CSci 4271W
Development of Secure Software Systems
Day 24: Protocols in practice

Stephen McCamant
University of Minnesota, Computer Science & Engineering

Outline

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

Packet sniffing

- Watch other people's traffic as it goes by on network
- Easiest on:
  - Old-style broadcast (thin, "hub") Ethernet
  - Wireless
- Or if you own the router

Forging packet sources

- Source IP address not involved in routing, often not checked
- Change it to something else!
- Might already be enough to fool a naive UDP protocol

TCP spoofing

- Forging source address only lets you talk, not listen
- Old attack: wait until connection established, then DoS one participant and send packets in their place
- Frustrated by making TCP initial sequence numbers unpredictable
  - Fancier attacks modern attacks are "off-path"

ARP spoofing

- Impersonate other hosts on local network level
- Typical ARP implementations stateless, don't mind changes
- Now you get victim's traffic, can read, modify, resend

rlogin and reverse DNS

- rlogin uses reverse DNS to see if originating host is on whitelist
- How can you attack this mechanism with an honest source IP address?

rlogin and reverse DNS

- rlogin uses reverse DNS to see if originating host is on whitelist
- How can you attack this mechanism with an honest source IP address?
- Remember, ownership of reverse-DNS is by IP address

Outline

Public key authenticity

- Public keys don't need to be secret, but they must be right
- Wrong key $\rightarrow$ can't stop middleperson
- 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

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

Cryptographic protocols, cont'd

Some classic network attacks

Key distribution and PKI

Announcements intermission

SSH

SSL/TLS

Project 1 status

- Probably don't need reminder that second submission is Friday
- Some clarifications on Piazza, consider asking more questions there
- I'll be available for questions after class

Outline

Cryptographic protocols, cont'd

Some classic network attacks

Key distribution and PKI

Announcements intermission

SSH

SSL/TLS

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

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

Cryptographic protocols, cont'd

Some classic network attacks

Key distribution and PKI

Announcements intermission

SSH

SSL/TLS

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$(S \| A)$, 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.