

**Initiator/Responder
anonymity
DoS resistance
Perfect forward secrecy
... and other desirable
protocol properties**

Station-to-station protocol

$$A \longrightarrow B : g^a$$

$$B \longrightarrow A : g^b, \text{Cert}_B, \{ \{ \{ g^b, g^a \} \}_{K_B} \}_{g^{ab}}$$

$$A \longrightarrow B : \text{Cert}_A, \{ \{ \{ g^a, g^b \} \}_{K_A} \}_{g^{ab}}$$

Problem: A learns that B intended to talk to her only after starting to use g^{ab} .

ISO 9798-3 protocol

$$A \longrightarrow B : g^a, A, N_A$$

$$B \longrightarrow A : \{g^a, g^b, N_A, N_B, A\}_{K_B}$$

$$A \longrightarrow B : \{g^a, g^b, N_A, N_B, B\}_{K_A}$$

- (recall that the signature does not hide the message)
- Adds identities under signature
 - ◆ If A has accepted the 2nd message then she knows that B intended to talk to her.
 - ◆ If B has accepted the 3rd message then he knows that A intended to talk to him.
- The symmetric key is $H(g^{ab}, A, B, N_A, N_B)$.

ISO 9798-3 protocol

$$A \longrightarrow B : g^a, A, N_A$$

$$B \longrightarrow A : \{g^a, g^b, N_A, N_B, A\}_{K_B}$$

$$A \longrightarrow B : \{g^a, g^b, N_A, N_B, B\}_{K_A}$$

- **Perfect forward secrecy** — if a , b , g^{ab} are deleted after use, then the leakage of a signing key does not reveal old symmetric keys.
- **Vulnerable to DoS** — After B receives the first message, he has to
 - ◆ store g^a , A , N_A ;
 - ◆ compute a signature (expensive);
 - ◆ (perform a modular exponentiation — compute g^b).
 - can be computed ahead-of-time
 - not changed so often
- **Not anonymous** to a passive eavesdropper.
 - ◆ Even if it has no knowledge of network topology.

Measures against DoS

- To avoid keeping state S
 - ◆ Have a long-term symmetric key K known only to yourself.
 - ◆ Send $\{S\}_K$ to the other party.
 - ◆ The next message from that party must again contain $\{S\}_K$.
 - ◆ If S is known to the other party, then encryption can be replaced by a MAC.
- To avoid DoS against computational resources:
 - ◆ Perform expensive computations only after the other party must have performed an expensive computation.
 - ◆ (the protocol must be designed in such a way)

Just Fast Keying with initiator privacy

$A \longrightarrow B : g^a, H(N_A)$

$B \longrightarrow A : H(N_A), N_B, \{g^b\}_{K_B}, \text{MAC}_{hk_B}(g^b, H(N_A), N_B, IP_A)$

$A \longrightarrow B : N_A, N_B, \bullet, g^a, g^b, \{K_A, \{g^a, g^b, H(N_A), N_B, K_B\}_{K_A}\}_{k_{\text{auth}}}$

$B \longrightarrow A : \{\{g^a, g^b, H(N_A), N_B, K_A\}_{K_B}\}_{k_{\text{auth}}}$

$$k_{\text{auth}} = H(g^{ab}, H(N_A), N_B, \text{"auth"})$$

$$k = H(g^{ab}, H(N_A), N_B, \text{"key"})$$

- \bullet is called a *cookie*.
- Assume that X cannot be legitimately found from $\text{MAC}_K(X)$.

Design considerations (1)

- Frequency of updating g^b and $\{\{g^b\}\}_{K_B}$ (and g^a)
 - ◆ A new g^b is computed after a certain time interval, not for each protocol round.
 - ◆ Hence B has to keep no state after 2nd message
 - ◆ Hence B can respond to the 3rd message multiple times
 - B caches recent pairs of 3rd and 4th messages
 - The cookie is the key for lookup
- Because of cookie, 1st and 3rd messages must come from the same IP-address.
 - ◆ If IP was not in the cookie, certain DDoS-attacks were possible.

Design considerations (2)

- $H(N_A)$ and N_A
 - ◆ B 's first expensive operation is computing g^{ab} after receiving the 3rd message.
 - ◆ Before doing it, 3rd message looks like

$$N_A, N_B, \text{MAC}_{hk_B}(g^b, H(N_A), N_B, IP_A), g^a, g^b, \square$$

- ◆ Suppose that I has heard the first two msgs between A and B .
- ◆ Suppose that $H(N_A)$ is used instead of N_A .
- ◆ I can then construct a message that looks like the one above.

Password-based authentication

$$A \longrightarrow B : A, pw$$

is very bad.

$$B \longrightarrow A : N_B$$

$$A \longrightarrow B : A, N_A, N_B, H(N_A, N_B, pw)$$

is also bad because of [off-line guessing attacks](#).

PAK (password-authenticated key exchange)

$$A \longrightarrow B : g^a \cdot H_1(A, B, pw)$$

$$B \longrightarrow A : g^b, H_{2a}(A, B, g^b, \bullet, \left(\frac{\bullet}{H_1(A, B, pw)} \right)^b, pw)$$

$$A \longrightarrow B : H_{2b}(A, B, g^b, \bullet, \bullet, pw)$$

The key is $H_3(A, B, \bullet, \bullet, pw)$

- The blinding/unblinding ability shows the knowledge of the password
- Off-line guessing impossible because of the mask g^a
- On-line guessing possible
- Both A and B must store pw .

A protocol with guessing attack

Let $G = \langle g \rangle$ be a group with hard DH problem.

For a user A , server S has stored $V_A = h(A, pw_A)$.

$$A \longrightarrow S : A, N_A, g^x$$

$$S \longrightarrow A : g^y, N_S \oplus h(g^{xy}, V_A, N_A)$$

$$A \longrightarrow S : N_S$$

A and S have agreed on a common secret g^{xy} .

Exercise. Attack it.

An improvement?

Let $G = \langle g \rangle$ be a group with hard DH problem.

For a user A , server S has stored $V_A = h(A, pw_A)$.

$$A \longrightarrow S : A, N_A, g^x \oplus h(A, V_A)$$

$$S \longrightarrow A : g^y \oplus h(A, V_A), N_S \oplus h(g^{xy}, V_A, N_A), g^{xy} \oplus h(g^{xy}, V_A, N_A)$$

$$A \longrightarrow S : N_S$$

A and S have agreed on a common secret g^{xy} .

Exercise. Attack it.

Encrypted Key Exchange

A and B share a password $pw_{A,B}$.
It is also treated as a symmetric key.

$$\begin{aligned} A &\longrightarrow B : \{K^+\}_{pw_{A,B}} \\ B &\longrightarrow A : \{\{k\}_{K^+}\}_{pw_{A,B}} \\ A &\longrightarrow B : \{N_A\}_k \\ B &\longrightarrow A : \{N_A, N_B\}_k \\ A &\longrightarrow B : \{N_B\}_k \end{aligned}$$

Here K^+ is a newly generated public key. A keeps the corresponding private key K^- to herself.

Exercise. What if K^+ were a symmetric key?

PAK-X

Server B only has to store $V = g^{pw}$.

$$A \longrightarrow B : g^a \cdot H_1(A, B, V)$$

$$B \longrightarrow A : g^b, g^c, c \oplus H_{2a}(A, B, g^b, \bullet, \left(\frac{\bullet}{H_1(A, B, V)} \right)^b, V^c, V)$$

$$A \longrightarrow B : H_{2b}(A, B, \langle \text{2nd message} \rangle, \bullet, \bullet, c, V)$$

A has to use pw to recompute V^c .