

19CSE311- Computer Security- Unit II

January 30, 2022

Dr. Remya S/Mr. Sarath R

Assistant Professor

Department of Computer Science and Engineering



AMRITA
VISHWA VIDYAPEETHAM
DEEMED TO BE UNIVERSITY

School of
Engineering

Agenda

- Security Services
- Authentication and Key Exchange Protocols
- Access Control Matrix
- User Authentication
- Directory Authentication Services
- Diffie Hellman Key Exchange Protocol
- Kerberos

Security Services

- The OSI Security Architecture is a framework that provides a systematic way of defining the requirements of security and characterizing the approaches to satisfying those requirements.
- The document defines **security attacks**, **mechanisms** and **services**, and the relationship among these categories.
- X.800 defines a security service as a service provided by a protocol layer of communicating open systems, which ensures adequate security of the system or of data transfers.

- A processing or communication service that is provided by a system to give a specific kind of protection to system resources.
- Security services implement security policies and are implemented by security mechanisms.
- The main security service are:
 - Authentication
 - Access Control
 - Data Confidentiality
 - Data Integrity
 - Non Repudiation

Basis for Authentication

- Something you know:
 - PIN
 - Password
- Something you have:
 - An access key or a card
 - A certificate
 - A smart card
 - A RFID tag
- Something you are:
 - Biometric

Weak Authentication

- PINs, Passwords provides weak authentication
 - Security is based upon how hard the pin/password is to guess.
 - Usually the passwords are short and weak.
 - Vulnerable to dictionary attacks.
- Widely used in practice
 - Unix, Web Emails,
- Protocol(A authenticates to B using a password P, that A shares with B)
 - 1 $A \rightarrow B$: Hi, this is A!
 - 2 $B \rightarrow A$: r (random challenge)
 - 3 $A \rightarrow B$: $H(p,r)$

Strong Authentication

- An entity authenticates to the other by proving the knowledge of a secret associated with that entity, without revealing anything meaningful about the secret itself.
- Can be achieved through:
 - Private/Public Key Encryption
 - MAC
 - Digital Signatures
- Strong because the security reduces to the security of the underlying cryptographic primitive, which is assumed to be hard to break.
- There exists both private key and public key based authentication.

Symmetric Encryption based Authentication

- Uses encryption to authenticate Alice to Bob (Assuming Alice-Bob have established a secret key K), then

A auth B

- 1 A \rightarrow B: Hi Bob, this is Alice!
- 2 B \rightarrow A: r (random challenge)
- 3 A \rightarrow B: $Enc_k(r, B)$ [response]

Security of the Previous Protocol

- An attacker needs to come up with a valid response.
 - Impossible if encryption is secure.
- r must not be re-used by Bob.

Freshness

- Assurance that message has not been used previously and originated within an acceptably recent time frame.
- Two methods:
 - Nonce (**N**umber used **once**)
 - Timestamps
- **Nonces**
 - One-time random number.
 - We depended on B to make sure r is a good nonce.
 - Choose nonces "randomly" from a large space (such as 2^{128}) to avoid reuse and for unpredictability- good RNG.

• Timestamps

- Inclusion of date/time-stamp in the message allows recipient to check it for freshness.
- These stamps need to be protected with cryptographic means.
- $A \rightarrow B: Enc_k(T, B)$, results in fewer messages and rounds
- But, it requires synchronized clocks, which are hard to achieve in practice!

Encryption-based Mutual Authentication

- Run two copies of Uni-lateral authentication protocol \rightarrow 4 rounds.
- We can piggyback common flows

- **Method. 1**

- ① $A \rightarrow B:$ A, rA
 - ② $B \rightarrow A:$ $Enc_k(rB, rA, a)$
 - ③ $A \rightarrow B:$ $Enc_k(rA, rB)$

- **Method. 2**

- ① $A \rightarrow B:$ $A, Enc_k(T, B)$
 - ② $B \rightarrow A:$ $Enc_k(T + 1, A)$

Session Key Exchange with KDC- Needham Schroeder Protocol

- $A \rightarrow \text{KDC}: ID_A || ID_B || N_1$
(Hello, I am alice, I want to talk to Bob, I need a section key and here is a randome nonce idetifying the request)
- $\text{KDC} \rightarrow A : E_{K_A}(K || ID_B || N_1 || E_{K_B}(K || ID_A))$
Encrypted(Here is a key, for you to talk to Bob as per your request N_1 ans also an envelope to Bob containing the same key)
- $A \rightarrow B: E_{K_B}(K || ID_A)$
(I would like to talk using key in envelope sent by KDC)
- $B \rightarrow A : E_K(N_2)$
(OK Alice, But can you prove to me that you are indeed Alice and know the key?)
- $A \rightarrow B : E_K(f(N_2))$ (Sure, I can!)

Session Key Exchange with KDC- Needham Schroeder Protocol (Corrected version with mutual authentication)

- $A \rightarrow KDC : ID_A || ID_B || N_1$
(Hello, I am alice, I want to talk to Bob, I need a session key and here is a random nonce identifying the request)
- $KDC \rightarrow A : E_{K_A}(K || ID_B || N_1 || E_{K_B}(TS1, K || ID_A))$
Encrypted (Here is a key, for you to talk to Bob as per your request N_1 and also an envelope to Bob containing the same key)
- $A \rightarrow B : E_K(TS2, B), E_{K_B}(TS1, K || ID_A)$
I would like to talk using key in envelope sent by KDC, here is an authenticator
- $B \rightarrow A : E_K(TS2 + 1, A)$
OK Alice, here is a proof that I am really Bob

Version 4 Summary

(a) Authentication Service Exchange: to obtain ticket-granting ticket

(1) $C \rightarrow AS: ID_c \parallel ID_{tgs} \parallel TS_1$

(2) $AS \rightarrow C: E_{K_c} [K_{c,tgs} \parallel ID_{tgs} \parallel TS_2 \parallel Lifetime_2 \parallel Ticket_{tgs}]$

$$Ticket_{tgs} = E_{K_{tgs}} [K_{c,tgs} \parallel ID_c \parallel AD_c \parallel ID_{tgs} \parallel TS_2 \parallel Lifetime_2]$$

(b) Ticket-Granting Service Exchange: to obtain service-granting ticket

(3) $C \rightarrow TGS: ID_v \parallel Ticket_{tgs} \parallel Authenticator_c$

(4) $TGS \rightarrow C: E_{K_{c,tgs}} [K_{c,v} \parallel ID_v \parallel TS_4 \parallel Ticket_v]$

$$Ticket_{tgs} = E_{K_{tgs}} [K_{c,tgs} \parallel ID_c \parallel AD_c \parallel ID_{tgs} \parallel TS_2 \parallel Lifetime_2]$$

$$Ticket_v = E_{K_v} [K_{c,v} \parallel ID_c \parallel AD_c \parallel ID_v \parallel TS_4 \parallel Lifetime_4]$$

$$Authenticator_c = E_{K_{c,tgs}} [ID_c \parallel AD_c \parallel TS_3]$$

(c) Client/Server Authentication Exchange: to obtain service

(5) $C \rightarrow K: Ticket_v \parallel Authenticator_c$

(6) $K \rightarrow C: E_{K_{c,v}} [TS_5 + 1]$ (for mutual authentication)

$$Ticket_v = E_{K_v} [K_{c,v} \parallel ID_c \parallel AD_c \parallel ID_v \parallel TS_4 \parallel Lifetime_4]$$

$$Authenticator_c = E_{K_{c,v}} [ID_c \parallel AD_c \parallel TS_5]$$

MAC Based Authentication

- Message Authentication Code(MAC) algorithm is a symmetric key cryptographic technique to provide message authentication.
- For establishing MAC process, the sender and receiver share a secret key K .
- Essentially, a MAC is an encrypted checksum generated on the underlying message that is sent along with a message to ensure message authentication.
- But in entity authentication, the procedure will be like as follows:
 - 1 $A \rightarrow B$ A, r_A
 - 2 $B \rightarrow A$ $r_B, HMAC_K(r_B, r_A, A)$
 - 3 $A \rightarrow B$ $HMAC_K(r_A, r_B, B)$
- Faster than encryption based protocols(computationally)

Public Key based Authentication(Needham-Shroeder(NS) PK-based)

- Assuming public keys are distributed between entities,
 - 1 $A \rightarrow B$ $Enc_{pkb}(rA, A)$
 - 2 $B \rightarrow A$ $Enc_{pka}(rA, rB)$
 - 3 $A \rightarrow B$ $Enc_{pkb}(rB)$
- Since the public key is available to everyone, there is chances of attack, can be solved by:
 - 1 $A \rightarrow B$ $Enc_{pkb}(rA, A)$
 - 2 $B \rightarrow A$ $Enc_{pka}(rA, rB, B)$
 - 3 $A \rightarrow B$ $Enc_{pkb}(rB)$

Signature Based Authentication (Assuming public keys are distributed between entities)

- **A auth B**

- ① $A \rightarrow B$: Hi Bob, this is Alice!
- ② $B \rightarrow A$: r (a challenge)
- ③ $A \rightarrow B$: $Sig_{SK_a}(r, B)$ (response)

- **A auth B, B auth A** (run two copies; piggyback common flows)

- ① $A \rightarrow B$: A, rA (could sign this too)
- ② $B \rightarrow A$: $rB, Sig_{SK_b}(rB, rA, A)$
- ③ $A \rightarrow B$: $Sig_{SK_a}(rA, rB, B)$

Authenticated Key Exchange(AKE)

- Public-key operations are costly.
- Why not
 - 1 Use public key mutual authentication protocols to exchange a symmetric key.
 - 2 Use this symmetric key with a symmetric encryption to secure subsequent communication.
- Authenticated key exchange or Authenticated key agreement is the exchange of session key in a key exchange protocol which also authenticates the identities of parties involved in key exchange.

AKE Protocol

- ① $A \rightarrow B: A, rA, Enc_{PK_b}(K)$
- ② $B \rightarrow A: rB, Sig_{SK_b}(rB, rA, A)$
- ③ $A \rightarrow B: Sig_{SK_a}(rA, rB, B)$
- ④ A and B output K as the authenticated key.
 - Such a protocol can be instantiated using RSA encryption/signing.
 - Generally only the server authenticates to the client, not vice versa.

X.509: One Way Authentication

- 1 message($A \rightarrow B$) used to establish
 - the identity of A and that message is from A
 - message was intended for B
 - integrity originality of message



X.509: Two Way Authentication

- 2 messages ($A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A$) which also establishes in addition:
 - the identity of B and that reply is from B
 - that reply is intended for A
 - integrity and originality of reply



X.509: Three Way Authentication

- 3 messages ($A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A, A \rightarrow B$) which enables above authentication without the need for synchronised clocks.

