h6.

- **Nounce verification rule**

\[
\frac{i \equiv \#(m) \ i \equiv j \sim m} {i \equiv \#(m) \ i \equiv j \sim \#(m)}
\]

1. \textbf{lemma} NV (\(\sigma : N\)) \{ m \ i \ j : \text{message} \ \sigma \} \{ \Gamma : \text{ctx} \ \sigma \} 
2. \quad (\sigma-\Gamma \vdash (K i, \iota \monec) \land K i, \text{send} j(\iota m)) \rightarrow (\sigma-\Gamma \vdash (K i, \iota m)) :=
3. \quad \text{assume} \ h0 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash (K i, \iota m) \land K i, \text{send} j(\iota m),
4. \quad \text{have} \ h1 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash (K i, \iota m \mid \monec) \land K i, \text{send} j(\iota m),
5. \quad \text{from} \ @andleft \ \sigma \Gamma \ (K i, \iota m \mid \monec) \land K i, \text{send} j(\iota m) h0,
6. \quad \text{have} \ h2 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash (K i, \iota m \mid \monec \mid \monec \mid \monec),
7. \quad \text{from} \ @mp \ \sigma \Gamma \ (\iota m \mid \monec) (\iota m \mid \monec \mid \monec) h2,
8. \quad \text{have} \ h3 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash (\iota m \mid \monec),
9. \quad \text{from} \ @pctruth \ \sigma \Gamma \ (\iota \monec \mid \monec),
10. \quad \text{have} \ h4 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash (\iota \monec),
11. \quad \text{from} \ @mp \ \sigma \Gamma \ (\iota \monec) (\iota \monec) h3,
12. \quad \text{show} \ \sigma-\Gamma \vdash K i, \text{send} j(\iota \monec),
13. \quad \text{from} \ @kgen \ \sigma \Gamma \ (\text{send} j(\iota \monec)) i \ h4.
from @mp \sigma \Gamma (K_i, \iota \ m. \text{nonc}) (\iota \ m. \text{nonc}) h_2 h_0,

have h_4 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash (K_i, [send \ j](\iota \ m)) \rightarrow ([send \ j](\iota \ m))

from @ktruth \sigma \Gamma i ([send \ j](\iota \ m)),

have h_5 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash [send \ j](\iota \ m),

from @mp \sigma \Gamma (K_i, [send \ j](\iota \ m)) ([send \ j](\iota \ m)) h_4 h_1,

have h_6 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash ([send \ j](\iota \ m)) \rightarrow (K_j, \iota \ m),

from @knowsend \sigma \Gamma m j,

have h_7 : \sigma-\Gamma \vdash K_j, \iota \ m,
have h3 : \(\sigma \vdash (K \ i, \ k.\ keys \ i \ j) \rightarrow k.\ keys \ i \ j\),
from @ktruth \(\sigma \vdash (k.\ keys \ i \ j)\),

have h4 : \(\sigma \vdash k.\ keys \ i \ j\),
from @mp \(\sigma \vdash (K \ i, \ k.\ keys \ i \ j) \ (k.\ keys \ i \ j)\) h3 h1,

have h5 : \(\sigma \vdash ([recv \ i]\ (m)k) \rightarrow (m)k\),
from @pdtruth \(\sigma \vdash (recv \ i) \ ((m)k)\),

have h6 : \(\sigma \vdash (m)k\),
from @mp \(\sigma \vdash ([recv \ i]\ (m)k) \ ((m)k)\) h5 h2,

have h7 : \(\sigma \vdash ((k.\ keys \ i \ j) \wedge (m)k) \rightarrow [send \ j]\ (m)\),
from @honestyright \(\sigma \vdash m \ k i j\),

have h8 : \(\sigma \vdash (k.\ keys \ i \ j) \wedge (m)k\),
from @andintro \(\sigma \vdash (k.\ keys \ i \ j) \ ((m)k)\) h4 h6,

have h9 : \(\sigma \vdash [send \ j]\ (m)\),
from @mp \(\sigma \vdash ((k.\ keys \ i \ j) \wedge (m)k) \ ([send \ j]\ (m))\) h7 h8,

have h10 : \(\sigma \vdash ([send \ j]\ (m)) \rightarrow (m)\),
from @pdtruth \(\sigma \vdash (send \ j) \ (m)\),

have h11 : \(\sigma \vdash (m)\),
from @mp \(\sigma \vdash ([send \ j]\ (m)) \ ((m)\) h10 h9,

show \(\sigma \vdash [recv \ i]\ (m)\),
from @pdgen \(\sigma \vdash (m) \ (recv \ i)\) h11.