#### Announcements

Homework 1

- Grade released
- Have *1-week "rebuttal period"* 
  - Submit re-grade request via GradeScope

# Lecture 10

# **Protocols (Continued)**

# Chapters 9 and 11 in KPS

[lecture slides are adapted from previous slides by Prof. Gene Tsudik]

# Recap: Key Distribution Center (KDC) aka Trusted Third Part (TTP)

- Alice and Bob need to share a key
- KDC shares different master key with *each* registered user (many users)
- Alice and Bob know their own master keys:



#### Key Distribution Center (KDC) or Trusted Third Party (TTP)

K(X) = Encryption of X with key K

**KDC** generates fresh K



- Alice and Bob communicate using **K** as a short-term (*session*) key for encryption and/or data integrity
- Note:
  - Msg2 is not tied to Msg1
  - Msg1 is possibly old
  - Msg2 is possibly old and so is Msg3
  - Bob and Alice don't authenticate each other!



Alice DOES NOT authenticate Bob

## **Public Key Distribution**

General schemes:

- •Public announcement (e.g., in a newsgroup or email message)
  - Can be forged
- Publicly available directory
  - Can be tampered with
- •Public-key certificates (PKCs) issued by trusted off-line Certification Authorities (CAs)

## **Certification Authorities**

- Certification authority (CA): trusted, highly secure (physically and electronically) component
- Issues public key certificates; each binds a public key to a specific entity
- Each entity (user, host, etc.) registers its public key with CA.
  - Bob provides "proof of identity" to CA.
  - CA creates public key certificate binding Bob's ID/name to this public key.
  - Certificate containing Bob's public key is signed by CA:

#### CA says: "this is Bob's public key"



#### **Certification Authority**

- When Alice wants to get Bob's public key:
  - Get Bob's certificate (from Bob or elsewhere)
  - Using CA's public key verify the signature on Bob's certificate
  - Check for expiration
  - Check for revocation (we'll talk about this later)
  - Extract Bob's public key



# A Certificate Contains

- Serial number (unique to issuer)
- Info about certificate owner, including algorithm and key value itself (not shown)



- info about certificate issuer
- valid dates
- digital signature by issuer

## A Sample Certificate (1/2)

→ 📴 www.googie.com				
0				
Certificate       www.google.com         Issued by: Avast trusted CA         Expires: Wednesday, January 11, 2017 at 9:13:00 AM Pacific Standard Time         This certificate is valid         Details				
Subject Name				
Country	US			
State/Province	California			
Locality	Mountain View Google Inc			
Organization				
Common Name	www.google.com			
lecuer Name				
Country	C7			
State/Province	Praque			
Organization	AVAST			
Organizational Unit	Software Development			
Common Name	Avast trusted CA			
Serial Number	3091			
Version	3			
Signature Algorithm	SHA-256 with RSA Encryption ( 1.2.840.113549.1.1.11 )			
Parameters	none			
Not Valid Before	Wednesday, October 19, 2016 at 10:15:34 AM Pacific Daylight Time			
	<ul> <li>Avast trusted CA</li> <li>Www.google.ct</li> <li>www.google.ct</li> <li>www.google.ct</li> <li>www.google.ct</li> <li>www.google.ct</li> <li>ssued Expires:</li> <li>This</li> <li>This</li> <li>Totals</li> <li>Subject Name Country</li> <li>State/Province Locality</li> <li>Organization</li> <li>Common Name</li> <li>Issuer Name Country</li> <li>State/Province</li> <li>Organization</li> <li>Common Name</li> <li>State/Province</li> <li>Organization</li> <li>Organization</li> <li>Organization</li> <li>Organization</li> <li>Organization</li> <li>Organization</li> <li>Serial Number</li> <li>Version</li> <li>Signature Algorithm</li> <li>Parameters</li> <li>Not Valid Before</li> </ul>			

OK

#### A Sample Certificate (2/2)



Avast trusted CA					
🛏 📴 www.google.com					
Public Key Info					
Algorithm	RSA Encryption ( 1.2.840.113549.1.1.1 )				
Parameters	none				
Public Key	256 bytes : D7 D3 86 4F 23 D4 E6 E4				
Exponent	65537				
Key Size	2048 bits				
Key Usage	Any				
Signature	256 bytes : 97 6B 72 86 AD 24 65 AD				
Extension	Subject Key Identifier ( 2.5.29.14 )				
Critical	NO				
Key ID	84 61 D1 1A 2F B1 EF 8E 4F F4 6F F0 8D 26 FC 91 58 77 9C A3				
Extension	Authority Key Identifier ( 2.5.29.35 )				
Critical	ritical NO				
Key ID	DB D4 F7 BB 15 76 6C 3B 01 A5 23 59 C2 37 26 97 46 5D DC 46				
Extension	ension Subject Alternative Name ( 2.5.29.17 )				
Critical	I NO				
DNS Name	www.google.com				
Fingerprinte					
SUA1	30 69 24 F3 14 57 D4 84 73 7F B2 BE B8 F5 92 42 46 8F 9D 2F				
MD5	20 CD 07 D1 A3 F4 96 95 2F 33 43 4D E6 F3 D0 1E				

# **Back to Protocols**

Needham-Schroeder Protocol (1978): First Distributed Security Protocol

 ${X}_{K} =$ Encryption of X with key K



#### Security?

**Denning-Sacco Attack:** suppose Eve recorded **an old** protocol session for which she somehow knows the session key K':

1. 
$$A \rightarrow T$$
:  $A, B, N_A$   
2.  $T \rightarrow A$ :  $\{N_A, B, K', \{K', A\}_{K_B}\}_{K_A}$   
3.  $A \rightarrow B$ :  $\{K', A\}_{K_B}$ 

At a later time:

3.  $E \rightarrow B$ : {K', A}<sub>KB</sub> 4.  $B \rightarrow E$ : {N<sub>B</sub>}<sub>K'</sub> 5.  $E \rightarrow B$ : {N<sub>B</sub>-1}<sub>K'</sub>

#### Fixing the Attack

- Bob has no guarantees about freshness of the message in step 3.
- Eve exploits this to impersonate Alice to Bob old session keys are useful.
- Can be fixed by adding timestamps:
  - Limits usefulness of old session keys
  - Eve's attack becomes:

3:  $E \rightarrow B$ : {K', T', A}<sub>KB</sub>

#### attack is now thwarted because T' is stale

#### PK-based Needham-Schroeder Protocol



- CERT<sub>B</sub> = Message 2, CERT<sub>A</sub> = Message 5
- PK<sub>A</sub>: Alice's public key, PK<sub>B</sub>: Bob's public key
- SK<sub>T</sub>: TTP's secret (private) key used for signing
- Everyone knows TTP's public key PK<sub>T</sub>

[X]<sub>K</sub> = Encryption of X with key K

#### Another Attack

- 1, 2, 4, 5: Delivery of public key
- Does not guarantee freshness of the public key

How to solve it?

- Timestamp in messages 2 and 5 or challenges in messages 1&2 and 4&5
- Public Key Certificate: assign expiration time/data to each certificate (messages 2 and 5)

#### PK-based Denning-Sacco Attack



# Lowe's Attack (Impersonation by Interleaving)

#### Original

- 3. A  $\rightarrow$  B: [N<sub>a</sub>, A]<sub>PKb</sub>
- 6. B  $\rightarrow$  A:  $[N_a, N_b]_{PKa}$
- 7.  $A \rightarrow B$ :  $[N_b]_{PK_b}$

#### Fix

- 3. A  $\rightarrow$  B: [N<sub>a</sub>, A]<sub>PKb</sub>
- 6. B  $\rightarrow$  A: [B, N<sub>a</sub>, N<sub>b</sub>]<sub>PKa</sub>
- 7. A  $\rightarrow$  B:  $[N_b]_{PK_b}$

Attack: E impersonates A				
3.				
3.	Ε	$\rightarrow$ B:	[N <sub>a</sub> , A] <sub>PKb</sub>	
6.	В	$\rightarrow$ E:	[N <sub>a</sub> ,N <sub>b</sub> ] <sub>Pka</sub>	
6.				
7.				
7.	Е	$\rightarrow$ B:	[N <sub>b</sub> ] <sub>PKb</sub>	