

Advanced Secure Protocol Design — Peer Code Review

Group Reviewed: ?

Setup & Environment

	Check	Notes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	README includes installation & run instructions	Used README.md but there are 4 different README files?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dependencies listed clearly	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Program runs without crashes or unhandled exceptions	

Protocol Compliance & Functionality

	Check	Notes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lists all online members	<p>Lists all members who have ever connected</p> <pre>[server] User bob (f7e67bfa-9146-41c2-816e-08585ece60dd) has disconnected. Connected users: alice (4a2ef005-0f5f-4edb-b72c-16455e9395d3) /list Connected users: alice (4a2ef005-0f5f-4edb-b72c-16455e9395d3), mallory (6c66d 906-51fe-4669-b630-58dbca459513), ray (9b7cd734-16f4-4b59-a4dc-b3af7df62426), poc_weak_key_user (ba0978e1-2c76-4a1a-8bcd-e21368ee9863), ron (c77d296f-48a0 -4760-85d0-a5a35beaf034), alen (f7b4abda-3346-4500-8ef4-57111ae002e7), bob (f 7e67bfa-9146-41c2-816e-08585ece60dd)</pre> <p>I like how all peers are informed when someone connects</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sends/receives private messages correctly	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sends/receives group messages correctly	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports secure file transfer	Not yet implemented
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	User experience	Nice clean chat terminals. My only thought is that maybe only the usernames should be displayed, not the IDs.

Security Implementation

	Check	Notes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All communications encrypted	Messages encrypted - tested with wireshark
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Keys generated securely	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Authentication implemented correctly	No authentication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Input validation and sanitisation present	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No sensitive info leaked in errors/logs	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Secure socket handling (no plaintext fallback)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cryptographically secure randomness used	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No plaintext passwords/keys stored or transmitted	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cert/key validation	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Replay/MITM resistance	If Mallory connects to server A, and Bob tries to send Alice a message, the message will not be sent. Testing this did break it however, as no more private messages were able to be sent to and from Bob and Alice. Group messages unaffected.

Ran bandit on all files:

```
Code scanned:
  Total lines of code: 367685
  Total lines skipped (#nosec): 0

Run metrics:
  Total issues (by severity):
    Undefined: 0
    Low: 863
    Medium: 29
    High: 28
  Total issues (by confidence):
    Undefined: 0
    Low: 2
    Medium: 19
    High: 899
Files skipped (0):
```

When choosing external packages to use, consider the security implications.

- server.py: 10 x Issue: [B110:try_except_pass] Try, Except, Pass detected.
- datavault.py: Issue: [B608:hardcoded_sql_expressions] Possible SQL injection vector through string-based query construction.
 - This is safe in this case but be wary of using f-strings for dynamic SQL

Backdoors

BACKDOOR_README.md contains all details of intentional backdoors.

```
6 1. **Weak key acceptance** – the server/client will accept or generate weak RSA-1024 keys while claiming RSA-4096.  
7 2. **Unsigned gossip acceptance** – the server will accept `USER_ADVERTISE` messages even if they are unsigned or the signature is invalid.
```

1.

```
79     # BACKDOOR: downgrade key size when requested by environment variable  
80     if os.getenv("BACKDOOR_WEAK_KEYS") == "1":  
81         # Intentionally weak 1024-bit RSA keys for demonstration/exercise  
82         priv_pem, pub_pem = _generate_rsa(1024)  
83         # Do not print the weakness by default – keep output minimal.  
84     else:  
85         priv_pem, pub_pem = generate_rsa4096()  
86         priv_path.write_bytes(priv_pem)  
87         pub_path.write_bytes(pub_pem)  
88     return priv_pem, pub_pem
```

Weak RSA key used, the key size is too small, making it vulnerable to attacks.

2.

```
950         # Verify signature using sender server pubkey  
951         sig_b64u = msg.get("sig")  
952         if not BACKDOOR_TRUST_GOSSIP:  
953             # Normal secure path: require sig and a known origin server pubkey  
954             if not sig_b64u or origin_sid not in server_addrs:  
955                 return  
956             pubkey_b64u = server_addrs[origin_sid][2]  
957             origin_pub_pem = der_b64url_to_public_pem(pubkey_b64u)  
958             if not rsa_pss_verify(origin_pub_pem, json.dumps(payload, sort_keys=True).encode(),  
b64url_decode(sig_b64u)):  
959                 print(f"[gossip] BAD SIGNATURE in USER_ADVERTISE from {origin_sid}")  
960                 return  
961         else:  
962             # BACKDOOR: when BACKDOOR_TRUST_GOSSIP=1, accept USER_ADVERTISE even if unsigned  
963             # or signature doesn't match. For stealth, we only print a short backdoor notice.  
964             if not sig_b64u:  
965                 # unsigned advert – accepted under backdoor  
966                 print(f"[BACKDOOR] accepting unsigned USER_ADVERTISE for {uid} (origin={origin_sid})")  
967             else:  
968                 # signed but we ignore signature correctness under the backdoor  
969                 print(f"[BACKDOOR] accepting USER_ADVERTISE from {origin_sid} despite signature")
```

Signatures not verified, an attacker can pretend to be someone else without worrying about a signature for authorisation.