CS459/698 Privacy, Cryptography, Network and Data Security

Authentication Protocols

Fall 2024, Tuesday/Thursday 02:30pm-03:50pm

Today's Lecture – Authentication Protocols

• Symmetric Authentication

- Needham-Schroeder
- Kerberos

• Asymmetric Authentication (PKI)

- **DH**
- Certificates
- PAKEs
- Single Sign On
 - SAML
 - OAuth
- DNSSEC

Recall, Definition of Authentication



Recall, Types of Authentication Tokens

- Something you know
 - Passwords, pins, etc
- Something you have
 - Mobile phones (SMS), RSA tokens, etc.
- Something you are
 - Fingerprints, retinal scans, etc.
 - (Experimental) Something you do
 - Keystroke metrics, typing and speech patterns, etc.
 - May be copied, so they provide less security vs Biometrics.





tion

Today's Focus

• Establishing Keys:

- Typically, once authenticated, we give access to some service or message
- Goal will typically be to establish a symmetric key between parties

Symmetric Crypto Authentication

Needham-Schroeder

Needham-Schroeder Overview



- Alice (A) wants to initiate communication with Bob (B)
- There's a Trusted Third Party (C) with pre established symmetric keys
- K_{AC} is a symmetric key known only to A and the Key Distribution Center (C)
- K_{BC} is a symmetric key known only to B and the Key Distribution Center (C)
- The server generates K_{AB} , a symmetric key used in the session between A and B
 - \circ ~ Every time Alice wants to talk to Bob, a new symmetric K_{AB} key is provided



K_{BC}









Alice requests to communicate with Bob, sending her identity, Bob's identity, and a fresh nonce N_A











Is Needham-Schroeder Vulnerable to Replay Attacks?

• Replay attack:

- Mallory intercepts a message meant for some other party
- They later send this message again pretending to be some other party

• Example

- Hashed password
- Car unlocking



Yes, it is 🛞



Needham-Schroeder is vulnerable to replay attacks

• 3 weeks later...



Needham-Schroeder is vulnerable to replay attacks

• 3 weeks later...





Needham-Schroeder is vulnerable to replay attacks

• 3 weeks later...





Bob will believe he is talking to Alice.

Typical Defenses against replays

- Need to ensure the data is "fresh"
- E.g.
- Using a Nonce
- Timestamps
 - Ensure Synchronization
- Caching Responses

Kerberos

Kerberos



- Based on the Needham-Schroeder protocol
- Fixes the potential for a replay attack vulnerability by adding a timestamp
- Used in Windows Active Directory
 - Developed by MIT, and named after Cerberus Server Client KDC

Effective Access Control

- Each client only needs single key.
- Each server also only needs a single key.
- Mutual Authentication.







1.Request Ticket Granting Ticket

2. Encrypted TGT and session key





Authentication Server (AS)



Ticket Granting Server (TGS)



Application server











The Keys



The Keys





Breaking Down Kerberos – Part 1



- { $K_{BT}|ID_B|L$ } is the ticket granting ticket (TGT)
- L is lifetime, T_A is the timestamp at A, N_B is a nonce
- K_{BT} is a session key between Bob and the TGS
- K_{AT} the TGS secret key

 K_{BA}

Breaking Down Kerberos – Part 2



- $\{K_{BT}|ID_B|L\}$ is the ticket granting ticket (TGT)
- $\{K_{BS}|ID_B|L\}$ is the service ticket (ST)
- $\overline{K_{BT}}$ is a session key between Bob and the TGS

Breaking Down Kerberos – Part 3



- $\{K_{BS}|ID_B|L\}$ is the service ticket (ST)
- *K_{BS}* is a session key between Bob and the Server



Reflect, why does Kerberos fix it

- Timestamps in previously insecure messages
- All tickets include a Lifetime (time they expire)


Asymmetric Crypto Authentication

Recap

Recall the Diffie-Hellman key exchange



A public-key protocol published in 1976 by Whitfield Diffie and Martin Hellman



Allows two parties that have no prior knowledge of each other to jointly establish a shared secret key over an insecure channel



Key used to encrypt subsequent communications using a symmetric key cipher

Recall the Diffie-Hellman key exchange



DH as paint!



Diffie-Hellman key exchange – The Math

- Alice chooses prime *p* at random and finds a generator *g*
- Alice chooses $X \leftarrow_{\mathsf{R}} \{2, 3, \dots, p-2\}$ and sends $A = g^{X} \pmod{p}$ to Bob, together with p and g
- Bob chooses $Y \leftarrow_{\mathbb{R}} \{2, 3, \dots, p-2\}$ and sends $B = g^{Y} \pmod{p}$ to Alice
- Alice and Bob both compute $s = g^{XY} \pmod{p}$
 - Alice does that by computing B^{X} (mod p)
 - Bob does that by computing A^{Y} (mod p)
- Now they share a common secret s which can be used to derive a symmetric key





Diffie-Hellman key exchange – Altogether



What's the Problem!

- Authentication!
- Need to verify the public keys!



Recall, Digital Signatures





Q: How can Alice and Bob be sure they're talking to each other?





Q: How can Alice and Bob be sure they're talking to each other?

A: By having each other's verification key!

Q: How can Alice and Bob be sure they're talking to each other?

A: By having each other's verification key!







Q: How can Alice and Bob be sure they're talking to each other?

A: By having each other's verification key!

Q: But how do they get the keys...

The Key Management Problem...Solutions?





A **CA** is a trusted third party who keeps a directory of people's (and organizations') verification keys

$\underbrace{\text{Certificate Authorities (CAs)}}_{(s_k^A, v_k^A)} \qquad \underbrace{\underset{(s_k^A, v_k^A)}{\underset{(s_k^C, v_k^C)}{\underset{(s_k^C, v_k^C)}{\underset{(s_k^C, v_k^C)}{\underset{(s_k^C, v_k^C)}{\underset{(s_k^C, v_k^C)}{\underset{(s_k^C, v_k^C)}{\underset{(s_k^C, v_k^C)}{\underset{(s_k^C, v_k^C)}{\underset{(s_k^C, v_k^C)}}}}} \underbrace{s_{ig_{s_k^C}}(m)}$

- A **CA** is a trusted third party who keeps a directory of people's (and organizations') verification keys
 - \circ Alice generates a (s_k^A, v_k^A) key pair, and sends the verification key and personal information, both signed with Alice's signature key, to the CA
 - The CA ensures that the personal information and Alice's signature are correct
 - The CA generates a certificate consisting of Alice's personal information, as well as her verification key. The entire certificate is signed with the CA's signature key
 - Most web traffic now is encrypted. Extended validation certificates (for which CAs charged a lot of money) now not treated differently by browsers.

Certificate Authorities

- Everyone is assumed to have a copy of the CA's verification key (s_k^{CA}) , so they can verify the signature on the certificate
- There can be multiple levels of certificate authorities; level n CA issues certificates for level n+1 CAs Public-key infrastructure (PKI)
- Need to have only verification key of root CA to verify the certificate chain



Chain of Certificates

Alice sends Bob the following certificate to prove her identity. Bob can follow the chain of certificates to validate Alice's identity.





Bob has v^{CA1}

CAs on the web

- Root verification key installed on browser
- https://letsencrypt.org changed the game by offering free certificates
- Other common CAs:

Rank	Issuer	Usage	Market Share
1	IdenTrust	38.5%	43.6%
2	DigiCert Group	13.1%	14.5%
3	Sectigo (Comodo Cybersecurity)	12.1%	13.4%
4	GlobalSign	16.1%	16.7%
5	Let's Encrypt	5.8%	6.4%
6	GoDaddy Group	4.8%	5.3%

Examples



Safari is using an encrypted connection to www.mathsisfun.com.

Encryption with a digital certificate keeps information private as it's sent to or from the https website www.mathsisfun.com.

🛅 Baltimore CyberTrust Root

- L, 🛅 Cloudflare Inc ECC CA-3
 - L, 🛅 sni.cloudflaressl.com



sni.cloudflaressl.com

Issued by: Cloudflare Inc ECC CA-3 Expires: Tuesday, June 13, 2023 at 7:59:59 PM Eastern Daylight Saving Time This certificate is valid

> Trust

\vee Details

Subject NameCountry or RegionUSState/ProvinceCaliforniaLocalitySan FranciscoOrganizationCloudflare, Inc.Common Namesni.cloudflaressl.com

Issuer Name

 Country or Region
 US

 Organization
 Cloudflare, Inc.

 Common Name
 Cloudflare Inc ECC CA-3

Serial Number 0D 62 A9 13 F8 92 16 F7 74 7D 82 56 83 B4 C1 93 Version 3

Signature Algorithm ECDSA Signature with SHA-256 (1.2.840.10045.4.3.2) Parameters None

Not Valid BeforeSunday, June 12, 2022 at 8:00:00 PM Eastern Daylight Saving TimeNot Valid AfterTuesday, June 13, 2023 at 7:59:59 PM Eastern Daylight Saving Time

Public Key Info

Algorithm	Elliptic Curve Public Key (1.2.840.10045.2.1)
Parameters	Elliptic Curve secp256r1 (1.2.840.10045.3.1.7)
Public Key	65 bytes : 04 74 C2 77 87 04 8D BD E0 C7 C8 8B CF 13 B8 F5 18 40 7E 98 1F C2 F7 9E 4A 66 23 5E C8 C8 93 33 75 CC C2 ED 56 1F AB DA 31 D5 5D 1A AB 39 60 9B 2B E9 91 02 62 8C B2 4D 28 F4 91 07 A8 26 01 44 2D
Key Size	256 bits
Key Usage	Encrypt, Verify, Derive

Signature 70 bytes : 30 44 02 20 7A 62 4A 32 ...

Password-Authenticated Key Exchange

How do we authenticate passwords?

- Typically send password in plain over a secure channel (TLS)
- Server's store only hash's (with salt)
 - Will see the password at least briefly
- We are good at crypto, can it help?



Password-authenticated key exchange (PAKE)

- A special form of cryptographic key exchange protocol introduced by Bellovin and Merritt
- Designed to help two parties (Bob and Alice) agree on a shared encryption key using a password
 - Balanced: Both parties have password
 - Augmented: Only client (server does not)
- Problem: Hard to get it right!
 - The password should be **pre-shared** through some secure channel or prior arrangement.



 $K = A^{b} \mod p = (g^{a} \mod p)^{b} \mod p = g^{ab} \mod p = (g^{b} \mod p)^{a} \mod p = B^{a} \mod p$

DH-EKE

Goals of PAKEs

- The secret keys will match if the passwords match, and appear random otherwise.
- Participants do not need to trust third parties (in particular, no Public Key Infrastructure)
- The resulting secret key is not learned by anyone not participating in the protocol including those who know the password.
- The protocol does not reveal either parties' password to each other (unless the passwords match), or to eavesdroppers.

Attacks on PAKEs

- Off-line dictionary attack
- On-line dictionary attacks
- Replay attacks
- Implementation Issues
- Entropy!?

Example: SRP

- Early widely deployed PAKEs
 - Apple iCloud!
- Poor security proof
 - On V6a (keeps getting broken)
- Vulnerable to offline dictionary attacks



Example: OPAQUE

- Proposed in 2018
- Has much stronger security proof
- Uses OPRFs to avoid leaking the salt to attacker
- Efficient, works for any hash of passwords on the server
- https://eprint.iacr.org/2018/163.pdf

Example: SPAKE2



Key Management - Single Sign-On(SSO)

Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML)

- Uses secure tokens (encrypted, digitally signed XMLcertificates) instead of credentials
- Allows users to access multiple related independent applications with trusted information with a single log
- Can use whatever authentication protocol you choose
- Primarily a standard for how these communications are formatted

Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML)



Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML)

• Advantages:

- Authentication is centralized
- Loose coupling of directories
- User errors such as forgotten, weak or leaked password are avoided
- Improves user experience (single-sign on for multiple applications)
- XML-based protocol
 - Widely used and known

• Disadvantages

- Complex to implement
 - Errors
 - Lengthened timelines
- If down, can remove access from multiple systems

OAuth

- Like SAML it provides a framework and formatting for granting tokens
- Key difference: Authorization not authentication
 - i.e., a set of capabilities not attestation that you are who you say you are
 - Tokens are not tied to you
 - eg. Github, Gitlab, etc





Source: Jason Goertzen and Miti Mazmudar

Recall, what is DNS?

- The internet uses IP addresses to determine where to send messages
- IP addresses are difficult for people to remember!
- The Domain Name System is responsible to translating something easy for a human to remember into IP addresses

example.com -> 93.184.216.34

WHAT IS DNS?



WHAT IS DNS?


WHAT IS DNS?



WHAT IS DNS?





DNS request - dig command



dig crysp.uwaterloo.ca

ZONES CONTAIN RESOURCE RECORDS



• You can look up more than just IPs

example.com. 57094 IN AAAA example.com. 57047 IN A example.com. 57094 IN NS example.com. 57094 IN NS 2606:2800:220:1:248:1893:25c8:1946 93.184.216.34 b.iana-servers.net. a.iana-servers.net.



CLIENTS RARELY QUERY DIRECTLY



• Designed with no integrity projection





CS459 Fall 2024

• Designed with no integrity projection



CS459 Fall 2024

• Designed with no integrity projection



CS459 Fall 2024

• Designed with no integrity projection



CS459 Fall 2024

• Designed with no integrity projection



CS459 Fall 2024

• Designed with no integrity projection



CS459 Fall 2024

• Designed with no integrity projection



CS459 Fall 2024



Securing DNS

Use **digital signatures** to make sure a correct and unmodified message is received from the correct entity!

- New records added to DNSSEC signed zone
- Record sets (RRSets) are signed, instead of individual records
- Have two keys:
 - Key Signing Key (KSK): kept in trusted hardware, hard to change
 - **Zone Signing Key (ZSK):** changed more often, smaller, used for records

Verification Procedure

- Assume you trust the public KSK held by a <u>"trust anchor"</u>
- Use it to verify the RRset containing a given **ZSK**
- Then use **ZSK** to verify the records



How do we maintain key integrity?

Construct a <u>chain of trust</u>!

- The root verification KSK must be manually configurated on the machine making the request
- When the root **ZSK** is queried use the trust anchor to verify key and its signature (https://www.cloudflare.com/dns/dnssec/root-signing-ceremony/)
- Each zone's parent zone contains a "Delegate signer" (DS) record which is used to verify zone's KSK
 - $\circ \quad \text{Hash of } \textbf{KSK}$

The verification process

- Light blue: Because of our trust anchor, we trust the KSK of the root
 (1). The root's KSK signs its ZSK, so now we trust the root's ZSK (2-3).
- Dark blue: We trust the root's ZSK. The root's ZSK signs .edu's KSK (4-5), so now we trust .edu's KSK.
- Light green: We trust the .edu's KSK (6). .edu's KSK signs .edu's ZSK, so now we trust .edu's ZSK (7-8).
- Dark green: We trust .edu's ZSK. .edu's ZSK signs berkeley.edu's KSK (9-10), so now we trust berkeley.edu's KSK.
- **Light orange:** We trust the berkeley.edu's KSK (11). berkeley.edu's KSK signs berkeley.edu's ZSK, so now we trust berkeley.edu's ZSK (12-13).
- **Dark orange:** We trust berkeley.edu's ZSK. berkeley.edu's ZSK signs the final answer record (14-15), so now we trust the final answer.

https://textbook.cs161.org/network/dnssec.html



Next Class, Security through the layers!