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## Today

- Common techniques for authenticating users, locally and remotely
- Security challenges associated with different authentication methods
- Mitigations designed to address some of the above security challenges


## Authentication

- Using cryptography, Alice and Bob can authenticate each other by proving they know respective secret keys
- Challenge-response authentication: Alice sends a random challenge to Bob. Bob signs (or MACs) the challenge.
- Switch roles, repeat.
- What exactly did we authenticate?
- Have Alice and Bob really committed their secret keys to memory?
- Did they manually perform cryptographic signing operations?


## Authentication

- Using cryptography, Alice and Bob can authenticate each other by proving they know respective secret keys
- Challenge-response authentication: Alice sends a random challenge to Bob. Bob signs (or MACs) the challenge.
- Switch roles, repeat.
- What exactly did we authenticate?
- Have Alice and Bob really committed their secret keys to memory?
- Did they manually perform cryptographic signing operations?
- They authenticated each other's computers.


## Authentication

- How do we authenticate a human user to a system?
- System is often remote server
- Authenticate: ascertain who is interacting with the system
- Necessary to apply appropriate security policy
- Only the intended subject should be able to authenticate to the system as that subject


Alice


System

## Authentication

How do we authenticate a human user to a machine?

- Provide identity and proof of identity
- Identity examples:
- Name, username, student ID, others?

- [proof]

Alice
System

## Authentication

How can Alice prove that she's really Alice?

- Three types of authentication factors
- Password: Something you know
- Token: Something you have
- Biometrics: Something you are
- Each factor can be used independently, or combined for multi-factor authentication.
- Typically two-factor

$\%$


Alice

Something you know. Password. Something you have. RSA token. Something you are. Fingerprint.

Something you pretend to be.

## Happy.

@swiftonsecurity

## Something you know

## Something you know

- A secret that only the real Alice should know
- A secret passcode.
- Examples: PIN, password
- PIN: Personal Identification Number (misnomer. Usually used for authentication, not identification.)
- A secret about Alice
- Examples: mother's maiden name, first pet, mortgage payment
- Technically, only proves knowledge of secret, not that it's really Alice
- Secrets leak, can be shared, guessed.


OOH, GOOD QUESTION!
I BET WE CAN CONSTRUV A COOL PROOF-OF-IDENITY PROTOCD. IU START BY PICKING TWO RANDOM-

https://xkcd.com/1121/

## Passwords

How does Alice prove she knows the password?

- Simplest: Alice provides the password to the system.
- Problems?
- Passive adversary may observe password in transit
- Need secure channel to protect confidentiality
- Active adversary may impersonate the system
- Alice needs a way of authenticating the system


## Setting

Alice uses a keyboard to type her password into client software that sends it on to the remote system for authentication.

Which points can Eve attack?


## Attacking Passwords

- Get it from Alice
- Intercept it
- Get it from the system



## Attacking Passwords

- Is Alice invested in keeping it a secret?
- Debit card PIN number?
- Personal email password?
- Netflix password?
- Corporate network password?
- Is it written down somewhere?
- Good against remote attackers
- Not good against targeted local attacks (co-workers, family, abusers)
- Know your threat model!
- Can it be guessed based on available knowledge about Alice (birthday, names of pets/kids/spouses, etc)?


Alice's computer


WHAT WOULD ACTUALLY HAPPEN:
HIS LAPTOP'S ENCRYPTED. DRUG HIM AND HIT HIM WITH THIS $\$ 5$ WRENCH UNTL HE TEUS US THE PASSWORD.

https://xkcd.com/538/

## Strong passwords

- Challenge: come up with passwords that are hard to guess, but easy to remember.
- Common password rules:
- Composition: Letters and numbers, mixed case, symbols, banned dictionary
- Length (char size)
- Lifetime (monthly, quarterly, yearly, etc)
- Unintended consequences
- Required letters/symbols $\rightarrow$ ?
- Monthly change requirement $\rightarrow$ ?


## Attacking Passwords

- Can Eve trick Alice into revealing her password?
- How does Alice know she is logging into the real system?
- Phishing!
- Tricking Alice into revealing her password by impersonating the system she is trying to access
- Alice has to be able to authenticate the system before providing her password



## Phishing

How can Alice authenticate the system?
HTTPS certificates validate the domain name in the URL.


What does it really tell you?

- That you are communicating with a server owned by UCSD?
- No. Only that you are communicating to www.ucsd.edu and your connection is secure (confidentiality and integrity are protected) against passive and active attackers on the link.


## Phishing

- How do you know www.ucsd.edu is a legitimate UCSD web site?
- What about:
- www.cse.ucsd.edu
- www.ucsd.cse.edu
- www.cse-ucsd.edu


## Phishing

- How do you know www.ucsd.edu is a legitimate UCSD web site?
- A user is expected to know which domains are associated with the entity they are trying to interact with.
- And how to properly parse the URL
- Some browsers now highlight the domain portion

```
\epsilon \omega
``` ब. 0 https/mwwucsdedu

\section*{UCSanDiego}

\section*{Phishing}

What if the user knows which domain is real?
- Homoglyphs: symbols that appear identical or very similar
- Attack: Register domain names that look just like the victim domain, but using a different character set.


Latin Small Letter \(A\)
Unicode U+0061
Unicode U+0061
Mathematical Sans-Serif Small A Unicode U+1D5BA

Both set in Helvetica Neve

\section*{Phishing}
- https:
//www.irongeek.com/homoglyph-attack-generator.php
```

            (3) ucsd.edu|
    - (9) $\mathrm{xn}-$-cs-0bco8j.edu

```
- https://www.xudongz.com/blog/2017/idn-phishing/
(3) https://www.apple.com|
- 3 https://www,xn-80ak6aa92e.com


\section*{Phishing}
- Related: When logging into a machine locally, how does Alice know that she is entering the password into the real login program?
- Trusted path: Mechanism that guarantees user is interacting with intended component
- CTRL+ALT+DEL on Windows

\section*{Attacking Passwords}
- Shoulder surf
- Side channels
- Hardware keyloggers


\section*{Attacking Passwords}
- Software keyloggers
- Passwords in memory
- Internal buffers
- Clipboard
- Stored passwords
- Cached passwords (e.g. browsers)
- Password managers (e.g Bitwarden, LastPass, etc)
- Good ones are well protected by master passwords
- AlicePasswords.txt


\section*{Attacking Passwords}
- Monitoring the transmission channel
- Channel should be encrypted to protect password confidentiality
- Examples: TLS/SSH/HTTPS


\section*{Attacking Passwords}
- Use system as an oracle: try to log in with different passwords
- Defense: Minimize error information
- Defense: Limit number of login attempts per user
- Attack: Try different users for common passwords
- Compromise password database
- Huge yield compared to user-side attacks
- https://haveibeenpwned.com/
- Password reuse issues

Eve


System

\section*{Protecting Passwords}
- How can the system verify that the password Alice entered is correct?
- Naive solution:
- Store a copy of the password and compare provided copy to the stored one
- Problem?
- If system is compromised, passwords are revealed
- Same passwords may be used on other systems

\section*{Protecting Passwords}
- Other solutions?

\section*{Protecting Passwords}
- Other solutions?
- Hint: System does not need to know the password, only be able to verify it is correct.
- What if the system stores a cryptographic hash of the password?
- H(password)
- Hash must be pre-image resistant (hard to invert)
- Better... but still problematic.

\section*{Protecting Passwords}
- Given a hash of a password, Eve can use it to validate guesses
- Also, obvious which users have identical passwords
- Dictionary attacks
- Dictionary: collection of possible, or likely, password strings
- Try every string in the dictionary until the correct entry is found.
- Pre-compute hashes of all strings in the dictionary, then perform reverse look-ups by hash to find corresponding password.

\section*{HACKERS RECENTLY LEAKED 153 MILLION ADOBE USER} EMAILS, ENCRYPTED PASSWORDS, AND PASSWORD HINTS. ADOBE ENCRYPTED THE PASSWORDS IMPRODPERLY, MISUSING BLOCK-MODE 3DES. THE RESULT IS SOMETHING WONDERFUL:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline USER PASSWORD & HINT & \\
\hline \(4 \mathrm{el} 18 \mathrm{caclab2722d6}\) & WEATHER VANE SWORD & प|1111 \\
\hline 4 el8acclab2722d6 & WLAIER VANE SWORD & प1111 \\
\hline 4 el8acclab2722d6 a002876 cblealifa & NAME1 & \\
\hline 8babba997e06e6bd & DUH & \\
\hline 8babb6999e06esbd a002876 chlealice & & पा1ा1 \\
\hline 8babb6299e06edbd 85e9da8 a8Sa78ade & 57 & \\
\hline 4 ll acclab2722d6 & FAVORITE OF 12 APOSTEES & \\
\hline lab29ee\%ddabesca 7a2da002876eble & WITH YOUR OUN HAND YOU HAVE DONE ALL THIS & \\
\hline a1991266299e7026 eodeclebab797397 & SEXY EARLOBES & पाएा1 \\
\hline a1F96262999e702b 617600277777d85 & BEST TOS EPISODE & -1111 \\
\hline 3973877adb068a+7 617ab0271727ad85 & SUGARLAND & \\
\hline \(19629 a c 86\) dabejca & NAME + JERSEY\# & \\
\hline 877ab789\%3362626 & ALPHA & \\
\hline 877a678899366261 & & \\
\hline 877ab7889336261 & & \\
\hline 877ab7899336261 & OBVIOUS & \\
\hline 877a67898336261 & MICHAEL JACKSON & \\
\hline 38a7c9779 codeb 4498 coll 79 d 4 dec6 65 & & \\
\hline 3807 c 9779 codeb 449 dcolld 7 d 4 dec 655 & HEDIDTHE MASH, HEDID THE & प|1 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
3807c9279codeb 44 \\

\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
PURLOINED \\
FOVL LATER- 3 POKEMON
\end{tabular} & \(\square 111 \square\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Protecting Passwords}

Dictionary attack cost example:
- Assume passwords are composed of upper or lower case letters or digits
- \(26+26+10=62 \approx 64\) possible values per character
- \(64^{n}=2^{6 n}\) possible passwords of length \(n\)
- For \(n=6,2^{36}\) possible password strings
- \(\approx 10 \mathrm{~TB}\) to store all possible 6-character passwords and respective SHA-1 hashes

Can be reduced using techniques like rainbow tables.

\section*{Protecting Passwords}
- How do we make dictionary attacks harder?
- Note, the attacker only had to compute one dictionary of hashes that could then be used for any user's password hash from any system.
- We can parameterize, or "salt", password hashes with unique random numbers
- Instead of storing \(H(p)\), store \((r, H(r \mid p))\), where \(r\) is random salt
- Precomputation is no longer possible. Attacker must compute unique hashes for every target
- Better... but still problematic.

\section*{Specialized Password-Cracking Hardware}
- 2012: Gosney 25 GPU password cracking cluster
- 350B NTLM hashes (used by Windows) per sec
- 180B MD5 hashes/sec, 63B SHA-1 hashes/sec

- State actors can build custom hardware

\section*{Protecting Passwords}
- How do we make dictionary attacks even harder?

\section*{Protecting Passwords}
- How do we make dictionary attacks even harder?
- Hint: The computation to verify a password for a given user on a legitimate system happens relatively infrequently, but an attacker attempting to crack a password hash must perform many, many attempts

\section*{Protecting Passwords}
- How do we make dictionary attacks even harder?
- Hint: The computation to verify a password for a given user on a legitimate system happens relatively infrequently, but an attacker attempting to crack a password hash must perform many, many attempts
- Conclusion: Use a deliberately slow and resource-consuming hashing function
- PBKDF2, bcrypt, scrypt

\section*{Protecting Passwords}
- Building blocks for password protection
- Hash
- Salt
- Slow down
- For Slow down, use one of:
- PBKDF2
- bcrypt
- scrypt

\section*{Open-ended question}

\section*{What is your password hygiene?}

Mine: Use strong passwords, don't reuse passwords, never share passwords, etc.

Go to www.menti.com and use the code 10441273

\section*{Something you have}

\section*{Something You Have}
- Something only Alice should have
- Examples: key, smartcard, RFID badge, SecurID token
- Frequently used as a second factor (in combination with a passcode)
- 2FA token
- Technically, only proves possession of the token, not that it's really Alice
- Tokens get shared, lost, stolen, duplicated

\section*{Smartcards}
- Idea: Put a secret key into a tiny computer that Alice can carry with her
- Plastic card with an embedded integrated circuit
- Provisioned with secret keys
- Interacts with readers through contact pads or short range wireless (NFC)
- Many uses beyond user authentication
- Stored value payment and transit
- SIM cards
- Satellite TV
- Sample authentication protocol:

1. Interrogate with a random challenge
2. Verify signed response


\section*{One Time Passcode Tokens}
- Same basic idea as a smart card: a tiny computer with a secret
- Typically without a direct computer interface
- How to provide challenge and get response?
- Response is displayed on token screen, user types it into the authentication system.
- Typically using current time instead of a challenge (requires time sync)
- Some variants have keypads to allow the user to type in a challenge as well

\section*{One Time Passcode Tokens}
- Typical protocol:
- Based on symmetric cryptography (shared secret between token and authenticating server)
- Periodically (e.g. once a minute) token generates a new single-use code by MACing current time
- To authenticate, Alice types in her password and current code (two-factor)
- Strengths:
- Knowing the password is not enough to impersonate Alice
- Each code is single-use. Eavesdropping (shoulder-surfing, keylogging, etc.) does not enable Eve to impersonate Alice in the future.
- Observing any number of codes does not help in predicting future ones.

\section*{One Time Passcode Tokens}
- Weaknesses:
- Vulnerable to man-in-the-middle and phishing attacks.
- Server needs to know the secret key to validate token codes. Single point of failure.
- Does not scale well to multiple accounts.


\section*{One-Time Passcode without Tokens}
- Virtual edition
- Everybody (in some parts of the world) already carries a tiny computer. Let's just use that.
- Strength: better scaling, support multiple keys with the same physical device.
- Weakness: the two authentication factors are not as isolated anymore.


\section*{One-time Passcode without Tokens}
- Extending the idea of using (possession of) your phone as an authentication factor.
- Authenticating server can send Alice a one-time code via SMS.
- Alice logs in with her password and received code.
- Often used for step-up authentication or account recovery.
- Step-up authentication: secondary (stronger) authentication mechanism invoked based on risk level
- Examples: When attempting to access more sensitive resources, or when behavior patterns do not match routine.
- Similar solutions use email instead of SMS.
- Proof that Alice has access to the email account she registered with.
- Widespread use, but weaker against range of threat models (SMS not very secure)

\section*{Something you are}

\section*{Something You Are}
- Some unique identifying characteristic that only Alice has (biometrics)
- Physical feature: fingerprint, iris print
- Behavioral characteristic: handwriting, typing
- Combination thereof: voice, gait
- How do you know that I am the same person that was here last week?
- Did I provide a password?
- Did I provide a badge?
- Pretty much all trust boils down to biometric authentication of one human by another.

\section*{Biometrics}
- The only authentication factor that is not designed to be transferable
- Clear separation of authentication and authorization
- Nothing to remember, nothing to carry around
- Can be very strong differentiator
- Unique-ish

\section*{Biometrics}
- Fingerprint
- Handprint
- Retina
- Iris
- Face recognition
- Vein
- Vascular pattern in back of hand
- Voiceprint
- Signature
- Typing
- Timing between character sequences
- Gait recognition
- Heartbeat
- DNA

\section*{Biometrics}
- General approach:
- Scan an analog sample
- Convert to set of digital features
- On enrollment save template of identifiable features

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biometrics

\section*{Biometrics}

\section*{Simplified flow}


\section*{Biometrics}
- What happens in a remote authentication setting?
- What does the authenticating system actually get?


\section*{Biometrics}
- Scenario A: Only the sensor is local to user.
- Feature extraction and matching happen on authenticating system.
- Authenticating system has to trust Alice's computer to provide sensor data.
- All biometric features and template data are on a central server.


\section*{Biometrics}
- Scenario B: Sensing and feature extraction are local to user.
- Matching happens on authenticating system.
- Authenticating system has to trust Alice's computer to provide authentic, fresh, unspoofed data.
- All biometric features and template data are still on a central server.


\section*{Biometrics}
- Scenario C: Sensing, feature extraction, and matching are local to user.
- Only the result is communicated to the authenticating system.
- Authenticating system has to trust Alice's computer to perform authentication.
- All biometric features and template data are isolated on end users' devices.


\section*{Biometrics}
- Use in distributed systems requires biometric scanner to be trusted and to have secure channel (authenticity, privacy, integrity, no replay) to the server.
- Challenges
- Accuracy
- Ease of use (particularly enrollment)
- User acceptance
- Feature stability

\section*{Enrollment Issues}
- Unlike passwords, hard to pre-enroll user
- Users must be enrolled interactively
- For many biometrics, getting good accuracy requires multiple readings
- Build templates and test against registration
- Repeat
- Some templates simply tough (e.g. smooth fingerprint)
- "Goats": Subjects who have consistently low match scores against themselves.

\section*{How strong is a biometric?}
- Non-adversarial
- False accept rate
- False reject rate
- Adversarial
- Intercept
- Spoofing

\section*{Non-adversarial testing}
- False accept rate
- How many random trials before expectation of false accept \(>0.5\)
- False reject rate
- How many random trials before expectation of false reject \(>0.5\)
- Lower FAR = less tolerant of close matches
- Harder to attack
- Necessarily increases FRR
- Lower FRR = more tolerant of close matches
- Easier to use
- Necessarily increases FAR
- Since match is approximate can almost always tune for one or other
- Equal error rate point where FAR \(=\) FRR
- Note, huge difference between a single false accept and system-wide false accept (more templates means more things you can accept against)

\section*{Biometrics Spoofing}
- Biometrics are private, but not secret
- Users expose biometric instances everywhere
- Fingerprints, hand geometry, face, handwriting, iris, gate, etc.
- Allows attacker to create biometric forgery
- Very hard to replace a biometric identifier

\section*{Biometrics Spoofing}
- There are spoofing techniques for virtually all biometrics


Put this mold into
a refrigerator to cool. and then peel carefully.


\section*{Chaos Computer Club}


\section*{Spoofing iris recognition technology with pictures}
(C) Mer 92015

In a recent report by Forbes, Chaos Computer Club security researcher Jan "Starbug" Krissler highlighted the vuinerabilities behind some iris-scanning.


German researcher reverse-engineers a fingerprint using photos
(C) De 30.2014

A German researcher from European hackers association Chaos Computer Club recently demonstrated a method to fool standard biometric security software.


Chaos Computer Club claims Touch ID fake fingerprint spoof
(C) 50023.2013

Well that was fast. German hacker collective, Chaos Computer Club, has claimed that it has already spoofed the iPhone 55's Touch

\section*{Biometric Spoofing Mitigations}
- Replay prevention
- Save previous image and reject if identical
- Tricky: can pick up and rotate to fool
- Improved validation prevision
- Verifier should have higher precision than forger
- Examples: pore detection, perspiration detection
- "Liveness" detection
- Examples: temperature, pulse, blood flow

\section*{Biometric Spoofing Mitigations}
- Multi-modal
- Multiple biometric factors

- Multi-factor
- Biometric plus password
- Biometric plus token

\section*{Privacy issues}
- Biometric identifiers can track your physical activities as well as your virtual activities
- Some with crisp legal standing (fingerprint, DNA)
- Easy to match (even if can't spoof)
- Very hard to obscure

\section*{Review}
- Three types of authentication factors
- Password: Something you know
- Token: Something you have
- Biometrics: Something you are
- Each factor can be used independently, or combined for multi-factor authentication
- Typically 2 -factor
- Use a slow salted hash to store passwords
- PBKDF2, bcrypt, or scrypt
- Don't make up your own!```

