Exercise Class December 10, 2020

This is a slightly edited and re-formated transcript of the live notes taken in class.

Exercise Sheet 4

Task: "Are we Missing Something?"

question: is there a protocol that (with FAIL/BREAK rules) is formally secure, but not secure "in real life?"

main challenge: add FAIL constant to right place. E.g., have the FAIL-rule work only for a "specific attack."

cause 1: security goal is "too narrow:"

- example protocol 1 first exchanges N_A , N_B , then example protocol 2 uses these for symmetric encryption: $enc^s_{[N_A,N_B]}(m)$
- specified goal for protocol 1: "adversary cannot get N_A and N_B " $[BREAK, N_A, N_B] \rightarrow \mathsf{FAIL}$
- real goal for protocol 2 : "adversary cannot get plaintext" (decryption of $enc_{[N_A,N_B]}^s(m)$)

when is this problematic?

- assumption: the only way for ADV to get m is to decrypt $\operatorname{enc}_{[N_A,N_B]}^{\mathsf{s}}(m)$.
- problem: if ADV can get *m* in another way.

when is this problematic? example protocol:

- ... steps to exchange N_A and N_B ...

Alice: $B \rightarrow \operatorname{enc}_{[N_A, N_B]}^{\mathsf{s}}(m)$

Bob: $y \rightarrow ok$ Alice: $ok \rightarrow m$

cause 2: BREAK/FAIL rules are not applicable at some point in the protocol run, making one participant "hang." see example in solution

guidelines for BREAK/FAIL rules to prevent this?

- cause 1: be specific about the goal of the protocol (keep m secret), not the tools (keep N_A , N_B secret)
- cause 2: non-blocking FAIL rule: only have these at end of protocol, exception: there
 might be a blocking rule in real protocol. So, use own instance for FAIL-rule (might
 need access to (variables), nonces, etc)

Exercise Sheet 5

Task: "Exponential attack size"

Is there a simpler protocol (with more messages) where $\sigma(x)$ will also be exponential, but structure is "simpler?"

Ping-Pong protocol: