Here's the hierarchical tree format for a security case for Instant Messaging (IM) software, based on the given predicates and the structure:

- \*\*Goal (G1, IM software is acceptably secure in the Instant Messaging system)\*\*

- \*\*Context (C1, Definition and description of IM software)\*\*

- \*\*Context (C2, Definition and description of the Instant Messaging system)\*\*

- \*\*Context (C3, Definition of acceptably secure)\*\*

- \*\*Strategy (S1, Argument that software assets are under protection)\*\*

- \*\*Justification (J1, Protection of software assets supports that IM software is acceptably secure)\*\*

- \*\*Goal (G2, All identified software critical assets are protected)\*\*

- \*\*Strategy (S2, Respective arguments of software critical assets)\*\*

- \*\*Context (C4, List of IM software critical assets)\*\*

- \*\*Justification (J2, Relationship between assets is clear and can be argued separately)\*\*

- \*\*Goal (G3, Each software critical asset is protected)\*\*

- \*\*Strategy (S3, Argument of the type which the software critical asset belongs to)\*\*

- \*\*Context (C5, List of software critical asset types in PEDD)\*\*

- \*\*Justification (J3, Types of software assets are according to PEDD)\*\*

- \*\*Goal (G4, Each software critical asset which belongs to each type is protected)\*\*

- \*\*(Repeat for each type as per the list in Context C5)\*\*

Based on the \*\*HasMultiplicity (S2, G4, number of software critical assets = 4)\*\* there will be multiple instances of \*\*Goal (G4)\*\* for each type specified in \*\*Context (C5)\*\*.