CSci 4271W Development of Secure Software Systems Day 20: Network protocols Stephen McCamant

Stepnen McCamant University of Minnesota, Computer Science & Engineering

Outline

Brief introduction to networking, cont'd One slide of logistics Some classic network attacks Cryptographic protocols, pt. 1 Key distribution and PKI



IP and ICMP Internet Protocol (IP) forwards individual packets Packets have source and destination addresses, other options Automatic fragmentation (usually avoided) ICMP (I Control Message P) adds errors, ping packets, etc. UDP UDP UDP User Datagram Protocol: thin wrapper around IP Adds source and destination port numbers (each 16-bit) Still connectionless, unreliable OK for some small messages

TCP Flow and congestion control Image: Transmission Control Protocol: provides reliable bidirectional stream abstraction Image: Flow control: match speed to slowest link Image: Packets have sequence numbers, acknowledged in order Image: Window" limits number of packets sent but not ACKed Image: Missed packets resent later Image: Additive increase, multiplicative decrease of rate

Routing

- Where do I send this packet next?
 Table from address ranges to next hops
 Core Internet routers need big tables
 Maintained by complex, insecure, cooperative
 - protocols
 - Internet-level algorithm: BGP (Border Gateway Protocol)

Below IP: ARP

- Address Resolution Protocol maps IP addresses to lower-level address
 - E.g., 48-bit Ethernet MAC address
- Based on local-network broadcast packets
- Complex Ethernets also need their own routing (but called switches)

DNS

- Domain Name System: map more memorable and stable string names to IP addresses
- Hierarchically administered namespace Like Unix paths, but backwards
- 🍯 .edu server delegates to .umn.edu server, etc.

DNS caching and reverse DNS

- To be practical, DNS requires caching
 Of positive and negative results
- But, cache lifetime limited for freshness
- Also, reverse IP to name mapping
 - Based on special top-level domain, IP address written backwards

Classic application: remote login

- Killer app of early Internet: access supercomputers at another university
- 🖲 Telnet: works cross-OS
 - Send character stream, run regular login program
- 🖲 rlogin: BSD Unix
 - Can authenticate based on trusting computer connection comes from
 - (Also rsh, rcp)

Problem set 1 due Friday

- Problem set 1 due 11:59pm Friday on Canvas
- Piazza has a comment expanding on what makes a "high-level" policy
 - Also a good place for remaining questions or clarifications

Outline

Brief introduction to networking, cont'd

One slide of logistics

- Some classic network attacks
- Cryptographic protocols, pt. 1
- Key distribution and PKI

Outline

Brief introduction to networking, cont'd One slide of logistics

Some classic network attacks

- Cryptographic protocols, pt. 1
- Key distribution and PKI



Forging packet sources

- Source IP address not involved in routing, often not checked
- Change it to something else!
- Might already be enough to fool a naive UDP protocol

TCP spoofing

Forging source address only lets you talk, not listen

- Old attack: wait until connection established, then DoS one participant and send packets in their place
- Frustrated by making TCP initial sequence numbers unpredictable
 - But see Oakland'12, WOOT'12 for fancier attacks, keyword "off-path"

ARP spoofing

- Impersonate other hosts on local network level
- Typical ARP implementations stateless, don't mind changes
- Now you get victim's traffic, can read, modify, resend

rlogin and reverse DNS

- rlogin uses reverse DNS to see if originating host is on whitelist
- How can you attack this mechanism with an honest source IP address?

rlogin and reverse DNS

- rlogin uses reverse DNS to see if originating host is on whitelist
- How can you attack this mechanism with an honest source IP address?
- Remember, ownership of reverse-DNS is by IP address

Outline

Brief introduction to networking, cont'd

One slide of logistics

Some classic network attacks

Cryptographic protocols, pt. 1

Key distribution and PKI

A couple more security goals

- Non-repudiation: principal cannot later deny having made a commitment
 - I.e., consider proving fact to a third party
- Forward secrecy: recovering later information does not reveal past information
 - Motivates using Diffie-Hellman to generate fresh keys for each session



Protocol notation

 $\begin{array}{l} A \rightarrow B : N_B, \{T_0, B, N_B\}_{K_B} \\ \hline \bullet A \rightarrow B : \text{message sent from Alice intended for Bob} \\ \hline \bullet B \text{ (after :): Bob's name} \\ \hline \bullet \{\cdots\}_K : \text{ encryption with key } K \end{array}$

Example: simple authentication

 $A \rightarrow B : A, \{A, N\}_{K_A}$

- E.g., Alice is key fob, Bob is garage door
- Alice proves she possesses the pre-shared key K_A
 Without revealing it directly
- Using encryption for authenticity and binding, not secrecy

Nonce

- $A \to B: A, \{A, N\}_{K_A}$
 - N is a nonce: a value chosen to make a message unique
 - Best practice: pseudorandom
 - In constrained systems, might be a counter or device-unique serial number

Replay attacks

- A nonce is needed to prevent a verbatim replay of a previous message
- Garage door difficulty: remembering previous nonces Particularly: lunchtime/roommate/valet scenario
- Or, door chooses the nonce: challenge-response authentication

Middleperson attacks

- 🖲 Older name: man-in-the-middle attack, MITM
- Adversary impersonates Alice to Bob and vice-versa, relays messages
- Powerful position for both eavesdropping and modification
- No easy fix if Alice and Bob aren't already related

Chess grandmaster problem

- Variant or dual of middleperson
- Adversary forwards messages to simulate capabilities with his own identity
- How to win at correspondence chess
- Anderson's MiG-in-the-middle

Anti-pattern: "oracle"

- Any way a legitimate protocol service can give a capability to an adversary
- Can exist whenever a party decrypts, signs, etc.
- "Padding oracle" was an instance of this at the implementation level



Public key authenticity

- Public keys don't need to be secret, but they must
- **e** Wrong key ightarrow can't stop middleperson
- So we still have a pretty hard distribution problem

Symmetric key servers

- Users share keys with server, server distributes session keys
- Symmetric key-exchange protocols, or channels
- Standard: Kerberos
- Drawback: central point of trust

Certificates

- A name and a public key, signed by someone else $C_A = Sign_S(A, K_A)$
- Basic unit of transitive trust
- Commonly use a complex standard "X.509"



CA hierarchies PKI for authorization Enterprise PKI can link up with permissions Organize CAs in a tree One approach: PKI maps key to name, ACL maps Distributed, but centralized (like DNS) name to permissions Check by follow a path to the root Often better: link key with permissions directly, name Best practice: sub CAs are limited in what they is a comment certify More like capabilities

The revocation problem

How can we make certs "go away" when needed?

- Impossible without being online somehow
- 1. Short expiration times
- 2. Certificate revocation lists
- 3. Certificate status checking