

Compositional properties of crypto-based components

Maria Spichkova

January 11, 2014

Abstract

This paper presents an Isabelle/HOL [?] set of theories which allows to specify crypto-based components and to verify their composition properties wrt. cryptographic aspects. We introduce a formalisation of the security property of data secrecy, the corresponding definitions and proofs. A part of these definitions is based on [?].

Please note that here we import the Isabelle/HOL theory ListExtras.thy, presented in [?].

Contents

1	Auxiliary data types	2
2	Correctness of the relations between sets of Input/Output channels	2
3	Secrecy: Definitions and properties	4
4	Local Secrets of a component	17
5	Knowledge of Keys and Secrets	22

1 Auxiliary data types

```
theory Secrecy-types
imports Main
begin
```

- We assume disjoint sets: Data of data values,
- Secrets of unguessable values, Keys - set of cryptographic keys.
- Based on these sets, we specify the sets EncType of encryptors that may be used for encryption or decryption, and Expression of expression items.
- The specification (component) identifiers should be listed in the set specID,
- the channel indentifiers should be listed in the set chanID.

```
datatype Keys = CKey | CKeyP | SKey | SKeyP | genKey
datatype Secrets = secretD | N | NA
type-synonym Var = nat
type-synonym Data = nat
datatype KS = kKS Keys | sKS Secrets
datatype EncType = kEnc Keys | vEnc Var
datatype specID = sComp1 | sComp2 | sComp3 | sComp4
datatype Expression = kE Keys | sE Secrets | dE Data | idE specID
datatype chanID = ch1 | ch2 | ch3 | ch4
```

```
primrec Expression2KSL:: Expression list  $\Rightarrow$  KS list
where
```

```
Expression2KSL [] = [] |
Expression2KSL (x#xs) =
  ((case x of (kE m)  $\Rightarrow$  [kKS m]
    | (sE m)  $\Rightarrow$  [sKS m]
    | (dE m)  $\Rightarrow$  []
    | (idE m)  $\Rightarrow$  []) @ Expression2KSL xs)
```

```
primrec KS2Expression:: KS  $\Rightarrow$  Expression
where
```

```
KS2Expression (kKS m) = (kE m) |
KS2Expression (sKS m) = (sE m)
```

```
end
```

2 Correctness of the relations between sets of Input/Output channels

```
theory inout
imports Secrecy-types
begin
```

```
consts
  subcomponents :: specID  $\Rightarrow$  specID set
```

— Mappings, defining sets of input, local, and output channels
 — of a component

consts

$ins :: specID \Rightarrow chanID\ set$
 $loc :: specID \Rightarrow chanID\ set$
 $out :: specID \Rightarrow chanID\ set$

— Predicate insuring the correct mapping from the component identifier
 — to the set of input channels of a component

definition

$inStream :: specID \Rightarrow chanID\ set \Rightarrow bool$

where

$inStream\ x\ y \equiv (ins\ x = y)$

— Predicate insuring the correct mapping from the component identifier
 — to the set of local channels of a component

definition

$locStream :: specID \Rightarrow chanID\ set \Rightarrow bool$

where

$locStream\ x\ y \equiv (loc\ x = y)$

— Predicate insuring the correct mapping from the component identifier
 — to the set of output channels of a component

definition

$outStream :: specID \Rightarrow chanID\ set \Rightarrow bool$

where

$outStream\ x\ y \equiv (out\ x = y)$

— Predicate insuring the correct relations between
 — to the set of input, output and local channels of a component

definition

$correctInOutLoc :: specID \Rightarrow bool$

where

$correctInOutLoc\ x \equiv$
 $(ins\ x) \cap (out\ x) = \{\}$
 $\wedge (ins\ x) \cap (loc\ x) = \{\}$
 $\wedge (loc\ x) \cap (out\ x) = \{\}$

— Predicate insuring the correct relations between
 — sets of input channels within a composed component

definition

$correctCompositionIn :: specID \Rightarrow bool$

where

$correctCompositionIn\ x \equiv$
 $(ins\ x) = (\bigcup (ins\ ' (subcomponents\ x)) - (loc\ x))$
 $\wedge (ins\ x) \cap (\bigcup (out\ ' (subcomponents\ x))) = \{\}$

— Predicate insuring the correct relations between

— sets of output channels within a composed component

definition

$correctCompositionOut :: specID \Rightarrow bool$

where

$correctCompositionOut\ x \equiv$

$(out\ x) = (\bigcup (out\ ' (subcomponents\ x)) - (loc\ x))$

$\wedge (out\ x) \cap (\bigcup (ins\ ' (subcomponents\ x))) = \{\}$

— Predicate insuring the correct relations between

— sets of local channels within a composed component

definition

$correctCompositionLoc :: specID \Rightarrow bool$

where

$correctCompositionLoc\ x \equiv$

$(loc\ x) = \bigcup (ins\ ' (subcomponents\ x))$

$\cap \bigcup (out\ ' (subcomponents\ x))$

— If a component is an elementary one (has no subcomponents)

— its set of local channels should be empty

lemma *subcomponents-loc*:

assumes $correctCompositionLoc\ x$

and $subcomponents\ x = \{\}$

shows $loc\ x = \{\}$

<proof>

end

3 Secrecy: Definitions and properties

theory *Secrecy*

imports *Secrecy-types inout ListExtras*

begin

— Encryption, decryption, signature creation and signature verification functions

— For these functions we define only their signatures and general axioms,

— because in order to reason effectively, we view them as abstract functions and

— abstract from their implementation details

consts

$Enc :: Keys \Rightarrow Expression\ list \Rightarrow Expression\ list$

$Decr :: Keys \Rightarrow Expression\ list \Rightarrow Expression\ list$

$Sign :: Keys \Rightarrow Expression\ list \Rightarrow Expression\ list$

$Ext :: Keys \Rightarrow Expression\ list \Rightarrow Expression\ list$

— Axioms on relations between encryption and decryption keys

axiomatization

$EncrDecrKeys :: Keys \Rightarrow Keys \Rightarrow bool$

where

ExtSign:

$EncrDecrKeys\ K1\ K2 \longrightarrow (Ext\ K1\ (Sign\ K2\ E)) = E$ **and**

DecrEnc:

$$\text{EncrDecrKeys } K1 \ K2 \longrightarrow (\text{Decr } K2 \ (\text{Enc } K1 \ E)) = E$$

— Set of private keys of a component

consts

specKeys :: *specID* \Rightarrow *Keys set*

— Set of unguessable values used by a component

consts

specSecrets :: *specID* \Rightarrow *Secrets set*

— Join set of private keys and unguessable values used by a component

definition

specKeysSecrets :: *specID* \Rightarrow *KS set*

where

specKeysSecrets C \equiv

$$\{y \mid \exists x. y = (kKS \ x) \wedge (x \in (specKeys \ C))\} \cup \\ \{z \mid \exists s. z = (sKS \ s) \wedge (s \in (specSecrets \ C))\}$$

— Predicate defining that a list of expression items does not contain

— any private key or unguessable value used by a component

definition

notSpecKeysSecretsExpr :: *specID* \Rightarrow *Expression list* \Rightarrow *bool*

where

notSpecKeysSecretsExpr P e \equiv

$$(\forall x. (kE \ x) \text{ mem } e \longrightarrow (kKS \ x) \notin specKeysSecrets \ P) \wedge \\ (\forall y. (sE \ y) \text{ mem } e \longrightarrow (sKS \ y) \notin specKeysSecrets \ P)$$

— If a component is a composite one, the set of its private keys

— is a union of the subcomponents' sets of the private keys

definition

correctCompositionKeys :: *specID* \Rightarrow *bool*

where

correctCompositionKeys x \equiv

$$subcomponents \ x \neq \{\} \longrightarrow \\ specKeys \ x = \bigcup (specKeys \ ' (subcomponents \ x))$$

— If a component is a composite one, the set of its unguessable values

— is a union of the subcomponents' sets of the unguessable values

definition

correctCompositionSecrets :: *specID* \Rightarrow *bool*

where

correctCompositionSecrets x \equiv

$$subcomponents \ x \neq \{\} \longrightarrow \\ specSecrets \ x = \bigcup (specSecrets \ ' (subcomponents \ x))$$

— If a component is a composite one, the set of its private keys and

— unguessable values is a union of the corresponding sets of its subcomponents

definition

correctCompositionKS :: *specID* \Rightarrow *bool*

where

$correctCompositionKS\ x \equiv$
 $subcomponents\ x \neq \{\} \longrightarrow$
 $specKeysSecrets\ x = \bigcup (specKeysSecrets\ ' (subcomponents\ x))$

- Predicate defining set of correctness properties of the component's
- interface and relations on its private keys and unguessable values

definition

$correctComponentSecrecy :: specID \Rightarrow bool$

where

$correctComponentSecrecy\ x \equiv$
 $correctCompositionKS\ x \wedge$
 $correctCompositionSecrets\ x \wedge$
 $correctCompositionKeys\ x \wedge$
 $correctCompositionLoc\ x \wedge$
 $correctCompositionIn\ x \wedge$
 $correctCompositionOut\ x \wedge$
 $correctInOutLoc\ x$

- Predicate $exprChannel\ I\ E$ defines whether the expression item E can be sent via the channel I

consts

$exprChannel :: chanID \Rightarrow Expression \Rightarrow bool$

- Predicate $eoutM\ sP\ M\ E$ defines whether the component sP may eventually
- output an expression E if there exists a time interval t of
- an output channel which contains this expression E

definition

$eout :: specID \Rightarrow Expression \Rightarrow bool$

where

$eout\ sP\ E \equiv$
 $\exists (ch :: chanID). ((ch \in (out\ sP)) \wedge (exprChannel\ ch\ E))$

- Predicate $eout\ sP\ E$ defines whether the component sP may eventually
- output an expression E via subset of channels M ,
- which is a subset of output channels of sP ,
- and if there exists a time interval t of
- an output channel which contains this expression E

definition

$eoutM :: specID \Rightarrow chanID\ set \Rightarrow Expression \Rightarrow bool$

where

$eoutM\ sP\ M\ E \equiv$
 $\exists (ch :: chanID). ((ch \in (out\ sP)) \wedge (ch \in M) \wedge (exprChannel\ ch\ E))$

- Predicate $ineM\ sP\ M\ E$ defines whether a component sP may eventually
- get an expression E if there exists a time interval t of
- an input stream which contains this expression E

definition

$ine :: specID \Rightarrow Expression \Rightarrow bool$

where

$ine\ sP\ E \equiv$
 $\exists (ch :: chanID). ((ch \in (ins\ sP)) \wedge (exprChannel\ ch\ E))$

- Predicate $ine\ sP\ E$ defines whether a component sP may eventually
- get an expression E via subset of channels M ,
- which is a subset of input channels of sP ,
- and if there exists a time interval t of
- an input stream which contains this expression E

definition

$ineM :: specID \Rightarrow chanID\ set \Rightarrow Expression \Rightarrow bool$

where

$ineM\ sP\ M\ E \equiv$
 $\exists (ch :: chanID). ((ch \in (ins\ sP)) \wedge (ch \in M) \wedge (exprChannel\ ch\ E))$

- This predicate defines whether an input channel ch of a component sP
- is the only one input channel of this component
- via which it may eventually output an expression E

definition

$out-exprChannelSingle :: specID \Rightarrow chanID \Rightarrow Expression \Rightarrow bool$

where

$out-exprChannelSingle\ sP\ ch\ E \equiv$
 $(ch \in (out\ sP)) \wedge$
 $(exprChannel\ ch\ E) \wedge$
 $(\forall (x :: chanID) (t :: nat). ((x \in (out\ sP)) \wedge (x \neq ch) \longrightarrow \neg exprChannel\ x\ E))$

- This predicate yields true if only the channels from the set $chSet$,
- which is a subset of input channels of the component sP ,
- may eventually output an expression E

definition

$out-exprChannelSet :: specID \Rightarrow chanID\ set \Rightarrow Expression \Rightarrow bool$

where

$out-exprChannelSet\ sP\ chSet\ E \equiv$
 $((\forall (x :: chanID). ((x \in chSet) \longrightarrow ((x \in (out\ sP)) \wedge (exprChannel\ x\ E))))$
 \wedge
 $(\forall (x :: chanID). ((x \notin chSet) \wedge (x \in (out\ sP)) \longrightarrow \neg exprChannel\ x\ E)))$

- This predicate defines whether
- an input channel ch of a component sP is the only one input channel
- of this component via which it may eventually get an expression E

definition

$ine-exprChannelSingle :: specID \Rightarrow chanID \Rightarrow Expression \Rightarrow bool$

where

$ine-exprChannelSingle\ sP\ ch\ E \equiv$
 $(ch \in (ins\ sP)) \wedge$
 $(exprChannel\ ch\ E) \wedge$
 $(\forall (x :: chanID) (t :: nat). ((x \in (ins\ sP)) \wedge (x \neq ch) \longrightarrow \neg exprChannel\ x\ E))$

- This predicate yields true if the component sP may eventually
- get an expression E only via the channels from the set chSet,
- which is a subset of input channels of sP

definition

ine-exprChannelSet :: *specID* \Rightarrow *chanID set* \Rightarrow *Expression* \Rightarrow *bool*

where

ine-exprChannelSet sP chSet E \equiv
 $((\forall (x :: \text{chanID}). ((x \in \text{chSet}) \longrightarrow ((x \in (\text{ins } sP)) \wedge (\text{exprChannel } x E))))$
 \wedge
 $(\forall (x :: \text{chanID}). ((x \notin \text{chSet}) \wedge (x \in (\text{ins } sP)) \longrightarrow \neg \text{exprChannel } x E)))$

- If a list of expression items does not contain any private key
- or unguessable value of a component P, then the first element
- of the list is neither a private key nor unguessable value of P

lemma *notSpecKeysSecretsExpr-L1*:

assumes *notSpecKeysSecretsExpr* P (a # l)

shows *notSpecKeysSecretsExpr* P [a]

<proof>

lemma *notSpecKeysSecretsExpr-L2*:

assumes *notSpecKeysSecretsExpr* P (a # l)

shows *notSpecKeysSecretsExpr* P l

<proof>

lemma *correctCompositionIn-L1*:

assumes *subcomponents* PQ = {P, Q}

and *correctCompositionIn* PQ

and *ch* \notin *loc* PQ

and *ch* \in *ins* P

shows *ch* \in *ins* PQ

<proof>

lemma *correctCompositionIn-L2*:

assumes *subcomponents* PQ = {P, Q}

and *correctCompositionIn* PQ

and *ch* \in *ins* PQ

shows (*ch* \in *ins* P) \vee (*ch* \in *ins* Q)

<proof>

lemma *ineM-L1*:

assumes *ch* \in M

and *ch* \in *ins* P

and *exprChannel* *ch* E

shows *ineM* P M E

<proof>

lemma *ineM-ine*:

assumes *ineM* P M E

shows *ine* P E

<proof>

lemma *not-ine-ineM*:

assumes $\neg \text{ine } P \ E$
shows $\neg \text{ineM } P \ M \ E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *eoutM-eout*:
assumes $\text{eoutM } P \ M \ E$
shows $\text{eout } P \ E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *not-eout-eoutM*:
assumes $\neg \text{eout } P \ E$
shows $\neg \text{eoutM } P \ M \ E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionKeys-subcomp1*:
assumes $\text{correctCompositionKeys } C$
and $x \in \text{subcomponents } C$
and $xb \in \text{specKeys } C$
shows $\exists x \in \text{subcomponents } C. (xb \in \text{specKeys } x)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionSecrets-subcomp1*:
assumes $\text{correctCompositionSecrets } C$
and $x \in \text{subcomponents } C$
and $s \in \text{specSecrets } C$
shows $\exists x \in \text{subcomponents } C. (s \in \text{specSecrets } x)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionKeys-subcomp2*:
assumes $\text{correctCompositionKeys } C$
and $xb \in \text{subcomponents } C$
and $xc \in \text{specKeys } xb$
shows $xc \in \text{specKeys } C$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionSecrets-subcomp2*:
assumes $\text{correctCompositionSecrets } C$
and $xb \in \text{subcomponents } C$
and $xc \in \text{specSecrets } xb$
shows $xc \in \text{specSecrets } C$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *correctCompKS-Keys*:
assumes $\text{correctCompositionKS } C$
shows $\text{correctCompositionKeys } C$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *correctCompKS-Secrets*:
assumes $\text{correctCompositionKS } C$

shows *correctCompositionSecrets C*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *correctCompKS-KeysSecrets:*
assumes *correctCompositionKeys C*
 and *correctCompositionSecrets C*
shows *correctCompositionKS C*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *correctCompositionKS-subcomp1:*
assumes *h1:correctCompositionKS C*
 and *h2:x ∈ subcomponents C*
 and *h3:xa ∈ specKeys C*
shows $\exists y \in \text{subcomponents } C. (xa \in \text{specKeys } y)$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *correctCompositionKS-subcomp2:*
assumes *h1:correctCompositionKS C*
 and *h2:x ∈ subcomponents C*
 and *h3:xa ∈ specSecrets C*
shows $\exists y \in \text{subcomponents } C. xa \in \text{specSecrets } y$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *correctCompositionKS-subcomp3:*
assumes *correctCompositionKS C*
 and *x ∈ subcomponents C*
 and *xa ∈ specKeys x*
shows *xa ∈ specKeys C*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *correctCompositionKS-subcomp4:*
assumes *correctCompositionKS C*
 and *x ∈ subcomponents C*
 and *xa ∈ specSecrets x*
shows *xa ∈ specSecrets C*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *correctCompositionKS-PQ:*
assumes *subcomponents PQ = {P, Q}*
 and *correctCompositionKS PQ*
 and *ks ∈ specKeysSecrets PQ*
shows $ks \in \text{specKeysSecrets } P \vee ks \in \text{specKeysSecrets } Q$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *correctCompositionKS-neg1:*
assumes *subcomponents PQ = {P, Q}*
 and *correctCompositionKS PQ*
 and $ks \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } P$
 and $ks \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } Q$

shows $ks \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } PQ$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionKS-negP*:
assumes $\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $\text{correctCompositionKS } PQ$
and $ks \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } PQ$
shows $ks \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } P$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionKS-negQ*:
assumes $\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $\text{correctCompositionKS } PQ$
and $ks \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } PQ$
shows $ks \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } Q$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *out-exprChannelSingle-Set*:
assumes $\text{out-exprChannelSingle } P \text{ ch } E$
shows $\text{out-exprChannelSet } P \{ch\} E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *out-exprChannelSet-Single*:
assumes $\text{out-exprChannelSet } P \{ch\} E$
shows $\text{out-exprChannelSingle } P \text{ ch } E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *ine-exprChannelSingle-Set*:
assumes $\text{ine-exprChannelSingle } P \text{ ch } E$
shows $\text{ine-exprChannelSet } P \{ch\} E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *ine-exprChannelSet-Single*:
assumes $\text{ine-exprChannelSet } P \{ch\} E$
shows $\text{ine-exprChannelSingle } P \text{ ch } E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *ine-ins-neg1*:
assumes $\neg \text{ine } P \text{ m}$
and $\text{exprChannel } x \text{ m}$
shows $x \notin \text{ins } P$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

theorem *TBtheorem1a*:
assumes $\text{ine } PQ \text{ E}$
and $\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $\text{correctCompositionIn } PQ$
shows $\text{ine } P \text{ E} \vee \text{ine } Q \text{ E}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

theorem *TBtheorem1b*:
assumes *ineM PQ M E*
 and *subcomponents PQ = {P,Q}*
 and *correctCompositionIn PQ*
shows *ineM P M E \vee ineM Q M E*
 \langle *proof* \rangle

theorem *TBtheorem2a*:
assumes *eout PQ E*
 and *subcomponents PQ = {P,Q}*
 and *correctCompositionOut PQ*
shows *eout P E \vee eout Q E*
 \langle *proof* \rangle

theorem *TBtheorem2b*:
assumes *eoutM PQ M E*
 and *subcomponents PQ = {P,Q}*
 and *correctCompositionOut PQ*
shows *eoutM P M E \vee eoutM Q M E*
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *correctCompositionIn-prop1*:
assumes *subcomponents PQ = {P,Q}*
 and *correctCompositionIn PQ*
 and *x \in (ins PQ)*
shows *(x \in (ins P)) \vee (x \in (ins Q))*
 \langle *proof* \rangle

lemma *correctCompositionOut-prop1*:
assumes *subcomponents PQ = {P,Q}*
 and *correctCompositionOut PQ*
 and *x \in (out PQ)*
shows *(x \in (out P)) \vee (x \in (out Q))*
 \langle *proof* \rangle

theorem *TBtheorem3a*:
assumes \neg (*ine P E*)
 and \neg (*ine Q E*)
 and *subcomponents PQ = {P,Q}*
 and *correctCompositionIn PQ*
shows \neg (*ine PQ E*)
 \langle *proof* \rangle

theorem *TBlemma3b*:
assumes *h1: \neg (ineM P M E)*
 and *h2: \neg (ineM Q M E)*
 and *h3: subcomponents PQ = {P,Q}*
 and *h4: correctCompositionIn PQ*

and $h5:ch \in M$
and $h6:ch \in ins\ PQ$
and $h7:exprChannel\ ch\ E$
shows $False$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem $TBtheorem3b$:
assumes $h1:\neg (ineM\ P\ M\ E)$
and $h2:\neg (ineM\ Q\ M\ E)$
and $h3:subcomponents\ PQ = \{P,Q\}$
and $h4:correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
shows $\neg (ineM\ PQ\ M\ E)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem $TBtheorem4a-empty$:
assumes $(ine\ P\ E) \vee (ine\ Q\ E)$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P,Q\}$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $loc\ PQ = \{\}$
shows $ine\ PQ\ E$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem $TBtheorem4a-P$:
assumes $ine\ P\ E$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P,Q\}$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $\exists\ ch. (ch \in (ins\ P) \wedge exprChannel\ ch\ E \wedge ch \notin (loc\ PQ))$
shows $ine\ PQ\ E$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem $TBtheorem4b-P$:
assumes $ineM\ P\ M\ E$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P,Q\}$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $\exists\ ch. ((ch \in (ins\ Q)) \wedge (exprChannel\ ch\ E) \wedge (ch \notin (loc\ PQ)) \wedge (ch \in M))$
shows $ineM\ PQ\ M\ E$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem $TBtheorem4a-PQ$:
assumes $(ine\ P\ E) \vee (ine\ Q\ E)$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P,Q\}$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $\exists\ ch. (((ch \in (ins\ P)) \vee (ch \in (ins\ Q))) \wedge (exprChannel\ ch\ E) \wedge (ch \notin (loc\ PQ)))$
shows $ine\ PQ\ E$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem $TBtheorem4b-PQ$:

assumes $(ineM\ P\ M\ E) \vee (ineM\ Q\ M\ E)$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $\exists\ ch. (((ch \in (ins\ P)) \vee (ch \in (ins\ Q))) \wedge$
 $(ch \in M) \wedge (exprChannel\ ch\ E) \wedge (ch \notin (loc\ PQ)))$
shows $ineM\ PQ\ M\ E$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *TBtheorem4a-notP1:*
assumes $ine\ P\ E$
and $\neg\ ine\ Q\ E$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $\exists\ ch. ((ine-exprChannelSingle\ P\ ch\ E) \wedge (ch \in (loc\ PQ)))$
shows $\neg\ ine\ PQ\ E$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *TBtheorem4b-notP1:*
assumes $ineM\ P\ M\ E$
and $\neg\ ineM\ Q\ M\ E$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $\exists\ ch. ((ine-exprChannelSingle\ P\ ch\ E) \wedge (ch \in M)$
 $\wedge (ch \in (loc\ PQ)))$
shows $\neg\ ineM\ PQ\ M\ E$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *TBtheorem4a-notP2:*
assumes $\neg\ ine\ Q\ E$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $ine-exprChannelSet\ P\ ChSet\ E$
and $\forall\ (x :: chanID). ((x \in ChSet) \longrightarrow (x \in (loc\ PQ)))$
shows $\neg\ ine\ PQ\ E$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *TBtheorem4b-notP2:*
assumes $\neg\ ineM\ Q\ M\ E$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $ine-exprChannelSet\ P\ ChSet\ E$
and $\forall\ (x :: chanID). ((x \in ChSet) \longrightarrow (x \in (loc\ PQ)))$
shows $\neg\ ineM\ PQ\ M\ E$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *TBtheorem4a-notPQ:*
assumes $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $ine-exprChannelSet\ P\ ChSet\ P\ E$

and $\text{ine-exprChannelSet } Q \text{ ChSetQ } E$
and $\forall (x :: \text{chanID}). ((x \in \text{ChSetP}) \longrightarrow (x \in (\text{loc } PQ)))$
and $\forall (x :: \text{chanID}). ((x \in \text{ChSetQ}) \longrightarrow (x \in (\text{loc } PQ)))$
shows $\neg \text{ine } PQ \ E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma ineM-Un1 :
assumes $\text{ineM } P \ A \ E$
shows $\text{ineM } P \ (A \ \text{Un } B) \ E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

theorem TBtheorem4b-notPQ :
assumes $\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $\text{correctCompositionIn } PQ$
and $\text{ine-exprChannelSet } P \ \text{ChSetP } E$
and $\text{ine-exprChannelSet } Q \ \text{ChSetQ } E$
and $\forall (x :: \text{chanID}). ((x \in \text{ChSetP}) \longrightarrow (x \in (\text{loc } PQ)))$
and $\forall (x :: \text{chanID}). ((x \in \text{ChSetQ}) \longrightarrow (x \in (\text{loc } PQ)))$
shows $\neg \text{ineM } PQ \ M \ E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{ine-nonempty-exprChannelSet}$:
assumes $\text{ine-exprChannelSet } P \ \text{ChSet } E$
and $\text{ChSet} \neq \{\}$
shows $\text{ine } P \ E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{ine-empty-exprChannelSet}$:
assumes $\text{ine-exprChannelSet } P \ \text{ChSet } E$
and $\text{ChSet} = \{\}$
shows $\neg \text{ine } P \ E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

theorem TBtheorem5a-empty :
assumes $(\text{eout } P \ E) \vee (\text{eout } Q \ E)$
and $\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $\text{correctCompositionOut } PQ$
and $\text{loc } PQ = \{\}$
shows $\text{eout } PQ \ E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

theorem TBtheorem45a-P :
assumes $\text{eout } P \ E$
and $\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $\text{correctCompositionOut } PQ$
and $\exists \text{ ch. } ((\text{ch} \in (\text{out } P)) \wedge (\text{exprChannel } \text{ch } E) \wedge$
 $\quad (\text{ch} \notin (\text{loc } PQ)))$
shows $\text{eout } PQ \ E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

theorem *TBtheorem54b-P:*

assumes *eoutM P M E*

and *subcomponents PQ = {P,Q}*

and *correctCompositionOut PQ*

and $\exists \text{ ch. } ((\text{ch} \in (\text{out } Q)) \wedge (\text{exprChannel ch } E) \wedge$
 $(\text{ch} \notin (\text{loc } PQ)) \wedge (\text{ch} \in M))$

shows *eoutM PQ M E*

<proof>

theorem *TBtheorem5a-PQ:*

assumes $(\text{eout } P \ E) \vee (\text{eout } Q \ E)$

and *subcomponents PQ = {P,Q}*

and *correctCompositionOut PQ*

and $\exists \text{ ch. } (((\text{ch} \in (\text{out } P)) \vee (\text{ch} \in (\text{out } Q))) \wedge$
 $(\text{exprChannel ch } E) \wedge (\text{ch} \notin (\text{loc } PQ)))$

shows *eout PQ E*

<proof>

theorem *TBtheorem5b-PQ:*

assumes $(\text{eoutM } P \ M \ E) \vee (\text{eoutM } Q \ M \ E)$

and *subcomponents PQ = {P,Q}*

and *correctCompositionOut PQ*

and $\exists \text{ ch. } (((\text{ch} \in (\text{out } P)) \vee (\text{ch} \in (\text{out } Q))) \wedge (\text{ch} \in M)$
 $\wedge (\text{exprChannel ch } E) \wedge (\text{ch} \notin (\text{loc } PQ)))$

shows *eoutM PQ M E*

<proof>

theorem *TBtheorem5a-notP1:*

assumes *eout P E*

and $\neg \text{eout } Q \ E$

and *subcomponents PQ = {P,Q}*

and *correctCompositionOut PQ*

and $\exists \text{ ch. } ((\text{out-exprChannelSingle } P \ \text{ch } E) \wedge (\text{ch} \in (\text{loc } PQ)))$

shows $\neg \text{eout } PQ \ E$

<proof>

theorem *TBtheorem5b-notP1:*

assumes *eoutM P M E*

and $\neg \text{eoutM } Q \ M \ E$

and *subcomponents PQ = {P,Q}*

and *correctCompositionOut PQ*

and $\exists \text{ ch. } ((\text{out-exprChannelSingle } P \ \text{ch } E) \wedge (\text{ch} \in M)$
 $\wedge (\text{ch} \in (\text{loc } PQ)))$

shows $\neg \text{eoutM } PQ \ M \ E$

<proof>

theorem *TBtheorem5a-notP2:*

assumes $\neg \text{eout } Q \ E$

and *subcomponents* $PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and *correctCompositionOut* PQ
and *out-exprChannelSet* P *ChSet* E
and $\forall (x :: \text{chanID}). ((x \in \text{ChSet}) \longrightarrow (x \in (\text{loc } PQ)))$
shows $\neg \text{eout } PQ \ E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

theorem *TBtheorem5b-notP2*:
assumes $\neg \text{eoutM } Q \ M \ E$
and *subcomponents* $PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and *correctCompositionOut* PQ
and *out-exprChannelSet* P *ChSet* E
and $\forall (x :: \text{chanID}). ((x \in \text{ChSet}) \longrightarrow (x \in (\text{loc } PQ)))$
shows $\neg \text{eoutM } PQ \ M \ E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

theorem *TBtheorem5a-notPQ*:
assumes *subcomponents* $PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and *correctCompositionOut* PQ
and *out-exprChannelSet* P *ChSetP* E
and *out-exprChannelSet* Q *ChSetQ* E
and $\forall (x :: \text{chanID}). ((x \in \text{ChSetP}) \longrightarrow (x \in (\text{loc } PQ)))$
and $\forall (x :: \text{chanID}). ((x \in \text{ChSetQ}) \longrightarrow (x \in (\text{loc } PQ)))$
shows $\neg \text{eout } PQ \ E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

theorem *TBtheorem5b-notPQ*:
assumes *subcomponents* $PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and *correctCompositionOut* PQ
and *out-exprChannelSet* P *ChSetP* E
and *out-exprChannelSet* Q *ChSetQ* E
and $M = \text{ChSetP} \cup \text{ChSetQ}$
and $\forall (x :: \text{chanID}). ((x \in \text{ChSetP}) \longrightarrow (x \in (\text{loc } PQ)))$
and $\forall (x :: \text{chanID}). ((x \in \text{ChSetQ}) \longrightarrow (x \in (\text{loc } PQ)))$
shows $\neg \text{eoutM } PQ \ M \ E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

4 Local Secrets of a component

theory *CompLocalSecrets*
imports *Secrecy*
begin

— Set of local secrets: the set of secrets which does not belong to
 — the set of private keys and unguessable values, but are transmitted
 — via local channels or belongs to the local secrets of its subcomponents
axiomatization

$LocalSecrets :: specID \Rightarrow KS \text{ set}$
where
 $LocalSecretsDef:$
 $LocalSecrets A =$
 $\{(m :: KS). m \notin specKeysSecrets A \wedge$
 $((\exists x y. ((x \in loc A) \wedge m = (kKS y) \wedge (exprChannel x (kE y))))$
 $|\ (\exists x z. ((x \in loc A) \wedge m = (sKS z) \wedge (exprChannel x (sE z)) \)) \)\}$
 $\cup (\bigcup (LocalSecrets \text{ ` (subcomponents A) } \))$

lemma $LocalSecretsComposition1:$
assumes $ls \in LocalSecrets P$
and $subcomponents PQ = \{P, Q\}$
shows $ls \in LocalSecrets PQ$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $LocalSecretsComposition-exprChannel-k:$
assumes $exprChannel x (kE Keys)$
and $\neg ine P (kE Keys)$
and $\neg ine Q (kE Keys)$
and $\neg (x \notin ins P \wedge x \notin ins Q)$
shows $False$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $LocalSecretsComposition-exprChannel-s:$
assumes $exprChannel x (sE Secrets)$
and $\neg ine P (sE Secrets)$
and $\neg ine Q (sE Secrets)$
and $\neg (x \notin ins P \wedge x \notin ins Q)$
shows $False$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $LocalSecretsComposition-neg1-k:$
assumes $subcomponents PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionLoc PQ$
and $\neg ine P (kE Keys)$
and $\neg ine Q (kE Keys)$
and $kKS Keys \notin LocalSecrets P$
and $kKS Keys \notin LocalSecrets Q$
shows $kKS Keys \notin LocalSecrets PQ$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $LocalSecretsComposition-neg-k:$
assumes $subcomponents PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionLoc PQ$
and $correctCompositionKS PQ$
and $(kKS m) \notin specKeysSecrets P$
and $(kKS m) \notin specKeysSecrets Q$
and $\neg ine P (kE m)$
and $\neg ine Q (kE m)$

and $(kKS\ m) \notin ((LocalSecrets\ P) \cup (LocalSecrets\ Q))$
shows $(kKS\ m) \notin (LocalSecrets\ PQ)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *LocalSecretsComposition-neg-s:*
assumes $h1: subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $h2: correctCompositionLoc\ PQ$
and $h3: correctCompositionKS\ PQ$
and $h4: (sKS\ m) \notin specKeysSecrets\ P$
and $h5: (sKS\ m) \notin specKeysSecrets\ Q$
and $h6: \neg\ ine\ P\ (sE\ m)$
and $h7: \neg\ ine\ Q\ (sE\ m)$
and $h8: (sKS\ m) \notin ((LocalSecrets\ P) \cup (LocalSecrets\ Q))$
shows $(sKS\ m) \notin (LocalSecrets\ PQ)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *LocalSecretsComposition-neg:*
assumes $h1: subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $h2: correctCompositionLoc\ PQ$
and $h3: correctCompositionKS\ PQ$
and $h4: ks \notin specKeysSecrets\ P$
and $h5: ks \notin specKeysSecrets\ Q$
and $h6: \forall\ m. ks = kKS\ m \longrightarrow (\neg\ ine\ P\ (kE\ m) \wedge \neg\ ine\ Q\ (kE\ m))$
and $h7: \forall\ m. ks = sKS\ m \longrightarrow (\neg\ ine\ P\ (sE\ m) \wedge \neg\ ine\ Q\ (sE\ m))$
and $h8: ks \notin ((LocalSecrets\ P) \cup (LocalSecrets\ Q))$
shows $ks \notin (LocalSecrets\ PQ)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *LocalSecretsComposition-neg1-s:*
assumes $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionLoc\ PQ$
and $\neg\ ine\ P\ (sE\ s)$
and $\neg\ ine\ Q\ (sE\ s)$
and $sKS\ s \notin LocalSecrets\ P$
and $sKS\ s \notin LocalSecrets\ Q$
shows $sKS\ s \notin LocalSecrets\ PQ$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *LocalSecretsComposition-neg1:*
assumes $h1: subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $h2: correctCompositionLoc\ PQ$
and $h3: \forall\ m. ks = kKS\ m \longrightarrow (\neg\ ine\ P\ (kE\ m) \wedge \neg\ ine\ Q\ (kE\ m))$
and $h4: \forall\ m. ks = sKS\ m \longrightarrow (\neg\ ine\ P\ (sE\ m) \wedge \neg\ ine\ Q\ (sE\ m))$
and $h5: ks \notin LocalSecrets\ P$
and $h6: ks \notin LocalSecrets\ Q$
shows $ks \notin LocalSecrets\ PQ$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *LocalSecretsComposition-ine1-k:*

assumes $kKS\ k \in LocalSecrets\ PQ$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionLoc\ PQ$
and $\neg\ ine\ Q\ (kE\ k)$
and $kKS\ k \notin LocalSecrets\ P$
and $kKS\ k \notin LocalSecrets\ Q$
shows $ine\ P\ (kE\ k)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *LocalSecretsComposition-ine1-s:*
assumes $sKS\ s \in LocalSecrets\ PQ$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionLoc\ PQ$
and $\neg\ ine\ Q\ (sE\ s)$
and $sKS\ s \notin LocalSecrets\ P$
and $sKS\ s \notin LocalSecrets\ Q$
shows $ine\ P\ (sE\ s)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *LocalSecretsComposition-ine2-k:*
assumes $kKS\ k \in LocalSecrets\ PQ$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionLoc\ PQ$
and $\neg\ ine\ P\ (kE\ k)$
and $kKS\ k \notin LocalSecrets\ P$
and $kKS\ k \notin LocalSecrets\ Q$
shows $ine\ Q\ (kE\ k)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *LocalSecretsComposition-ine2-s:*
assumes $h1:sKS\ s \in LocalSecrets\ PQ$
and $h2:subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $h3:correctCompositionLoc\ PQ$
and $h4:\neg\ ine\ P\ (sE\ s)$
and $h5:sKS\ s \notin LocalSecrets\ P$
and $h6:sKS\ s \notin LocalSecrets\ Q$
shows $ine\ Q\ (sE\ s)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *LocalSecretsComposition-neg-loc-k:*
assumes $h1:kKS\ key \notin LocalSecrets\ P$
and $h2:exprChannel\ ch\ (kE\ key)$
and $h3:kKS\ key \notin specKeysSecrets\ P$
shows $ch \notin loc\ P$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *LocalSecretsComposition-neg-loc-s:*
assumes $h1:sKS\ secret \notin LocalSecrets\ P$
and $h2:exprChannel\ ch\ (sE\ secret)$

and $h3:sKS\ secret \notin specKeysSecrets\ P$
shows $ch \notin loc\ P$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionKS-exprChannel-k-P:*
assumes $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and *correctCompositionKS PQ*
and $kKS\ key \notin LocalSecrets\ PQ$
and $ch \in ins\ P$
and $exprChannel\ ch\ (kE\ key)$
and $kKS\ key \notin specKeysSecrets\ PQ$
and *correctCompositionIn PQ*
shows $ch \in ins\ PQ \wedge exprChannel\ ch\ (kE\ key)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionKS-exprChannel-k-Pex:*
assumes $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and *correctCompositionKS PQ*
and $kKS\ key \notin LocalSecrets\ PQ$
and $ch \in ins\ P$
and $exprChannel\ ch\ (kE\ key)$
and $kKS\ key \notin specKeysSecrets\ PQ$
and *correctCompositionIn PQ*
shows $\exists ch. ch \in ins\ PQ \wedge exprChannel\ ch\ (kE\ key)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionKS-exprChannel-k-Q:*
assumes $h1:subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $h2:correctCompositionKS\ PQ$
and $h3:kKS\ key \notin LocalSecrets\ PQ$
and $h4:ch \in ins\ Q$
and $h5:exprChannel\ ch\ (kE\ key)$
and $h6:kKS\ key \notin specKeysSecrets\ PQ$
and $h7:correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
shows $ch \in ins\ PQ \wedge exprChannel\ ch\ (kE\ key)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionKS-exprChannel-k-Qex:*
assumes $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and *correctCompositionKS PQ*
and $kKS\ key \notin LocalSecrets\ PQ$
and $ch \in ins\ Q$
and $exprChannel\ ch\ (kE\ key)$
and $kKS\ key \notin specKeysSecrets\ PQ$
and *correctCompositionIn PQ*
shows $\exists ch. ch \in ins\ PQ \wedge exprChannel\ ch\ (kE\ key)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionKS-exprChannel-s-P:*

assumes *subcomponents* $PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and *correctCompositionKS* PQ
and $sKS \text{ secret} \notin LocalSecrets \ PQ$
and $ch \in ins \ P$
and *exprChannel* $ch \ (sE \ secret)$
and $sKS \ secret \notin specKeysSecrets \ PQ$
and *correctCompositionIn* PQ
shows $ch \in ins \ PQ \wedge exprChannel \ ch \ (sE \ secret)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionKS-exprChannel-s-Pex*:
assumes *subcomponents* $PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and *correctCompositionKS* PQ
and $sKS \ secret \notin LocalSecrets \ PQ$
and $ch \in ins \ P$
and *exprChannel* $ch \ (sE \ secret)$
and $sKS \ secret \notin specKeysSecrets \ PQ$
and *correctCompositionIn* PQ
shows $\exists ch. \ ch \in ins \ PQ \wedge exprChannel \ ch \ (sE \ secret)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionKS-exprChannel-s-Q*:
assumes $h1: subcomponents \ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $h2: correctCompositionKS \ PQ$
and $h3: sKS \ secret \notin LocalSecrets \ PQ$
and $h4: ch \in ins \ Q$
and $h5: exprChannel \ ch \ (sE \ secret)$
and $h6: sKS \ secret \notin specKeysSecrets \ PQ$
and $h7: correctCompositionIn \ PQ$
shows $ch \in ins \ PQ \wedge exprChannel \ ch \ (sE \ secret)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionKS-exprChannel-s-Qex*:
assumes *subcomponents* $PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and *correctCompositionKS* PQ
and $sKS \ secret \notin LocalSecrets \ PQ$
and $ch \in ins \ Q$
and *exprChannel* $ch \ (sE \ secret)$
and $sKS \ secret \notin specKeysSecrets \ PQ$
and *correctCompositionIn* PQ
shows $\exists ch. \ ch \in ins \ PQ \wedge exprChannel \ ch \ (sE \ secret)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

5 Knowledge of Keys and Secrets

theory *KnowledgeKeysSecrets*
imports *CompLocalSecrets*

begin

An component A knows a secret m (or some secret expression m) that does not belong to its local secrets, if

- A may eventually get the secret m ,
- m belongs to the set LS_A of its local secrets,
- A knows some list of expressions m_2 which is an concatenations of m and some list of expressions m_1 ,
- m is a concatenation of some lists of secrets m_1 and m_2 , and A knows both these secrets,
- A knows some secret key k^{-1} and the result of the encryption of the m with the corresponding public key,
- A knows some public key k and the result of the signature creation of the m with the corresponding private key,
- m is an encryption of some secret m_1 with a public key k , and A knows both m_1 and k ,
- m is the result of the signature creation of the m_1 with the key k , and A knows both m_1 and k .

primrec

$know :: specID \Rightarrow KS \Rightarrow bool$

where

$know\ A\ (kKS\ m) =$
 $((ine\ A\ (kE\ m)) \vee ((kKS\ m) \in (LocalSecrets\ A))) \mid$
 $know\ A\ (sKS\ m) =$
 $((ine\ A\ (sE\ m)) \vee ((sKS\ m) \in (LocalSecrets\ A)))$

axiomatization

$knows :: specID \Rightarrow Expression\ list \Rightarrow bool$

where

$knows_emptyexpression:$

$knows\ C\ [] = True$ **and**

$know1k:$

$knows\ C\ [KS2Expression\ (kKS\ m1)] = know\ C\ (kKS\ m1)$ **and**

$know1s:$

$knows\ C\ [KS2Expression\ (sKS\ m2)] = know\ C\ (sKS\ m2)$ **and**

$knows2a:$

$knows\ A\ (e1\ @\ e) \longrightarrow knows\ A\ e$ **and**

$knows2b:$

$knows\ A\ (e\ @\ e1) \longrightarrow knows\ A\ e$ **and**

$knows3:$

$(knows\ A\ e1) \wedge (knows\ A\ e2) \longrightarrow knows\ A\ (e1\ @\ e2)$ **and**

$knows4:$

$(IncrDecrKeys\ k1\ k2) \wedge (know\ A\ (kKS\ k2)) \wedge (knows\ A\ (Enc\ k1\ e))$
 $\longrightarrow knows\ A\ e$

and

$knows5:$

$(\text{IncrDecrKeys } k1 \ k2) \wedge (\text{know } A \ (kKS \ k1)) \wedge (\text{knows } A \ (\text{Sign } k2 \ e))$
 $\longrightarrow \text{knows } A \ e$

and

knows6:

$(\text{know } A \ (kKS \ k)) \wedge (\text{knows } A \ e1) \longrightarrow \text{knows } A \ (\text{Enc } k \ e1)$

and

knows7:

$(\text{know } A \ (kKS \ k)) \wedge (\text{knows } A \ e1) \longrightarrow \text{knows } A \ (\text{Sign } k \ e1)$

primrec *eoutKnowCorrect* :: *specID* \Rightarrow *KS* \Rightarrow *bool*

where

eout-know-k:

$\text{eoutKnowCorrect } C \ (kKS \ m) =$
 $((\text{eout } C \ (kE \ m)) \longleftrightarrow (m \in (\text{specKeys } C) \vee (\text{know } C \ (kKS \ m)))) \mid$

eout-know-s:

$\text{eoutKnowCorrect } C \ (sKS \ m) =$
 $((\text{eout } C \ (sE \ m)) \longleftrightarrow (m \in (\text{specSecrets } C) \vee (\text{know } C \ (sKS \ m))))$

definition *eoutKnowsECorrect* :: *specID* \Rightarrow *Expression* \Rightarrow *bool*

where

$\text{eoutKnowsECorrect } C \ e \equiv$
 $((\text{eout } C \ e) \longleftrightarrow$
 $(\exists k. e = (kE \ k) \wedge (k \in \text{specKeys } C)) \vee$
 $(\exists s. e = (sE \ s) \wedge (s \in \text{specSecrets } C)) \vee$
 $(\text{knows } C \ [e])))$

lemma *eoutKnowCorrect-L1k*:

assumes *eoutKnowCorrect* *C* (*kKS* *m*)

and *eout* *C* (*kE* *m*)

shows $m \in (\text{specKeys } C) \vee (\text{know } C \ (kKS \ m))$

<proof>

lemma *eoutKnowCorrect-L1s*:

assumes *eoutKnowCorrect* *C* (*sKS* *m*)

and *eout* *C* (*sE* *m*)

shows $m \in (\text{specSecrets } C) \vee (\text{know } C \ (sKS \ m))$

<proof>

lemma *eoutKnowsECorrect-L1*:

assumes *eoutKnowsECorrect* *C* *e*

and *eout* *C* *e*

shows $(\exists k. e = (kE \ k) \wedge (k \in \text{specKeys } C)) \vee$
 $(\exists s. e = (sE \ s) \wedge (s \in \text{specSecrets } C)) \vee$
 $(\text{knows } C \ [e])$

<proof>

lemma *know2knows-k*:

assumes *know* *A* (*kKS* *m*)

shows *knows* *A* [*kE* *m*]

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *knows2know-k*:
assumes *knows A* [kE m]
shows *know A* (kKS m)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *know2knowsPQ-k*:
assumes *know P* (kKS m) \vee *know Q* (kKS m)
shows *knows P* [kE m] \vee *knows Q* [kE m]
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *knows2knowPQ-k*:
assumes *knows P* [kE m] \vee *knows Q* [kE m]
shows *know P* (kKS m) \vee *know Q* (kKS m)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *knows1k*:
know A (kKS m) = *knows A* [kE m]
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *know2knows-neg-k*:
assumes \neg *know A* (kKS m)
shows \neg *knows A* [kE m]
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *knows2know-neg-k*:
assumes \neg *knows A* [kE m]
shows \neg *know A* (kKS m)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *know2knows-s*:
assumes *know A* (sKS m)
shows *knows A* [sE m]
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *knows2know-s*:
assumes *knows A* [sE m]
shows *know A* (sKS m)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *know2knowsPQ-s*:
assumes *know P* (sKS m) \vee *know Q* (sKS m)
shows *knows P* [sE m] \vee *knows Q* [sE m]
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *knows2knowPQ-s*:
assumes *knows P* [sE m] \vee *knows Q* [sE m]
shows *know P* (sKS m) \vee *know Q* (sKS m)

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *knows1s*:

know A (sKS m) = *knows* A [sE m]

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *know2knows-neg-s*:

assumes \neg *know* A (sKS m)

shows \neg *knows* A [sE m]

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *knows2know-neg-s*:

assumes \neg *knows* A [sE m]

shows \neg *know* A (sKS m)

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *knows2*:

assumes $e2 = e1 @ e \vee e2 = e @ e1$

and *knows* A $e2$

shows *knows* A e

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *correctCompositionInLoc-exprChannel*:

assumes *subcomponents* $PQ = \{P, Q\}$

and *correctCompositionIn* PQ

and $ch : \text{ins } P$

and *exprChannel* ch m

and $\forall x. x \in \text{ins } PQ \longrightarrow \neg \text{exprChannel } x \ m$

shows $ch : \text{loc } PQ$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *eout-know-nonKS-k*:

assumes $m \notin \text{specKeys } A$

and *eout* A (kE m)

and *eoutKnowCorrect* A (kKS m)

shows *know* A (kKS m)

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *eout-know-nonKS-s*:

assumes $m \notin \text{specSecrets } A$

and *eout* A (sE m)

and *eoutKnowCorrect* A (sKS m)

shows *know* A (sKS m)

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *not-know-k-not-ine*:

assumes \neg *know* A (kKS m)

shows \neg *ine* A (kE m)

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *not-know-s-not-ine*:
assumes $\neg \text{know } A \text{ (sKS } m)$
shows $\neg \text{ine } A \text{ (sE } m)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *not-know-k-not-eout*:
assumes $m \notin \text{specKeys } A$
and $\neg \text{know } A \text{ (kKS } m)$
and $\text{eoutKnowCorrect } A \text{ (kKS } m)$
shows $\neg \text{eout } A \text{ (kE } m)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *not-know-s-not-eout*:
assumes $m \notin \text{specSecrets } A$
and $\neg \text{know } A \text{ (sKS } m)$
and $\text{eoutKnowCorrect } A \text{ (sKS } m)$
shows $\neg \text{eout } A \text{ (sE } m)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *adv-not-know1*:
assumes $h1:\text{out } P \subseteq \text{ins } A$
and $h2:\neg \text{know } A \text{ (kKS } m)$
shows $\neg \text{eout } P \text{ (kE } m)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *adv-not-know2*:
assumes $h1:\text{out } P \subseteq \text{ins } A$
and $h2:\neg \text{know } A \text{ (sKS } m)$
shows $\neg \text{eout } P \text{ (sE } m)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *LocalSecrets-L1*:
assumes $(\text{kKS}) \text{ key} \in \text{LocalSecrets } P$
and $(\text{kKS } \text{key}) \notin \bigcup (\text{LocalSecrets } \text{'subcomponents } P)$
shows $\text{kKS } \text{key} \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } P$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *LocalSecrets-L2*:
assumes $\text{kKS } \text{key} \in \text{LocalSecrets } P$
and $\text{kKS } \text{key} \in \text{specKeysSecrets } P$
shows $\text{kKS } \text{key} \in \bigcup (\text{LocalSecrets } \text{'subcomponents } P)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *know-composition1*:
assumes $h1:m \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } P$
and $h2:m \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } Q$
and $h3:\text{know } P \text{ } m$
and $h4:\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$

and $h5:correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $h6:correctCompositionKS\ PQ$
shows $know\ PQ\ m$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *know-composition2*:
assumes $m \notin specKeysSecrets\ P$
and $m \notin specKeysSecrets\ Q$
and $know\ Q\ m$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $correctCompositionKS\ PQ$
shows $know\ PQ\ m$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *know-composition*:
assumes $m \notin specKeysSecrets\ P$
and $m \notin specKeysSecrets\ Q$
and $know\ P\ m \vee know\ Q\ m$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $correctCompositionKS\ PQ$
shows $know\ PQ\ m$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *know-composition-neg-ine-k*:
assumes $\neg know\ P\ (kKS\ key)$
and $\neg know\ Q\ (kKS\ key)$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
shows $\neg (ine\ PQ\ (kE\ key))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *know-composition-neg-ine-s*:
assumes $\neg know\ P\ (sKS\ secret)$
and $\neg know\ Q\ (sKS\ secret)$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
shows $\neg (ine\ PQ\ (sE\ secret))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *know-composition-neg1*:
assumes $h1:m \notin specKeysSecrets\ P$
and $h2:m \notin specKeysSecrets\ Q$
and $h3:\neg know\ P\ m$
and $h4:\neg know\ Q\ m$
and $h5:subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $h6:correctCompositionLoc\ PQ$
and $h7:correctCompositionIn\ PQ$

and $h8:correctCompositionKS\ PQ$
shows $\neg know\ PQ\ m$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *know-decomposition*:
assumes $h1:m \notin specKeysSecrets\ P$
and $h2:m \notin specKeysSecrets\ Q$
and $h3:know\ PQ\ m$
and $h4:subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $h5:correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $h6:correctCompositionLoc\ PQ$
shows $know\ P\ m \vee know\ Q\ m$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *eout-knows-nonKS-k*:
assumes $h1:m \notin (specKeys\ A)$
and $h2:eout\ A\ (kE\ m)$
and $h3:eoutKnowsECorrect\ A\ (kE\ m)$
shows $knows\ A\ [kE\ m]$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *eout-knows-nonKS-s*:
assumes $h1:m \notin specSecrets\ A$
and $h2:eout\ A\ (sE\ m)$
and $h3:eoutKnowsECorrect\ A\ (sE\ m)$
shows $knows\ A\ [sE\ m]$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *not-knows-k-not-ine*:
assumes $\neg knows\ A\ [kE\ m]$
shows $\neg ine\ A\ (kE\ m)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *not-knows-s-not-ine*:
assumes $\neg knows\ A\ [sE\ m]$
shows $\neg ine\ A\ (sE\ m)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *not-knows-k-not-eout*:
assumes $m \notin specKeys\ A$
and $\neg knows\ A\ [kE\ m]$
and $eoutKnowsECorrect\ A\ (kE\ m)$
shows $\neg eout\ A\ (kE\ m)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *not-knows-s-not-eout*:
assumes $m \notin specSecrets\ A$
and $\neg knows\ A\ [sE\ m]$
and $eoutKnowsECorrect\ A\ (sE\ m)$

shows $\neg eout\ A\ (sE\ m)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *adv-not-knows1*:
assumes $out\ P \subseteq ins\ A$
and $\neg\ knows\ A\ [kE\ m]$
shows $\neg eout\ P\ (kE\ m)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *adv-not-knows2*:
assumes $out\ P \subseteq ins\ A$
and $\neg\ knows\ A\ [sE\ m]$
shows $\neg eout\ P\ (sE\ m)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *knows-decomposition-1-k*:
assumes $kKS\ a \notin specKeysSecrets\ P$
and $kKS\ a \notin specKeysSecrets\ Q$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $knows\ PQ\ [kE\ a]$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $correctCompositionLoc\ PQ$
shows $knows\ P\ [kE\ a] \vee knows\ Q\ [kE\ a]$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *knows-decomposition-1-s*:
assumes $sKS\ a \notin specKeysSecrets\ P$
and $sKS\ a \notin specKeysSecrets\ Q$
and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $knows\ PQ\ [sE\ a]$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $correctCompositionLoc\ PQ$
shows $knows\ P\ [sE\ a] \vee knows\ Q\ [sE\ a]$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *knows-decomposition-1*:
assumes $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $knows\ PQ\ [a]$
and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
and $correctCompositionLoc\ PQ$
and $(\exists\ z. a = kE\ z) \vee (\exists\ z. a = sE\ z)$
and $\forall\ z. a = kE\ z \longrightarrow$
 $kKS\ z \notin specKeysSecrets\ P \wedge kKS\ z \notin specKeysSecrets\ Q$
and $\forall\ z. a = sE\ z \longrightarrow$
 $sKS\ z \notin specKeysSecrets\ P \wedge sKS\ z \notin specKeysSecrets\ Q$
shows $knows\ P\ [a] \vee knows\ Q\ [a]$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *knows-composition1-k*:

assumes $(kKS\ m) \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } P$
and $(kKS\ m) \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } Q$
and $\text{knows } P\ [kE\ m]$
and $\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $\text{correctCompositionIn } PQ$
and $\text{correctCompositionKS } PQ$
shows $\text{knows } PQ\ [kE\ m]$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *knows-composition1-s*:
assumes $(sKS\ m) \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } P$
and $(sKS\ m) \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } Q$
and $\text{knows } P\ [sE\ m]$
and $\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $\text{correctCompositionIn } PQ$
and $\text{correctCompositionKS } PQ$
shows $\text{knows } PQ\ [sE\ m]$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *knows-composition2-k*:
assumes $(kKS\ m) \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } P$
and $(kKS\ m) \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } Q$
and $\text{knows } Q\ [kE\ m]$
and $\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $\text{correctCompositionIn } PQ$
and $\text{correctCompositionKS } PQ$
shows $\text{knows } PQ\ [kE\ m]$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *knows-composition2-s*:
assumes $(sKS\ m) \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } P$
and $(sKS\ m) \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } Q$
and $\text{knows } Q\ [sE\ m]$
and $\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $\text{correctCompositionIn } PQ$
and $\text{correctCompositionKS } PQ$
shows $\text{knows } PQ\ [sE\ m]$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *knows-composition-neg1-k*:
assumes $kKS\ m \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } P$
and $kKS\ m \notin \text{specKeysSecrets } Q$
and $\neg \text{knows } P\ [kE\ m]$
and $\neg \text{knows } Q\ [kE\ m]$
and $\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$
and $\text{correctCompositionLoc } PQ$
and $\text{correctCompositionIn } PQ$
and $\text{correctCompositionKS } PQ$
shows $\neg \text{knows } PQ\ [kE\ m]$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *knows-composition-neg1-s*:

assumes $sKS\ m \notin specKeysSecrets\ P$
 and $sKS\ m \notin specKeysSecrets\ Q$
 and $\neg\ knows\ P\ [sE\ m]$
 and $\neg\ knows\ Q\ [sE\ m]$
 and $subcomponents\ PQ = \{P, Q\}$
 and $correctCompositionLoc\ PQ$
 and $correctCompositionIn\ PQ$
 and $correctCompositionKS\ PQ$
shows $\neg\ knows\ PQ\ [sE\ m]$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *knows-concat-1*:

assumes $knows\ P\ (a\ \# \ e)$

shows $knows\ P\ [a]$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *knows-concat-2*:

assumes $knows\ P\ (a\ \# \ e)$

shows $knows\ P\ e$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *knows-concat-3*:

assumes $knows\ P\ [a]$

and $knows\ P\ e$

shows $knows\ P\ (a\ \# \ e)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *not-knows-conc-knows-elem-not-knows-tail*:

assumes $\neg\ knows\ P\ (a\ \# \ e)$

and $knows\ P\ [a]$

shows $\neg\ knows\ P\ e$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *not-knows-conc-not-knows-elem-tail*:

assumes $\neg\ knows\ P\ (a\ \# \ e)$

shows $\neg\ knows\ P\ [a] \vee \neg\ knows\ P\ e$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *not-knows-elem-not-knows-conc*:

assumes $\neg\ knows\ P\ [a]$

shows $\neg\ knows\ P\ (a\ \# \ e)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *not-knows-tail-not-knows-conc*:

assumes $\neg\ knows\ P\ e$

shows $\neg\ knows\ P\ (a\ \# \ e)$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *knows-composition3*:

fixes $e::\text{Expression}$ *list*

assumes $h1:\text{knows } P \ e$

and $h2:\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$

and $h3:\text{correctCompositionIn } PQ$

and $h4:\text{correctCompositionKS } PQ$

and $h5:\forall (m::\text{Expression}). ((m \text{ mem } e) \longrightarrow$
 $((\exists z1. m = (kE \ z1)) \vee (\exists z2. m = (sE \ z2))))$

and $h6:\text{notSpecKeysSecretsExpr } P \ e$

and $h7:\text{notSpecKeysSecretsExpr } Q \ e$

shows $\text{knows } PQ \ e$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *knows-composition4*:

assumes $h1:\text{knows } Q \ e$

and $h2:\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$

and $h3:\text{correctCompositionIn } PQ$

and $h4:\text{correctCompositionKS } PQ$

and $h5:\forall m. m \text{ mem } e \longrightarrow ((\exists z. m = kE \ z) \vee (\exists z. m = sE \ z))$

and $h6:\text{notSpecKeysSecretsExpr } P \ e$

and $h7:\text{notSpecKeysSecretsExpr } Q \ e$

shows $\text{knows } PQ \ e$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *knows-composition5*:

assumes $\text{knows } P \ e \vee \text{knows } Q \ e$

and $\text{subcomponents } PQ = \{P, Q\}$

and $\text{correctCompositionIn } PQ$

and $\text{correctCompositionKS } PQ$

and $\forall m. m \text{ mem } e \longrightarrow ((\exists z. m = kE \ z) \vee (\exists z. m = sE \ z))$

and $\text{notSpecKeysSecretsExpr } P \ e$

and $\text{notSpecKeysSecretsExpr } Q \ e$

shows $\text{knows } PQ \ e$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end