

1.

a. Define the properties of a one-way hash function.

(6 marks)

Answer

A hash function h maps arbitrary length value x to fixed length value y such that:

- **Hard to reverse.** Given value y not feasible to find x with $y = h(x)$.
- **Collision freeness.** Hard to find values x, x' such that $h(x) = h(x')$.
- **Unpredictability.** The hash value $h(x)$ does not give any information about any part of its operand x .

Q1 A hash function maps x into a fixed length
 $h(x)$
 A It should be unpredictable:
 That is given $h(x)$ nothing can be
 known about x
 It should be irreversible:
 Given $h(x)$ it should not be feasible
 to compute x
 It should be free from collisions:
 Given two values x, y if $x \neq y$
 then the probability of $h(x) = h(y)$
 should be low

b. Following an intrusion at Adobe (October 2013), attackers gained access to a user password file. It is believed that each password p was stored in encrypted form in the file as $E_{des}^{ecb}(K_A \cdot p)$ using triple DES (ECB mode) where K_A is a secret Adobe master key. Describe two security weaknesses of this scheme. (6 marks)

Answer

Q1 Duplicate Passwords can be seen in
B the file.

Given two users with two identical passwords P, P' where $P = P'$

It can be seen that the two users have the same password, if one user had a password hint and another didn't that hint could be used to solve the other users password

TRIPLE DES is reversible and an attacker need only compromise master key K_A to retrieve all passwords

ECB was used which allows patterns in the passwords to be seen.
ONLY applicable FOR larger passwords

No IV was used!

6

- c. Continuing Question 1 (b), describe how the passwords should have been stored and explain how your scheme defends against a pre-computation dictionary attack. (6 marks)

Answer

C They should have been stored using a secure one way hash function with a salt value. The salt value defends against a precomputation dictionary attack as every bit of salt doubles the size of dictionary the attacker needs to generate.

Example!: 1 bit salt (not large enough)
 User = A, Password = XYZ, Salt = 0 ^{randomly chosen}

Store
 A, 0, $h(XYZ^0)$ in file

where h is a secure one way hash such as SHA256

Attacker assuming XYZ was in dictionary would have had to precompute both $h(XYZ^0)$ and $h(XYZ^1)$

As you add salt the amount of precomputation grows exponentially

- d. The following Java code generates a symmetric cipher based on a random session key.

```
KeyGenerator kg= KeyGenerator.getInstance("DES");
kg.init(new Random(0));
SecretKey key= kg.generateKey();
Cipher cipher= Cipher.getInstance("DES/ECB/PKCS5Padding");
cipher.init(Cipher.ENCRYPT_MODE, key);
```

Give a Java code fragment that encrypts the contents of a file using this key. (6 marks)

Answer ???

```
//creating file output stream to write to file
try(FileOutputStream fos = new FileOutputStream(fname+".des")){

//creating object output stream to write objects to file
ObjectOutputStream oos = new ObjectOutputStream(fos);
```

```

oos.writeObject(key); //saving key to file for use during decryption

//creating file input stream to read contents for encryption
try(FileInputStream fis = new FileInputStream(fname)){

//creating cipher output stream to write encrypted contents
try(CipherOutputStream cos = new CipherOutputStream(fos,
                                                    cipher)){

int read;
byte buf[] = new byte[4096];

while((read = fis.read(buf)) != -1) //reading from file
    cos.write(buf, 0, read); //encrypting and writing to file

```

Q1 File encryptedFile = new File(filename);

D CipherOutputStream cos = cipher.getOutputStream(encryptedFile);

File plaintextFile = new File(PTfilename);

OS.write(plaintextFile);

IN Pseudo code

PF = OPEN the File handler to the Plain File

EF = OPEN the File handler to the new encrypted File

3 Read for every block in PF:

WRITE BLOCK TO EF using ciphered out stream

- e. Identify and explain any security vulnerabilities in the code in Question 1(d) above. (6 marks)

Answer ???

Q1

E The use of DES

DES is no longer considered a secure encryption algorithm. Its 56 bit keys are susceptible to a brute force attack. A more secure algorithm such as AES should be used

The use of ECB blocks

ECB should not be used as it allows patterns in the plaintext to appear in the ciphertext. It is also vulnerable to cut and paste attacks where blocks from the encrypted file can be moved around without breaking the decryption

The use of Random() does not give us secure random numbers. Its output is predictable

The lack of an IV

2. Consider the following Needham-Schroeder style authentication protocol, whereby initiator A asks Authentication Server Y for a session key K_{AB} that it can use with service B.

Msg1 $A \rightarrow T: A, B, N_A$
 Msg2 $T \rightarrow A: \{N_A, B, K_{AB}, \{K_{AB}\}_{K_{BT}}\}_{K_{AT}}$
 Msg3 $A \rightarrow B: A, \{K_{AB}\}_{K_{BT}}$

Principles A and B share long-term secret keys K_{AT} and K_{BT} with server T, respectively; N_A is a nonce and $\{\dots\}_K$ denotes symmetric key encryption with secret key K.

- a) Describe an attack on the protocol whereby Eve can masquerade as A to B. (10 marks)

Answer

A Assuming Eve shares a key K_{ET}
 Trent she can do the following

MSG α 1 $E \rightarrow T$ E, B, N_E
 MSG α 2 $T \rightarrow E$ $\{N_E, B, K_{EB}, \{K_{EB}\}_{K_{BT}}\}_{K_{ET}}$

Eve receiving the previous message from Bob uses K_{ET} to retrieve K_{EB} and $\{K_{EB}\}_{K_{BT}}$ for later use

If Eve wants to masquerade as Alice she can send:

MSG α 3 $A[E] \rightarrow B$ $A, \{K_{EB}\}_{K_{BT}}$

Bob will receive the message see it's from Alice and extract K_{EB} using his K_{BT}

10 Bob cannot tell K_{EB} is actually from Eve as it is just a key

Bob will now use K_{EB} thinking he is communicating with Alice

Eve could replace A with any other user in MSG α 3 and Bob will believe he is talking to that user

- b) Revise the protocol so that: it eliminates the vulnerability in Question 2(a); provides mutual authentication between A and B and supports key revocation in the event that K_{AT} is compromised. (10 marks)

Answer

Q2

B. MSG 1 $A \rightarrow T$ A, B, N_A

MSG 2 $T \rightarrow A$ $\{N_A, B, K_{AB}, \{K_{AB}, A, B, \text{Timestamp}\}_{K_{BT}}}\}_{K_{AT}}$

MSG 3 $A \rightarrow B$ $A, \{K_{AB}, A, B, \text{Timestamp}\}_{K_{BT}}, \{A, N_A\}_{K_{AB}}$

MSG 4 $B \rightarrow A$ $\{A, N_A + 1\}_{K_{AB}}, \{B, N_B\}_{K_{AB}}$

MSG 5 $A \rightarrow B$ $\{B, N_B + 1\}_{K_{AB}}$

It provides key revocation with the timestamp. Session keys will expire (Parties won't accept a key that's stale and be forced to key after a predetermined amount of time)

It provides mutual auth using the nonces. A and B are included in the nonce so that Alice's nonce looks different than Bob's nonce.

- c) Alice logs into the workstation corresponding to Principle A and K_{AT} is determined by her password. Alice does not want to give her password every time she uses the protocol to request services, however, she is concerned about the workstation storing long-term key K_{AT} for the duration of her login session. Describe how the protocol can be revised to provide single-sign-on for Alice while addressing her password security concerns. (5 marks)

Answer

C She can do this by changing the protocol to be similar to Kerberos

Alice requests a session key from Trent using KAT. For example Alice could do

Msg 1 $A \rightarrow T \quad A, N_A, \text{validity}$

Msg 2 $T \rightarrow A \quad \{N_A, K_{\text{sessionAT}}, \text{validity}\}_{K_{AT}}$

Alice's workstation uses KAT to retrieve $K_{\text{sessionAT}}$ from Msg 2

Trent will now send messages to A ^{using} $K_{\text{sessionAT}}$ instead of KAT and Trent will discard it after the validity so it is no longer used

When Alice wants to message Bob she would send the message as before to Trent:

$A \rightarrow T \quad A, B, N_A$

Trent would then respond with the 4 message as normal (as message 2) but use $K_{\text{sessionAT}}$ instead of KAT

3. The following SSL-style protocol fragment establishes a secure connection between browser B and web-server A:

Msg 1: $B \rightarrow A : \{B, K_{ab}, N_A\}_{K_A}$

Msg 2: $A \rightarrow B : \{N_B + 1\}_{K_{ab}}$

where K_A is the public key owned by A, K_{ab} is a symmetric key proposed by A and N_B is a nonce. In a Protocol Msg 1, $\{\dots\}_{K_{ab}}$ denotes symmetric key encryption in Protocol Msg 2.

- a) Explain how the protocol should be extended to support public key certificates. Your answer should include a revision of the protocol, description certificate(s) content and how it is used by the browser / web server. (10 marks)

Answer

A	MSG 1	B → A	Hello
	MSG 2	A → B	Cert A
	MSG 3	B → A	$\{B, K_{AB}, N_B\}_{K_A}$
	MSG 4	A → B	$\{N_B + 1\}_{K_{AB}}$

Where Cert A contains $\{K_A, A, \text{validity}\}_{SKT}$ digitally signed by CA's Private Key

The Browser knows K_T , our CA and has his public key installed using Cert A. It can validate the public key in the cert belongs to A and has not expired. It will use this K_A in Msg 3. 10

The web server to get Cert A would need to securely send its K_A and our CA K_T would need to validate K_A is owned by A.

- b) The protocol assumes that B is competent to generate a good session key K_{ab} . Give an example of why this might not be the case. Revise the protocol so it uses a Diffie-Hellman key exchange to establish the session key K_{ab} . (10 marks)

Answer

B_i B could be using a poor random number generator to generate K_{AB} or even reuse K_{AB} . The Browser b could be poorly designed or a bug intentionally/accidentally left in it (see heartbleed)

B: Msg 1 $B \rightarrow A \{ B, g, n, (g^x \bmod n), N_B \}_{K_A}$
 Msg 2 $A \rightarrow B g^y \bmod n$

After message 1 A, the server has
 g, n and $g^x \bmod n$
 A generates a random prime y (the one it
 sends in Msg 2)
 A computes key k as $\underbrace{(g^x \bmod n)}_{\text{From M1}}^y \bmod n$

After message 2 B, the browser has
 g, n (it generated those) and $g^y \bmod n$ 10
 B computes key k as $(g^y \bmod n)^x \bmod n$

Key k that the browser has computed
 is the same as key k that the
 server has computed. these are
 equivalent to key K_{AB}

- c) Apple iOS comes with a pre-installed trusted Certificate Authority (CA) certificate from a foreign military agency. Describe how this agency might spy on a user's secure (HTTPS) web browsing. (5 marks)

Answer

C Using this CA the agency could perform a Man In the middle Attack on the user's browsing

The agency would either poison the DNS or trick the user by some other means ^(installing a proxy) to visit their webserver instead of the legitimate one

The military CA will issue certificates to that fake webserver and the certificate would bind that server to (for example Amazon.com)

When the user visits the site they

5 would be presented with a certificate which they would trust and believe they are talking to the real Amazon.com

This certificate would be trusted as the phone trusts certs signed by that agency's CA