



Lightweight Authentication and Key Exchange

John Viega

viega@securesoftware.com

- Drive discussion and understanding about requirements
- The crypto world has produced good solutions that lead to operational nightmares (SSL)
- Lots of off-the-shelf solutions
- Solutions tend not to map well to implicit requirements

- **Entity authentication**
 - Who's on the other side
 - Connections themselves are assumed virtual
 - All messages must be authenticated as coming from a set of entities
 - Non-repudiation usually isn't a goal and is expensive
- **A goal for both parties: message integrity**
- **Another goal: Temporal consistency**
 - Attackers shouldn't replay messages
 - Missing messages should be detectable
- **Another goal: connection confidentiality**
- **All can be provided with layered services**

What can go wrong?

- **One entity can pretend to be another**
 - False login
 - Connect to a fake server
 - “Man-in-the-middle”: attacker as relay
- **Single-entity authentication is rarely enough**
 - Only when no notion of access control
- **Spectacular failures result**
 - Do you click the lock on your browser?
 - Would my mom know what to look for if she did?
 - This is true even in non-web applications
- **Password authentication is notably suspect**
 - Particularly, dictionary attacks

- **Authentication requires secrets**
- ***Efficient* communication needs shared secrets**
 - Though not necessarily long-term
- **Key management is...**
 - Necessary
 - A source of tremendous risk
- **Should server admins have user passwords?**
- **Should low-entropy passwords persist?**
- **Should we lock out possible attackers?**

- **If insecure channels are necessary, only for account setup**

- **With a shared secret, who needs it?**
- **There's already a virtual "established connection"**
- **Might not want to save state**
 - Managing sequential nonces is a pain
- **Avoid exposing our "good" secrets**
 - Many messages encrypted under same key
 - Good design: single key for single purpose
- **Forward secrecy: damage control**
 - Compromise of some secrets won't compromise all

Usability should be priority #1

- **A hard balance to strike**
- **Defense-in-depth theoretically helps...**
- **Physical solutions are slow to adopt**
 - Cost
 - Operational problems (newest I've heard: germs)
- **Passwords are "usable"...**
- **... but not when they're secure!**
- **Best bet?**
 - A range of solutions to meet various needs
 - Defaults should be a good compromise
 - We'll revisit later

- **Public key crypto is expensive**
- **ECC may not help enough for small devices**
- **AKE takes significant time on a CryptoPhone**
- **More an issue on server side**

- **Terse protocols with minimal messages?**

- **Traditional approach: lack of attacks**
 - Assurance requires extensive review
- **Model checking: prove resistance to attacks**
 - Can only do this for known attacks
 - Large state spaces can require approximations
 - In practice, all checkers have limitations
- **Provable security: prove secure**
 - In the sense of an attack implying an attack on a vetted algorithm (e.g., AES, RSA, Diffie-Hellman)
 - Requires concrete security models and *some* review
 - E.g., Bellare-Rogaway: all network-only attacks

- **802.1X (EAP)**
 - Bad bindings abound
 - Usually assumes trusted (physical) path
- **Radius**
 - Central management
 - Hard to do securely
- **Kerberos**
 - Central management
 - Widely supported, rarely deployed
- **IKE: Internet Key Exchange**
- **Supporting existing infrastructure compelling**
- **Otherwise, why?**

Other Requirements

- **Multi-party problem**
- **Protection against bad random numbers**
- **Support for password resets / changes**
- **Server compromise forbids spoofing?**

- **In general, assume worst feasible threat model**
- **Should \$10/hr tech support be able to reset a password?**
- **People should be leery of bringing a password to someone else's machine**

- **Look at classes of solutions**
- **Plus some commentary**
- **I might be wrong, based on assumptions**
- **Mostly, I've tried to leave it open**
- **Assumptions:**
 - Mutual authentication
 - Usability is a priority
 - Key exchange needs to happen
 - Both parties should contribute random data
- **Ignoring (for now):**
 - Multi-party problem
 - Key servers

- **crypt, MD5-MCF, S/KEY, HTTP Digest Auth, ...**
 - None provide mutual authentication
 - All require existing client-trusted (secure) channel
- **Not much, but easy, given requirements**
- **Forward secrecy requires synchronization**
 - But, easy to do
- **Password-based protocols are susceptible to dictionary attacks**
- **Two messages possible using a nonce**
 - $A \rightarrow \text{GCM}_K(N, X, B) \rightarrow B \rightarrow \text{GCM}_K(N+1, Y, A) \rightarrow A$
 - $S = X \oplus Y$
- **Otherwise, three messages**

- We'll skip the math
- Forward secrecy easier (use ephemeral keys)
- Implementation more complex and slower
- Provably secure protocols, such as modified "Station to Station" (StS).
- Relying on even ad-hoc PKI seems unrealistic
- Password-based possible
- Simple modification to modified StS
- Also, EKE family of protocols

- **Authentication alone shouldn't be enough**
 - Secure channel needs to result
 - Bindings for SecurID would need some work
- **Shared secrets and passwords**
- **Allow devices to cache credentials**
 - Encourage more efficient transfers
 - Discourage day-to-day passwords
- **Support one-time setup for passwords**
- **Bindings for one-time passwords?**
- **Provide guidelines for deployment**
 - Password expiration recommendations
- **Forward secrecy, etc.**

Questions?

viega@securesoftware.com