

SK3

Author(s): Victor Shoup and Avi D. Rubin 1996

Last modified February 11, 2003

Summary: Symmetric key distribution using Smart Cards, by Shoup and Rubin.

Protocol specification (in common syntax)

A, B, S, Ca, Cb : principal
 Ka, Kb : symkey
 Kac, Kbc : symkey
 Na, Nb : nonce
 0, 1, 2 : number
 alias Kab = {A, 0}Kb
 alias Pab = Kab + {B, 1}Ka

```

1.   A  -> S   :   A, B
2.   S  -> A   :   Pab, {Pab, B, 2}Ka
3.   A  -> Ca  :   A
4.   Ca -> A   :   Na, {Na, 1, 1}Kac
5.   A  -> B   :   A, Na
6.   B  -> Cb  :   A, Na
7.   Cb -> B   :   Nb, {Nb, 0, 0}Kab, {Na, Nb, 1}Kab, {Nb, 0, 1}Kab
8.   B  -> A   :   Nb, {Na, Nb, 1}Kab
9.   A  -> Ca  :   B, Na, Nb, Pab, {Pab, B, 2}Ka, {Na, Nb, 1}Kab, {Nb, 0, 1}Ka
10.  Ca -> A   :   {Nb, 0, 0}Kab, {Nb, 0, 1}Kab
11.  A  -> B   :   {Nb, 0, 1}Kab

```

Description of the protocol rules

- the operator $\{M\}K$ denotes DES encryption.
- the operator $+$ is xor.
- the principal Ca (resp. Cb) is a smart card connected to A (resp. B) and used to store its long term keys.
- **NB:** the connection between A and Ca (resp. B and Cb) is assumed to be secure (i.e. no intruder has the capability to listen to this connection).

- K_a (resp. K_b) is a long term (symmetric) keys associated to the principal A (resp. B). It is assumed to be known initially only by C_a (resp. C_b) and the server S .
 - K_{ac} (resp. K_{bc}) is a secret symmetric key share (and initially only known by) A and C_a (resp. B and C_b).
 - $0, 1, 2$ are arbitrary padding constants, known to every principal.
- 1,2 A requires and obtains from the server S the pair key P_{ab} associated to A and B . $\{P_{ab}, B, 2\}K_a$ is a verifier for this value.
 - 3,4 A requires and obtains a nonce N_a from her smart card C_a . $\{N_a, 1, 1\}K_{ac}$ is a verifier. In [SR96], it is suggested to use a 8 bytes counter on C_a to generate N_a .
 - 5 A sends the nonce, meaning she request the establishment of a session symmetric key.
 - 6,7 B obtains the nonce N_b from C_b (same remark as in 3,4 for the counters). $\{N_b, 0, 0\}K_b$ is a session key and $\{N_a, N_b, 1\}K_{ab}$, and $\{N_b, 0, 1\}K_{ab}$ are verifiers respectively for A and B .
 - 8 B transmits the nonce N_b and A 's verifier to A .
 - 9 the nonce N_b and A 's verifier are transmitted to A .
 - 10 A 's smart card C_a makes the verifications, computes the session key $\{N_b, 0, 0\}K_b$ and transmits it to A .
 - 11 A acknowledge to B , who can compare this message to his verifier remaining from message 7.

Requirements

The session key $\{N_b, 0, 0\}K_b$ must remain secret.

References

[SR96]. Some variants and implementation issues are discussed in the update [Sho96]. See also the implementor's paper [JHC⁺98].

Claimed proofs

The proof of [SR96] is based on the probabilistic definition of secure key distribution from Bellare and Rogaway [BR95].

[Bel01] uses a theorem proving approach, following Paulson's inductive method.

Remark

See [Sho96]. The nonce Na that A obtains from his smart card Ca must actually be truly random and not implemented by counters as first suggested in [SR96].

Indeed, if the next value of Na (sent in message 5 of session i) is predictable (let us call it Na'), then then the intruder I can query B for the verifiers including Na' (session ii) and use them to answer the next challenge of A (hence, authentication error in session iii).

| | | | | | |
|--------|------|----|------|---|--|
| i.5. | A | -> | B | : | A, Na |
| ii.5. | I(A) | -> | B | : | A, Na' |
| ii.6. | B | -> | Cb | : | A, Na' |
| ii.7. | Cb | -> | B | : | Nb', {Nb', 0, 0}Kab, {Na', Nb', 1}Kab, {Nb', 0, 1}Ka |
| ii.8. | B | -> | A | : | Nb', {Na', Nb', 1}Kab |
| iii.5. | A | -> | I(B) | : | A, Na' |
| iii.8. | I(B) | -> | A | : | Nb', {Na', Nb', 1}Kab |

According to [Sho96], the nonce Nb may though be a counter.

Citations

- [Bel01] Giampaolo Bella. Mechanising a protocol for smart cards. In *Proc. of e-Smart 2001, international conference on research in smart cards*, LNCS. Springer-Verlag, september 2001.
- [BR95] Mihir Bellare and Phillip Rogaway. Provably secure session key distribution– the three party case. In *Proceedings 27th Annual Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, ACM, pages 57–66, 1995.
- [JHC⁺98] Rob Jerdonek, Peter Honeyman, Kevin Coffman, Kim Rees, and Kip Wheeler. Implementation of a provably secure, smartcard-based key distribution protocol. In *In Proceedings of the Third Smart Card Research and Advanced Application Conference*, 1998.

- [Sho96] Victor Shoup. A note on session key distribution using smart cards. <http://www.shoup.net/papers/update.ps>, july 1996.
- [SR96] Victor Shoup and Avi Rubin. Session key distribution using smart cards. In *In Proceedings of Advances in Cryptology, EUROCRYPT'96*, volume 1070 of *LNCS*. Springer-Verlag, 1996.