

Security

Use these slides in conjunction with the material from 2004.

Some parts based on or inspired by the slides from Prof. Claudia Eckert, Jouni Karvo, Pirkko Kuusela, Pasi Lassila Past contributions by Olaf Bergmann, Carsten Bormann, Dirk Kutscher

© 2005 Jörg Ott



Security

- Background and security properties
- Cryptographic algorithms
- Security mechanisms
- Security protocols and systems
- Security Devices



Motivation for Security in Communications

- Pretty much common sense today
- Open communications
 - Global access to information resources
 - · Ubiquitous availability of communication networks
- Protection
 - Assets (information, other valuables)
 - Privacy of persons
 - Transactions in critical communications
- "Electronic business"
 - Authentication, Authorization, and Accounting (AAA)
 - Offer (digital) services to known (and unknown) customers
- (Legal) requirements

```
© 2005 Jörg Ott
```



Some Terms in Brief

- (Communication) protocols / systems may have weaknesses
- A weakness may (but need not) cause a vulnerability
- A vulnerability can be exploited.
- Threats may makes use of one or more vulnerabilities.
- Attacks may result from threats to the system.
- Attacks may result in damage to the system.
- Risk = probability of an attack × amount of damage







Some Sources of Attacks

- 50% of all attacks from the inside (employees)
 - Laziness, personal gain, frustration
 - May be triggered by third parties: social engineering!
- Hacker, "script kiddies"
 - Curiosity, thrill, addiction
 - Experiencing how far they can get
 - Most important: peer recognition in the community!
- "Professional": industry espionage, secret service
- (Organized) crime
 - Blackmailing: e.g., for online gambling sites
 - Competitive edge: DoS against your opponent



Some Security Threats

- Connection / session hijacking
- Masquerading / impersonation / identity spoofing
- Man-in-the-middle (MITM) attacks
- Theft of service
- Connection / session disruption or termination
- Replay
- Eavesdropping
 - Content sniffing, traffic analyses
- Denial-of-service
- Break in

© 2005 Jörg Ott



Solutions

- Achieving security goals
 - Preventing attacks
 - Noticing attacks (e.g., monitoring, intrusion detection)
 - Limiting damage from attacks (e.g., isolation)
- Management aspects (planning, training, guidelines, policy, etc.)
- Technical measures
 - Overall system design
 - Protection of hosts and other devices
 - Physical; OS & software (e.g., regular updates)
 - Secure algorithms and protocols
 - Security devices (e.g., firewalls)



Security Properties

- Confidentiality of messages
 - Protection against eavesdropping
- Authentication of peers, messages
 - Protection against masquerading of senders
 - Prerequisite for authorization of actions
- Integrity of messages
 - Protection against modification in transit
- Non-repudiation of actions (accountability)
 - message origin
 - Reception of messages

© 2005 Jörg Ott



Related Properties

- Availability of systems and services
 - Protection against maliciously caused overload
 - E.g., denial-of-service attacks
 - Distinction from dependability and safety
 - Different background
 - Ensure correctness, protect against malfunctioning
- Privacy of (personal) information
 - Partially in competition with authentication



Security

- Background and security properties
- Cryptographic algorithms
- Security mechanisms
- Security protocols and systems
- Security Devices



Cryptographic Algorithms

Cipher algorithms

- Symmetric algorithms: DES (56-bit), AES (128-bit and more)
- Asymmetric (public-key) algorithms: e.g., RSA, PGP
- Digest algorithms
 - Compute a digest ("finger-print") of a message: SHA-1, MD5
 - Basis for hashed message authentication code (HMACs)
- Pseudo random number generators
 - Generate keys for ciphers and HMAC generators



General

- Algorithms should be publicly known
 - No security by obscurity
 - Enables broad community review and attempts to break the algorithm
 - Strength should only depend on the strength of the chosen key
- Attacks against algorithms
 - Crypto-text only
 - Known plaintext attacks
 - Chosen plaintext attacks
- Algorithms should not reveal additional hints to the attacker
 - Allow for brute force searching of the entire key space as only resort
 - Large key space is important! (today: $\geq 2^{128}$ for symmetric, $\geq 2^{2048}$ for asymmetric)
 - Need to be computationally efficient; operate on blocks and (infinite) streams

© 2005 Jörg Ott 13 HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY

General (2)

Asymmetric ciphers usually rely on complexity of math operations

- E.g., finding prime factors of a really large number
- Issue: "really large" grows over time; keys need to get longer
 Solely depends on computing power available
- Economic aspect: effort invested vs. value gained
- One-way functions (message digests)
 - Map a large data portion onto a fixed length hash (or digest)
 Many-to-one mapping, clashes possible
 - Needs to be defined so that it is not possible to construct a second (meaningful) messages that maps to the same output
 - Changing any bit in the input results in changing all the output
 - Need to be computationally efficient
 - If large amounts of data need to be handled



Symmetric Ciphers





DES Successors

- Simple DES no longer considered secure
 - Can be "easily" broken with brute force
- Triple DES: Enhance the key space by running DES 3 times
 - DES-EEE₃: three different encryption keys
 - DES-EDE₃: three different keys: encryption, decryption, encryption
 - DES-EEE₂: two different keys: keys for first and third encryption identical
 - Effective key length up to 168 bits
- Official DES Successor: Advanced Encryption Standard (AES)
 Multiple key lengths: 128, 192, 256 bits
- Other algorithms suitable for software: Twofish, Blowfish, RC5



plaintext

authenticated text

e(KS(A))

authenticated text

Α

Authentication:

В

plaintext

authenticated text

d(KP(A))



RSA: Principle

- Rivest, Shamir, Adleman (1978)
- Background: complexity of prime factorization of large numbers
- Algorithm:
 - Choose two large numbers p and q and calculate n = p × q
 - Calculate an encryption key e < n such that e and (p – 1) × (q – 1) are relatively prime
 - Compute decryption key d as

 $d = e^{-1} \times mod ((p - 1) \times (q - 1))$

• Construct public key = (e, n) and private key = (d, n)

| Encryption: | c = m ^e mod n |
|-------------|--------------------------|
| Decryption: | m= c ^e mod n |

19

© 2005 Jörg Ott



RSA: Example

- Let p = 7 and q = 11 [everyone seems to be using these]
 We get n = p × q = 7 × 11 = 77 and (p - 1) × (q - 1) = 6 × 10 = 60
- Pick e = 7 [7 and 60 are relative
- Pick e = 7 [7 and 60 are relatively prime]
 We get d = 7⁻¹ mod 60

- Public key (e, n) = (7, 77)
- Private key (d, n) = (43, 77)
- Message: 9 encryption: $c=m^e \mod n = 9^7 \mod 77 = 37$ decryption: $m=m^c \mod n = 37^{43} \mod 77 = 9$



Algorithms: Message Digest

- RSA computation is expensive
 - May be difficult to operate (imagine RSA key stored on a chipcard)
 need to tunnel messages through card
- Seek representative for the full message
- Cryptographic checksum
 - Stronger than CRC (typically longer and more complex)
 - But: several messages map to the same checksum
- One-way function
 - Do not allow determining the original message based upon the digest
 - Do not allow determining another message that yields the same digest
- May be used for integrity protection
 - Encrypt the checksum with RSA or use a shared secret (later)

| © 2005 Jörg Ott | 21 |
|---|----|
| | |
| HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY | |

Message Digest Algorithms

- One-way function (examples: MD5, SHA-1)
 - Map a large data portion onto a fixed length hash (or digest)





Message Authentication Code (MAC)

- Combine integrity protection and message authentication
 Base the outcome of the digest function on a key
- Use DES in CBC mode with a key, last output block is digest
- Keyed MD5: Append keying material to the message
 - Shared key k: sender sends m + MD5(m+k)
 - Random key k: sender sends m + MD5(m+k) + E(k, public_receiver)
- Hashed Message Authentication Code (HMAC)
 - · Use shared or random key to vary initial values
 - Important: no cryptography involved → no export regulations
 - HMAC-H(k, text) = H(k XOR opad || H(k XOR ipad || text))

| © 2005 Jörg Ott | 23 |
|---|----|
| | |
| HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY | |
| HMAC Overview | |
| Hash function H takes blocks of size B as input | |
| Key K Padding (0) | |
| ipad | |
| $0x36, 0x36, 0x36, \dots, 0x36 + +$ | |
| Message (m) | |
| opad | |
| 0x5C, 0x5C, 0x5C,, 0x5C + opad + | |
| H ((K + ipad) m) | |
| H HMAC | |



Algorithms: Random Number Generation

- Random numbers: dynamically generated keys, challenges, etc.
 - Pseudo-random numbers are predictable and therefore not suitable
- > Time of days, process id, etc. are also somewhat predictable
 - Also an attacker knows the time
 - The process id is usually drawn from a very limited space
- Use user "input" (mouse movements, key strokes)
 - But not necessarily reliable (and there may not be input devices)
- Use hardware input
 - · Measure entropy of the environment
 - Radioactive sources, atmospheric noise from radio, other
 - Project example: lava lamp image
 - Nice reference: www.random.org

© 2005 Jörg Ott

HELSINKI UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Security

- Background and security properties
- Cryptographic algorithms
- Security mechanisms
- Security protocols and systems
- Security Devices



Some Security Mechanisms

- Message integrity protection and authentication
 - (Hashed) Message authentication codes: (H)MACs ✓
 - Digital signatures

Key exchange/management

- Obtain and validate public keys
- Securely exchange keys between communication peers
- Generate shared session keys
- Usually address negotiation of algorithms and re-keying as well
- User Authentication
 - Establish the identity of communicating peers
 - Often prerequisite for (meaningful) key exchange

© 2005 Jörg Ott

HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY

Digital Signatures

An application of public-key cryptography (and message digests)

- Main advantage of public-key cryptography
 - No need to transmit shared secrets (password, secret keys)
 - Private key does not have to be disclosed

Simplest case: encrypt full message w/ private key: E(m, private)

- Provide identity along with message
- Receiver can validate message origin by decrypting with public key
- Issues:
 - Replay attacks possible → ensure message uniqueness (e.g., timestamp)
 - Computational overhead incurred by RSA → sign message summary
- Sender sends: m + E (MD5(m), private)
 - Includes information about digest algorithm, identity, timestamp, ...



Issues with Public Key Cryptography

- Problem: Obtaining public keys of communication partners
 - Transmission over unsecured channels is not useful
 - Authentication (and integrity) is required

Solution: Certificates

- Certificates bind a public key to an entity
- Digitally signed by a Certificate Authority (CA)
- A CA can provide a certificate for its own public key
 Signed by a well-known root CA
- Hierarchy of CAs and corresponding directory services
 Public Key Infrastructure (PKI)
 - important prerequisite for deploying public key cryptography

| © 2005 Jörg Ott | | | 29 |
|--|--|--|--------|
| | | | |
| HELSINKI UNT | VERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY | | |
| | Sample | Certificate | |
| Certificate Viewer:"aallo | nmurtaja.hut.fi" 🔀 . | Certificate Viewer:"aallonmurtaja.hut.fi" | × |
| General Details | | General Details | |
| This certificate has be | een verified for the following uses: | Certificate Hierarchy | |
| SSL Server Certificate | | aallonmurtaja.hut.fi | _ |
| Issued To Common Name (CN) Organization (O) Organizational Unit (OU) Serial Number | aallonmurtaja.hut.fi Helsinki University of Technology Computing Centre 08:97:3C | Certificate Fields | - |
| Issued By Common Name (CN) Organization (O) Organizational Unit (OU) | CA for TLS Servers Helsinki University of Technology Certificate Services | Certificate -Version -Serial Number | |
| Validity Issued On Expires On | 10.01.2005 08.01.2007 | Certificate Signature Algorithm | |
| Fingerprints SHA1 Fingerprint MD5 Fingerprint | A2:18:C3:68:1A:6F:8C:0F:D6:ED:8F:C5:FE:C8:85:32:82:28:15:76 13:78:A1:18:E2:E8:8E:4D:8C:E3:3D:AB:8C:A2:9E:D3 | Field Value | - - |
| | | OU = Certificate Services O = Helsinki University of Technology C = FI | |



X.509 Certificates

| TBSCertificate ::= SEQUENC | CE { |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| version [0] | EXPLICIT Version DEFAULT v1, |
| serialNumber | CertificateSerialNumber, |
| signature | AlgorithmIdentifier, |
| issuer | Name, |
| validity | Validity, |
| subject | Name, |
| subjectPublicKeyInfo | SubjectPublicKeyInfo, |
| issuerUniqueID [1] | IMPLICIT UniqueIdentifier OPTIONAL, |
| <pre>subjectUniqueID [2]</pre> | IMPLICIT UniqueIdentifier OPTIONAL, |
| extensions [3] | EXPLICIT Extensions OPTIONAL |
| | If present, version MUST be v3 |
| } | |

Extensions:

Subject Alternative Names Issuer Alternative Names

© 2005 Jörg Ott

HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY

X.509 Certificates

SubjectAltName ::= GeneralNames IssuerAltName ::= GeneralNames

| GeneralName ::= CHOICE { | | |
|---------------------------|-----|-------------------|
| otherName | [0] | OtherName, |
| rfc822Name | [1] | IA5String, |
| dNSName | [2] | IA5String, |
| x400Address | [3] | ORAddress, |
| directoryName | [4] | Name, |
| ediPartyName | [5] | EDIPartyName, |
| uniformResourceIdentifier | [6] | IA5String, |
| iPAddress | [7] | OCTET STRING, |
| registeredID | [8] | OBJECT IDENTIFIER |

}



Public Key Infrastructure (PKI)

- Have a (trusted) party certify the key's correctness:
 - That the key belongs to a particular subject (person, device)
 - That the key is (still) valid
- Certification Authority (CA)
 - Asserts a an identity public key mapping + validity period in a certificate
 - · Digitally signs the certificate to ensure authenticity and integrity
 - Signature can be validated by another CA
 - Validation "hierarchy" or "path"
- Provide a repository to store all this information
 - Interaction between CAs
 - Register, publish, and revoke certificates





Public Key Infrastructure (PKI)

- Certification Authorities (CAs)
 - Optional: generate private public key pairs
 - Validate a private-public key pair (authenticate subject)
 - Generate certificates
 - Publish certificates (to other CAs, to other entities for signature validation)
 - Revoke certificates (in case of compromise)
 - Management functions and inter-CA communications
 - Key pair management: update, recovery, ...
- Registration Authorities (RAs)
 - Optional, for interaction with the user, key pair generation, etc.
 - Functionality may completely be integrated with CA (logical decomposition)
- End entity: acts on behalf of the user (user equipment)
 - Stores private keys "securely", inquires certificates
- Certificate and CRL Repository
- RFC 2510, 2511, 2585, 3280(!)

© 2005 Jörg Ott

HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY

Public Key Infrastructure





Self-Signed Certificates

- Certificates usually handed out by CA
 - Workable for servers
 - Impractical + expensive + hard to deal with for end users

Alternative: self-signed certificate

- Self-generated key pair
- Self-created certificate
 - Signed with the own key
- Sufficient to satisfy (syntactical) protocol requirements (e.g., TLS)
- Semantics may suffice for certain applications, too
 - Certificates convey during initial contact
 - Stored at both peers
 - Allows to validate that the same peer was contacted before

© 2005 Jörg Ott



HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY

Key Exchange Protocols

- Public-key cryptography not very efficient for encrypting larger messages
 - Often used to securely agree a session key (key exchange)
 - Session encryption is done with symmetric cryptography

Alternatives for key exchange:

- Pre-shared key
 - Offline agreement of a shared key for a symmetric algorithm
 - All the problems of shared keys that have to be configured on two systems...
- Exchange session key using public-key crypto
- Diffie-Hellman key generation
 - A key generation algorithm
 - Allows two partners to securely compute a common secret key
 - No eavesdropping possible → perfect forward secrecy
 - Preventing man-in-the-middle attacks requires authentication
 - → combine with public-key crypto



One Moment – Primitive Root...?

- Just a quick note:
- R is a primitive root of P [R = prim_root (P)]

```
If R^{P-1} \mod P = 0
```

AND

If for all k < P-1 $R^k \mod P \neq 0$

Now let's do a little brain exercise...



Diffie-Hellman Key Generation





Diffie-Hellman Key Generation





User Authentication

Establish the identity of one or both peers (client, server)

- Three-way handshake
- Trusted third party
- Public key authentication
- Exchange (or generate) session key along with authentication

Related system aspects

- Backend protocols to access security databases
 - Authentication, Authorization, and Accounting (AAA)
 - RADIUS (widely deployed)
 - DIAMETER (more complete successor)
- Important aspect: Identity management

© 2005 Jörg Ott

Three-way Handshake

HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY

Assumption: Shared secret key

 SHK = CHK = Server/client handshake key E (m, k): encrypt message m with key k Client chooses random number x Sends encrypted with shared secret Server uses ClientId to determine key Decrypts and returns x+1 encrypted Also chooses random number y Sends encrypted with shared secret Client decrypts x+1 and y If x+1 decrypts correctly: server authenticated Returns y+1 encrypted Server decrypts y+1 If y+1 decrypts correctly: client authenticated Generated session key SK and sends encrypted © 2005 Jörg Ott

- **Trusted Third Party (Kerberos)**
- Authentication server as trusted entity

HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY

- Keys of A and B (KA and KB) are shared with the server
- A and B want to communicate securely (auth + encr)
- Server provides session K with lifetime L at time T







Simple Public Key Authentication

- No shared key necessary!
 - But a public key infrastructure of some sort
- A generates random number x
 - B decrypts and returns it → authenticated
- Different related approaches conceivable



© 2005 Jörg Ott



Security

- Background and security properties
- Cryptographic algorithms
- Security mechanisms
- Security protocols and systems
- Security Devices



Some Security Protocols

- Link layer
 - Link layer authentication: IEEE 802.1x
 - Wired Equivalent Privacy (WEP) for IEEE 802.11 Wireless LANs (insecure)
 - IEEE 802.11i as successor
- IP layer
 - IPsec
 - VPN tunneling alternatives: PPTP, L2TP
- Transport layer
 - Secure Shell (SSH) + associated protocols (file transfer, etc.)
 - Transport Layer Security (TLS)
- Application layer
 - HTTP digest authentication
 - Privacy enhanced mail (PEM)
 - Pretty good privacy (PGP)
 - S/MIME protection of message contents

© 2005 Jörg Ott



HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY

IPSEC (1)

- Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol (RFC2401)
 - Provide security services at the IP layer (network layer)
 - Protect one or more paths between a pair of hosts
 Special case: protect path between gateways

Security Protocols

- Authentication Header (AH, RFC2402)
 - Authentication
 - Integrity
 - Usually used with HMAC-MD5-96 or HMAC-SHA-1-96
- Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP, RFC2406)
 - Authentication
 - Integrity
 - Usually used with HMAC-MD5-96 or HMAC-SHA-1-96
 - Encryption
 - Default cipher: DES (insecure), → 3DES, AES



IPsec Authentication Header (Transport Mode)







IPSEC (2)

Security Associations (SAs)

- Fundamental abstraction for IPsec
- A unidirectional "connection" offering security services
- One SA for each service and for each direction
- Combining SAs, if more than one service is needed
- Identified by SPI, IP destination addr, protocol ID (ESP or AH)
- Two Types of SAs
 - Transport Mode
 - SA between two hosts
 - Protection for upper layer protocols (UDP, TCP, ...)
 - Tunnel Mode
 - An SA applied to an IP tunnel
 - Tunnel IP packets on behalf of hosts (used by security gateways)

© 2005 Jörg Ott

HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY

IPsec Tunnels





Key Management for IPsec

- Manual key management
 - · Configure each system with keying material and SA parameters
 - · Only feasible for static environments
 - A VPN tunnel between two sites in a common administrative domain
- Internet Security Association and Key Management Protocol (ISAKMP)
 - Generic key management framework defining procedures and Packet Format for SA management:
 - Establishment, negotiation, modification and deletion
- Internet Key Exchange (IKE)
 - Specialization of ISAKMP for IPsec
 - Two Phases:
 - Establishment of the ISAKMP SA (secure, authenticated bidirectional channel for SA negotiation)
 - SA negotiation for IPsec
 - Negotiable key exchange mechanisms

© 2005 Jörg Ott

55



Security Protocols above IPsec

- IPsec deployment issues
 - IPsec between IP and transport layer
 - Need kernel support for IPsec
 - Most IPsec deployment so far in security gateways

Easier to deploy alternatives:

- TLS = Transport Layer Security
 - Standardized form of SSL (Secure Socket Layer, Netscape)
 - Once established, similar to TCP
 - Secures *connection*, not application semantics
 - In practical use, usually authenticates server, not client
- Application Layer Security Protocols
 - Part of the application layer signaling (e.g., HTTP)
 - Secure the application messages
 - If they are MIME-encoded: S/MIME (secure MIME)
 - Alternative: PGP, PEM



Transport Layer Security (TLS)

- Provide authentication, confidentiality and integrity between two communicating applications
 - Transparent to applications
 - Often used for client-server applications
 - Used for secure HTTP: https://
- Layered on top of a reliable transport protocol (e.g. TCP)
- Two layers:
 - TLS Record Protocol
 - Provides confidential and reliable (integrity) transport for higher layer protocols
 - Symmetric cryptography and HMACs
 - TLS Handshake Protocol
 - Allows for secure authentication of communication partners
 - Public key cryptography and certificates
 - Used on top of the TLS Record Protocol





TLS Handshake Protocol Exchange

Client Server ClientHello TCP Syn • Offers set of ciphers • Includes random value TCP Ack ServerHello ClientHello • Selects cipher Includes random value Provides certificate Certificate Calculate master key ClientKeyExchange Derive of session keys CertificateVerify [ChangeCipherSpec] for the record layer Finished Synchronize on new session key

ServerHello Certificate ServerKeyExchange CertificateRequest ServerHelloDone

[ChangeCipherSpec] Finished

© 2005 Jörg Ott

| 1 1 | 03 13.704424 | 194.89.117.197 | 194.89.117.193 | TCP | 3631 > https [ACK] Seg=1 Ack=1 win=16384 Len=0 |
|-----------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------|--|
| 1 | 04 13.705152 | 194.89.117.197 | 194.89.117.193 | SSLV2 | Client Hello |
| 1 | 05 13,730701 | 194.89.117.193 | 194,89,117,197 | TLS | Server Hello, Certificate[Unreassembled Packet] |
| 1 1 | 06 13, 733071 | 194.89.117.193 | 194.89.117.197 | TLS | Continuation Data, Continuation Data, [Unreassembled Packet] |
| 1 1 | 07 13, 733210 | 194.89.117.197 | 194.89.117.193 | TCP | 3631 > https [ACK] Seg=106 Ack=1013 win=16384 Len=0 |
| 1 | 10 17 324197 | 194 89 117 197 | 194 89 117 193 | TIS | Client Key Exchange Change Change Sner Encrypted Handshake Message |
| 1 | 11 17 502078 | 104 80 117 103 | 194 89 117 197 | TLS | Change Cipher Sher Encrypted Handshake Message |
| 1 1 | 12 17 502651 | 104 80 117 107 | 104 90 117 102 | TIS | Annication Data |
| 1 | 12 17 641544 | 104 90 117 102 | 104 90 117 107 | TLS | Application Data [uppassombled Backet] |
| 1 | 14 17 640446 | 104 90 117 102 | 104 90 117 107 | TLS | Apprication Data, [on easembled Packet] |
| | 14 17.042440 15 17 647546 | 104 90 117 107 | 104 90 117 102 | TCD | Continuation Data, [on easempleu Packet] |
| | 13 17.042340 | 194.89.117.197 | 194.89.117.193 | | 2021 > HCCh2 CACK 202 ACK=1097 WHIEL0284 CENEO |
| [⊞ Trar | nsmission Cont | rol Protocol, Src Po | rt: 3631 (3631), Dst | Port: http: | (443), Seq: 1, Ack: 1, Len: 105 |
| 🛛 🗆 Secu | ure socket Lay | er | | | |
| Ξs | SLV2 Record La | aver: Client Hello | | | |
| | Lenath: 103 | 5 | | | |
| | Handshake Me | ssage Type: Client H | ello (1) | | |
| | Version: TLS | 1.0 (0×0301) | | | |
| | Cipher Spec | Length: 78 | | | |
| | Session TD L | ength: 0 | | | |
| | Challenge Le | ngth: 16 | | | |
| | Charlenge Ce | (26 space) | | | |
| - I ' | Cipher Specs | - (20 Specs) no: 5513 no4 139 with | MD5 (0×010080) | | |
| | Cipher Spr | EC. 33L2_RC4_128_WIN | - CPC WITH MP5 (040300) | 202 | |
| | Cipher Spe | 80. SSL2_RC2_CBC_I20. | CBC_WITH_MDJ (0X03000 | 30) | |
| | Cipher Spe | EC: SSL2_DES_192_EDE: | S_CBC_WITH_MD5 (0X0/00 | 500) | |
| | Ciprier Spe | EC: SSL2_DES_64_CBC_) | VITH_MUS (UXU6UU4U) | | |
| | Cipner spe | EC: SSL2_RC4_128_EXP | DRT40_WITH_MD5 (UXU200 | 080) | |
| | Cipher Spe | ec: SSL2_RC2_CBC_128 | _CBC_WITH_MD5 (0×0400) | 30) | |
| | Cipher Spe | ec: TLS_DHE_RSA_WITH | AES_256_CBC_SHA (0X00 | 00039) | |
| | Cipher Spa | ec: TLS_DHE_DSS_WITH | _AES_256_CBC_SHA (0×00 | 00038) | |
| | Cipher Spa | ec: TLS_RSA_WITH_AES | _256_CBC_SHA (0x00003! | 5) | |
| | Cipher Spe | ec: TLS_DHE_RSA_WITH | _AES_128_CBC_SHA (0x00 | 00033) | |
| | Cipher Spa | ec: TLS_DHE_DSS_WITH | _AES_128_CBC_SHA (0×00 | 00032) | (1) |
| | Cipher Spa | ec: TLS_RSA_WITH_RC4. | _128_MD5 (0x000004) | | |
| | Cipher Spe | ec: TLS_RSA_WITH_RC4 | 128_SHA (0x000005) | | |
| | Cipher Sp | ec: TLS_RSA_WITH_AES | 128_CBC_SHA (0x000021 | F) | |
| | Cipher Spe | ec: TLS_DHE_RSA_WITH | 3DES_EDE_CBC_SHA (0x0 | 000016) | |
| | Cipher Spa | ec: TLS_DHE_DSS_WITH | 3DES_EDE_CBC_SHA (0x0 | 000013) | |
| | Cipher Sp | ec: SSL_RSA_FIPS_WITH | 3DES EDE CBC SHA (0) | (OOfeff) | |
| | Cipher Sp | PC: TIS RSA WITH 3DE | S EDE CBC SHA (0x0000 | Dal | |
| | Cipher Sp | PC: TIS DHE RSA WITH | DES CBC SHA (0x00001 | 5) | |
| | Cinher Sn | PC: TIS DHE DSS WITH | DES CBC SHA (0x00001) | 5 | |
| | Cipher Sp | PC: SSL PSA ETPS WITH | H DES CBC SHA (0x00fet | -/ Fel | |
| | Cipher Sp | PC: TIS PSA WITH DES | CBC SHA (0x000009) | | |
| | Cipher Spe | PC: TES_RSA_WIND_DES | 24 WITH DC4 56 SHA (0) | 0000643 | |
| | Cipher Spe | DC: TLS_RSA_EXPORTIO | A WITH DES CBC SHA (0) | 20000047 | |
| | cipher spe | EC. TLS_RSA_EXPORTIO | TH DEA 40 MDE (OUDOO) | 2000002) | |
| | Cipher Spe | EC. TES_RSA_EXPORT_W. | TH_RC4_40_MDJ (0X0000 | 205) | |
| | Cipner Spe | EC: TLS_RSA_EXPORT_W. | LTH_RC2_CBC_40_MD5 (U) | (000006) | |
| | chai renge | | | | |
| 0050 | 04 00 80 00 0 | 0 39 00 00 38 00 00 | 35 00 00 33 00 | 9 85. | .3. |
| 0060 | 00 32 00 00 0 | 4 00 00 05 00 00 2f | 00 00 16 00 00 .2. | / | |
| 0070 | 13 00 te tt 0 | 0 00 0a 00 00 15 00 | 00 12 00 te te | | ··· <u>·</u> |
| 0080 | 00 00 09 00 0 b5 do 42 16 d | 0 64 00 00 62 00 00 F 68 52 64 F2 do F3 | | u p | |
| 0090 | DJ UE 42 1 6 U | 1 08 JC 04 IS UP 32 | 2/ 10/23/04B | | |
| Challenge | e data used to authentic | cate server (ssl.handshake.challer | ge), 16 bytes | | ∄ P: 865 D: 20 M: 0 |
| | | | | | |



| 103 13.704424 | 194.89.117.197 | 194.89.117.193 | TCP | 3631 > https [ACK] Seq=1 Ack=1 Win=16384 Len=0 |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------|---|
| 104 13.703132 | 194.89.117.197 | 194.89.117.193 | 35LVZ | Chient Hello - Contificato[Uproaccombled Dacket] |
| 106 13 733071 | 194 89 117 193 | 194 89 117 197 | TLS | Continuation Data Continuation Data [Unreassembled Packet] |
| 107 13 733210 | 194 89 117 197 | 194 89 117 193 | TCP | 3631 > https://www.sed=106.ack=1013.wip=16384.len=0 |
| 110 17, 324197 | 194.89.117.197 | 194.89.117.193 | TIS | Client Key Exchange, Change Cipher Spec, Encrypted Handshake Mess |
| 111 17, 502078 | 194.89.117.193 | 194.89.117.197 | TLS | Change Cipher Spec. Encrypted Handshake Message |
| 112 17.502651 | 194.89.117.197 | 194.89.117.193 | TLS | Application Data |
| 113 17.641544 | 194.89.117.193 | 194.89.117.197 | TLS | Application Data. [Unreassembled Packet] |
| 114 17.642446 | 194.89.117.193 | 194.89.117.197 | TLS | Continuation Data. [Unreassembled Packet] |
| 115 17.642546 | 194.89.117.197 | 194.89.117.193 | TCP | 3631 > https [АСК] seq=752 Ack=1697 win=16384 Len=0 |
| Ecomo 105 (566 b) | tes on wine 566 b | tas conturad) | | |
| I Ethernet II Src | · 00.a0.8e.09.27.d4 | Dst: 00:05:4e:44:b6:ac | | |
| I Internet Protoco | l. src Addr: 194.89. | 117.193 (194.89.117.193 |). Dst Ad | dr: 194.89.117.197 (194.89.117.197) |
| I Transmission Cont | rol Protocol. Src F | Port: https (443). Dst P(| ort: 3631 | (3631). Seg: 1. Ack: 106. Len: 512 |
| E secure socket Lav | /er | o. c | | |
| E TLS Record Lav | er: Server Hello | | | |
| Content Type | e: Handshake (22) | | | |
| Version: TLS | 5 1.0 (0x0301) | | | <i>.</i> <u>—</u> . |
| Length: 74 | | | | Morld Evampla |
| 🛛 🗆 Handshake Pr | otocol: Server Hell | 0 | | |
| Handshake | Type: Server Hello | (2) | | |
| Length: 7 | 0 | | | |
| Version: | TLS 1.0 (0×0301) | | | ()) |
| Random.gm | t_unix_time: Mar 21 | , 2005 21:32:22.00000000 | 0 | |
| Random.by | tes | | | (-/ |
| Session I | D Length: 32 | | | |
| Session I | D (32 bytes) | | | |
| Cipner Su | TTE: ILS_RSA_WITH_R | C4_128_MD5 (UXUUU4) | | |
| | on Method: Null (0) | | | |
| Gont pot Type | en: Centin Icale | | | |
| Voncion: Tis | (0×0.201) | | | |
| Length: 919 | 5 I.O (0X030I) | | | |
| E Handshake Br | otocol: certificate | 3 | | |
| Handshake | Type: Certificate | (11) | | |
| Length: 9 | 15 | (11) | | |
| Certifica | tes Length: 912 | | | |
| ■ Certifica | tes (912 bytes) | | | |
| Certif | icate Length: 909 | | | |
| [Unreassembled Pa | acket: SSĹ] | | | |
| | | | | |
| 1 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| © 2005 Jöra Ott | | | | 61 |

© 2005 Jörg Ott



HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY

Application Layer Security: HTTPS

- Web servers usually the "trusted" partners
 - Bank, government, insurance, etc.
- Web browsers (clients) usually the customers
 - "Few" web servers for "many" clients
- TLS for connection establishment
 - Web servers authenticated via certificates
 - Scales well as there are not so many
- HTTP Digest authentication via TLS connection
 - Server refuses request and challenges client
 - Client provides credentials typically based upon shared secret Username, password
 - Response does not reveal secret



HTTP Digest Authentication



© 2005 Jörg Ott

HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY

Secure/Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (S/MIME)

- Example for an *application layer* security mechanism.
- Security services for sending and receiving MIME data
 - Authentication, message integrity, non-Repudiation of origin, confidentiality
- Not restricted to e-mail
 - May be used with HTTP and other application protocols
- Relies on the Cryptographic Message Syntax (CMS)
 - Specification for authenticating, digitally signing and encrypting contents
 - Security functions are applied on *envelopes* containing message content (or other envelopes)
 - May embed certificates and other key management information
- Uses public key cryptography and certificates
 - Most useful with a PKI (e.g., CA hierarchy)

A Brief Excursion to MIME

Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions

• Not just mail: used with HTTP and many other application protocols

Define the purpose of a piece of content (in a message body)

Image

• Type, encodings

HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY

- Intended interpretation
- Specify additional parameters
- Allow for references
- Allow for multipart contents
 - Arbitrarily nested pieces of contents
 - Specify the above for each part individually

| text | |
|-------|--|
| Image | |
| Sound | |

© 2005 Jörg Ott



A Brief Excursion to MIME

| | Content-Ty | <pre>/pe: image/jpeg</pre> | | ation pro | otocols |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| • | Content-II Content-II | cansfer-Encoding: base64 D: 42 | - + | nessag | e body) |
| | Content-Di | isposition: attachment; | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | te | ×t |
| | Allow for r | references | | Ima | ige |
| • | Allow Cont • Arb Cont • Spe Cont | ent-Type: multipart/alte ent-Type: multipart/mixe ext-Type: multipart/rela | ernative ed ated | I. | ind |





S/MIME Processing Steps

- S/MIME messages are combination of MIME bodies and CMS content types
 - Several MIME types as well as several CMS content types are used
- Data to be secured is always a canonical MIME entity
 - Secure MIME entity: sub-part, sub-parts, or an entire MIME entity
 - Canonicalization depends on the respective content type
- Optionally, apply transfer encoding
- MIME entity and security information as input to CMS processing
 - Will result in a CMS object
- CMS object is wrapped in MIME

| © 2005 Jörg Ott | 67 |
|-----------------------|----|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| NETWORKING LABORATORY | |
| | |
| | |

Resulting S/MIME Messages

Content-type: application/pkcs7-mime

- PKCS#7: Cryptographic Message Syntax (CMS) Version 1.5 (RFC2315)
 - Current spec of CMS: RFC 3852; ASN.1-encoded cryptographic objects
- ;smimetype= parameter to indicate what the object is used for
 - enveloped-data, signed-data, compressed-data
 - Concatenation possible: signed-encrypted-data
- ;name=filename.suffix and ;filename=filename.suffix
 - application/pkcs7-mime: SignedData + EnvelopedData -> .p7m
 - application/pkcs7-mime: CompressedData
 - application/pkcs7-signature: SignedData
 - Filename is arbitrary; no longer than 8 characters

Signing only: multipart/signed

• Does not require S/MIME software on the receiver for viewing the contents

-> .p7z

-> .p7s

Sample Encoding: Encryption

Content-Type: application/pkcs7-mime; smime-type=enveloped-data; name=smime.p7m

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

Content-Disposition: attachment; filename=smime.p7m

rfvbnj756tbBghyHhHUujhJhjH77n8HHGT9HG4VQpfyF467GhIGfHfYT6 7n8HHGghyHhHUujhJh4VQpfyF467GhIGfHfYGTrfvbnjT6jH7756tbB9H f8HHGTrfvhJhjH776tbB9HG4VQbnj7567GhIGfHfYT6ghyHhHUujpfyF4 0GhIGfHfQbnj756YT64V

© 2005 Jörg Ott

HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY

Sample Encoding: Signing

```
Content-Type: multipart/signed;
    protocol="application/pkcs7-signature";
    micalg=shal; boundary=boundary42
--boundary42
Content-Type: text/plain
This is a clear-signed message.
--boundary42
Content-Type: application/pkcs7-signature; name=smime.p7s
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64
Content-Disposition: attachment; filename=smime.p7s
ghyHhHUujhJhjH77n8HHGTrfvbnj756tbB9HG4VQpfyF467GhIGfHfYT6
4VQpfyF467GhIGfHfYT6jH77n8HHGghyHhHUujhJh756tbB9HGTrfvbnj
n8HHGTrfvhJhjH776tbB9HG4VQbnj7567GhIGfHfYT6ghyHhHUujpfyF4
7GhIGfHfYT64VQbnj756
```

```
--boundary42--
```



Security

- Background and security properties
- Cryptographic algorithms
- Security mechanisms
- Security protocols and systems
- Security Devices



"Security Devices" for IP Networks

- Some protection against attacks from the outside
- Packet Filter
 - (dis)allow forwarding of packets to/from certain addresses
 - Protect networks from stray traffic
- Application Layer Gateway (ALG) / Proxy
 - · control (and police) communications at application layer
- Firewall
 - Combination of the above
 - · protect internal resources against access from the outside
- Network Address Translator (NAT)
 - minimize required fraction of "Internet" address space
 - hide internal IP addresses
 - perform packet filtering for unknown traffic



© 2005 Jörg Ott









© 2005 Jörg Ott



HELSINKI UNIVERISITY OF TECHNOLOGY NETWORKING LABORATORY







Firewalls

- Packet filters, enforcing packet altering/forwarding policies
 - Filter specification: Usually statically configured
 - Most configurations disallow packets for "non-standard ports"
- Stateful packet inspection
 - Detect transport or application context of packets
 - Dynamically adapt filter specification
- Application layer gateways
 - Terminate connections: act as transparent or explicitly visible proxies
 - Monitor connection: parse contents of application protocols
 - Functioning precludes end-to-end security!
 - Dynamically adapt filter specification
- Policies may be applied at all layers



Network Address Translators

- Intermediate systems that can translate addresses (and port numbers) in IP packets
 - Often used to map global addresses to address/port number combination of hosts in a corporate network
- Different motivations
 - Efficient usage of address space
 - Share one globally unique address
 - Use a private address space in the enterprise (10.x.x.x, 192.168.x.x, ...)
 - Security
 - Make internal host inaccessible from the public Internet
 - Hide addresses / address structure
- Include dynamically configured packet filters, stateful packet inspection









Firewall Applicability

Firewalls and NATs help against unwanted traffic from the outside

- Denial-of-Service attacks, port scans, break-in attacks, worms
- ALGs against viruses

But: Firewalls and NATs may also prevent legitimate traffic

- Evil to IP communications: Break end-to-end model
- Have many implicit assumptions about protocols
- Do not work well with a number of protocols
 - Including their security features
- Just one piece in a security portfolio, to be applied wisely
- Applications and protocols still need security
- Users and their behavior still pose a significant risk