

Ad Hoc Networks – Network Access Control

Shambhu Upadhyaya
Wireless Network Security
CSE 566 (Lecture 22)



University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Shambhu Upadhyaya
1

Introduction

- Ad hoc networks do not implement any network access control
- Network becomes vulnerable to resource consumption attacks
- It may be a common attack in adversarial environment
- Most routing protocols do not address this type of attack – a node trusts its neighbors
- Some solutions talk about authenticating control packets
- Need to provide access control for both control and data packets



University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Shambhu Upadhyaya
2

Naïve Solution

- Employ a network-wide key so every node can use it to compute a MAC on the packets it sends and verifies packets from neighbors
- Disadvantage
 - Attacker needs to compromise one node
 - If global key is divulged, difficult to identify the compromised node (lack of source authentication)
 - Expensive to recover from compromise since group key update is involved
- Digital signature for packet source authentication
 - Forbiddingly expensive
- Need a lightweight authentication protocol in ad hoc networks



University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Shambhu Upadhyaya

3

Proposed Solution

- Hop-by-hop authentication
- Node joining ad hoc network needs to perform only some inexpensive operations to bootstrap a trust relationship
- Then switch to a very lightweight protocol for traffic authentication
- Transparent and resides in between the data link layer and the network layer
- Based on one-way hash chains and TESLA for broadcast source authentication



University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Shambhu Upadhyaya

4

Assumptions

- Links are bidirectional
- Large networks (may be disjoint or mergeable)
- Nodes are relatively underpowered
- Loose time synchronization
- Physical layer uses techniques such as spread spectrum to prevent jamming attacks



More Assumptions

- Security Assumptions
 - Each node possesses a public key certificate issued by a trusted CA (such as in a university)
 - Triangular inequality in receiving packets
- Attack models
 - Resource consumption attacks (external or internal)
 - Eavesdrop, drop packets, replay older packets or modify overheard packets and re-inject them into network



Design Goals

- Efficiency
 - All operations based on public key technique should be minimized
- Scalability
- Immediate authentication
 - Delay will incur buffering overhead
- Transparency and independence
 - New protocol should work with other protocols, independent of deployed routing protocols



University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Shambhu Upadhyaya
7

Background

- One-way key chains and TESLA
- One-way Hash Chain
 - Chain of key generated through repeated application of a one-way hash function on a random no.
 - If $y=F(x)$, it is computationally infeasible to compute x given y
- TESLA
 - Broadcast authentication scheme that uses one-way key chain along with MAC



University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Shambhu Upadhyaya
8

One-way Hash Chain

- One-way hash chain authentication
 - Sender first signs the last value (called commitment) in the chain with its private key
 - This guarantees the authenticity of $K(0)$
 - Then the sender discloses key in the reverse order
 - Receiver can verify $K(j)$ by checking if $K(j-1) = F(K(j))$ if it has $K(j-1)$



University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Shambhu Upadhyaya
9

Tesla

- Tesla authentication
 - Sender uses a key K from its chain to compute a MAC over packet $P(i)$
 - Attach the MAC to $P(i)$
 - Receiver cannot verify $P(i)$ rightaway
 - K is disclosed in the next packet $P(i+1)$
 - This allows receiver to verify authenticity of K
 - You can now compute MAC
 - If both K and MAC are correct and if $P(i)$ is received before $P(i+1)$, receiver accepts $P(i)$
- Receiver should be able to determine the sending time of each packet
 - Done through periodic key disclosure and loose time synchronization
- Drawback is that there is delay in authenticating a packet



University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Shambhu Upadhyaya
10

LHAP Details

- Architecture, Lightweight traffic authentication, trust management
- Architecture
 - Transparency and independence
 - Resides between data link and network layers
 - To transmit a packet
 - LHAP adds a header (node id, packet type, authentication tag)
 - Pass it to data link layer
 - To receive a packet
 - Verify authentication
 - If valid, remove the header and pass the packet to network layer; otherwise, discard



Architectural Features

- Every node in the network verifies every packet
- Packets from unauthorized nodes are dropped
- Hop-by-hop authentication
- Efficiency
 - Lightweight packet authentication
 - Lightweight trust management
- Packet authentication based on one-way hash chain
- Tesla for bootstrapping trust between nodes and maintaining trust between nodes (reduces no. of public key operations)



Lightweight Traffic Authentication

- Each node generates a one-way key chain (keys are called Traffic key)
- Used to authenticate traffic to immediate neighbors
- When a node joins a network, every neighbor obtains an authenticated traffic key from the node's key chain to establish trust relationship for the first time
- When transmitting a packet, a node appends a new traffic key to the packet
- This helps others verify authenticity of packets when the new node starts transmission (verify the attached traffic key)



Trust Management

- Trust bootstrapping, trust maintenance, trust termination
- Don't want to use public key based technique
- Instead uses Tesla to reduce the no. of signature operations to one
 - Every node uses digital signatures only once to bootstrap a Tesla key chain
 - Tesla keys are then used to provide authenticated traffic keys
- Trust maintenance is by periodic announcement of its most recently released traffic keys authenticated by its Tesla keys
 - Neighbors will drop any packets that are authenticated by an old traffic key
 - This is called KEYUPDATE message
 - If no KEYUPDATE happens for a long time, you terminate trust relationship



LHAP Building Blocks

- Traffic authentication and trust management
- Traffic authentication
 - Uses one-way key chains (doesn't use Tesla, why?)
 - Every node uses traffic keys for authenticating traffic packets from itself or received from neighbor
 - When a node wants to broadcast a message, it sends the message and its next traffic key
 - Every receiving node verifies the authenticity of the packet by verifying the traffic key
 - Advantages
 - Enables instant verification of traffic packets
 - Unlike Tesla, it is not necessary to disclose traffic keys periodically



University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Shambhu Upadhyaya
15

LHAP Building Blocks, Contd..

- Trust bootstrapping
 - A node that wishes to join a network must compute two key chains
 - Traffic key chain and Tesla key chain
 - It then signs the commitments of these key chains and broadcasts them to neighbors
 - Each neighbor first verifies the new node's certificate using CA's public key
 - Then uses node's public key in the certificate to verify the signature (authenticity of the commitments)
 - Updates its TRUST table
 - To authenticate itself to node A, it sends an ACK to A
 - Upon receiving ACK, node A verifies the signature and records the neighbor's key chain commitments



University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Shambhu Upadhyaya
16

LHAP Building Blocks, Contd..

- Maintenance
 - Periodically each node broadcasts a KEYUPDATE message to neighbors
 - Update the TRUST tables accordingly
- Termination
 - When a compromised node is detected and announced (permanent)
 - If a node doesn't receive a valid KEYUPDAATE message from a neighbor for longer than one Tesla interval (temporary)



University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Shambhu Upadhyaya
17

Summary

- Provides protection against all kinds of attacks – outside attacks, wormhole and rushing attacks and insider attacks
- Simulation indicates that LHAP is efficient and allows a tradeoff between security and performance
 - Bandwidth overhead, and amount of normal packet drop etc. are studied



University at Buffalo The State University of New York

Shambhu Upadhyaya
18

References

- Sencun Zhu, Shouhuai Xu, Sanjeev Setia, Sushil Jajodia, "LHAP: A Lightweight Hop-by-Hop Authentication Protocol for Ad-Hoc Networks", ACM Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems, 2003



University at Buffalo *The State University of New York*

Shambhu Upadhyaya
19