CSci 5271
Introduction to Computer Security
Crypto and protocols combined slides

Stephen McCamant
University of Minnesota, Computer Science & Engineering

Preview question

Which of the following would have to be completely abandoned if scalable quantum computers become widely available?

A. one-time pads
B. RSA
C. AES
D. ROT-13
E. SHA-3

Outline

General description

- Public-key encryption (generalizes block cipher)
  - Separate encryption key EK (public) and decryption key DK (secret)
- Signature scheme (generalizes MAC)
  - Separate signing key SK (secret) and verification key VK (public)

RSA setup

- Choose $n = pq$, product of two large primes, as modulus
- n is public, but p and q are secret
- Compute encryption and decryption exponents e and d such that

$$M^{ed} = M \pmod{n}$$

RSA encryption

- Public key is (n, e)
- Encryption of M is $C = M^e \pmod{n}$
- Private key is (n, d)
- Decryption of C is $C^d = M^{ed} = M \pmod{n}$

RSA signature

- Signing key is (n, d)
- Signature of M is $S = M^d \pmod{n}$
- Verification key is (n, e)
- Check signature by $S^e = M^{de} = M \pmod{n}$
- Note: symmetry is a nice feature of RSA, not shared by other systems

RSA and factoring

- We're not sure factoring is hard (likely not even NP-complete), but it's been unsolved for a long time
- If factoring is easy (e.g., in P), RSA is insecure
- Converse might not be true: RSA might have other problems

Homomorphism

- Multiply RSA ciphertexts $\Rightarrow$ multiply plaintexts
- This *homomorphism* is useful for some interesting applications
- Even more powerful: fully homomorphic encryption (e.g., both $+$ and $\times$)
  - First demonstrated in 2009; still very inefficient

Problems with vanilla RSA

- Homomorphism leads to chosen-ciphertext attacks
- If message and e are both small compared to n, can compute $M^{1/e}$ over the integers
- Many more complex attacks too

Hybrid encryption

- Public-key operations are slow
- In practice, use them just to set up symmetric session keys

\+ Only pay RSA costs at setup time

— Breaks at either level are fatal

Padding, try #1

- Need to expand message (e.g., AES key) size to match modulus
- PKCS#1 v. 1.5 scheme: prepend 00 01 FF FF .. FF
- Surprising discovery (Bleichenbacher'98): allows adaptive chosen ciphertext attacks on SSL
  - Variants recurred later (c.f. "ROBOT" 2018)

Modern "padding"

- Much more complicated encoding schemes using hashing, random salts, Feistel-like structures, etc.
- Common examples: OAEP for encryption, PSS for signing
- Progress driven largely by improvement in random oracle proofs

Simpler padding alternative

- "Key encapsulation mechanism" (KEM)
- For common case of public-key crypto used for symmetric-key setup
  - Also applies to DH
- Choose RSA message r at random mod n, symmetric key is $H(r)$

— Hard to retrofit, RSA-KEM insecure if e and r reused with different n

Post-quantum cryptography

- One thing quantum computers would be good for is breaking crypto
- Square root speedup of general search
  - Countermeasure: double symmetric security level
- Factoring and discrete log become poly-time
  - DH, RSA, DSA, elliptic curves totally broken
  - Totally new primitives needed (lattices, etc.)
- Not a problem yet, but getting ready

Box and locks revisited

- Alice and Bob's box scheme fails if an intermediary can set up two sets of boxes
  - Man-in-the-middle (or middleperson) attack
- Real world analogue: challenges of protocol design and public key distribution

Outline

- Public key encryption and signatures
- Cryptographic protocols, pt. 1
- Announcements intermission
- Key distribution and PKI
- SSH
- SSL/TLS
- DNSSEC

A couple more security goals

- Non-repudiation: principal cannot later deny having made a commitment
  - I.e., consider proving fact to a third party
- Forward secrecy: recovering later information does not reveal past information
  - Motivates using Diffie-Hellman to generate fresh keys for each session

Abstract protocols

- Outline of what information is communicated in messages
  - Omit most details of encoding, naming, sizes, choice of ciphers, etc.
- Describes honest operation
  - But must be secure against adversarial participants
- Seemingly simple, but many subtle problems

Protocol notation

$A \to B : N_B, \{T_0, B, N_B\}_{K_B}$

- $A \to B$: message sent from Alice intended for Bob
- B (after :): Bob's name
- $\{\cdots\}_K$: encryption with key K

Example: simple authentication

$A \to B : A, \{A, N\}_{K_A}$

- E.g., Alice is key fob, Bob is garage door
- Alice proves she possesses the pre-shared key K_A
  - Without revealing it directly
- Using encryption for authenticity and binding, not secrecy

Nonce

$A \to B : A, \{A, N\}_{K_A}$

- N is a *nonce*: a value chosen to make a message unique
- Best practice: pseudorandom
- In constrained systems, might be a counter or device-unique serial number

Replay attacks

- A nonce is needed to prevent a verbatim replay of a previous message
- Garage door difficulty: remembering previous nonces
  - Particularly: lunchtime/roommate/valet scenario
- Or, door chooses the nonce: *challenge-response* authentication

Man-in-the-middle attacks

- Gender neutral: middleperson attack
- Adversary impersonates Alice to Bob and vice-versa, relays messages
- Powerful position for both eavesdropping and modification
- No easy fix if Alice and Bob aren't already related

Chess grandmaster problem

- Variant or dual of MITM
- Adversary forwards messages to simulate capabilities with his own identity
- How to win at correspondence chess
- Anderson's MiG-in-the-middle

Anti-pattern: "oracle"

- Any way a legitimate protocol service can give a capability to an adversary
- Can exist whenever a party decrypts, signs, etc.
- "Padding oracle" was an instance of this at the implementation level

Outline

Public key encryption and signatures
Cryptographic protocols, pt. 1
Announcements intermission
Key distribution and PKI
SSH
SSL/TLS
DNSSEC

Upcoming assignments

- Exercise set 3: Wednesday night
  - All relevant lecture material now presented
- Next progress reports: week from Wednesday

Other FYIs

- Midterm solutions now posted
- My Monday 11/11 office hours will be 9:45-10:45 instead of 10-11

Outline

Public key encryption and signatures
Cryptographic protocols, pt. 1
Announcements intermission
Key distribution and PKI
SSH
SSL/TLS
DNSSEC

Public key authenticity

- Public keys don't need to be secret, but they must be right
- Wrong key $\rightarrow$ can't stop MITM
- So we still have a pretty hard distribution problem

Symmetric key servers

- Users share keys with server, server distributes session keys
- Symmetric key-exchange protocols, or channels
- Standard: Kerberos
- Drawback: central point of trust

Certificates

- A name and a public key, signed by someone else
  - $C_A = \text{Sign}_S(A, K_A)$
- Basic unit of transitive trust
- Commonly use a complex standard "X.509"

Certificate authorities

- "CA" for short: entities who sign certificates
- Simplest model: one central CA
- Works for a single organization, not the whole world

Web of trust

- Pioneered in PGP for email encryption
- Everyone is potentially a CA: trust people you know
- Works best with security-motivated users
  - Ever attended a key signing party?

CA hierarchies

- Organize CAs in a tree
- Distributed, but centralized (like DNS)
- Check by follow a path to the root
- Best practice: sub CAs are limited in what they certify

PKI for authorization

- Enterprise PKI can link up with permissions
- One approach: PKI maps key to name, ACL maps name to permissions
- Often better: link key with permissions directly, name is a comment
  - More like capabilities

The revocation problem

- How can we make certs "go away" when needed?
- Impossible without being online somehow

1. Short expiration times
2. Certificate revocation lists
3. Certificate status checking

Outline

Public key encryption and signatures
Cryptographic protocols, pt. 1
Announcements intermission
Key distribution and PKI
SSH
SSL/TLS
DNSSEC

Short history of SSH

- Started out as freeware by Tatu Ylönen in 1995
- Original version commercialized
- Fully open-source OpenSSH from OpenBSD
- Protocol redesigned and standardized for "SSH 2"

OpenSSH t-shirt

SSH host keys

- Every SSH server has a public/private keypair
- Ideally, never changes once SSH is installed
- Early generation a classic entropy problem
  - Especially embedded systems, VMs

Authentication methods

- Password, encrypted over channel
- `.shosts`: like `.rhosts`, but using client host key
- User-specific keypair
  - Public half on server, private on client
- Plugins for Kerberos, PAM modules, etc.

Old crypto vulnerabilities

- 1.x had only CRC for integrity
  - Worst case: when used with RC4
- Injection attacks still possible with CBC
  - CRC compensation attack
- For least-insecure 1.x-compatibility, attack detector
- Alas, detector had integer overflow worse than original attack

Newer crypto vulnerabilities

- IV chaining: IV based on last message ciphertext
  - Allows chosen plaintext attacks
  - Better proposal: separate, random IVs
- Some tricky attacks still left
  - Send byte-by-byte, watch for errors
  - Of arguable exploitability due to abort
- Now migrating to CTR mode

SSH over SSH

- SSH to machine 1, from there to machine 2
  - Common in these days of NATs
- Better: have machine 1 forward an encrypted connection (cf. HA1)

1. No need to trust 1 for secrecy
2. Timing attacks against password typing

SSH (non-)PKI

- When you connect to a host freshly, a mild note
- When the host key has changed, a large warning

```
@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@
@   WARNING: REMOTE HOST IDENTIFICATION HAS CHANGED!    @
@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@
IT IS POSSIBLE THAT SOMEONE IS DOING SOMETHING NASTY!
Someone could be eavesdropping on you right now
(man-in-the-middle attack)!
It is also possible that a host key has just been changed.
```

Outline

- Public key encryption and signatures
- Cryptographic protocols, pt. 1
- Announcements intermission
- Key distribution and PKI
- SSH
- SSL/TLS
- DNSSEC

SSL/TLS

- Developed at Netscape in early days of the public web
  - Usable with other protocols too, e.g. IMAP
- SSL 1.0 pre-public, 2.0 lasted only one year, 3.0 much better
- Renamed to TLS with RFC process
  - TLS 1.0 improves SSL 3.0
- TLS 1.1 and 1.2 in 2006 and 2008, only gradual adoption

IV chaining vulnerability

- TLS 1.0 uses previous ciphertext for CBC IV
- But, easier to attack in TLS:
  - More opportunities to control plaintext
  - Can automatically repeat connection
- "BEAST" automated attack in 2011: TLS 1.1 wakeup call

Compression oracle vuln.

- Compr$(S \parallel A)$, where S should be secret and A is attacker-controlled
- Attacker observes ciphertext length
- If A is similar to S, combination compresses better
- Compression exists separately in HTTP and TLS

But wait, there's more!

- Too many vulnerabilities to mention them all in lecture
- Kaloper-Meršinjak et al. have longer list
  - "Lessons learned" are variable, though
- Meta-message: don't try this at home

HTTPS hierarchical PKI

- Browser has order of 100 root certs
  - Not same set in every browser
  - Standards for selection not always clear
- Many of these in turn have sub-CAs
- Also, "wildcard" certs for individual domains

Hierarchical trust?

- No. Any CA can sign a cert for any domain
- A couple of CA compromises recently
- Most major governments, and many companies you've never heard of, could probably make a `google.com` cert
- Still working on: make browser more picky, compare notes

CA vs. leaf checking bug

- Certs have a bit that says if they're a CA
- All but last entry in chain should have it set
- Browser authors repeatedly fail to check this bit
- Allows any cert to sign any other cert

MD5 certificate collisions

- MD5 collisions allow forging CA certs
- Create innocuous cert and CA cert with same hash
  - Requires some guessing what CA will do, like sequential serial numbers
  - Also 200 PS3s
- Oh, should we stop using that hash function?

CA validation standards

- CA's job to check if the buyer really is `foo.com`
- Race to the bottom problem:
  - CA has minimal liability for bad certs
  - Many people want cheap certs
  - Cost of validation cuts out of profit
- "Extended validation" (green bar) certs attempt to fix

HTTPS and usability

- Many HTTPS security challenges tied with user decisions
- Is this really my bank?
- Seems to be a quite tricky problem
  - Security warnings often ignored, etc.
  - We'll return to this as a major example later

Outline

DNS: trusted but vulnerable

- Almost every higher-level service interacts with DNS
- UDP protocol with no authentication or crypto
  - Lots of attacks possible
- Problems known for a long time, but challenge to fix compatibly

DNSSEC goals and non-goals

\+ Authenticity of positive replies

\+ Authenticity of negative replies

\+ Integrity

— Confidentiality

— Availability

First cut: signatures and certificates

- Each resource record gets an `RRSIG` signature
  - E.g., `A` record for one name→address mapping
  - Observe: signature often larger than data
- Signature validation keys in `DNSKEY` RRs
- Recursive chain up to the root (or other "anchor")

Add more indirection

- DNS needs to scale to very large flat domains like `.com`
- Facilitated by having single `DS` RR in parent indicating delegation
- Chain to root now includes `DS`es as well

Negative answers

- Also don't want attackers to spoof non-existence
  - Gratuitous denial of service, force fallback, etc.
- But don't want to sign "x does not exist" for all x
- Solution 1, `NSEC`: "there is no name between `acacia` and `baobab`"

Preventing zone enumeration

- Many domains would not like people enumerating all their entries
- DNS is public, but “not that public”
- Unfortunately `NSEC` makes this trivial
- Compromise: `NSEC3` uses password-like salt and repeated hash, allows opt-out

DANE: linking TLS to DNSSEC

- “DNS-based Authentication of Named Entities”
- DNS contains hash of TLS cert, don’t need CAs
- How is DNSSEC’s tree of certs better than TLS’s?

Signing the root

- Political problem: many already distrust US-centered nature of DNS infrastructure
- Practical problem: must be very secure with no single point of failure
- Finally accomplished in 2010
  - Solution involves ‘key ceremonies’, international committees, smart cards, safe deposit boxes, etc.

Deployment

- Standard deployment problem: all cost and no benefit to being first mover
- Servers working on it, mostly top-down
- Clients: still less than 20%
- Will probably be common for a while: insecure connection to secure resolver

What about privacy?

- Users increasingly want privacy for their DNS queries as well
- Older DNSCurve and DNSCrypt protocols were not standardized
- More recent “DNS over TLS” and “DNS over HTTPS” are RFCs
- DNS over HTTPS in major browsers might have serious centralization effects