Overview

- Key exchange
  - Session vs. interchange keys
  - Classical, public key methods
  - Key generation
- Cryptographic key infrastructure
  - Certificates
- Key storage
  - Key escrow
  - Key revocation
- Digital signatures

Notation

- $X \rightarrow Y : \{ Z \| W \} k_{X,Y}$
  - X sends Y the message produced by concatenating Z and W enciphered by key $k_{X,Y}$, which is shared by users X and Y
- $A \rightarrow T : \{ Z \} k_A \| \{ W \} k_{A,T}$
  - A sends T a message consisting of the concatenation of Z enciphered using k_A, A's key, and W enciphered using $k_{A,T}$, the key shared by A and T
- r_1, r_2 nonces (nonrepeating random numbers)

Session, Interchange Keys

- Alice wants to send a message *m* to Bob
  - Assume public key encryption
  - Alice generates a random cryptographic key k_s and uses it to encipher *m*
    - To be used for this message *only*
    - Called a *session key*
  - She enciphers k_s with Bob;s public key k_B
    - k_B enciphers all session keys Alice uses to communicate with Bob
    - Called an interchange *key*
  - Alice sends $\{ m \} k_s \{ k_s \} k_B$

Benefits

- Limits amount of traffic enciphered with single key
  - Standard practice, to decrease the amount of traffic an attacker can obtain
- Prevents some attacks
  - Example: Alice will send Bob message that is either "BUY" or "SELL". Eve computes possible ciphertexts { "BUY" } k_B and { "SELL" } k_B. Eve intercepts enciphered message, compares, and gets plaintext at once

Key Exchange Algorithms

- Goal: Alice, Bob get shared key
  - Key cannot be sent in clear
    - Attacker can listen in
    - Key can be sent enciphered, or derived from exchanged data plus data not known to an eavesdropper
  - Alice, Bob may trust third party
  - All cryptosystems, protocols publicly known
    - Only secret data is the keys, ancillary information known only to Alice and Bob needed to derive keys
    - Anything transmitted is assumed known to attacker

Classical Key Exchange

- Bootstrap problem: how do Alice, Bob begin?
  - Alice can't send it to Bob in the clear!
- Assume trusted third party, Cathy
  - Alice and Cathy share secret key k_A
  - Bob and Cathy share secret key k_B
- Use this to exchange shared key k_s

Simple Protocol

Alice $\xrightarrow{\{\text{ request for session key to Bob }\}\, k_A}$ Cathy

Alice $\xleftarrow{\{\, k_s \,\}\, k_A \,\|\, \{\, k_s \,\}\, k_B}$ Cathy

Alice $\xrightarrow{\{\, k_s \,\}\, k_B}$ Bob

May 13, 2004 ECS 235 Slide #7

Problems

- How does Bob know he is talking to Alice?
  - Replay attack: Eve records message from Alice to Bob, later replays it; Bob may think he's talking to Alice, but he isn't
  - Session key reuse: Eve replays message from Alice to Bob, so Bob re-uses session key
- Protocols must provide authentication and defense against replay

May 13, 2004 ECS 235 Slide #8

Needham-Schroeder

Alice → Cathy: Alice || Bob || r_1

Alice ← Cathy: { Alice || Bob || r_1 || k_s || { Alice || k_s } k_B } k_A

Alice → Bob: { Alice || k_s } k_B

Alice ← Bob: { r_2 } k_s

Alice → Bob: { $r_2 - 1$ } k_s

Argument: Alice talking to Bob

- Second message
  - Enciphered using key only she, Cathy know
    - So Cathy enciphered it
  - Response to first message
    - As r_1 in it matches r_1 in first message
- Third message
  - Alice knows only Bob can read it
    - As only Bob can derive session key from message
  - Any messages enciphered with that key are from Bob

Argument: Bob talking to Alice

- Third message
  - Enciphered using key only he, Cathy know
    - So Cathy enciphered it
  - Names Alice, session key
    - Cathy provided session key, says Alice is other party
- Fourth message
  - Uses session key to determine if it is replay from Eve
    - If not, Alice will respond correctly in fifth message
    - If so, Eve can't decipher r_2 and so can't respond, or responds incorrectly

Denning-Sacco Modification

- Assumption: all keys are secret
- Question: suppose Eve can obtain session key. How does that affect protocol?
  - In what follows, Eve knows k_s

Eve → Bob: $\{ \text{Alice} \,||\, k_s \} k_B$

Eve ← Bob: $\{ r_2 \} k_s$

Eve → Bob: $\{ r_2 - 1 \} k_s$

Solution

- In protocol above, Eve impersonates Alice
- Problem: replay in third step
  - First in previous slide
- Solution: use time stamp *T* to detect replay
- Weakness: if clocks not synchronized, may either reject valid messages or accept replays
  - Parties with either slow or fast clocks vulnerable to replay
  - Resetting clock does *not* eliminate vulnerability

Needham-Schroeder with Denning-Sacco Modification

Alice → Cathy: Alice || Bob || r_1

Alice ← Cathy: { Alice || Bob || r_1 || k_s || { Alice || T || k_s } k_B } k_A

Alice → Bob: { Alice || T || k_s } k_B

Alice ← Bob: { r_2 } k_s

Alice → Bob: { $r_2 - 1$ } k_s

Otway-Rees Protocol

- Corrects problem
  - That is, Eve replaying the third message in the protocol
- Does not use timestamps
  - Not vulnerable to the problems that Denning-Sacco modification has
- Uses integer *n* to associate all messages with particular exchange

The Protocol

Alice → Bob: n || Alice || Bob || { r_1 || n || Alice || Bob } k_A

Cathy ← Bob: n || Alice || Bob || { r_1 || n || Alice || Bob } k_A || { r_2 || n || Alice || Bob } k_B

Cathy → Bob: n || { r_1 || k_s } k_A || { r_2 || k_s } k_B

Alice ← Bob: n || { r_1 || k_s } k_A

Argument: Alice talking to Bob

- Fourth message
  - If *n* matches first message, Alice knows it is part of this protocol exchange
  - Cathy generated k_s because only she, Alice know k_A
  - Enciphered part belongs to exchange as r_1 matches r_1 in encrypted part of first message

Argument: Bob talking to Alice

- Third message
  - If *n* matches second message, Bob knows it is part of this protocol exchange
  - Cathy generated k_s because only she, Bob know k_B
  - Enciphered part belongs to exchange as r_2 matches r_2 in encrypted part of second message

Replay Attack

- Eve acquires old k_s, message in third step
  - $n \| \{ r_1 \| k_s \} k_A \| \{ r_2 \| k_s \} k_B$
- Eve forwards appropriate part to Alice
  - Alice has no ongoing key exchange with Bob: *n* matches nothing, so is rejected
  - Alice has ongoing key exchange with Bob: *n* does not match, so is again rejected
    - If replay is for the current key exchange, *and* Eve sent the relevant part *before* Bob did, Eve could simply listen to traffic; no replay involved

Kerberos

- Authentication system
  - Based on Needham-Schroeder with Denning-Sacco modification
  - Central server plays role of trusted third party ("Cathy")
- Ticket
  - Issuer vouches for identity of requester of service
- Authenticator
  - Identifies sender

Idea

- User u authenticates to Kerberos server
  - Obtains ticket $T_{u,TGS}$ for ticket granting service (TGS)
- User u wants to use service s:
  - User sends authenticator A_u, ticket $T_{u,TGS}$ to TGS asking for ticket for service
  - TGS sends ticket $T_{u,s}$ to user
  - User sends A_u, $T_{u,s}$ to server as request to use s
- Details follow

Ticket

- Credential saying issuer has identified ticket requester
- Example ticket issued to user u for service s

$$T_{u,s} = s \,||\, \{ u \,||\, u\text{'s address} \,||\, \text{valid time} \,||\, k_{u,s} \} k_s$$

where:

- $k_{u,s}$ is session key for user and service
- Valid time is interval for which ticket valid
- u's address may be IP address or something else
  - Note: more fields, but not relevant here

Authenticator

- Credential containing identity of sender of ticket
  - Used to confirm sender is entity to which ticket was issued
- Example: authenticator user u generates for service s

$$A_{u,s} = \{ u \parallel \text{generation time} \parallel k_t \} k_{u,s}$$

where:

- k_t is alternate session key
- Generation time is when authenticator generated
  - Note: more fields, not relevant here

Protocol

user → Cathy: $user \parallel TGS$

Cathy → *user*: $\{ k_{u,TGS} \} k_u \parallel T_{u,TGS}$

user → TGS: $service \parallel A_{u,TGS} \parallel T_{u,TGS}$

TGS → *user*: $user \parallel \{ k_{u,s} \} k_{u,TGS} \parallel T_{u,s}$

user → *service*: $A_{u,s} \parallel T_{u,s}$

service → *user*: $\{ t + 1 \} k_{u,s}$

Analysis

- First two steps get user ticket to use TGS
  - User *u* can obtain session key only if *u* knows key shared with Cathy
- Next four steps show how *u* gets and uses ticket for service *s*
  - Service *s* validates request by checking sender (using $A_{u,s}$) is same as entity ticket issued to
  - Step 6 optional; used when *u* requests confirmation

Problems

- Relies on synchronized clocks
  - If not synchronized and old tickets, authenticators not cached, replay is possible
- Tickets have some fixed fields
  - Dictionary attacks possible
  - Kerberos 4 session keys weak (had much less than 56 bits of randomness); researchers at Purdue found them from tickets in minutes

Public Key Key Exchange

- Here interchange keys known
  - e_A, e_B Alice and Bob's public keys known to all
  - d_A, d_B Alice and Bob's private keys known only to owner
- Simple protocol
  - k_s is desired session key

Alice $\xrightarrow{\{ k_s \} e_B}$ Bob

Problem and Solution

- Vulnerable to forgery or replay
  - Because e_B known to anyone, Bob has no assurance that Alice sent message
- Simple fix uses Alice's private key
  - k_s is desired session key

Alice $\xrightarrow{\{ \{ k_s \} d_A \} e_B}$ Bob

Notes

- Can include message enciphered with k_s
- Assumes Bob has Alice's public key, and *vice versa*
  - If not, each must get it from public server
  - If keys not bound to identity of owner, attacker Eve can launch a *man-in-the-middle* attack (next slide; Cathy is public server providing public keys)
    - Solution to this (binding identity to keys) discussed later as public key infrastructure (PKI)

Man-in-the-Middle Attack



Key Generation

- Goal: generate difficult to guess keys
- Problem statement: given a set of K potential keys, choose one randomly
  - Equivalent to selecting a random number between 0 and K–1 inclusive
- Why is this hard: generating random numbers
  - Actually, numbers are usually *pseudo-random*, that is, generated by an algorithm

What is "Random"?

- *Sequence of cryptographically random numbers*: a sequence of numbers n_1, n_2, … such that, for any integer $k > 0$, an observer cannot predict n_k even if all of n_1, …, n_{k-1} are known
  - Best: physical source of randomness
    - Random pulses
    - Electromagnetic phenomena
    - Characteristics of computing environment such as disk latency
    - Ambient background noise

What is "Pseudorandom"?

- *Sequence of cryptographically pseudorandom numbers*: sequence of numbers intended to simulate a sequence of cryptographically random numbers but generated by an algorithm
  - Very difficult to do this well
  - Linear congruential generators [$n_k = (an_{k-1} + b) \bmod n$] broken
  - Polynomial congruential generators [$n_k = (a_j n_{k-1}^j + \ldots + a_1 n_{k-1}\ a_0) \bmod n$] broken too
  - Here, "broken" means next number in sequence can be determined

Best Pseudorandom Numbers

- *Strong mixing function*: function of 2 or more inputs with each bit of output depending on some nonlinear function of all input bits
  - Examples: DES, MD5, SHA-1
  - Use on UNIX-based systems:

    ```
    (date; ps gaux) | md5
    ```

    where "ps gaux" lists all information about all processes on system

Cryptographic Key Infrastructure

- Goal: bind identity to key
- Classical: not possible as all keys are shared
  - Use protocols to agree on a shared key (see earlier)
- Public key: bind identity to public key
  - Crucial as people will use key to communicate with principal whose identity is bound to key
  - Erroneous binding means no secrecy between principals
  - Assume principal identified by an acceptable name

Certificates

- Create token (message) containing
  - Identity of principal (here, Alice)
  - Corresponding public key
  - Timestamp (when issued)
  - Other information (perhaps identity of signer)

  signed by trusted authority (here, Cathy)

$$C_A = \{ e_A \,||\, \text{Alice} \,||\, T \}\, d_C$$

Use

- Bob gets Alice’s certificate
  - If he knows Cathy’s public key, he can decipher the certificate
    - When was certificate issued?
    - Is the principal Alice?
  - Now Bob has Alice’s public key
- Problem: Bob needs Cathy’s public key to validate certificate
  - Problem pushed “up” a level
  - Two approaches: Merkle’s tree, signature chains

Merkle’s Tree Scheme

- Keep certificates in a file
  - Changing any certificate changes the file
  - Use crypto hash functions to detect this
- Define hashes recursively
  - h is hash function
  - C_i is certificate i
- Hash of file ($h(1,4)$ in example) known to all



Validation



- To validate C_1:
  - Compute $h(1, 1)$
  - Obtain $h(2, 2)$
  - Compute $h(1, 2)$
  - Obtain $h(3, 4)$
  - Compute $h(1,4)$
  - Compare to known $h(1, 4)$
- Need to know hashes of children of nodes on path that are not computed

Details

- f: $D \times D \rightarrow D$ maps bit strings to bit strings
- h: $N \times N \rightarrow D$ maps integers to bit strings
  - if $i \geq j$, $h(i, j) = f(C_i, C_j)$
  - if $i < j$,
    $h(i, j) = f(h(i, \lfloor (i+j)/2 \rfloor), h(\lfloor (i+j)/2 \rfloor + 1, j))$

Problem

- File must be available for validation
  - Otherwise, can't recompute hash at root of tree
  - Intermediate hashes would do
- Not practical in most circumstances
  - Too many certificates and users
  - Users and certificates distributed over widely separated systems

Certificate Signature Chains

- Create certificate
  - Generate hash of certificate
  - Encipher hash with issuer's private key
- Validate
  - Obtain issuer's public key
  - Decipher enciphered hash
  - Recompute hash from certificate and compare
- Problem: getting issuer's public key

X.509 Chains

- Some certificate components in X.509v3:
  - Version
  - Serial number
  - Signature algorithm identifier: hash algorithm
  - Issuer's name; uniquely identifies issuer
  - Interval of validity
  - Subject's name; uniquely identifies subject
  - Subject's public key
  - Signature: enciphered hash

X.509 Certificate Validation

- Obtain issuer's public key
  - The one for the particular signature algorithm
- Decipher signature
  - Gives hash of certificate
- Recompute hash from certificate and compare
  - If they differ, there's a problem
- Check interval of validity
  - This confirms that certificate is current

Issuers

- *Certification Authority (CA)*: entity that issues certificates
  - Multiple issuers pose validation problem
  - Alice’s CA is Cathy; Bob’s CA is Don; how can Alice validate Bob’s certificate?
  - Have Cathy and Don cross-certify
    - Each issues certificate for the other

Validation and Cross-Certifying

- Certificates:
  - Cathy<<Alice>>
  - Dan<<Bob>
  - Cathy<<Dan>>
  - Dan<<Cathy>>
- Alice validates Bob’s certificate
  - Alice obtains Cathy<<Dan>>
  - Alice uses (known) public key of Cathy to validate Cathy<<Dan>>
  - Alice uses Cathy<<Dan>> to validate Dan<<Bob>>

PGP Chains

- OpenPGP certificates structured into packets
  - One public key packet
  - Zero or more signature packets
- Public key packet:
  - Version (3 or 4; 3 compatible with all versions of PGP, 4 not compatible with older versions of PGP)
  - Creation time
  - Validity period (not present in version 3)
  - Public key algorithm, associated parameters
  - Public key

OpenPGP Signature Packet

- Version 3 signature packet
  - Version (3)
  - Signature type (level of trust)
  - Creation time (when next fields hashed)
  - Signer's key identifier (identifies key to encipher hash)
  - Public key algorithm (used to encipher hash)
  - Hash algorithm
  - Part of signed hash (used for quick check)
  - Signature (enciphered hash)
- Version 4 packet more complex

Signing

- Single certificate may have multiple signatures
- Notion of "trust" embedded in each signature
  - Range from "untrusted" to "ultimate trust"
  - Signer defines meaning of trust level (no standards!)
- All version 4 keys signed by subject
  - Called "self-signing"

Validating Certificates

- Alice needs to validate Bob's OpenPGP cert
  - Does not know Fred, Giselle, or Ellen
- Alice gets Giselle's cert
  - Knows Henry slightly, but his signature is at "casual" level of trust
- Alice gets Ellen's cert
  - Knows Jack, so uses his cert to validate Ellen's, then hers to validate Bob's

Arrows show signatures
Self signatures not shown



Storing Keys

- Multi-user or networked systems: attackers may defeat access control mechanisms
  - Encipher file containing key
    - Attacker can monitor keystrokes to decipher files
    - Key will be resident in memory that attacker may be able to read
  - Use physical devices like “smart card”
    - Key never enters system
    - Card can be stolen, so have 2 devices combine bits to make single key

Key Escrow

- *Key escrow system* allows authorized third party to recover key
  - Useful when keys belong to roles, such as system operator, rather than individuals
  - Business: recovery of backup keys
  - Law enforcement: recovery of keys that authorized parties require access to
- Goal: provide this without weakening cryptosystem
- Very controversial

Desirable Properties

- Escrow system should not depend on encipherment algorithm
- Privacy protection mechanisms must work from end to end and be part of user interface
- Requirements must map to key exchange protocol
- System supporting key escrow must require all parties to authenticate themselves
- If message to be observable for limited time, key escrow system must ensure keys valid for that period of time only

Components

- User security component
  - Does the encipherment, decipherment
  - Supports the key escrow component
- Key escrow component
  - Manages storage, use of data recovery keys
- Data recovery component
  - Does key recovery

Example: EES, Clipper Chip

- Escrow Encryption Standard
  - Set of interlocking components
  - Designed to balance need for law enforcement access to enciphered traffic with citizens' right to privacy
- Clipper chip prepares per-message escrow information
  - Each chip numbered uniquely by UID
  - Special facility programs chip
- Key Escrow Decrypt Processor (KEDP)
  - Available to agencies authorized to read messages

User Security Component

- Unique device key k_{unique}
- Nonunique family key k_{family}
- Cipher is Skipjack
  - Classical cipher: 80 bit key, 64 bit input, output blocks
- Generates Law Enforcement Access Field (LEAF) of 128 bits:
  - $\{ \text{UID} \| \{ k_{session} \} k_{unique} \| hash \} k_{family}$
  - *hash*: 16 bit authenticator from session key and initialization vector