We have formalized NDN access control using CSP [1]. Due to the space limit, we only present four models in [1], and the improved models are illustrated in this appendix. In addition, auxiliary definitions are also listed here.

[1] Fei, Y., Zhu, H.: Modeling and Verifying NDN Access Control Using CSP (submitted to ICFEM2018)

## **Appendix**

In order to describe the improved models, we update the definition in message  $MSG_{vro}$  and  $MSG_{dat2}$  in [1] as below.

```
MSG_{dat2} = \{ msg_{dat}.a.b.n.H(k).E(k, E(k_1, c_1)), msg_{dat}.a.b.n.H(k).E(k, E(k_1, c_1)).E(k_2, c_2) \mid a, b \in Entity, n \in Name, k, k_1, k_2 \in Key, c_1, c_2 \in Content \}
MSG_{pro} = \{ msg_{pro}.E(k, E(k_1, c_1)).k_2.k_3, msg_{pro}.E(k, E(k_1, c_1)).E(k_2, c_2).k_3.k_4.k_5 \mid k, k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4, k_5 \in Key, c_1, c_2 \in Content \}
```

Table 1 represents the new involved constants and variables.

Table 1. New involved constants and variables

Constants	$K_I$ (public key of intruder), $K_M$ (public key of ACM), $K_A$ (public key of CA), $K_I^{-1}$ (private key of intruder), $K_M^{-1}$ (private key of ACM), $K_A^{-1}$ (private key of CA)
Variables	$k + k + k + k + c$ (public key of $\Delta CM$ ) $k^{-1} k^{-1} k^{-1}$ (private key of $\Delta CM$ )
variables	$k_a, k_{a1}, k_{a2}$ (public key of CA), $k_a^{-1}, k_{a1}^{-1}$ (private key of CA),

Here we give sixteen improved models as below.

```
SystemR\_Sig = _{df} \quad READER\_Sig(R, M, K, K_M, NN, ND, NDK)[|PROCESS\_PATH|]PROCESS\\ [|COM\_PATH|]ACM\_R\_Sig(R, M, K_M, DK, DATA, NK\_e, NK\_d, HL)\\ SystemW\_Sig = _{df} \quad WRITER\_Sig(W, M, K, K_M, NN, ND, DK, DATA)[|PROCESS\_PATH|]PROCESS\\ [|COM\_PATH|]ACM\_W\_Sig(W, M, HL, NK\_e, NK\_d, NDK)\\ SystemR\_Sig_1 = _{df} \quad SystemR\_Sig[|INTRUDER\_PATH|]INTUDER\_Sig\\ SystemW\_Sig_1 = _{df} \quad SystemW\_Sig[|INTRUDER\_PATH|]INTUDER\_Sig\\ SystemR\_Sig\_C = _{df} \quad READER\_Sig(R, M, K, K_I, NN, ND, NDK)[|PROCESS\_PATH|]PROCESS\\ [|COM\_PATH|]ACM\_R\_Sig(R, M, K_M, DK, DATA, NK\_e, NK\_d, HL)\\ SystemW\_Sig\_C = _{df} \quad WRITER\_Sig(W, M, K, K_I, NN, ND, DK, DATA)[|PROCESS\_PATH|]PROCESS\\ [|COM\_PATH|]ACM\_W\_Sig(W, M, HL, NK\_e, NK\_d, NDK)\\ SystemR\_Sig\_C_1 = _{df} \quad SystemR\_Sig\_C[|INTRUDER\_PATH|]INTUDER\_Sig\\ SystemW\_Sig\_C_1 = _{df} \quad SystemW\_Sig\_C[|INTRUDER\_PATH|]INTUDER\_Sig\\ SystemW\_Sig\_C_1 = _{df} \quad SystemW\_Sig\_C[|INTRUDER\_PATH|]INTUDER\_Sig
```

Here gives the definition of subprocesses  $READER\_Sig$  and  $READER\_Dig$ . They simulate the read operations.

```
READER_1(r, m, k, k_m, nn, nd, ndk) =_{df}
                         Initialization\{n = false; d = false\} \rightarrow
                          ComRM!msq_{int}.r.m.nd \rightarrow ComRM!msq_{dat}.m.r.nd.E(dk, data) \rightarrow
                          ComRM!msg_{int}.r.m.ndk \rightarrow ComRM?msg_{dat}.m.r.ndk.E(nk\_e,dk1) \rightarrow
                          ComRM!msg_{int}.r.m.nn \rightarrow ComRM?msg_{dat}.m.r.nn.hl \rightarrow
                          ComRM!msg_{int}.r.m.nn.H(k) \rightarrow ComRM!msg_{dat}.m.r.nn.H(k1).E(k1,E((k_m^{-1}),nk\_d)) \rightarrow ComRM!msg_{int}.r.m.nn.H(k1).E(k1,E((k_m^{-1}),nk\_d)) \rightarrow ComRM!msg_{int}.r.m.nn.H(k1).E(k1,E((k_m^{-1}),nk\_d)) \rightarrow ComRM!msg_{dat}.m.r.nn.H(k1).E(k1,E((k_m^{-1}),nk\_d)) \rightarrow ComRM!msg_{dat}.m.r.nn.H(k1).E(k1,E((k_m^{-1}),nk\_d))
                          \mathit{CheckNK!} \mathit{msg}_{\mathit{pro}}.\mathit{E}(\mathit{k1}, \mathit{E}((k_m^{-1}), \mathit{nk\_d})).\mathit{k}^{-1}.\mathit{k}_m \rightarrow \mathit{CheckNK?} \mathit{msg}_{\mathit{ack}}.\mathit{ack} \rightarrow \mathit{checkNK!}
                            \left( \begin{array}{l} (\mathit{NKFakingSuccess}\{n=\mathit{true}\} \rightarrow \mathit{SKIP}) \\ \lhd (\mathit{ack} == \mathit{YES}) \rhd (\mathit{NKFakingError}\{n=\mathit{false}\} \rightarrow \mathit{SKIP}) \end{array} \right); 
                          GetData!msg_{pro}.E(dk,data).E(nk\_e,dk1).nk\_d \rightarrow GetData?msg_{ack}.ack1 \rightarrow GetData!msg_{ack}.ack1 \rightarrow GetData!msg_{ack}.ack
                            \left( \begin{array}{l} (DataAcquisitionSuccess\{d=true\} \rightarrow SKIP) \\ \lhd (ack1 == YES) \rhd (DataAcquisitionError\{d=false\} \rightarrow SKIP) \end{array} \right); 
                          READER_1(r, m, k, k_m, nn, nd, ndk)
READER_2(r, m, k, k_m, k_a, nn, nd, ndk) =_{df}
                         READER_1(r, m, k, k_m, nn, nd, ndk)[[
                          ComRM?msg_{dat}.m.r.nn.H(k1).E(k1, E((k_m^{-1}), nk_{-d}))
                           \leftarrow ComRM?msg_{dat}.m.r.nn.H(k1).E(k1, E((k_m^{-1}), nk_-d)).E((k_a^{-1}), k_m),
                          CheckNK!msg_{pro}.E(k1, E((k_m^{-1}), nk_{-d})).k^{-1}.k_m
                            \leftarrow CheckNK!msg_{pro}.E(k1, E((k_m^{-1}), nk_{-}d)).E((k_a^{-1}), k_m).k^{-1}.k_m.k_a]]
READER\_Sig(r, m, k, k_m, nn, nd, ndk) =_{df}
                          READER_1(r, m, k, k_m, nn, nd, ndk)[[
                          ComRM?{|ComRM|} \leftarrow ComRM?{|ComRM|}, ComRM?{|ComRM|} \leftarrow FakeRM2?{|ComRM|},
                          ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow ComRM!\{|ComRM|\}, ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow FakeRM2!\{|ComRM|\}]]
READER\_Dig(r, m, k, k_m, nn, nd, ndk) =_{df}
                         READER_2(r, m, k, k_m, nn, nd, ndk)[[
                          ComRM?{|ComRM|} \leftarrow ComRM?{|ComRM|}, ComRM?{|ComRM|} \leftarrow FakeRM2?{|ComRM|},
                          ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow ComRM!\{|ComRM|\}, ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow FakeRM2!\{|ComRM|\}]]
```

Here lists the definition of subprocesses WRITER\_Sig and WRITER\_Dig. They simulate the write operations.

```
WRITER_1(w, m, k, k_m, nn, nd, dk, data) =_{df}
                   Initialization\{n = false\} \rightarrow
                   ComWM!msg_{int}.w.m.nn \rightarrow ComWM?msg_{dat}.m.w.nn.hl \rightarrow
                   Com WM! msg_{int}.w.m.nn.H(k) \rightarrow
                    ComWM?msg_{dat}.m.w.nn.H(k1).E(k1,E((k_m^{-1}),(nk_-e,nk_-d))) \rightarrow
                    ComWM!msg_{dat}.w.m.nd.E(dk, data) \rightarrow ComWM!msg_{int}.m.w.ndk \rightarrow
                    ComWM!msg_{dat}.w.m.ndk.E(nk_e, dk) \rightarrow
                    CheckNK! msg_{pro}. E(k1, E((k_m^{-1}), (nk\_e, nk\_d))).k^{-1}.k_m \rightarrow CheckNK! msg_{ack}.ack \rightarrow C
                      \left( \begin{array}{l} (NKFakingSuccess\{n=true\} \rightarrow SKIP) \\ \lhd (ack == YES) \rhd (NKFakingError\{n=false\} \rightarrow SKIP) \end{array} \right); 
                    WRITER_{1}(w,m,k,k_{m},nn,nd,dk,data)
WRITER_2(w, m, k, k_m, k_a, nn, nd, dk, data) =_{df}
                    WRITER_1(w, m, k, k_m, nn, nd, dk, data)[[
                    Com WM? msg_{dat}.m.w.nn. \\ H(k1). \\ E(k1, E((k_m^{-1}), (nk_-e, nk_-d)))
                     \leftarrow \textit{ComWM?msg}_{dat}.\textit{m.w.nn.}\textit{H}(k1).\textit{E}(k1,\textit{E}((k_{m}^{-1}),(nk\_e,nk\_d))).\textit{E}(k_{a}^{-1},k_{m}),
                    CheckNK!msg_{pro}.E(k1, E((k_m^{-1}), (nk_-e, nk_-d))).k^{-1}.k_m
                     \leftarrow CheckNK!msg_{pro}.E(k1, E((k_m^{-1}), (nk_-e, nk_-d))).E((k_a^{-1}), k_m).k^{-1}.k_m.k_a]]
WRITER\_Sig(w, m, k, k_m, nn, nd, dk, data) =_{df}
                     WRITER_1(w, m, k, k_m, nn, nd, dk, data)
                    ComWM?\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow ComWM?\{|ComWM|\}, ComWM?\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow FakeWM2?\{|ComWM|\},
                    ComWM!\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow ComWM!\{|ComWM|\}, ComWM!\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow FakeWM2!\{|ComWM|\}]]
WRITER\_Dig(w, m, k, k_m, k_a, nn, nd, dk, data) =_{df}
                     WRITER_2(w, m, k, k_m, k_a, nn, nd, dk, data)[[
                    ComWM?\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow ComWM?\{|ComWM|\}, ComWM?\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow FakeWM2?\{|ComWM|\},
                    ComWM!\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow ComWM!\{|ComWM|\}, ComWM!\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow FakeWM2!\{|ComWM|\}]\}
```

Here shows the definition of subprocesses  $ACM_R\_Sig$  and  $ACM_R\_Dig$ . They simulate the behavior of ACM when it communicates with the readers.

```
 ACM_-R_1(r,m,k_m,dk,data,nk_-e,nk_-d,hl) =_{df} \\ ComRM?msg_{int}.r.m.nd \to ComRM!msg_{dat}.m.r.nd.E(dk,data) \to \\ ComRM?msg_{int}.r.m.ndk \to ComRM!msg_{dat}.m.r.ndk.E(nk_-e,dk) \to \\ ComRM?msg_{int}.r.m.nn \to ComRM!msg_{dat}.m.r.nn.hl \to \\ ComRM?msg_{int}.r.m.nn \to ComRM!msg_{dat}.m.r.nn.H(k).E(k,E(k_m^{-1},nk_-d)) \to \\ ACM_-R_1(r,m,k_m,dk,data,nk_-e,nk_-d,hl) \\ ACM_-R_2(r,m,k_m,k_a,dk,data,nk_-e,nk_-d,hl) =_{df} \\ ACM_-R_1(r,m,k_m,dk,data,nk_-e,nk_-d,hl)[[\\ ComRM!msg_{dat}.m.r.nn.H(k).E(k,E(k_m^{-1},nk_-d)) \\ \leftarrow ComRM!msg_{dat}.m.r.nn.H(k).E(k,E(k_m^{-1},nk_-d)).E(k_a^{-1},k_m)]] \\ ACM_-R_-Sig(r,m,k_m,dk,data,nk_-e,nk_-d,hl) =_{df} \\ ACM_-R_1(r,m,k_m,dk,data,nk_-e,nk_-d,hl)[[\\ ComRM?\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow ComRM?\{|ComRM|\},ComRM?\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow FakeRM1?\{|ComRM|\},ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow FakeRM1!\{|ComRM|\}]] \\ ACM_-R_-Sig(r,m,k_m,dk,data,nk_-e,nk_-d,hl)[[] \\ ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow ComRM!\{|ComRM|\},ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow FakeRM1!\{|ComRM|\}]] \\ ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow ComRM!\{|ComRM|\},ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow FakeRM1!\{|ComRM|\}] \\ ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow ComRM!\{|ComRM|\},ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow FakeRM1!\{|ComRM|\}] \\ ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow ComRM!\{|ComRM|\},ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow FakeRM1!\{|ComRM|\}] \\ ComRM![|ComRM|] + ComRM![
```

```
\begin{split} &ACM_{-}R_{-}Dig(r,m,k_{m},k_{a},dk,data,nk_{-}e,nk_{-}d,hl) =_{df} \\ &ACM_{-}R_{2}(r,m,k_{m},k_{a},dk,data,nk_{-}e,nk_{-}d,hl)[[\\ &ComRM?\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow ComRM?\{|ComRM|\},ComRM?\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow FakeRM1?\{|ComRM|\},\\ &ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow ComRM!\{|ComRM|\},ComRM!\{|ComRM|\} \leftarrow FakeRM1!\{|ComRM|\}]] \end{split}
```

We illustrate the definition of subprocesses  $ACM\_W\_Sig$  and  $ACM\_W\_Dig$ . They simulate the behavior of ACM when it communicates with the writers.

```
ACM_{-}W_{1}(w, m, k_{m}, hl, nk_{-}e, nk_{-}d, ndk) =_{df}
               Initialization\{\, d = false\} \, \rightarrow \,
               ComWM?msg_{int}.w.m.nn \rightarrow ComWM!msg_{dat1}.m.w.nn.hl \rightarrow
               ComWM?msg_{int}.w.m.nn.H(k) \rightarrow
               ComWM!msg_{dat}.m.w.nn.H(k).E(k,E(k_m^{-1},(nk_-e,nk_-d))) \rightarrow
               ComWM?msg_{dat}.w.m.nd.E(dk,data) \rightarrow ComWM!msg_{int}.w.m.ndk \rightarrow
               ComWM?msg_{dat}.m.w.ndk.E(nk_e1, dk1) \rightarrow
               GetData!msg_{pro}.E(dk,data).E(nk\_e1,dk1).nk\_d \rightarrow
               GetData?msg_{ack}.ack \rightarrow
                  \left( \begin{array}{l} (DataAcquisitionSuccess\{d=true\} \rightarrow SKIP) \\ \lhd (ack==YES) \rhd (DataAcquisitionError\{d=false\} \rightarrow SKIP) \end{array} \right); 
               ACM_{-}W_{1}(w, m, hl, nk_{-}e, nk_{-}d, ndk)
ACM_{-}W_{2}(w, m, k_{m}, k_{a}, hl, nk_{-}e, nk_{-}d, ndk) =_{df}
               A\,CM_{-}W_{1}(\,w,\,m,\,k_{m}\,,\,hl,\,nk_{-}e,\,nk_{-}d,\,ndk)[[
               ComWM!msg_{dat}.m.w.nn.H(k).E(k,E(k_m^{-1},(nk\_e,nk\_d)))
                 \leftarrow ComWM!msg_{dat}.m.w.nn.H(k).E(k,E(k_m^{-1},(nk\_e,nk\_d)).E(K_a^{-1},k_m)]]
ACM_{-}W_{-}Sig(w, m, hl, nk_{-}e, nk_{-}d, ndk) =_{df}
               ACM_{-}W_{1}(w, m, hl, nk_{-}e, nk_{-}d, ndk)[[
               ComWM?\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow FakeWM1?\{|ComWM|\}, ComWM?\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow FakeWM1?\{|ComWM|\}, ComWM?\{|ComWM|\}, ComWM?[|ComWM|], ComWM], ComWM?[|ComWM|], ComWM?[|ComWM|], ComWM], ComWM], ComWM[|ComWM|], ComWM], ComWM[|ComWM|], ComWM[|ComWM|], ComWM[|ComWM|], ComWM], ComWM[|ComWM|], ComWM[|ComWM|], ComWM], ComWM[|ComWM|], ComWM[|C
               ComWM!\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow ComWM!\{|ComWM|\}, ComWM!\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow FakeWM!!\{|ComWM|\}]
ACM_-W_-Dig(w,\,m,\,hl,\,nk\_e,\,nk\_d,\,ndk) =_{df}
               ACM_{-}W_{2}(w, m, hl, nk_{-}e, nk_{-}d, ndk)[[
               ComWM?\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow ComWM?\{|ComWM|\}, ComWM?\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow FakeWM1?\{|ComWM|\},
               ComWM!\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow ComWM!\{|ComWM|\}, ComWM!\{|ComWM|\} \leftarrow FakeWM1!\{|ComWM|\}]
```

We also update the definition of *PROCESS*.

```
\begin{split} PROCESS() =_{df} & CheckNK?msg_{pro}.E(k1,E((k_{m1}^{-1}),nk_{-}d)).k2^{-1}.k_{m2} \\ & \left( (checkNK!msg_{ack}.YES \to PROCESS()) \\ \lhd ((k1 == k2)\&\&(k_{m1} == k_{m2})\&\&(nk_{-}d == NK_{-}d_{-}f)) \rhd (CheckNK!msg_{ack}.NO \to PROCESS()) \right) \\ & \Box CheckNK?msg_{pro}.E(k1,E((k_{m1}^{-1}),nk_{-}d)).E((k_{a1}^{-1}),k_{m2}).k2^{-1}.k_{m3}.k_{a2} \to \\ & \left( (CheckNK!msg_{ack}.YES \to PROCESS()) \\ \lhd ((k1 == k2)\&\&(k_{a1} == k_{a2})\&\&(k_{m1} == k_{m3})\&\&(k_{m2} == k_{m3})\&\&(nk_{-}d == NK_{-}d_{-}f)) \rhd \right) \\ & \Box CheckNK!msg_{ack}.NO \to PROCESS()) \\ & \Box CheckNK?msg_{pro}.E(k1,E((k_{m1}^{-1}),(nk_{-}e,nk_{-}d))).k2^{-1}.k_{m2} \to \\ & \left( (CheckNK!msg_{ack}.YES \to PROCESS()) \\ & \lhd ((k1 == k2)\&\&(k_{m1} == k_{m2})\&\&(nk_{-}e == NK_{-}e_{-}f)\&\&(nk_{-}d == NK_{-}d_{-}f)) \rhd \right) \\ & \left( (CheckNK!msg_{ack}.NO \to PROCESS()) \\ & \lhd ((k1 == k2)\&\&(k_{m1} == k_{m2})\&\&(nk_{-}e == NK_{-}e_{-}f)\&\&(nk_{-}d == NK_{-}d_{-}f)) \rhd \right) \\ & \left( (CheckNK!msg_{ack}.NO \to PROCESS()) \right) \\ & \left( (CheckNK!msg_{ack}.NO \to PROCESS()) \right) \end{aligned}
```

```
 \begin{split} & \Box CheckNK?msg_{pro}.E(k1,E((k_{m1}^{-1}),(nk_{-}e,nk_{-}d))).E((k_{a1}^{-1}),k_{m2}).k2^{-1}.k_{m3}.k_{a2} \rightarrow \\ & \begin{pmatrix} (CheckNK!msg_{ack}.YES \rightarrow PROCESS()) \\ \lhd ((k1=k2)\&\&(k_{a1}==k_{a2})\&\&(k_{m1}==k_{m3})\&\&(k_{m2}==k_{m3})\&\&(nk_{-}e==NK_{-}e_{-}f)\&\&(nk_{-}d==NK_{-}d_{-}f)) \rhd \\ (CheckNK!msg_{ack}.NO \rightarrow PROCESS()) \\ & \Box GetData?msg_{ack}.E(dk1,data).E(nk_{-}e,dk2).nk_{-}d \rightarrow \\ & \begin{pmatrix} (GetData!msg_{ack}.YES \rightarrow PROCESS()) \\ \lhd ((((nk_{-}e==NK_{-}e)\&\&(nk_{-}d==NK_{-}e))\&\&(nk_{-}d==NK_{-}e_{-}f)\&\&(nk_{-}d==NK_{-}e_{-}f) \otimes \&(nk_{-}d==NK_{-}e_{-}f)) \rangle \\ \&\&(dk1==dk2)) \rhd (GetData!msg_{ack}.NO \rightarrow PROCESS()) \\ \end{pmatrix} \end{split}
```

We will add new element to Fact in [1], which is the set of facts which intruders might learn.

```
Fact_{1} =_{df} Fact \cup \{E(K, E(K_{M}^{-1}, content)) \mid content \in \{NK_{-}d, (NK_{-}e, NK_{-}d), NK_{-}d_{-}f, (NK_{-}e_{-}f, NK_{-}d_{-}f)\}\}
```

And we also need to define a new deducing rule for the new element.

$$\{K^{-1}, E(K, E(K_M^{-1}, content))\} \mapsto E(K_M^{-1}, content)$$

We also add new definitions of how the intruders get new facts form messages:

```
Info(msg_{dat}.a.b.n.H(k).E(k,E(k_1,c_1))) = _{df} \{a,b,n,H(k),E(k,E(k_1,c_1))\}
Info(msg_{dat}.a.b.n.H(k).E(k,E(k_1,c_1)).E(k_2,c_2)) = _{df} \{a,b,n,H(k),E(k,E(k_1,c_1)),E(k_2,c_2)\}
```

where  $a,b \in Entity$ ,  $n \in Name$ ,  $k,k1,k2 \in Key$ ,  $c1,c2 \in Content$ . Finally, we give the definition of  $INTUDER\_Sig$  and  $INTUDER\_Dig$ . They simulate the behavior of the intruders.

```
INTUDER_{1}(F) =_{df}
\square\square_{m \in MSG_{out}} FakeRM1?m \rightarrow FakeRM2!m \rightarrow INTUDER_{1}(F \cup Info(m))
\square\square_{m \in (MSG_{out} \setminus MSG_{dat2})} FakeRM2?m \rightarrow FakeRM1!m \rightarrow INTUDER_{1}(F \cup Info(m))
\square\square_{m \in MSG_{dat2}} FakeRM2?m \rightarrow FakeRM1!m[[k_{m}^{-1} \leftarrow K_{I}^{-1}, nk_{-}d \leftarrow NK_{-}d_{-}f]] \rightarrow INTUDER_{1}(F \cup Info(m))
\square\square_{m \in MSG_{out}} FakeWM1?m \rightarrow FakeWM2!m \rightarrow INTUDER_{1}(F \cup Info(m))
\square\square_{m \in (MSG_{out} \setminus MSG_{dat2})} FakeWM2?m \rightarrow FakeWM1!m \rightarrow INTUDER_{1}(F \cup Info(m))
\square\square_{m \in (MSG_{out} \setminus MSG_{dat2})} FakeWM2?m \rightarrow FakeWM1!m[[k_{m}^{-1} \leftarrow K_{I}^{-1}, (nk_{-}e, nk_{-}d) \leftarrow (NK_{-}e_{-}f, NK_{-}d_{-}f)]] \rightarrow INTUDER_{1}(F \cup Info(m))
\square\square_{f \in Fact, f \notin F, F \rightarrow f} Initialization\{l = false\} \rightarrow Deduce.f.F \rightarrow \left( (DataLeakageSuccess\{l = true\} \rightarrow INTRUDER_{1}(F \cup \{f\})) \right) \left( \neg (f = Data) \rhd (DataLeakageError\{l = false\} \rightarrow INTRUDER_{1}(F \cup \{f\})) \right)
INTUDER_{-}Sig =_{df}
INTUDER_{1}(IK \cup \{K_{I}, K_{I}^{-1}, K_{M}\})
INTUDER_{1}(IK \cup \{K_{I}, K_{I}^{-1}, K_{M}, K_{A}\})
```