

**Problem 1. [15 points]****Part a. [7 points]**

Does  $Inv A_1$  hold, where

$$A_1 : ((j \text{ in } hst.keys) \text{ and } j > 0 \text{ and } hst[j] = [A,p]) \Rightarrow hst[j-1] = [B,1,p]$$

**Solution**

No.

Here is a counter-example evolution.

1. Protocol goes through steps Initial, A.1, B.1, Z.1, B.2, starting with A sending msg  $[A,B,1,enc(kA, [A,B,xA])]$ .  
State:  $A.nl = xA$ ;  $A.key = kA$ ;  $A.t$  at A.2;  $B.t$  at B.3;  $B.kAB = p$ ;  $hst = [[B,1,p]]$ ;  
 $[B,A,eA]$  in channel where  $eA = enc(kA, [xA,p])$ .
  2. Attacker intercepts the final message,  $[B,A,eA]$ , in step 1.  
Attacker sends  $[A,B,2,grbg]$ .  
 $B.t$  receives this message, executes B.3 unsuccessfully, returns to B.1.
  3. Attacker replays msg 1,  $[A,B,1,enc(kA, [A,B,xA])]$ . Protocol goes through steps B.1, Z.1, B.2.  
State:  $A.nl = xA$ ;  $A.key = kA$ ;  $A.t$  at A.2;  $B.t$  at B.3;  $B.kAB = q$  and  $q \neq p$ ;  $hst = [[B,1,p], [B,1,q]]$ ;  
 $[B,A,fA]$  in channel where  $fA = enc(kA, [xA,q])$ .
  4. Attacker replaces msg  $[B,A,fA]$  with msg  $[B,A,eA]$  (obtained in step 2).
  5.  $A.t$  receives msg 4, executes A.2 successfully.  
State:  $hst = [[B,1,p], [B,1,q], [A,p]]$  and  $q \neq p$ .  
 $A_1$  false.
- 

**Part b. [8 points]**

Does  $Inv A_2$  hold, where

$$A_2 : ((j \text{ in } hst.keys) \text{ and } j > 0 \text{ and } hst[j] = [B,2,p]) \Rightarrow hst[j-1] = [A,p]$$

**Solution**

No.

Here is a counter-example evolution.

1. Protocol goes through steps Initial, A.1, B.1, Z.1, B.2, starting with A sending msg  $[A,B,1,enc(kA, [A,B,xA])]$ .  
State:  $A.nl = xA$ ;  $A.key = kA$ ;  $A.t$  at A.2;  $B.t$  at B.3;  $B.kAB = p$ ;  $hst = [[B,1,p]]$ ;  
 $[B,A,eA]$  in channel where  $eA = enc(kA, [xA,p])$ .
  2. Attacker intercepts the final message,  $[B,A,eA]$ , in step 1.  
Attacker sends  $[B,A,grbg]$  (prelude to doing `getPwDA`).  
 $A.t$  receives this message, executes A.2 unsuccessfully, returns to A.1.
  3. Attacker executes `getPwDA`; obtains  $kA$ .  
Attacker decrypts  $eA$  using  $kA$  to get  $p$ .  
Attacker sends  $[A,B,2, enc(p, 'HELLO')]$ .
  4.  $B.t$  receives msg 3, executes B.3 successfully.  
State:  $hst = [[B,1,p], [B,2,p]]$ .  
 $A_2$  false.
-

**Problem 2. [15 points]****Part a. [7 points]**

Does  $Inv A_1$  hold, where

$$A_1 : ((j \text{ in } hst.keys) \text{ and } j > 0 \text{ and } hst[j] = [A,p]) \Rightarrow hst[j-1] = [B,1,p]$$

**Solution**

No.

The evolution in problem 1a also works here.

---

**Part b. [8 points]**

Does  $Inv A_2$  hold, where

$$A_2 : ((j \text{ in } hst.keys) \text{ and } j > 0 \text{ and } hst[j] = [B,2,p]) \Rightarrow hst[j-1] = [A,p]$$

**Solution**

No.

The evolution in problem 1b also works here.

---

**Problem 1a: Attempt to prove  $Inv A_2$  holds**

First prove that master keys are not exposed and that the keys at the users and the kdc are equal.

- $Inv \psi(A.key)$  holds.  
(Holds initially. The only A.key expressions sent by the users and kdc are:  $enc(A.key, [A,B,xA])$  where  $x_A$  is random; and  $enc(A.key, [x_A,k_{AB}])$  where  $k_{AB}$  is random.)
- $Inv A.key = Z.key_A$  holds.  
(Holds initially. Preserved by `getPwdA`.)
- $Inv \psi(B.key)$  and  $Inv B.key = Z.key_B$  hold.  
(Proof similar to that of  $Inv \psi(A.key)$  and  $Inv A.key = Z.key_A$ .)

Now to attempt to prove  $Inv A_2$ .

1. Suppose B appends  $[B,2,p]$  to hst at time  $b_0$ .  
So B.t is at B.3 and receives  $[A,B,2, enc(p, 'HELLO')]$  where  $p = B.k_{AB}$ .
2. So B's previous step is B.2, say at time  $b_1$ .  
B receives  $[Z,B, enc(key_B, [x_B,p]), .]$ , where  $x_B = B.n_L$ , and appends  $[B,1,p]$  to hst.
3. So B's previous step is B.1, say at time  $b_2$ .  
B receives  $[A,B,1, f]$ , sets  $B.n_L$  to random value  $x_B$ , and sends  $[B,Z, enc(B.key, [A,B,x_B,f])]$ .
4. Because  $x_B$  is random and  $Inv \psi(B.key)$  holds, Z generated entry  $enc(key_B, [x_B,p])$  in msg 2 at some time  $z_0$  during  $[b_2, b_1]$ . So Z sends  $[Z,B, enc(key_B, [x_B,p]), .]$ , where  $x_B = B.n_L$  at  $z_0$ .  
So at  $z_0$ , Z receives  $[B,Z, enc(B.key, [A,B,x_B, enc(A.key, [A,B, x_A])])]$  for some  $x_A$ . Entry 2 of this message has to be generated by B (because  $Inv \psi(B.key)$  holds). For this value  $x_B$ , B generates such an entry only once.  
Hence in step 3,  $f$  equals  $enc(A.key, [A,B, x_A])$ .
5. Hence at some time  $a_0$  before  $b_2$ , A generated  $f$  and set  $A.n_L$  to the random value  $x_A$ . (Attacker could not have generated this entry because  $Inv \psi(A.key)$  holds.)
6. At time  $z_0$ ,  $\psi(p)$  holds (because attacker does not have B.key).  
If  $\psi(p)$  continues to hold at  $b_0$ , then attacker could not have generated entry  $enc(p, 'HELLO')$  in step 1 message. Hence it was generated by A at some time  $a_1$  during  $[z_0, b_0]$ , at which point A adds  $[A,p]$  to hst. After that A has not updated hst. So  $A_2$  holds.  
If  $\psi(p)$  does not hold at  $b_0$ , then attacker can generate the message in step 1. So we have to show that this is not possible. Attacker can obtain  $p$  only by obtaining the A.key after time  $z_0$ . Attacker can get A.key after time  $z_0$  using `getPwdA`, but for that it has to move A.t to A.1....