Information Security CS 526

Topic 14: Key Distribution & Agreement, Secure Communication

Topic 14: Secure Communication

Readings for This Lecture

- On Wikipedia
 - <u>Needham-Schroeder protocol</u> (only the symmetric key part)
 - Public Key Certificates
 - HTTP Secure



Outline and Objectives

- Key distribution among multiple parties
- Kerberos
- Distribution of public keys, with public key certificates
- Diffie-Hellman Protocol
- TLS/SSL/HTTPS

Symmetric Key Agreement among Multiple Parties

- For a group of N parties, every pair needs to share a different symmetric key
 - What is the number of keys?
 - What secure channel to use to establish the keys?
- How to establish such keys
 - Symmetric Encryption Use a central authority, a.k.a. (TTP).
 - Asymmetric Encryption PKI.

Needham-Schroeder Shared-Key

Protocol

- Parties: A, B, and trusted server T
- Setup: A and T share K_{AT}, B and T share K_{BT}
- Goal:
 - Security: Mutual entity authentication between A and B; key establishment, Secure against active attacker & replay
 - Efficiency: Minimize the involvement of T; T can be stateless
- Messages:

 $\begin{array}{ll} A \rightarrow T & A, B, N_A & (1) \\ A \leftarrow T & E[K_{AT}] (N_A, B, k, E[K_{BT}](k, A)) & (2) \\ A \rightarrow B & E[K_{BT}] (k, A) & (3) \\ A \leftarrow B & E[k] (N_B) & (4) \\ A \rightarrow B & E[k] (N_B-1) & (5) \end{array}$

What bad things can happen if there is no N_A?

Another subtle flaw in Step 3.

Topic 14: Secure Communication

Kerberos

- Implements the idea of Needham-Schroeder protocol
- Kerberos is a network authentication protocol
- Provides authentication and secure communication
- Relies entirely on symmetric cryptography
- Developed at MIT: <u>http://web.mit.edu/kerberos/www</u>
- Used in many systems, e.g., Windows 2000 and later as default authentication protocol



Kerberos Overview

- One issue of Needham-Schroeder Needs [K_{AT}] to talk to any new service.
 - Think about a login session with K_{AT} derived from a password; either the password needs to be stored, or user needs to enter it every time
- Kerberos solution:
 - Separates TTP into an AS and a TGS.
- The client authenticates to AS using a long-term *shared secret* and receives a TGT [SSO].
- Use this TGT to get additional tickets from TGS without resorting to using the shared secret.

AS = Authentication ServerTGS = Ticket Granting ServerSS = Service ServerTGT = Ticket Granting Ticket

Kerberos Protocol - 1



Topic 14: Secure Communication

Kerberos Protocol – 2 (Simplified)

- 1. C \rightarrow AS: TGS || N_C
- 2. AS \rightarrow C: {K_{C,TGS} || C}_{KAS,TGS} || {K_{C,TGS} || N_C || TGS}_{KAS,C}

(Note that the **first** part of message 2 is the **ticket granting ticket (TGT)** for the TGS)

- 3. C \rightarrow TGS: SS || N'_C || {K_{C,TGS} || C}_{K_{AS,TGS}} || {C||T₁}_{K_{C,TGS}}
- 4. TGS \rightarrow C: {K_{C,SS} || C}_{K_{TGS,SS}} || {K_{C,SS} || N'_C || SS}_{K_{C,TGS}}

(Note that the **first** part in message 4 is the **ticket** for the server S).

- 5. C \rightarrow SS: {K_{C,SS} || C}_{K_{TGS,SS}} || {C || T₂}_{K_{C,SS}}
- 6. SS \rightarrow C: {T₃}_{K_{C,SS}}

Kerberos Drawback

- Highly trusted TTP: KS
 - Malicious KS can silently eavesdrop in any communication
- Single point of failure:
- Security partially depends on tight clock synchronization.
- Useful primarily inside an organization
 Does it scale to Internet? What is the main difficulty?

Public Keys and Trust





•Public Key: P_A

•Secret key: S_A

- How are public keys stored?
- How to obtain the public key?
- How does Bob know or 'trusts' that P_A is Alice's public key?

- •Public Key: P_B
 - •Secret key: S_B

Distribution of Public Keys

- Public announcement: users distribute public keys to recipients or broadcast to community at large.
- Publicly available

directory: can obtain greater security by registering keys with a public directory.

 Both approaches have problems, and are vulnerable to forgeries



Public-Key Certificates

- A certificate binds identity (or other information) to public key
- Contents digitally signed by a trusted Public-Key or Certificate Authority (CA)
 - Can be verified by anyone who knows the public-key authority's public-key.
- For Alice to send an encrypted message to Bob, obtains a certificate of Bob's public key

Public Key Certificates



Mario Rossi's

X.509 Certificates

- Part of X.500 directory service standards.
 - Started in 1988
- Defines framework for authentication services:
 - Defines that public keys stored as certificates in a public directory.
 - Certificates are issued and signed by an entity called certification authority (CA).
- Used by numerous applications: SSL, IPSec, SET
- Example: see certificates accepted by your browser

How to Obtain a Certificate?

- Define your own CA (use openssl or Java Keytool)
 - Certificates unlikely to be accepted by others
- Obtain certificates from one of the vendors: VeriSign, Thawte, and many others



CAs and Trust

- Certificates are trusted if signature of CA verifies
- Chain of CA's can be formed, head CA is called root CA
- In order to verify the signature, the public key of the root CA should be obtain.
- TRUST is centralized (to root CA's) and hierarchical
- What bad things can happen if the root CA system is compromised?
- How does this compare with the TTP in Needham/Schroeder protocol?

Key Agreement: Diffie-Hellman Protocol

Key agreement protocol, both A and B contribute to the key

Setup: p prime and g generator of Z_p^* , p and g public.



Authenticated Diffie-Hellman



Alice computes g^{ac} mod n and Bob computes g^{bc} mod n !!!



Topic 14: Secure Communication

Forward Secrecy

- Compromise of long-term keys does not compromise past session keys.
 - I.e., a session that is secure now remains secure in future
 - Violated in secret-key based protocols such as Needham-Schroeder and used in Kerberos
- Can be satisfied by ephemeral Diffie-Hellman
 - Do not store secrets such as a, b after computing g^{ab} .
 - Long-term secret (digital signature signing keys) used only for authenticity
 - Stealing a key cannot compromise authenticity of past sessions

Secure communication



Topic 14: Secure Communication

Transport Layer Security (TLS)

- Predecessors: Secure socket layer (SSL): Versions 1.0, 2.0, 3.0
- TLS 1.0 (SSL 3.1); Jan 1999
- TLS 1.1 (SSL 3.2); Apr 2006
- TLS 1.2 (SSL 3.3); Aug 2008
- Standard for Internet security
 - Originally designed by Netscape
 - Goal: "... provide privacy and reliability between two communicating applications"
- Two main parts
 - Handshake Protocol
 - Establish shared secret key using public-key cryptography
 - Signed certificates for authentication
 - Record Layer
 - Transmit data using negotiated key, encryption function

Usage of SSL/TLS

- Applied on top of transport layer (typically TCP)
- Used to secure HTTP (HTTPS), SMTP, etc.
- One or both ends can be authenticated using public key and certificates
 - Typically only the server is authenticated
- Client & server negotiate a cipher suite, which includes
 - A key exchange algorithm, e.g., RSA, Diffie-Hellman, SRP, etc.
 - An encryption algorithm, e.g., RC4, Triple DES, AES, etc.
 - A MAC algorithm, e.g., HMAC-MD5, HMC-SHA1, etc.

What Goes Wrong in Real World?

- Heartbleed software bug in OpenSSL
 - Improper input validation (missing bounds check)
 - Buffer over-read: Exploitation is able to read data in memory, including private key, etc.
- SSL Certificate validation errors
- Non-random private keys in RSA n=pq (the same primes are occasionally generated)
- Pre-computation can be used to break Diffie-Hellman used in TLS
 - (Optional) See "Imperfect Forward Secrecy: How Diffie-Hellman Fails in Practice" in CCS 2015

Viewing HTTPS web sites

- Browser needs to communicate to the user the fact that HTTPS is used
 - E.g., a golden lock indicator on the bottom or on the address bar
 - Check some common websites
 - When users correctly process this information, can defeat phishing attacks
 - Security problems exist
 - People don't know about the security indicator
 - People forgot to check the indicator
 - Browser vulnerabilities enable incorrect indicator to be shown
 - Use confusing URLs, e.g.,
 - https:// homebanking.purdueefcu.com@host.evil.com/
 - · Stored certificate authority info may be changed

Coming Attractions ...

 Malware Defense & Intrusion Detection

