Threat Modelling for Symbolic Evaluation Dolev-Yao

Design and Verification of Security Protocols and Security Ceremonies

Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciências da Computação Dr. Jean Everson Martina

August-November 2016





How to Start!

• How can we tell if a cryptographic protocol or a security ceremony is secure?

How to Start!

- How can we tell if a cryptographic protocol or a security ceremony is secure?
- Phrased another way, how can we be sure that a given protocol/ceremony meets a given security goal?

How to Start!

- How can we tell if a cryptographic protocol or a security ceremony is secure?
- Phrased another way, how can we be sure that a given protocol/ceremony meets a given security goal?
- Whom are we defending against?

• The sense of security is directly related to the threats available within the environment;

- The sense of security is directly related to the threats available within the environment:
- One would feel unsafe in a setting where others would feel secure;

- The sense of security is directly related to the threats available within the environment:
- One would feel unsafe in a setting where others would feel secure;
- Is security a sensation?

As the security is related to the threats:

- As the security is related to the threats:
 - Assume no threats and you will be secure!

- As the security is related to the threats:
 - Assume no threats and you will be secure!
 - Assume weaker threats and you still be secure;

- As the security is related to the threats:
 - Assume no threats and you will be secure!
 - Assume weaker threats and you still be secure;
 - Are we able to foresee all the threats in a scenario?

 We can have two different things, one that we consider secure and another that we don't;

- We can have two different things, one that we consider secure and another that we don't;
- How do we compare two different things in terms of security?

- We can have two different things, one that we consider secure and another that we don't;
- How do we compare two different things in terms of security?
- We need a baseline for comparison;

- We can have two different things, one that we consider secure and another that we don't;
- How do we compare two different things in terms of security?
- We need a baseline for comparison;
- The name of this baseline is a Threat Model.

- We can recall the NSPKP example:
 - Needham and Schroeder assumed no internal could be an attacker;

- We can recall the NSPKP example:
 - Needham and Schroeder assumed no internal could be an attacker;
 - Everything worked for 15 years;

- We can recall the NSPKP example:
 - Needham and Schroeder assumed no internal could be an attacker;
 - Everything worked for 15 years;
 - Gavin Lowe assumed an internal could engage in the protocol to take advantage;

- We can recall the NSPKP example:
 - Needham and Schroeder assumed no internal could be an attacker;
 - Everything worked for 15 years;
 - Gavin Lowe assumed an internal could engage in the protocol to take advantage;
 - The protocol is considered broken since.

Importance of Threat Models

Lesson from NSSPK

To claim security and not to be surprised in the future you need to clearly specify the threat model of your protocol or ceremony and it must be as close as the environment where the protocol or ceremony will run within.

 D. Dolev and A. Yao. "On the security of public key protocols". IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 29(2):198-208. 1983;

- D. Dolev and A. Yao. "On the security of public key protocols". IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 29(2):198-208. 1983;
- The original motivation for the paper was to verify public key protocols against active attackers with considerable power;

- D. Dolev and A. Yao. "On the security of public key protocols". IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 29(2):198-208. 1983;
- The original motivation for the paper was to verify public key protocols against active attackers with considerable power;
- The setting for the paper was the cold war times;

- D. Dolev and A. Yao. "On the security of public key protocols". IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 29(2):198-208. 1983;
- The original motivation for the paper was to verify public key protocols against active attackers with considerable power;
- The setting for the paper was the cold war times;
- Most mechanised formal methods for security analysis use some version of this model.

• The underlying public key system is 'perfectly secure':

- The underlying public key system is 'perfectly secure':
 - One-way functions are unbreakable;

- The underlying public key system is 'perfectly secure':
 - One-way functions are unbreakable;
 - Public directory is secure and cannot be tampered with;

- The underlying public key system is 'perfectly secure':
 - One-way functions are unbreakable;
 - Public directory is secure and cannot be tampered with;
 - Everyone has access to all public keys;

- The underlying public key system is 'perfectly secure':
 - One-way functions are unbreakable;
 - Public directory is secure and cannot be tampered with;
 - Everyone has access to all public keys;
 - Only the peer knows his private key.

• Adversary has complete control over the entire network:

- Adversary has complete control over the entire network:
 - He acts as a legitimate user;

- Adversary has complete control over the entire network:
 - He acts as a legitimate user;
 - He can obtain any message from any party;

- Adversary has complete control over the entire network:
 - He acts as a legitimate user;
 - He can obtain any message from any party;
 - He can initiate the protocol with any party, and can be a receiver to any party in the network;

- Adversary has complete control over the entire network:
 - He acts as a legitimate user;
 - He can obtain any message from any party;
 - He can initiate the protocol with any party, and can be a receiver to any party in the network;
 - Can read any message, decompose it into parts and re-assemble.

- Adversary has complete control over the entire network:
 - He acts as a legitimate user;
 - He can obtain any message from any party;
 - He can initiate the protocol with any party, and can be a receiver to any party in the network;
 - Can read any message, decompose it into parts and re-assemble.

Concurrent executions of the protocol can occur;

The Dolev-Yao Assumptions

- Concurrent executions of the protocol can occur;
- The attacker cannot gain partial knowledge and perform statistical tests;

The Dolev-Yao Assumptions

- Concurrent executions of the protocol can occur;
- The attacker cannot gain partial knowledge and perform statistical tests;
- The attacker can decrypt if and only if he knows the correct key;

The Dolev-Yao Assumptions

- Concurrent executions of the protocol can occur;
- The attacker cannot gain partial knowledge and perform statistical tests;
- The attacker can decrypt if and only if he knows the correct key;
- We assumes that cryptographic functions have no special properties.

 The model has the following features, which can be viewed as either benefits or restrictions depending on what you are trying to do:

- The model has the following features, which can be viewed as either benefits or restrictions depending on what you are trying to do:
 - It is simple to describe protocols in this model;

- The model has the following features, which can be viewed as either benefits or restrictions depending on what you are trying to do:
 - It is simple to describe protocols in this model;
 - Adversary has unlimited power, so although this is a conservative approach this may not be realistic;

- The model has the following features, which can be viewed as either benefits or restrictions depending on what you are trying to do:
 - It is simple to describe protocols in this model;
 - Adversary has unlimited power, so although this is a conservative approach this may not be realistic;
 - Protocols have a 'black-box' nature, which means that linking individual protocols with others is extremely difficult. Dolev-Yao helps on that.

 Secrecy properties: Alice is given a message M as input, and starts exchanging messages with Bob, with the goal of sending message M to Bob in a secret way;

- Secrecy properties: Alice is given a message M as input, and starts exchanging messages with Bob, with the goal of sending message M to Bob in a secret way;
- The security property is that an adversary cannot recover M, even if actively interfering with the protocol;

- Secrecy properties: Alice is given a message M as input, and starts exchanging messages with Bob, with the goal of sending message M to Bob in a secret way;
- The security property is that an adversary cannot recover M, even if actively interfering with the protocol;
- No other security properties are considered.

 Stateless parties: The main limitation on the honest parties is that they are stateless;

- Stateless parties: The main limitation on the honest parties is that they are stateless;
- The messages transmitted by a party at every step of the protocol are a function of their initial knowledge and the message they just received;
- In particular, parties cannot use information collected from previous messages not addressed to them;
- For this reason, these protocols have been named "ping-pong" protocols;

- Stateless parties: The main limitation on the honest parties is that they are stateless;
- The messages transmitted by a party at every step of the protocol are a function of their initial knowledge and the message they just received;
- In particular, parties cannot use information collected from previous messages not addressed to them;
- For this reason, these protocols have been named "ping-pong" protocols;
- We observe that the stateless restriction is only put on the honest parties, and the adversary can maintain state, record communications, and store values that are subsequently used in the construction of messages;

 Concurrent execution: The adversary can start an arbitrary number of protocol executions, involving different sets of parties, where each player can participate in several concurrent executions;

- Concurrent execution: The adversary can start an arbitrary number of protocol executions, involving different sets of parties, where each player can participate in several concurrent executions;
- In this respect, the model considered here is more general than the computational model considered at the time, which focused on single protocol execution;

- Concurrent execution: The adversary can start an arbitrary number of protocol executions, involving different sets of parties, where each player can participate in several concurrent executions;
- In this respect, the model considered here is more general than the computational model considered at the time, which focused on single protocol execution;
- The computational cryptography community started addressing the important issue of concurrency only in the 90's.

 In the Dolev-Yao model, there are two kinds of active parties: honest participants and the adversary;

- In the Dolev-Yao model, there are two kinds of active parties: honest participants and the adversary;
- The honest participants follow the steps of the protocol without deviation;

- In the Dolev-Yao model, there are two kinds of active parties: honest participants and the adversary;
- The honest participants follow the steps of the protocol without deviation;
- The attacker do not follow the rules;

- In the Dolev-Yao model, there are two kinds of active parties: honest participants and the adversary;
- The honest participants follow the steps of the protocol without deviation;
- The attacker do not follow the rules;
- The peers do not share long term secrets, even the attacker keeps things for himself.

 All the peers start with some knowledge set, including all public information, peers names and their own random numbers to be used as nonces;

- All the peers start with some knowledge set, including all public information, peers names and their own random numbers to be used as nonces;
- If a message is cast in the network, it go to the destination's knowledge set and the attackers knowledge set (Eavesdrop);

- From the attacker knowledge set:
 - He can decrypt whatever he has the key to do so and re-encrypt whatever he know with the keys he has at hand (Encryption);

- From the attacker knowledge set:
 - He can decrypt whatever he has the key to do so and re-encrypt whatever he know with the keys he has at hand (Encryption);
 - He can break down messages to atomic components (Atomic Breakdown);

- From the attacker knowledge set:
 - He can decrypt whatever he has the key to do so and re-encrypt whatever he know with the keys he has at hand (Encryption);
 - He can break down messages to atomic components (Atomic Breakdown);
 - He can re-arrange all the components he knows in all possible ways to form new messages (Fabricate);

He can modify messages in transit (Modify);

- He can modify messages in transit (Modify);
- He can replay any message he collects from traffic (Replay);

- He can modify messages in transit (Modify);
- He can replay any message he collects from traffic (Replay);
- He can prevent the delivery of any message (Block);

- He can modify messages in transit (Modify);
- He can replay any message he collects from traffic (Replay);
- He can prevent the delivery of any message (Block);
- He can engage legitimately with other peers on the protocol (Initiate);

- He can modify messages in transit (Modify);
- He can replay any message he collects from traffic (Replay);
- He can prevent the delivery of any message (Block);
- He can engage legitimately with other peers on the protocol (Initiate);
- He can re-arrange the order of the messages in traffic (Re-order);

- He can modify messages in transit (Modify);
- He can replay any message he collects from traffic (Replay);
- He can prevent the delivery of any message (Block);
- He can engage legitimately with other peers on the protocol (Initiate);
- He can re-arrange the order of the messages in traffic (Re-order);
- He can mimic the identity of any peer in the network (Spoof).

It is usually logically implemented;

- It is usually logically implemented;
- It uses free variables to allow for the powers to happen;

- It is usually logically implemented;
- It uses free variables to allow for the powers to happen;
- Although the amount of knowledge the attacker can have is potentially unbound, it is finite;

- It is usually logically implemented;
- It uses free variables to allow for the powers to happen;
- Although the amount of knowledge the attacker can have is potentially unbound, it is finite;
- Some techniques create other significant limits to the Dolev-Yao Threat Model.

Is Dolev-Yao enough to put a security protocols against and claim it secure?

- Is Dolev-Yao enough to put a security protocols against and claim it secure?
- Can you foresee some capability missing?

- Is Dolev-Yao enough to put a security protocols against and claim it secure?
- Can you foresee some capability missing?
- Is Dolev-Yao sufficient to compare two security protocols?

- Is Dolev-Yao enough to put a security protocols against and claim it secure?
- Can you foresee some capability missing?
- Is Dolev-Yao sufficient to compare two security protocols?
- What can go wrong when we compare two security protocols that use Dolev-Yao as Threat Model

Questions????



creative commons



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

