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## Outline

- 1. Cryptology: concepts and algorithms
- symmetric algorithms for confidentiality
- symmetric algorithms for data authentication
- public-key cryptology
- 2. Cryptology: protocols
- identification/entity authentication
- key establishment
- 3. Public-Key Infrastructure principles
- 4. Networking protocols
- email, web, IPsec, SSL/TLS
- 5. New developments in cryptology
- 6. How to use cryptography well
- 7. Hash functions


## Definitions (ctd)

data

## encryption

## entities

## anonymity

identification

Confidentiality
Integrity
Availability
authentication data authentication confidentiality

## Authorisation

Non-repudiation of origin, receipt
Contract signing
Notarisation and Timestamping
E-voting, e-auction,...

## Cryptology: basic principles

Alice

Clear text

Bob

$\Rightarrow \underset{\substack{\text { CRYP } \\ \text { TOB } \\ \text { OX }}}{\substack{\operatorname{T}^{\wedge} \mathrm{C} \& \\ \text { @\& }( }}$

Eve Lusten of Modiluy


## Identification

- the problem
- passwords
- challenge response with symmetric key and MAC (symmetric tokens)
- challenge response with public key (signatures, ZK)
- biometry
- symmetric key establishment and Kerberos
- public key establishment


## Entity authentication



Eve
Bob

## Entity authentication



## Identification is based on one or more of the following elements:

- what someone knows
- password, PIN
- what someone has
- magstripe card, smart card

- what someone is (biometrics)
- fingerprint, retina, hand shape,...
- how someone does something
- manual signature, typing pattern
- where someone is
- dialback, location based services (GSM, secure GPS)


## Identification with passwords


-Eve can guess the password
-Eve can listen to the channel and learn Alice's password
-Bob needs to know Alice's secret
-Bob needs to store Alice's secret in a secure way

## Improved identification with passwords



Bob stores $f(P)$ rather than Alice's secret $P$

- it is difficult to deduce $P$ from $f(P)$


## Password entropy: effective key length



| $\square 5$ chars |
| :--- |
| $\square 6$ chars |
| $\square 7$ chars |
| $\square 8$ chars |
| $\square 9$ chars |
| $\square 10$ chars |

Problem: passwords from dictionaries

## Improved+ identification with passwords



Bob stores $f(P, S) \| S$ rather than Alice's secret $P$
it is harder to attack the passwords of all users simultaneously


## Example: UNIX

- Function f()$=$ DES applied 25 times to the all zero plaintext with as key the password P (87-bit characters)
- Salt: 12-bit modification to DES
- etc/passwd public
- PC: 2 million passwords/second
- But time-memory tradeoff...
- Precomputation per salt $25.2^{56}$
- Storage per salt: 2 Terabyte
- Find one key in time $25.2^{38}$


## Problem: human memory is limited



- Solution: store key K on magstripe, USB key, hard disk
- Stops guessing attacks

But this does not solve the other problems related to passwords

And now you identify the card, not the user....

## Improvement: Static Data Authentication

- Replace K by a signature of a third party CA (Certification Authority) on Alice's name: SigSK $_{\text {CA }}$ (Alice) $=$ special certificate
- Advantage: can be verified using a public string $\mathrm{PK}_{\mathrm{CA}}$
- Advantage: can only be generated by CA
- Disadvantage: signature $=40 . .128$ bytes
- Disadvantage: can still be copied/intercepted


## "Certificate" for static data authentication

DN: $\mathrm{Cn}=$ Jan Peeters, $0=K B C, c=B E$
Serial \#: 8391037 Start: 3/12/08 1:00 $\quad$ Validity period
End: 4/12/09 12:01 Revocation information
CRL: cn=RVC,
$0=E M V, c=B E$
Name of issuing CA

CA DN: o=EMV, c=BE CA's Digital signature on the data in the certificate

## Entity authentication with symmetric token

Challenge response protocol

random number $r$

## MACK(r)

- Eavesdropping no longer effective
- Bob still needs secret key K


## Entity authentication with symmetric token

 With implicit challenge from clock

- Eavesdropping no longer effective
- Bob still needs secret key K
- resynchronization mechanism needed


## Lamport's one-time passwords

 iterated one-way function

## Entity authentication with public key token

Challenge response protocol

## random number r

## $\operatorname{SigSK}_{\mathrm{A}}(\mathrm{r})$

- Eavesdropping no longer effective
- Bob no longer needs a secret - only $\mathrm{PK}_{\mathrm{A}}$


## Entity authentication with ZK

Zero knowledge

## Commitment c

## Challenge e

## Response( $\left.\mathrm{SK}_{\mathrm{A}}, \mathrm{e}, \mathrm{c}\right)$



- Mathematical proof that Bob only learns that he is talking to Alice (1 bit of information)
- Bob cannot use this information to convince a third party that he is/was talking to Alice


## Mutual authentication

- Many applications need entity authentication in two directions
- !! This is not complete the same as 2 parallel unilateral protocols for entity authentication


## 2 stage authentication

- Local: user to device
- Device to rest of the world


## Biometry

- Based on our unique features
- Identification or verification
- Is this Alice?
- Check against watchlist
- Has this person ever registered in the system?


## Some unique features

## DNA

 skin

Een lichtstraal registreert het bloedvatenpatroon op het netvlies, terwiil het oog op een klein doel is gericht.
finger

Een scanner maakt een opname van de geometrie van de vinger.

## Key board dynamics

Software meet ritme, snelheid en duur van toetsaanslag. Nog niet zo'n betrouwbare metina.
een videocamera
maakt een opna-
me van de iris.

## Biometric procedures

- Registration
- Template extraction
- Measurement
- Processing
- Template matching

- Link with applications


## Robustness/performance

- Performance evaluation
- False Acceptance Ratio or False Match Rate
- False Rejection Ratio or False Non-Match Rate
- Application dependent



## Robustness/performance (2)



## Fingerprint

- Used for PC/laptop access
- Widely available
- Reliable and inexpensive
- Simple interface




## Fingerprint (2)

- Small sensor
- Small template (100 bytes)
- Commercially available
- Optical/thermical/capacitive
- Liveness detection
- Problems for some ethnic groups and some professions
- Connotation with crime


## Fingerprint (3): gummy fingers

## Making an Artificial Finger directly from a Live Finger

## How to make a mold



## Hand geometry

- Flexible performance tuning
- Mostly 3D geometry
- Example: 1996 Olympics



## Voice recognition

- Speech processing technology well developed
- Can be used at a distance
- Can use microphone of our gsm
- But tools to spoof exist as well
- Typical applications: complement PIN for mobile or domotica


## Iris Scan

- No contact and fast
- Conventional CCD camera
- 200 parameters
- Template: 512 bytes
- All etnic groups
- Reveals health status



## Retina scan

- Stable and unique pattern of blood vessels
- Invasive
- High security



## Manual signature

- Measure distance, speed, accelerations, pressure
- Familiar
- Easy to use
- Template needs continuous update
- Technology not fully mature



## Facial recognition

- User friendly
- No cooperation needed
- Reliability limited
- Robustness issues
- Lighting conditions
- Glasses/hair/beard/...



## Comparison

| Feature | Uniqueness | Permanent | Performance | Acceptability | Spoofing |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facial | Low | Average | Low | High | Low |
| Fingerprint | High | High | High | Average | High |
| Hand <br> geometry | Average | Average | Average | Average | Average |
| Iris | High | High | High | Low | High |
| Retina | High | Average | High | Low | High |
| Signature | Low | Low | Low | High | Low |
| Voice | Low | Low | Low | High | Low |

## Biometry: pros and cons

- Real person
- User friendly
- Cannot be forwarded
- Little effort for user
- Privacy (medical)
- Intrusive?
- Cannot be replaced
- Risk for physical attacks
- Hygiene
- Does not work everyone, e.g., people with disabilities
- Reliability
- Secure implementation: derive key in a secure way from the biometric
- No cryptographic key


## Location-based authentication

- Dial-back: can be defeated using fake dial tone
- IP addresses and MAC addresses can be spoofed
- Mobile/wireless communications: operator knows access point, but how to convince others?
- Trusted GPS?


## Limitations of entity authentication

- Establish who someone is
- Establish that this person is active
- But what about keeping authenticity alive?


Rest of
communication

## The maffia fraud

- or the grandmaster chess problem



## Solution

- Authenticated key agreement
- Run a mutual entity authentication protocol
- Establish a key
- Encrypt and authenticate all information exchanged using this key


## Key establishment

- The problem
- How to establish secret keys using secret keys?
- How to establish secret keys using public keys?
- Diffie-Hellman and STS
- How to distribute public keys? (PKI)


## Key establishment: the problem

- Cryptology makes it easier to secure information, by replacing the security of information by the security of keys
- The main problem is how to establish these keys
- $95 \%$ of the difficulty
- integrate with application
- if possible transparent to end users


## GSM (1)

Challenge response protocol random number r

## MACK(r)

derivation of session key k for this call

encrypt all data with k

## GSM (2)

- SIM card with long term secret key K (128 bits)
- secret algorithms
- A3: MAC algorithm
- A8: key derivation algorithm
- A5.1/A5.2: encryption algorithm
- anonimity: IMSI (International Mobile Subscriber Identity) replaced by TIMSI (temporary IMSI)
- the next TIMSI is sent (encrypted) during the call set-up


## Point-to point symmetric key distribution

- Before: Alice and Bob share long term secret $K_{A B}$ generate session key k $E K_{A B}(k \|$ time $\|$ Bob $)$
decrypt


## $\underset{\leftarrow}{E k(\text { time } \| \text { Alice } \| \text { hello) }}$

- After: Alice and Bob share a short term key $k$
- which they can use to protect a specific interaction
- which can be thrown away at the end of the session
- Alice and Bob have also authenticated each other


## Symmetric key distribution with 3rd party

- Before (KDC=Key Distribution Center)
- Alice shares a long term secret with KDC: $\boldsymbol{K}_{\boldsymbol{A}}$
- Bob shares long term secret with KDC: $\boldsymbol{K}_{B}$

KDC generate session key k

$$
\left.\begin{array}{c}
\text { need } \\
\text { key } \\
\text { for }
\end{array}\right\} \quad \mid E K_{A}(k) \| E K_{B}(k)
$$

!! never use this protocol in practice it is just a toy example

Bob


# Symmetric key distribution with 3rd party(2) 

- After: Alice and Bob share a short term key $k$
- Need to trust third party!
- Single point of failure in system


## Kerberos/Single Sign On (SSO)

- Alice uses her password only once per day



## TGS



## Kerberos/Single Sign On (2)

- Step 1: Alice gets a "day key" $\boldsymbol{K}_{\boldsymbol{A}}$ from AS (Authentication Server)
- based on a Alice's password (long term secret)
$-\boldsymbol{K}_{A}$ is stored on Alice's machine and deleted in the evening
- Step 2: Alice uses $\boldsymbol{K}_{A}$ to get application keys $k_{i}$ from TGS (Ticket Granting Server)
- Step 3: Alice can talk securely to applications (printer, file server) using application keys $\boldsymbol{k}_{i}$

A public-key distribution protocol: Diffie-Hellman

- Before: Alice and Bob have never met and share no secrets; they know a public system parameter $\alpha$

compute $k=\left(\alpha^{y}\right)^{x}$
compute $k=\left(\alpha^{x}\right)^{y}$
- After: Alice and Bob share a short term key $k$
- Eve cannot compute $k$ : in several mathematical structures it is hard to derive $x$ from $\alpha^{x}$
(this is known as the discrete logarithm problem)


## Diffie-Hellman (continued)



- BUT: How does Alice know that she shares this secret key $\boldsymbol{k}$ with Bob?
- Answer: Alice has no idea at all about who the other person is! The same holds for Bob.


## Meet-in-the middle attack

- Eve shares a key $k l$ with Alice and a key $k 2$ with Bob
- Requires active attack



## Station to Station protocol (STS)

- The problem can be fixed by adding digital signatures
- This protocol plays a very important role on the Internet (under different names)



## IKE - Main Mode with Digital Signatures



Initiator

K derived from
master $=\operatorname{prf}\left(N_{i} \| N_{r}, g^{x y}\right)$
$\mathrm{SIG}_{\mathrm{i}}=$ Signature on
$\mathrm{H}\left(\right.$ master, $\left.\mathrm{g}^{\mathrm{x}}| | \mathrm{g}^{\mathrm{y}}\|\ldots\| \mathrm{I} . . \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$


H is equal to prf or the hash function tied to the signature algorithm (all inputs are concatenated)

# Key establishment in future mobile systems 


random number r

$\operatorname{Sig} A\left(r|\mid B),{ }^{\prime}\right.$

$$
\operatorname{SigB}\left(\mathrm{r}\left\|\mathrm{r}^{\prime}\right\| \mathrm{A} \| \mathrm{B}\right)
$$

[+] slightly more efficient (ECC)

## Key transport using RSA

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { generate } k \\
E_{P K B}(k)
\end{gathered}
$$

# decrypt using SKB to obtain $k$ 

- How does Bob know that $\boldsymbol{k}$ is a fresh key?
- How does Bob know that this key $\boldsymbol{k}$ is coming from Alice?
- How does Alice know that Bob has received the key $k$ and that Bob is present (entity authentication)?


## Key transport using RSA (2)

generate $k$

$$
E_{P K B}(k) \quad \xrightarrow{E_{P K B}\left(k \| \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)} \begin{gathered}
\text { decrypt using } \\
\text { SKB to } \\
\text { obtain } k
\end{gathered}
$$

- Freshness is solved with a timestamp $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{A}}$


## Key transport using RSA (3)

generate $k$

$$
\xrightarrow{\operatorname{Sig}_{S K A}\left(E_{P K B}\left(k \| \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)\right)} \quad \begin{gathered}
\text { decrypt using } \\
\text { SKB and } \\
\text { verify using } \\
\text { PKA }
\end{gathered}
$$

- Alice authenticates by signing the message
- There are still attacks (signature stripping...)


## Key transport using RSA (4): X. 509

generate $k$

$$
\xrightarrow{\operatorname{Sig}_{S K A}\left(B\left\|\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{A}}\right\| E_{P K B}(A \| k)\right)} \begin{gathered}
\left\|\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{A}}\right\| E_{P K B}(A \| k)
\end{gathered} \begin{gathered}
\text { decrypt using } \\
\text { SKB and } \\
\text { verify using } \\
\text { PKA }
\end{gathered}
$$

Mutual: B can return a similar message including part of the first message
Problem (compared to D-H/STS): lack of forward secrecy

If the long term key $S K B$ of Bob leaks, all past session keys can be recovered!

## Distribution of public keys

- How do you know whose public key you have?
- Where do you get public keys?
- How do you trust public keys?
- What should you do if your private key is compromised?

reduce protection of public key of many users to knowledge of a single public key of a Certification Authority (CA)

digital certificates \&
Public Key Infrastructure (PKI)

## Public Key Certificates



## Certificate Revocation List



## Essential PKI Components

- Certification Authority
- Revocation system
- Certificate repository ("directory")
- Key backup and recovery system
- Support for non-repudiation
- Automatic key update
- Management of key histories
- Cross-certification
- PKI-ready application software

PKI-ready application software: old view of PKI (does not work in practice)


## Example of a key hierarchy



