Task 1: Consider the following interaction with Trudy (T) - god on the wire, in picture.

Goal: Trudy is attempting to impersonate as Alice to Bob

Step 1: Trudy initiates the protocol as Alice - Bob

$$\begin{split} T &\rightarrow B : \{N_T\}_B \text{ , } \{K_T\}_B \\ B &\rightarrow T : N_T \text{ , } \{N_B\}_A \text{ , } \{K_2\}_A \end{split}$$

 $T \rightarrow B : N_B$

Problem: Trudy would need $N_{\rm B}$ to complete the handshake and K_2 to completely derive the shared key established during handshake.

Step 2: Finding out N_B

 $T \rightarrow A$: $\{N_{\scriptscriptstyle B}\}_{\!\scriptscriptstyle A}$, $\{K_{\scriptscriptstyle T}\}_{\!\scriptscriptstyle A}$

 $A \rightarrow T : N_B$, $\{N_A\}_B$, $\{K_2\}_B$

T Aborts

Step 3: Finding out K_2 - not essential to breaking the protocol but allows future communication using the shared key established.

$$\begin{split} T &\rightarrow A : \{K_2\}_A \text{ , } \{K_T\}_A \\ A &\rightarrow T : \text{ } \text{K_2 , } \{N_A\}_B \text{ , } \{K_2\}_B \\ T \text{ Aborts} \end{split}$$

Now Trudy can use N_B , K_2 figured out from Step 2 & 3 to complete the protocol handshake and at the end of endshake, assumptions B, C fail and Alice never completes the handshake.

Task 2: Modified protocol - to fix the bug highlighted above.

The problem with broken protocol is that it leaks info by sending solved responses (for a challenge from the other party) in plain text at different phases - Phase 2 & 3 of the 3-phase handshake.

Modified 3-phase protocol:

$$\begin{split} A &\rightarrow B : \{N_A\}_B \ , \, \{K_1\}_B \\ B &\rightarrow A : \{N_A\}_A \ , \, \{N_B\}_A \ , \, \{K_2\}_A \\ A &\rightarrow B : N_B \end{split}$$

The modified protocol addresses this issue by **encrypting** the responses **with public key** of the other party **in 2nd phase**, while still using a **plain response** in the **3rd phase**.

These modifications ensures that:

- A genuine handshake initiator, say Alice, can decode the response to verify that Bob has indeed solved the challenge correctly in Phase 2. Thus Phase 2 verifies Bob's (non-initiator) authenticity.
- If the initiator were an intruder, say Trudy, they would never be able to complete Phase 3 of the handshake since unlike in broken protocol, Phase 2 doesn't leak plain responses needed for Phase 3.
- This suggests that the patch is indeed a fix and not another form of the broken protocol.

Task 3: Verifiable authenticity for the sender of a message

Notation: $[M_A]_A$ - Message from A signed with private key of A.

$$\begin{array}{l} A \to B: \{N_A\}_B \;, \; \{K_1\}_B \\ \\ B \to A: \{N_A\}_A \;, \; \{N_B\}_A \;, \; \{K_2\}_A \\ \\ A \to B: N_B \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{Authentication Phase} \\ \text{(parties establish a shared key for secure communication)} \\ \\ A \to B: \{M_A\}_K \;, \; [M_A]_A \\ \\ B \to A: \{M_B\}_K \;, \; [M_B]_B \\ \\ \dots \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{Messaging Phase} \\ \text{(Message is encrypted using shared secret key and a signature of the contents is generated using their private key)} \\ \end{array}$$

Authenticity of the message can be verified at any point by the receiver through:

- Decoding the message contents (say $\{M_A\}_K -> M_A$)
- Using Sender's public key on the decoded message and verify that it indeed complies with the signature sent along (here [M_A]_A)