

3 problems over 3 pages. 50 points.

Closed book. Closed notes. No calculator or electronic device.

1. [20 points]

Here is secret-key authentication protocol between client A and server B.

```

Protocol(A, B) {
  chan ← [];           // channel
  hst ← [];           // connect history
  K ← random();       // A-B key
  startSystem(Attacker()); // start attacker
  startSystem(Server(B,A,K)); // start server B
  startSystem(Client(A,B,K)); // start client A
}

Attacker() {
  α; // initially has A, B, all programs
  // functions executable by attacker
  function rChan {α ← chan;} // read chan
  function wChan(x) {chan ← x;} // write chan
}

Client(A, B, K) { // atomicity points: 1
  nL ← 0;
  t ← startThread(client());
  return;

  function client() {
    while (true) {
      nL ← nL + 2;
      tx([A,B,1,nL]);
      1: msg ← rx([B,A,1,...]);
      if (msg[4] = enc(K,nL)) {
        nR ← msg[3];
        S ← enc(-K, nL+nR);
        hst.append([A,S]);
        tx([A,B,2, enc(K,nR)]);
      }
    }
  }
}

Server(B, A, K) { // atomicity points: 1,2
  nL ← 0;
  t ← startThread(server());
  return;

  function server() {
    while (true) {
      1: msg ← rx([A,B,1,.]);
      nR ← msg[3];
      nL ← nL + 3;
      tx([B,A,1,nL,enc(K,nR)]);
      2: msg ← rx([A,B,2,.]);
      if (msg[3] = enc(K,nL)) {
        S ← enc(-K, nL+nR);
        hst.append([B,S]);
      }
    }
  }
}

```

For each part, say whether its claim is true or false. If true, come up with an argument.

If false, come up with a counter-example evolution (in parts a,b) or a dictionary attack(in part c).

a. $Inv A_1$ holds, where

$$A_1 : \psi(K)$$

b. $Inv A_2$ holds, where

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

c. Attacker cannot learn K by dictionary attack, assuming that K is a weak key.

2. [10 points]

Here is a Diffie-Hellman protocol with public parameters g and p (known to all).

```

Protocol(A, B) {
  chan ← [];           // channel
  K ← random();       // A-B key
  startSystem(Attacker());
  startSystem(Client(A,B,K));
  startSystem(Server(B,A,K));
}

Attacker() {
  α; // initially has A, B, g, p, all programs
  // functions executable by attacker
  function rChan {α ← chan;} // read chan
  function wChan(x) {chan ← x;} // write chan
}

```

```

Client(A, B, K) { // atomicity points: 1
  t ← startThread(client());
  return;

  function client() {
    nL ← random();
    tL ← gnL mod p;
    tx([A,B,1,enc(K,tL)]);
  1: msg ← rx([B,A,1,.]);
    tR ← msg[3];
    keyDH ← tRnL mod p;
    data ← random();
    tx([A,B,2,enc(keyDH,['HELLO',data])]);
  } }

```

```

Server(B, A, K) { // atomicity points: 1,2
  t ← startThread(server());
  return;

  function server() {
  1: msg ← rx([A,B,1,.]);
    tR ← dec(K,msg[3]);
    nL ← random();
    tL ← gnL mod p;
    keyDH ← tRnL mod p;
    tx([B,A,1,tL]);
  2: msg ← rx([A,B,2,.]);
    data ← dec(keyDH,msg[3])[1];
  } }

```

Can the attacker obtain data by dictionary attack, assuming K is a weak key?

If you answer no, come up with an argument.

If you answer yes, come up with an evolution ending with the attacker obtaining data.

3. [20 points] Here is a Needham-Schroeder protocol with KDC Z, client A, server B, and attacker.

```

Protocol(Z, A, B) { // kdc, client, server
  chan ← [];
  hst ← []; // connect history
  kAZ ← random(); // initial A-Z key
  kBZ ← random(); // initial B-Z key
  startSystem(Attacker());
  startSystem(Kdc(Z,A,B,kAZ,kBZ));
  startSystem(Client(A,Z,B,kAZ));
  startSystem(Server(B,Z,A,kBZ));
}

Client(A, Z, B, kAZ) { // atomicity points: 1, 2
  key ← kAZ;
  t ← startThread(client());
  return;

  function client() {
    while (true) {
      n1 ← random();
      tx([A,Z,B,n1]);
    1: msg ← rx([Z,A,.]);
      z ← dec(key,msg[2]);
      if (z.size = 4 and z[0,1] = [n1,B]) {
        kAB ← z[2];
        tkt ← z[3];
        n2 ← random();
        tx([A,B,tkt,enc(kAB,n2)]);
    2: msg ← rx([B,A,.]);
      z ← dec(kAB,msg[2]);
      if (z.size = 2 and z[0] = n2-1) {
        n3 ← z[1];
        hst.append([A,kAB]);
        tx([A,B,enc(kAB,n3-1)]);
      }
    }
  }
}

Kdc(Z, A, B, kAZ, kBZ) {
  // atomicity points: 1
  keyA ← kAZ;
  keyB ← kBZ;
  while (true) {
    1: msg ← rx([A,Z,B,.]);
      kAB ← random();
      tkt ← enc(keyB,[kAB,A]);
      tx([Z,A,enc(keyA,[msg[3],B,kAB,tkt])]);
  }
}

Server(B, Z, A, kBZ) { // atomicity points: 1,2
  key ← kBZ;
  t ← startThread(server());
  return;

  function server() {
    while (true) {
      1: msg ← rx([A,B,..]);
      tkt ← msg[2];
      z ← dec(key,tkt);
      if (z.size = 2 and z[1] = A) {
        kAB ← z[0];
        n2 ← dec(kAB,msg[3]);
        n3 ← random();
        tx([B,A,enc(kAB,[n2-1,n3])]);
      2: msg ← rx([A,B,.]);
      if (msg[2] = enc(kAB,n3-1))
        hst.append([B,kAB]);
    }
  }
}

Attacker() {
  α; // everything attacker has read
  // functions executable by attacker
  function readChan {α ← chan;}
  function writeChan(x) {chan ← x;}
  function getPwdA() {
    α.append(A.key);
    A.key ← Z.keyA ← random();
  }
}

```

For each part, say whether its claim is true or false. If true, come up with an argument. If false, come up with a counter-example evolution.

a. *Inv* A_1 holds, where

$$A_1 : \psi(A.mKey)$$

// attacker does not learn A's current master key

b. *Inv* A_2 holds, where

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