

# SSH, SSL, and IPsec: wtf?

Eric Rescorla  
RTFM, Inc.  
ekr@rtfm.com

# What are we trying to accomplish?

- Alice, Bob want to talk to each other
- But they're worried about attack
  - How do you know you're talking to the right person?
  - How do you know people can't listen to your conversation
  - How do you know people can't change your conversation?
- We want to build a system that protects against these attacks

# Terminology Dump 1: Attacker Capabilities

**Passive** Attacker doesn't send anything.

**Active** Attacker is allowed to send traffic.

**On-path** Attacker is on the communications path between A and B.

- Sees all traffic
- Can seamlessly impersonate either side

**Off-path** Attacker is not on communications path between A and B

- Can't see traffic between A and B.
- Can sometimes send traffic as either (subject to address filtering).

## Terminology Dump 2: Security Properties

**Confidentiality** Information being transmitted is kept secret from attackers

**Data Origin Authentication** Receivers can determine the origin of traffic.

**Message Integrity** Tampering of traffic can be detected.

**Third-party Verifiability** A party not involved in the initial communication can verify what happened. (Often misleadingly called *non-repudiation*)

# A simple problem: remote authentication

- You're a Web server
  - X connects to you claiming to be Alice
  - How can you tell?
- Assumptions:
  - All you have is the network traffic
    - \* Can send messages to X
    - \* Receive X's response
  - Attackers can forge but not view, intercept, or modify traffic
  - You have some prior relationship with Alice

## Remote authentication: basic ideas

- Alice needs to be able to do something others can't do
  - Generally, compute some function
    - \* But why can't X do that?
- How do we break the symmetry?
  - Give Alice more resources
  - *Give Alice some secret*

# One-sided authentication with shared secrets

- Assume Alice and Bob share a secret  $S_{ab}$ 
  - Alice needs to prove possession of  $S_{ab}$
  - (Assume Alice authenticates Bob some other way)
- Simple approach:
  - Bob and Alice both store  $S_{ab}$
  - Alice sends Bob  $S_{ab}$
  - Bob does `memcmp()`.

## Problems with the previous scheme

**Snooping.** an attacker who is on-path can capture the password and *replay* it

**Hijacking.** an attacker can wait for you to exchange the password and then take over the connection

**One-way authentication.** how does Alice authenticate Bob?



# Fixing snooping

- Alice doesn't send  $S_{ab}$  over the wire
  - Instead she computes some function  $f$
  - And sends  $f(S_{ab})$
- What properties does  $f$  need?
  - 1st Preimage Resistant** hard to compute  $S_{ab}$  from  $f(S_{ab})$
  - 2nd Preimage Resistant** hard to find  $S'$  st  $f(S') = f(S_{ab})$
- Luckily, we have such functions


# Cryptographic hash functions

- Basic idea: one-way function (also called *message digests*)
  - Take an arbitrary length bit string  $m$  and reduce it to 100-200 ( $b$ ) bits
  - $H(m) = h$
- Hash functions are preimage resistant
  - Takes approximately  $2^b$  operations to find  $m$  given  $h$
- Hash functions are collision resistant
  - Takes approximately  $2^{b/2}$  operations to find  $m, m'$  st.  
 $H(m) = H(m')$
- Popular algorithms: MD5, SHA-1, SHA-256



# Why mutual authentication?

- We assumed that Alice was talking to Bob
  - But how does Alice know that?
  - She can't trust the network
  - What if she's connecting to the attacker




- Alice has just logged in for the attacker
  - He can issue any commands he wants (oops!)



# Hijacking

- This protocol still has a hijacking problem



- We need to authenticate the data
  - Not just the initial handshake

# Authenticating data

- Break the data into records
  - Attach a *message authentication code* (MAC) to each record
  - Receiver verifies MACs on record



# A message authentication code? Dude, wait, what?

- What's a MAC?
  - A one-way function of the key and some data
  - $F(k, data) = x$ 
    - \*  $x$  is short (80-200 bits)
    - \* Hard to compute  $x$  without  $k$
    - \* Hard to compute  $data$  even with  $k, x$
- This sounds kinda like a hash
  - MACs are usually built from hashes
    - \* World's simplest MAC:  $H(k + data)$  (this has problems)
- Popular MACs: HMAC




# Where does the key come from?

- We want a key that's unique to this connection
  - And tied to both sides
  - Get it from the challenge-response handshake
- First attempt:  $K = H(S_{ab} + Challenge1 + Challenge2)$ 
  - But now the key is the same in both directions
  - And the same as the challenge response!
  - Allows *reflection* attacks
- Second attempt
  - $K_{a \rightarrow b} = H(S_{ab} + "AB" + Challenge1 + Challenge2)$
  - $K_{b \rightarrow a} = H(S_{ab} + "BA" + Challenge1 + Challenge2)$

# World's simplest security protocol

*Alice*

*Bob*



- Each side knows who the other is
- All messages are authenticated
  - But they're not confidential
  - So don't send any secret information


# Symmetric Encryption

- We have two functions  $E, D$  st.
  - $E(k, Plaintext) = Ciphertext$
  - $D(k, Ciphertext) = Plaintext$
  - These are easy to compute
  - Either function is hard to compute without  $k$
- Popular encryption algorithms: DES, 3DES, AES, RC4

# A (mostly) complete channel security protocol

*Alice*

*Bob*



Rather than encrypting the MAC, we should encrypt the message and MAC the ciphertext

- Each side knows who the other is
- All messages are authenticated
- *All messages are confidential*

## So, we're done, right?


- How do Alice and Bob get  $S_{ab}$ ?
- Some out of band channel
  - Send a letter—do you trust USPS?
  - Meet in person—airplane tickets are expensive
  - Guys with briefcases handcuffed to their wrists?
- All of these are pretty inconvenient
  - We can do better

# Diffie-Hellman Key Agreement

- Each side has two keys (“public” and “private”)
  - You publish the public key but the private key is secret
  - $F(K_{pub}^a, K_{priv}^b) = F(K_{pub}^b, K_{priv}^a) = ZZ$
  - You need at least one private key to compute  $ZZ$
- This is crypto rocket science—but you don’t need to understand how it works

Not actually true. Diffie-Hellman is not that complicated and you do need to understand how it works!


# Using Diffie-Hellman



- Each side sends its public key
- The other side combines its private key with the other side's public key to compute  $ZZ$
- The traffic keys are generated from  $ZZ$

We need four different keys:  
— Encryption keys Alice -> Bob and Bob -> Alice;  
— MAC keys Alice -> Bob and Bob -> Alice

# Man-in-the-middle attack



- Each side thinks it's talking to the other
  - This is what happens when you don't authenticate
- Alice and Bob need some way to authenticate each other's public keys



# Digital Signatures

- Remember MACs?
- There's a public key version of this
  - “Sign” with  $K_{priv}$
  - “Verify” with  $K_{pub}$
- A signed message can only be generated by someone who has the private key
- Popular algorithms: RSA, DSA, ECDSA

# Public key distribution

- Public key cryptography is one piece of the puzzle
  - But only one piece
- I can verify a signature came from a given key
  - But where do I get that key from?
- We could have a global directory
  - Obvious scaling problems here
- What if I could give you a credential vouching for your public key?


# Certificates

- Digital signatures let us do exactly that
- Create a central *certificate authority* (CA)
  - Alice proves her identity to the CA
  - The CA gives her a signed message “*Alice’s public key is X*” (a certificate)
- Anyone can verify this certificate
  - As long as they have the public key of the CA
  - This key is compiled into the software
- Popular CAs: VeriSign, Thawte, GoDaddy  
LetsEncrypt — free, easy to use

# Diffie-Hellman with certificates

*Alice*


*Bob*



- Certificates contain DH public keys
- Each side can authenticate the other
  - This is actually a bug
  - Certificates are too inconvenient for users to get
  - And the user doesn't always need to be authenticated
  - Or is authenticated some other way

# One-way authentication with PKC

- One side (server) has a certificate
- The other side (client) makes up a random key pair



- This authenticates the server but not the client
- We can do a similar trick with RSA
  - Encrypt with public key, decrypt with private key
- This is the main operational mode for SSL/TLS

Well, it was. Now, we're moving toward forward secrecy (next slide)

# Perfect Forward Secrecy

- What happens if one side's computer is compromised?
  - Attacker gets private key
  - Can decode all communications by that side
- Fix: have certificates with signature keys (RSA, DSA)
  - Generate a random DH key for each handshake
  - Sign it with your signature key
- Compromise of private key doesn't affect past traffic
  - But you can MITM future connections
- This is the main operational mode for IPsec and TLS 1.3

# Algorithm negotiation

- There are a lot of choices here
  - Who authenticates,
  - Public key algorithm
  - Digest algorithm
  - Encryption algorithm
- Each make sense in some scenarios
  - A good protocol is adaptable
- This means some kind of negotiation
  - This needs to be protected to prevent downgrade attacks

# A complete channel security protocol

*Alice*

*Bob*

$\xrightarrow{\text{Random1, Algorithms}}$

$\xleftarrow{\text{Random2, Algorithm, Cert}^b}$

$\xrightarrow{\text{Cert}^a, \text{MAC}(\text{ZZ}, \text{HandshakeMsgs})}$

$\xleftarrow{\text{MAC}(\text{ZZ}, \text{HandshakeMsgs})}$

$\xrightarrow{E(k_{a \rightarrow b}, (\text{Message1}, \text{MAC}))}$

$\xleftarrow{E(k_{b \rightarrow a}, (\text{Message2}, \text{MAC}))}$

Again, we should MAC the ciphertext rather than encrypting the MAC



# Secure Sockets Layer (SSL)

- Originally a Netscape proprietary protocol
- Target application: e-commerce
  - What people thought the Web was for in 1994
  - Objective: send my credit card to Amazon securely
- Basic principles (ca. 1994)
  - The server is authenticated (via certificate)
  - The client is unauthenticated
  - This should be easy to plug in to both sides

# SSL/TLS History (1)

- SSLv1 (never released)
  - Designed by Kipp Hickman
  - Severe security flaws (immediately obvious to anyone who knew crypto)
- SSLv2
  - Hickman again (after being beaten up by others)
  - Modest security flaws (truncation attacks, downgrade)
  - Very widely deployed
- SSLv3
  - Freier, Karlton, Kocher
  - Fixes the above problems


## SSL/TLS History (2)

- Transport Layer Security (TLS) 1.0 (RFC 2246)
  - First standardized version of SSL
  - Modest improvements to key derivation
- TLS 1.1 (RFC 4346)
  - Fixes for modest security flaws
- TLS 1.2 (RFC 5246)
  - Flexibility for hash functions (thanks Dr. Wang!)
- As you can see, this is in maintenance mode

TLS 1.3 is in progress, major changes:

- No RSA key exchange (for forward secrecy);
- authenticated encryption modes;
- 0 RTT handshakes

# HTTP over SSL (HTTPS)




- The client *knows* that the server expects HTTPS
  - It's in the URL `https://www.example.com/`
  - It's on a separate port
- The server's certificate has its domain name (`www.example.com`)

# SSL Session Resumption

- Asymmetric (private key) operations are expensive
  - And HTTPS tends to involve a lot of SSL/TCP connections
- Caching pays off here
  - Each handshake establishes a *session*
  - Clients can *resume* the session with the same keying material
  - Thus skipping the key exchange

# Upward Negotiation

- What if the client and server don't know each other's capabilities
  - Would be nice to discover them
  - And automatically upgrade to TLS
- Example: SMTP



- Of course, this allows downgrade attacks

# DoS Attacks on SSL/TLS

- Resource consumption
  - Public key operations are expensive
    - \* Client can force the server to do a lot of them
    - \* But not blindly (TCP handshake)
  - State on the server side
- SSL/TLS connection runs over TCP
  - TCP connections are easy to DoS
  - SSL/TLS can't protect you from this
  - Needs to be at a lower layer

# Datagram TLS (RFC 4347)

- TLS requires a reliable channel
  - The handshake is in sequence
  - The data records depend on each other
  - In practice this means TCP
- What about unreliable channels?
  - DTLS is a slight modification of TLS
  - Reliability for the handshake
  - Record independence
- More DoS resistance (more on this later)




# Secure Shell (SSH)

- Originally designed by Tatu Ylonen
  - Replacement for rsh
  - Now the standard tool for secure remote login
  - A lot of authentication mechanisms
- Other features
  - Remote X
  - File transfer
  - Port forwarding
- Original version was seriously broken
  - Later standardized versions are better
  - Transport protocol looks a lot like TLS

# SSH leap of faith authentication

- No certificates—server just has a raw public key
  - The server provides the key when the client connects
  - The client stores the server's key on first connection
  - Any changes in the key are an error
- The key can be authenticated out of band
  - The server operator tells the client the key fingerprint (hash) over the phone
  - But only the most paranoid people do this
- This was considered insanity at the time
  - Now it's considered clever


# SSL Key Exchange Protocol



# SSH Client Authentication


- Server is authenticated first
- Client is then authenticated
  - Raw password
  - Challenge-response
  - Public key
  - GSS-API
  - Kerberos
- Mechanisms are negotiated

# SSH Client Authentication Protocol



# Port Forwarding

- SSH provides a port forwarding feature
- Example: X11 remote



- SSH server does `setenv DISPLAY localhost:XXXX`
- Apps just automatically work

# Secure Remote Shell

- SSH is backward compatible with rsh
  - So other applications can be securely remoted
  - Even without port forwarding
- Examples
  - CVS
  - rsync
  - dump/restore
- Apps don't need security, just remote access

# IPsec: IP Security


- Basic idea: secure IP datagrams
  - Instead of at application layer like TLS or SSH
- Why was this considered a good idea?
  - Secure all traffic, not just TCP/UDP
  - Automatically secure applications
    - \* Without any change to the application
  - Built-in-firewalling/access control



# IPsec history

- Work started in 1992-1993
- General agreement on packet formats early on
  - Though confusion about integrity vs. authentication
- Key agreement was very controversial
  - Design issues
  - IPR issues
- First “proposed standards” published in 1998
  - Mishmash of IKE, ISAKMP, OAKLEY
- Complaints about clarity and complexity
  - IKEv2 approved in 2005

# IPsec architecture



# IPsec Packet Formats




# IKE “Anonymity”

- The handshakes we’ve seen leak your identity to passive attackers
  - Arguably this is bad
  - IKE tries to stop this

*Initiator*


*Responder*



- An active attacker can get the initiator’s identity

# IKE DoS prevention

- Objective: prevent blind DoS attacks



- Ticket has to be stateless

# IPsec Status

- Many implementations
  - Windows, OS X, Linux, FreeBSD, IOS...
- Nearly all deployments are in VPN settings
- And people are cutting over to SSL/VPN
  - Semi-manual configuration
- This is not what was intended
- Widely regarded as a semi-failure

# What was wrong with IPsec?

- Complexity
- Time to market
- Wrong design goals
- Hard to use

## Final thoughts

- All of these protocols look strikingly alike
  - To some extent they were designed by the same people
  - But also there appear to only be so many ways to do this
- All have gone through multiple revisions
  - This is really hard to get right
  - Even when you ave experienced people
  - Don't invent your own
- Usage models matter
  - SSL/TLS and SSH got this right
  - IPsec did not