

MIT OpenCourseWare
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

6.033 Computer System Engineering
Spring 2009

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.

Nickolai Zeldovich

key ideas for today:

- open design
- identity vs authenticator
- authenticating messages vs principals (message integrity, bind data)
- public key authentication

--- new board ---

security model

C - I - S

last time:

- talked about some general ideas for how to build secure systems
- defensive design: expect compromise, break into parts, reduce privilege
- last recitation, saw examples of what can cause parts to be compromised

for the rest of the lectures:

- assume that we can design end-points to be correct & secure
(hard but let's go along with this for now)
- figure out how to achieve security in the face of attackers
 - attackers can look at, modify, and send messages

basic goals that we want to achieve

- inside the server: guard - service

- authentication
- authorization
- confidentiality

--- new board ---

basic building block: crypto

- let's look at how you might implement encryption
- two functions, Encrypt and Decrypt

C -> E -> I -> D -> S

- military systems, E and D are secret
- closed design

- problem: if someone steals your design, you're in big trouble
- hard to analyze system without at the same time losing secrecy
- key principle in building secure systems: minimize secrets!

--- new board ---

open design

- big advantage: if someone steals design & key, can just change keys
- can analyze system separately from the specific secret key
- minimizes the secrets

important principle in designing systems:

- figure out precisely what secrets distinguish bad guys from good guys
- it's very hard to keep things secret
- knowing what's important will allow you to focus on the right things

same diagram but with keys going into E & D

example of symmetric key crypto: one-time pad

XOR the message with random bits, which are the key
quickly describe XOR, why you get the original message back
problem: key is giant (but scheme is perfectly secure)

stream ciphers: various algorithms that generate random-looking bits
no longer perfectly unbreakable, just requires lots of computation
SLIDE: RC4

attack if keys reused

C->S: Encrypt(k, "Credit card NNN")
S->C: Encrypt(k, "Thank you, ...")

XOR two ciphertexts and known response to get unknown request message!
never reuse keys with symmetric crypto! (one-time pad!)

--- new board ---

previously needed shared keys, doesn't scale

RSA: public-key cryptography

keys for encryption, decryption differ
SLIDE: RSA algorithm
short example computation?

$p = 31, q = 23, N = 713$
 $e = 7, d = 283$

$m = 5$
 $c = m^e \bmod N = 5^7 \bmod 713 = 408$
 $m = c^d \bmod N = 408^{283} \bmod 713 = 5$

difficult to generate e from d, and vice-versa
assumption: factoring N is hard!

much more computationally expensive than symmetric-key crypto!
important property: don't need a shared key between each party
encrypting a message for someone is diff. than decrypting it
server can use the same key for many clients sending to it

similarly tricky to use in practice

how to represent messages?
small messages are weak
large messages are inefficient
can multiply messages together
need something called padding

crypto mechanisms rely on computational complexity
pick key sizes appropriately -- "window of validity"

--- new board ---

principal authentication

principal/identity: a way of saying who you are
authenticator: something that convinces others of your identity
open design principle sort-of applies here

want to keep identity public, authenticator private
focus on what's distinguishing good guy from bad guy
usually there's a rendezvous to agree on an acceptable authenticator

authenticator types: right side of the board

real world: SSN

bad design: confuses principal's identity and authenticator

passwords

assuming user is the only one that knows password, can infer that

if someone knows the password, it must be the user

server stores list of passwords, which is a disaster if compromised

common solution: store hashes of passwords

define a cryptographic hash:

$H(m) \rightarrow v$, v short (e.g. 256 bits)

given $H(m)$, hard to find m' such that $H(m') = H(m)$

foils the timing attack we had last time

in theory hard to reverse

dictionary attack: try short character sequences, words

physical object

magnetic card: stores a long password, not very interesting

smartcard: computer that authenticates using crypto

biometric

oldest form of authentication: people remember faces, voices

can be easy to steal (you leave fingerprints, face images everywhere)

unlike a password, hard to change if compromised

more of an identity than authentication mechanism

need to trust/authenticate who you're providing your authenticator to!

fake login screen, fake ATM machine can get a user's password/PIN

next recitation you'll read more about what happens in the real world

web phishing attacks: convincing you to authenticate to them

--- new board ---

suppose we trust our client (e.g. laptop, smartcard, ...)

how to design protocol?

board: C - I - S diagram

client sending a message saying "buy 10 shares of Google stock"

simple version: just send password over the network

attacker has password, can now impersonate user

better version? send a hash of a password

attacker doesn't get our password (good, probably)

but the hash is now just as good -- can splice it onto other msg!

** need both authentication AND integrity **

better? include checksum of message, eg CRC

attacker can re-compute checksum! need checksum to be keyed

better yet: send a hash of [message + password], called a MAC

message authentication code

if you're going to do this: look up HMAC

best: establish a session key, minimize use of password (long-term secret)

send a message to the other party saying "i will use this key for a bit"

use that key to MAC individual messages