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Terminology Dump 1: Attacker Capabilities

**Passive** Attacker doesn’t send anything.

**Active** Attacker is allowed to send traffic.

**On-path** Attacker is on the communications path between A and B.
- Sees all traffic
- Can seamlessly impersonate either side

**Off-path** Attacker is not on communications path between A and B.
- Can’t see traffic between A and B.
- Can sometimes send traffic as either (subject to address filtering).

Terminology Dump 2: Security Properties

**Confidentiality** Information being transmitted is kept secret from attackers

**Data Origin Authentication** Receivers can determine the origin of traffic.

**Message Integrity** Tampering of traffic can be detected.

**Third-party Verifiability** A party not involved in the initial communication can verify what happened. (Often misleadingly called non-repudiation)

A simple problem: remote authentication

- You’re a Web server
  - X connects to you claiming to be Alice
  - How can you tell?

- Assumptions:
  - All you have is the network traffic
    - Can send messages to X
    - Receive X’s response
  - Attackers can forge but not view, intercept, or modify traffic
  - You have some prior relationship with Alice

Remote authentication: basic ideas

- Alice needs to be able to do something others can’t do
  - Generally, compute some function
    - But why can’t X do that?

- How do we break the symmetry?
  - Give Alice more resources
  - Give Alice some secret

What are we trying to accomplish?

- Alice, Bob want to talk to each other
- But they’re worried about attack
  - How do you know you’re talking to the right person?
  - How do you know people can’t listen to your conversation?
  - How do you know people can’t change your conversation?
- We want to build a system that protects against these attacks
One-sided authentication with shared secrets

- Assume Alice and Bob share a secret $S_{ab}$
- Alice needs to prove possession of $S_{ab}$
- (Assume Alice authenticates Bob some other way)

Simple approach:
- Bob and Alice both store $S_{ab}$
- Alice sends Bob $S_{ab}$
- Bob does memcmp().

Problems with the previous scheme

Snooping. an attacker who is on-path can capture the password and replay it

Hijacking. an attacker can wait for you to exchange the password and then take over the connection

One-way authentication. how does Alice authenticate Bob?

Fixing snooping

- Alice doesn’t send $S_{ab}$ over the wire
  - Instead she computes some function $f$
  - And sends $f(S_{ab})$

- What properties does $f$ need?
  1st Preimage Resistant hard to compute $S_{ab}$ from $f(S_{ab})$
  2nd Preimage Resistant hard to find $S'$ s.t. $f(S') = f(S_{ab})$

- Luckily, we have such functions

Cryptographic hash functions

- Basic idea: one-way function (also called message digests)
  - Take an arbitrary length bit string $m$ and reduce it to 100-200 (b) bits
  - $H(m) = h$

- Hash functions are preimage resistant
  - Takes approximately $2^b$ operations to find $m$ given $h$

- Hash functions are collision resistant
  - Takes approximately $2^{b/2}$ operations to find $m, m'$ st. $H(m) = H(m')$

- Popular algorithms: MD5, SHA-1, SHA-256

Challenge-Response

- So, Alice just sends $H(S_{ab})$: right?
  - Wrong
  - This becomes the new secret
  - So we still have a replay attack problem

- Bob needs to force Alice to compute a new function each time

\[ Alice: \quad Bob \]

\[ \quad H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge}) \]

- Challenge needs to be unique for every exchange
  - Does not need to be unpredictable

Why mutual authentication?

- We assumed that Alice was talking to Bob
  - But how does Alice know that?
  - She can’t trust the network
  - What if she’s connecting to the attacker

Alice: \quad Attacker \quad Bob

\[ \quad \text{Challenge} \quad \text{Challenge} \quad \text{Challenge} \]

\[ \quad H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge}) \quad H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge}) \quad \text{Attack Commands} \]

- Alice has just logged in for the attacker
  - He can issue any commands he wants (oops!)
**Where does the key come from?**

- We want a key that’s unique to this connection
  - And tied to both sides
  - Get it from the challenge-response handshake
- First attempt: \( K = H(S_{ab}, \text{Challenge1}, \text{Challenge2}) \)
  - But now the key is the same in both directions
  - Allows reflection attacks
- Second attempt
  - \( K_{a\to b} = H(S_{ab}, \text{Challenge1}, \text{Challenge2}) \)
  - \( K_{b\to a} = H(S_{ab}, \text{Challenge2}, \text{Challenge1}) \)

**Adding mutual authentication**

- We already know how to authenticate Alice
  - Now we need to authenticate Bob
  - Just reverse the procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alice</th>
<th>Bob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge1</td>
<td>Challenge1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge1}) )</td>
<td>( H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge1}) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge2}) )</td>
<td>( H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge2}) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each side needs to control its own challenges
  - Otherwise we have replay issues again

**Authenticating data**

- Break the data into records
  - Attach a message authentication code (MAC) to each record
  - Receiver verifies MACs on record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>MAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hijacking**

- This protocol still has a hijacking problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alice</th>
<th>Attacker</th>
<th>Bob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge1}),\text{Challenge2} )</td>
<td>( H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge1}),\text{Challenge2} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge2}) )</td>
<td>( H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge2}) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- We need to authenticate the data
  - Not just the initial handshake

**World’s simplest security protocol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alice</th>
<th>Bob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge1</td>
<td>Challenge1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge1}) )</td>
<td>( H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge1}) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge2}) )</td>
<td>( H(S_{ab}+\text{Challenge2}) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Message1} \rightarrow \text{MAC} )</td>
<td>( \text{Message2} \rightarrow \text{MAC} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each side knows who the other is
- All messages are authenticated
- But they’re not confidential
  - So don’t send any secret information

**A message authentication code? Dude, wait, what?**

- What’s a MAC?
  - A one-way function of the key and some data
  - \( F(k, \text{data}) = x \)
    - \( x \) is short (80-200 bits)
    - Hard to compute \( x \) even with \( k \)
  - Hard to compute data even with \( k, x \)
- This sounds kinda like a hash
  - MACs are usually built from hashes
    - World’s simplest MAC: \( H(k + \text{data}) \) (this has problems)
- Popular MACs: HMAC
Symmetric Encryption

- We have two functions $E, D$ st.
  - $E(k, \text{Plaintext}) = \text{Ciphertext}$
  - $D(k, \text{Ciphertext}) = \text{Plaintext}$
  - These are easy to compute
  - Either function is hard to compute without $k$

- Popular encryption algorithms: DES, 3DES, AES, RC4

A (mostly) complete channel security protocol

**Alice**

1. **Challenge**

2. $H(S_{A} + \text{Challenge})$, $H(S_{B} + \text{Challenge})$

3. $E(k_{A}^{-1}(\text{Message} 1 \cdot \text{MAC}))$

4. $E(k_{A}^{-1}(\text{MAC} 2))$

**Bob**

- Each side knows who the other is
- All messages are authenticated
- All messages are confidential

So, we’re done, right?

- How do Alice and Bob get $S_{AB}$?
- Some out of band channel
  - Send a letter—do you trust USPS?
  - Meet in person—airplane tickets are expensive
  - Guys with briefcases handcuffed to their wrists?
- All of these are pretty inconvenient
  - We can do better

Diffie-Hellman Key Agreement

- Each side has two keys (“public” and “private”)
  - You publish the public key but the private key is secret
  - $F(K_{A}^{\text{pub}} \cdot K_{B}^{\text{pub}}) = ZZ$
  - You need at least one private key to compute ZZ
- This is crypto rocket science—but you don’t need to understand how it works

Using Diffie-Hellman

**Alice**

1. Random1, $K_{A}^{\text{pub}}$

2. Random2, $K_{B}^{\text{pub}}$

3. $E(k_{A}^{-1}(\text{Message} 1 \cdot \text{MAC}))$

4. $E(k_{A}^{-1}(\text{MAC} 2))$

**Bob**

- Each side sends its public key
- The other side combines its private key with the other side’s public key to compute $ZZ$
- The traffic keys are generated from $ZZ$

Man-in-the-middle attack

**Alice**

1. Random1, $K_{A}^{\text{pub}}$

2. Random2, $K_{B}^{\text{pub}}$

3. $E(k_{A}^{-1}(\text{Message} 1 \cdot \text{MAC}))$

4. $E(k_{A}^{-1}(\text{MAC} 2))$

**Attacker**

- Random1, $K_{A}^{\text{pub}}$

**Bob**

- Random2, $K_{B}^{\text{pub}}$

- $E(k_{A}^{-1}(\text{Message} 1 \cdot \text{MAC}))$

- $E(k_{A}^{-1}(\text{MAC} 2))$

- Each side thinks it’s talking to the other
  - This is what happens when you don’t authenticate
- Alice and Bob need some way to authenticate each other’s public keys
**Digital Signatures**

- Remember MACs?
- There’s a public key version of this
  - “Sign” with $K_{priv}$
  - “Verify” with $K_{pub}$
- A signed message can only be generated by someone who has the private key
- Popular algorithms: RSA, DSA, ECDSA

**Certificates**

- Digital signatures let us do exactly that
- Create a central certificate authority (CA)
  - Alice proves her identity to the CA
  - The CA gives her a signed message “Alice’s public key is X” (a certificate)
- Anyone can verify this certificate
  - As long as they have the public key of the CA
  - This key is compiled into the software
- Popular CAs: VeriSign, Thawte, GoDaddy

**Public key distribution**

- Public key cryptography is one piece of the puzzle
  - But only one piece
- I can verify a signature came from a given key
  - But where do I get that key from?
- We could have a global directory
  - Obvious scaling problems here
- What if I could give you a credential vouching for your public key?

**Diffie-Hellman with certificates**

**Alice**

- Random1.Cert

**Bob**

- Random2.Cert

$E(k_{secp}(Message1.MAC))$

$E(k_{secp}(Message2.MAC))$

- Certificates contain DH public keys
- Each side can authenticate the other
  - This is actually a bug
  - Certificates are too inconvenient for users to get
  - And the user doesn’t always need to be authenticated
  - Or is authenticated some other way

**One-way authentication with PKC**

- One side (server) has a certificate
- The other side (client) makes up a random key pair

**Client**

- Random1.Cert

**Server**

- Random2.K<sub>pub</sub>

$E(k_{secp}(Message1.MAC))$

$E(k_{secp}(OK.MAC))$

- This authenticates the server but not the client
- We can do a similar trick with RSA
  - Encrypt with public key, decrypt with private key
- This is the main operational mode for SSL/TLS

**Perfect Forward Secrecy**

- What happens if one side’s computer is compromised?
  - Attacker gets private key
  - Can decode all communications by that side
- Fix: have certificates with signature keys (RSA, DSA)
  - Generate a random DH key for each handshake
  - Sign it with your signature key
- Compromise of private key doesn’t affect past traffic
  - But you can MITM future connections
- This is the main operational mode for IPsec
Algorithm negotiation

- There are a lot of choices here
  - Who authenticates,
  - Public key algorithm
  - Digest algorithm
  - Encryption algorithm
- Each make sense in some scenarios
  - A good protocol is adaptable
- This means some kind of negotiation
  - This needs to be protected to prevent downgrade attacks

Secure Sockets Layer (SSL)

- Originally a Netscape proprietary protocol
- Target application: e-commerce
  - What people thought the Web was for in 1994
  - Objective: send my credit card to Amazon securely
- Basic principles (ca. 1994)
  - The server is authenticated (via certificate)
  - The client is unauthenticated
  - This should be easy to plug in to both sides

SSL/TLS History (1)

- SSLv1 (never released)
  - Designed by Kipp Hickman
  - Severe security flaws (immediately obvious to anyone who knew crypto)
- SSLv2
  - Hickman again (after being beaten up by others)
  - Modest security flaws (truncation attacks, downgrade)
  - Very widely deployed
- SSLv3
  - Freier, Karlton, Kocher
  - Fixes the above problems

SSL/TLS History (2)

- Transport Layer Security (TLS) 1.0 (RFC 2246)
  - First standardized version of SSL
  - Modest improvements to key derivation
- TLS 1.1 (RFC 4346)
  - Fixes for modest security flaws
- TLS 1.2 (draft-ietf-tls-rfc4346)
  - Flexibility for hash functions (thanks Dr. Wang!)
- As you can see, this is in maintenance mode

A complete channel security protocol

Alice

Bob

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Random1, Algorithms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random2, Algorithm, Cert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert, MAC(2Z,Handshake,Msg1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC(2Z,Handshake,Msg2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E(k_{Alice}(Message1,MAC))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E(k_{Bob}(Message2,MAC))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HTTP over SSL (HTTPS)

Client

Server

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCP SYN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCP SYN-ACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP ACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSL Handshake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTTP Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTTP Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The client knows that the server expects HTTPS
  - It’s in the URL https://www.example.com/
  - It’s on a separate port
- The server’s certificate has its domain name (www.example.com)
SSL Session Resumption

- Asymmetric (private key) operations are expensive
  - And HTTPS tends to involve a lot of SSL/TCP connections
- Caching pays off here
  - Each handshake establishes a session
  - Clients can resume the session with the same keying material
  - Thus skipping the key exchange

Upward Negotiation

- What if the client and server don’t know each other’s capabilities
  - Would be nice to discover them
  - And automatically upgrade to TLS
- Example: SMTP

Client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELO + TLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OK do TLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSL Handshake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMTP transaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Server

- Of course, this allows downgrade attacks

DoS Attacks on SSL/TLS

- Resource consumption
  - Public key operations are expensive
    - Client can force the server to do a lot of them
    - But not blindly (TCP handshake)
  - State on the server side
- SSL/TLS connection runs over TCP
  - TCP connections are easy to DoS
  - SSL/TLS can’t protect you from this
  - Needs to be at a lower layer

Datagram TLS (RFC 4347)

- TLS requires a reliable channel
  - The handshake is in sequence
  - The data records depend on each other
  - In practice this means TCP
- What about unreliable channels?
  - DTLS is a slight modification of TLS
  - Reliability for the handshake
  - Record independence
- More DoS resistance (more on this later)

Secure Shell (SSH)

- Originally designed by Tatu Ylonen
  - Replacement for rsh
  - Now the standard tool for secure remote login
  - A lot of authentication mechanisms
- Other features
  - Remote X
  - File transfer
  - Port forwarding
- Original version was seriously broken
  - Later standardized versions are better
  - Transport protocol looks a lot like TLS

SSH leap of faith authentication

- No certificates—server just has a raw public key
  - The server provides the key when the client connects
  - The client stores the server’s key on first connection
  - Any changes in the key are an error
- The key can be authenticated out of band
  - The server operator tells the client the key fingerprint (hash) over the phone
  - But only the most paranoid people do this
- This was considered insanity at the time
  - Now it’s considered clever
**SSL Key Exchange Protocol**

Client

- Protocol=SSH−2.0...
- Protocol=SSL−2.0...
- KeyExInit(algorithms,...)
- KeyExInit(algorithms,...)
- DH(group size)
- p-g
- \( DH_{pub} \)
- \( DH_{pub} \cdot \text{Sign}(K_{priv},DH_{pub}) \)

Server

**SSH Client Authentication**

- Server is authenticated first
- Client is then authenticated
  - Raw password
  - Challenge-response
  - Public key
  - GSS-API
  - Kerberos
- Mechanisms are negotiated

---

**SSL Client Authentication Protocol**

Client

- Auth: None
- Auth: publickey,password...
  - publickey=XXX
  - No
  - publickey=YYY
  - No
  - signature
  - OK

Server

**Port Forwarding**

- SSH provides a port forwarding feature
- Example: X11 remote

- SSH server setsenv DISPLAY localhost:XXXX
- Apps just automatically work

---

**IPsec: IP Security**

- Basic idea: secure IP datagrams
  - Instead of at application layer like TLS or SSH
- Why was this considered a good idea?
  - Secure all traffic, not just TCP/UDP
  - Automatically secure applications
  - Without any change to the application
  - Built-in-firewalling/access control

---

**Secure Remote Shell**

- SSH is backward compatible with rsh
  - So other applications can be securely remote
  - Even without port forwarding
- Examples
  - CVS
  - rsync
  - dump/restore
- Apps don't need security, just remote access
**IPsec history**

- Work started in 1992-1993
- General agreement on packet formats early on
  - Though confusion about integrity vs. authentication
- Key agreement was very controversial
  - Design issues
  - IPR issues
- First “proposed standards” published in 1998
  - Mishmash of IKE, ISAKMP, OAKLEY
- Complaints about clarity and complexity
  - IKEv2 approved in 2005

**IPsec architecture**

**IKE “Anonymity”**

- The handshakes we’ve seen leak your identity to passive attackers
  - Arguably this is bad
  - IKE tries to stop this

**IKE DoS prevention**

- Objective: prevent blind DoS attacks

**IPsec Status**

- Many implementations
  - Windows, OS/X, Linux, FreeBSD, IOS...
- Nearly all deployments are in VPN settings
- And people are cutting over to SSL/VPN
  - Semi-manual configuration
- This is not what was intended
- Widely regarded as a semi-failure
What was wrong with IPsec?

- Complexity
- Time to market
- Wrong design goals
- Hard to use

Final thoughts

- All of these protocols look strikingly alike
  - To some extent they were designed by the same people
  - But also there appear to only be so many ways to do this
- All have gone through multiple revisions
  - This is really hard to get right
  - Even when you are experienced people
  - Don’t invent your own
- Usage models matter
  - SSL/TLS and SSH got this right
  - IPsec did not