File 20111118.0013: Weekly activity report 0215:

```
weekly activity report 215 (loughry)
Joe Loughry
Sent: 18 November 2011 00:13
To: Joe Loughry

Weekly activity report no. 20111117.1628 (GMT-7) sequence no. 0215, week 6 MT

I reported a return to making progress Thursday this week in a meeting
with Dr Martin.  I have been re-reading to catch up, following the
method of Charmaz to construct the grounded theory model that was
missing in September.  I intend to have the model in shape to show to
Dr Flchais soon.  I reported that I have funding until January, but
my priority must be to finish in the shortest amount of time possible.
Dr Martin asked about filing paperwork with the department; I replied
that I have already talked to Julie Sheppard about it; she requested
that I should wait until early December to do that; she is expecting
the paperwork then and there will be no problems with it.  We talked
about GSS reports---due next week.  I should schedule a meeting with Dr
Flchais as soon as I have the model in hand.  I suggested the Applidium
report for reading group the week after next.

We talked about Applidium's attack on the Siri protocol, and what might
happen to the F-35 (a flying cross domain system, and one on which I
have friends working) in light of the announced sale of seventy-four UK
AV-8B Harrier aircraft, engines, and spare parts to the U.S.  I speculated
that Congress would soon terminate the F-35 programme, counting on EMALS
to make something other than the F-35B flyable off the Queen Elizabeth
class, the F-35C to be abandoned in favour of new F-18s, and the F-35A to
be replaced by re-starting production of the F-22.  This solution neatly
sidesteps the risk of handing the fifth generation over to China's J-20
and Russia's Su-50, follows historical precedent by apportioning work
evenly to Boeing and Lockheed, and saves a trillion dollars.  An export
licence will be quietly issued for the F-22 to Japan.  I predict this
is what will happen 23rd Nov.

Security Reading Group discussed 'J-PAKE: Authenticated Key Exchange
without PKI' by Hao and Ryan (Trans. Comp. Sci. XI, LNCS 6480,
pp. 192--206, 2010).  John Lyle suggested this paper because the
protocol seems to be doing magic; with only rubbish passwords and no
trusted third party, it provides both forward security and resistance
to off-line attack.  The magic, it seemed to me, reduces to a couple of
places where the protocol depends on the vanishingly small probability
that two randomly chosen values will ever coincide, or that neither of
two other computed values will collapse to zero or one.  The really
interesting feature, as John pointed out, is the off-line attack
resistance.  The effective lifetime of the password is only two rounds
of the protocol when the session key is being established.  Even if the
attacker later learns a password, it cannot be used by either a passive
or an active attacker to compromise an existing session key.  The only
instance where this protocol fails is in the case where an attacker
might repeatedly be able to try one good password against many usernames.

We argued over the two-round protocol.  I think the first round provides
a useful check on the bounds of two important values, protecting against
a catastrophic failure of the second round.  Justin maintained that the
first round was simply a necessary exchange of values.  The authors of
the paper call it an implicit authentication.  Everyone agreed this is a
well-written paper; the details of the protocol are well worked out and
sufficient background was provided for the reader to get the protocol
```

without having to seek out all the references and read them first.

Joe Loughry
Doctoral Student in the Department of Computer Science
St Cross College, Oxford

End of WAR 0215.

References