

APPENDIX F

EXAMPLE OF ATTACK-TRACES FOUND WITH PHOEBE

We now details on some attacks, as found by Phoebe.

Example 10 (Anonymity for PrivAuth^* .) Phoebe shows the following run breaking anonymity of C in PrivAuth^* .

```
[1. (a, C, 1, {kb})?: (b, n1, a) {⟨pubk(b), n1⟩}_a
, 2. (a, C, 1, {kb})!: (n2) {⟨a, n1, n2⟩}_b ]
```

The run starts with a receive by agent $ag = (a, C, 1, [Kb])$, and the intruder sent a “hello” message pretending to be b . Upon receiving the “ack” back and without decrypting its second part, the intruder deduces that the responder is a , as participants other than a would not reply to its “hello”. Also, the intruder deduces that “ $\text{pubk}(b)$ ” is in a ’s whitelist.

Example 11 (Strong Sessions-Unlinkability for the Basic Hash Protocol.) Phoebe shows the following run violating the strong sessions-unlinkability of the Basic-Hash, with $\text{maxSessions} = 3$ and $\text{tagNames} = [\text{Tag } 1, \text{Tag } 2]$, i.e., with more sessions than tag names. The intruder implicitly knows that there are not enough tag names to have distinct tags for three sessions.

```
[1. (t1, T, 1, {})!: (n1) ⟨n1, hash(⟨n1, k1⟩)⟩
, 1. (t1, T, 2, {})!: (n2) ⟨n2, hash(⟨n2, k1⟩)⟩
, 1. (t1, T, 3, {})!: (n3) ⟨n3, hash(⟨n3, k1⟩)⟩ ]
```

Example 12 (Sessions-Unlinkability by Key for the Tag Reader Protocol TR .) Phoebe shows the following run violating our Property [6](#), i.e., “weak unlinkability by key” for TR .

```
Just [1. (t1, T, 1, {})!: (n1) { |n1| }_k1
, 1. (t2, T, 2, {})!: (n2) { |n2| }_k1
, 1. (r1, R, 1, {k1, k2})?: () { |n1| }_k1
, 2. (r1, R, 1, {k1, k2})!: (n3) { |n3| }_k1
, 2. (t1, T, 1, {})?: () { |n2| }_k1
, 2. (t2, T, 2, {})?: () { |n1| }_k1
, 3. (t1, T, 1, {})!: () { |⟨n2, n1⟩| }_k1
, 3. (t2, T, 2, {})!: () { |⟨n1, n2⟩| }_k1 ]
```

By replaying the message of $t1$ for $t2$, the intruder deduces that they have the same shared-key with the reader.