



Authentication of PPP channels

PPP is a protocol ...

- ... to encapsulate network packets (L3, e.g. IP) ...
- ... and carry them over a point-to-point link
 physical (e.g. RTC, ISDN)
 - virtual L2 (e.g. xDSL with PPPOE)
 - virtual L3 (e.g. L2TP over UDP/IP)
- activated in three sequential steps:
 - LCP (Link Control Protocol)
 - authentication (optional; PAP, CHAP or EAP)
 - L3 encapsulation (e.g. IPCP, IP Control Protocol)

Authentication of remote access

- for dial-up and for wireless and virtual links
- PAP
 - Password Authentication Protocol
 - password sent in clear
- CHAP
 - Challenge Handshake Authentication Protocol
 - symmetric challenge
- EAP
 - Extensible Authentication Protocol
 - external techniques (challenge, OTP, TLS)

PAP

- Password Authentication Protocol
- RFC-1334
- user-id and password sent in clear
- authentication only once when the channel is created
- very dangerous!

CHAP

- RFC-1994 "PPP Challenge Handshake Authentication Protocol (CHAP)"
- symmetric challenge (password based)
 - initial challenge compulsory (at channel creation)
 - authentication request optionally repeated (with a different challenge) during transmission – decision taken by the NAS
- those that support both CHAP and PAP must offer CHAP first

EAP

- RFC-2284
- "PPP Extensible Authentication Protocol (EAP)"
- a flexible L2 authentication framework
- authentication predefined mechanisms:
 - MD5-challenge (similar to CHAP)
 - OTP
 - generic token card
- other mechanisms may be added:
 - RFC-2716 "PPP EAP TLS authentication protocol"
 - RFC-3579 "RADIUS support for EAP"

EAP - encapsulation

- authentication data are transported via its own encapsulation protocol (because L3 packets are not yet available ...)
- features of EAP encapsulation:
 - independent of IP
 - supports any link layer (e.g. PPP, 802, ...)
 - explicit ACK/NAK (no windowing)
 - assumes no reorderingno support for fragmentation

EAP

the link is not assumed to be physically secure
 EAP methods must provide security on their own

- methods EAP:
 - FAP-TI S
 - EAP-MD5
 - tunnelled TLS (to operate any EAP method protected by TLS)
 - EAP-SRP (Secure Remote Password)
 - GSS_API (included Kerberos)
 - AKA-SIM







Network authentication protocols

- RADIUS
 - the de-facto standard
 - proxy towards other AS
- DIAMETER
 - evolution of RADIUS
 - emphasis on roaming among different ISP
 - takes care of security
- TACACS+ (TACACS, XTACACS)
 - originally technically better than RADIUS, achieved smaller acceptance because it was a proprietary solution (Cisco)

RADIUS

- Remote Authentication Dial-In User Service
- Livingston Technologies
- port 1812/UDP (error: 1645/UDP)
- supports authentication, authorization and accounting to control network access:
 - physical ports (analogical, ISDN, IEEE 802)
 - virtual ports (tunnel, wireless access)
- centralized administration and accounting
- client-server schema between NAS and AS
 - timeout + retransmission
 - secondary server

RADIUS - RFC

- RFC-2865 (protocol)
- RFC-2866 (accounting)
- RFC-2867/2868 (tunnel accounting and attributes)
- RFC-2869 (extensions)
- RFC-3579 (RADIUS support for EAP)
- RFC-3580 (guidelines for 802.1X with RADIUS)



RADIUS: data protection

- packet integrity and authentication via keyed-MD5:
 - key = shared-secret
 - client without key are ignored
- password transmitted "encrypted" with MD5 (after padding with NUL bytes to a multiple of 128 bit):

password

md5(key+authenticator)

RADIUS

- user authentication via PAP, CHAP, token-card and EAP
 - CISCO provides a free server for CryptoCard
 - others support SecurID
- attributes in TLV form, easily extensible without modification to installed base: attribute type – length – value



RADIUS – packet types

- ACCESS-REQUEST
- ACCESS-REJECT
- ACCESS-CHALLENGE
- ACCESS-ACCEPT (parameters):
 - SLIP/PPP: IPaddr, netmask, MTU, ...
 - terminal: host, port

RADIUS - authenticator

- double purpose:
 - server reply authentication and no replay
 - masking the password
- in Access-Request:
 - it is named Request Authenticator
 - 16 byte randomly generated by the NAS
- in Access-Accept / Reject / Challenge
 - it is named Response Authenticator
 - it is computed via a keyed-digest:

md5 (code || ID || length || RequestAuth || attributes || secret)







DIAMETER

- evolution of RADIUS
- special emphasis on roaming between ISP
- RFC-3588 "Diameter base protocol"
- RFC-3589 "Commands for the 3GPP"
- RFC-3539 "AAA transport profile"
- RFC-4004 "Diameter mobile IPv4 application"
- RFC-4005 "Diameter network access server application"
- RFC-4006 "Diameter credit-control application"
- RFC-4072 "Diameter EAP application"

Security of DIAMETER

- compulsory protection via IPsec or TLS:
 - Diameter client MUST support IPsec and MAY support TLS
 - Diameter server MUST support IPsec and TLS
- compulsory configurations:
 - (IPsec) ESP with non null algo for both authentication and privacy
 - (TLS) mutual authentication (client MUST have a public-key certificate)
 - (TLS) MUST support RSA+RC4_128/3DES+ MD5/SHA1 e MAY support RSA+AES_128+SHA1

IEEE 802.1x

Port-Based Network Access Control:

- L2 authentication architecture
- useful in a wired network to block access
- absolutely needed in wireless networks
- first implementations:
 - Windows-XP and Cisco wireless access-points

http://standards.ieee.org/getieee802/download/802.1X-2001.pdf

IEEE 802.1x

- authentication and key-management framework:
 - may derive session keys for use in packet authentication, integrity and confidentiality
 - standard algorithms for key derivation (e.g. TLS, SRP, ...)
 - optional security services (authentication or authentication+encryption)









Optimal level?

- the upper we go in the stack, the more specific are the security functions (e.g. it's possible to identify the user, commands, data) and independent from the underlying network ... but we leave more room for DoS attacks
- the lower we go in the stack, the more quickly we can "expel" the intruders ... but the fewer the data for the decision (e.g. only the MAC or IP addresses, no user identification, no commands)







Security measures at data-link level

- although there exist encrypting NIC for the client, normally L2 is never protected in a LAN but only in point-to-point geographic links
- more often the LAN management is associated to the security management:
 - VLAN
 - switch with protected ports (e.g. 802.1x)
 - alarms when a new MAC is detected
 - static L3 address assignment
 - say no to completely dynamic DHCP

DHCP security

- non-authenticated protocol
- activation of a shadow server is trivial
- possible attacks from the fake server:
 - denial-of-service
 - provides a wrong network configuration
 - MITM
 - provides a configuration with a 2-bit subnet + default gateway equal to an attacker host
 - if we additionally activate NAT we can intercept the replies too

DHCP protection

- some switch (e.g. Cisco) offers:
 - DHCPsnooping = only replies from "trusted ports"
 - IP guard = only IP got from a DHCP server (but there is a limit on the number of recognized addresses)
- RFC-3118 "Authentication for DHCP messages"
 - use of HMAC-MD5 to authenticate the messages
 - rarely adopted

Security at network level (L3)

- end-to-end protection for L3-homogeneous networks (e.g. IP networks)
- creation of VPN (Virtual Private Network)





When is a VPN appropriate?

- when data are transmitted over an untrusted network (e.g. public or shared) ...
- ... for internal company communications among remote sites (Intranet)
- ... for closed external communications among companies that previously entered into an agreement (Extranet)

When is a VPN NOT appropriate?

- when data are transmitted over an untrusted network ...
- ... for external communications among companies that have no agreement
- ... for communications with unknown customers (business-to-consumer e-commerce)

Techniques to create a VPN

- via private addressing
- via protected routing (IP tunnel)
- via cryptographic protection of the network packets (secure IP tunnel)

1. VPN via private addresses

 the networks to be part of the VPN use non-public addresses so that they are unreachable from other networks (e.g. private IANA networks as per RFC-1918)

- this protection can be easily defeated if somebody:
 - guesses or discovers the addresses
 - can sniff the packets during transmission
 - has access to the communication devices

2. VPN via tunnel

- the routers encapsulate whole L3 packets as a payload inside another packet
 - IP in IP
 - IP over MPLS
 - other
- the routers perform access control to the VPN by ACL (Access Control List)
- this protection can be defeated by anybody that manages a router or can sniff the packets during transmission



IP tunnel: fragmentation

- if the packet has size equal to the MTU, then encapsulation will only possible with fragmentation
- maximum performance loss = 50%
- largest loss for applications with large packets (typically the non-interactive applications, e.g. file transfer)

3. VPN via secure IP tunnel

- before encapsulation, the packets are protected with:
 - digest (integrity + authentication)
 - encryption (confidentiality)
 - numbering (to avoid replay)
- if the cryptographic algorithms are strong, then the only possible attack is to stop the communications
- also known as S-VPN (Secure VPN)



IPsec

- IETF architecture for L3 security in IPv4 / IPv6:
 - to create S-VPN over untrusted networks
 - to create end-to-end secure packet flows
- definition of two specific packet types:
 - AH (Authentication Header) for integrity, authentication, no replay
 - ESP (Encapsulating Security Payload) for confidentiality (+AH)
- protocol for key exchange:
 - IKE (Internet Key Exchange)

IPsec security services

- authentication of IP packets:
 - data integrity
 - sender authentication
 - (partial) protection against "replay" attacks
- confidentiality of IP packets:
 - data encryption



IPsec local database

SAD (SA Database)

 list of active SA and their characteristics (algorithms, keys, parameters)

SPD (Security Policy Database)

- list of security policy to apply to the different packet flows
- a-priori configured (e.g. manually) or connected to an automatic system (e.g. ISPS, Internet Security Policy System)





IPsec – key exchange

- RFC-2407 = IPsec interpretation of ISAKMP
- RFC-2408 = ISAKMP
- RFC-2409 = IKE
- RFC-2412 = OAKLEY

IPv4 header										
4	٤	9	3							
vers.	IHL	тоѕ	total length							
ic	dentifi	cation	flags fragment offset							
TTI	L	protocol	header checksum							
source IP address										
destination IP address										
		options			padding					



- IP addresses (32 bit) of sender and receiver
- IHL (Internet Header Length) in 32-bit words
- TOS (Type Of Service): nearly ever used (!)
- length: no. of bytes of the IP packet
- identification: ID of the packet (for fragments)
- flags: may/don't fragment, last/more fragments
- TTL (Time To Live): max number of hops
- protocol: protocol of the payload



Tunnel mode IPsec									
 used to create a VPN, usually by gateways pro: protection of header variable fields con: computationally heavy 									
			IPv4 header (end-to-end)	TCP/UDP header + data					
	_								
	IPv4 header (tunnel)		IPv4 header (end-to-end)	TCP/UDP header + data					
IPv4 hea (tunnel	der)	IPsec header	IPv4 header (end-to-end)	TCP/UDP header + data					

AH

- Authentication Header
- mechanism (first version, RFC-1826):
 - data integrity and sender authentication
 - compulsory support of keyed-MD5 (RFC-1828)
 - optional support of keyed-SHA-1 (RFC-1852)

mechanism (second version, RFC-2402):

- data integrity, sender authentication and (partial) protection from replay attack
- HMAC-MD5-96
- HMAC-SHA-1-96





Normalization for AH

- reset the TTL / Hop Limit field
- if the packet contains a Routing Header, then:
 - set the destination field to the address of the final destination
 - set the content of the routing header to the value that it will have at destination
 - set the Address Index field at the value that it will have at destination
- reset all options with the C bit (change en route) set

Keyed-MD5 in AH

- given M normalize it to generate M'
- pad M' to a multiple of 128 bit (by adding 0x00 bytes) to generate M'p
- pad the key K to a multiple of 128 bit (by adding 0x00 bytes) to generate Kp
- compute the authentication value:

ICV = md5 (Kp || M'p || Kp)

HMAC-MD5-96

- given M normalize it to generate M'
- pad M' to a multiple of 128 bit (by adding 0x00 bytes) to generate M'p
- pad the key K to a multiple of 128 bit (by adding 0x00 bytes) to generate Kp
- given ip = 00110110 and op = 01011010 (repeated to give 128 bit) compute the authentication base:
 B = md5 ((Kp ⊕ op) || md5 ((Kp ⊕ ip) || M'p))
- ICV = 96 leftmost bits of B

ESP

- Encapsulating Security Payload
- first version (RFC-1827) gave only confidentiality
- base mechanism: DES-CBC (RFC-1829)
- other mechanisms possible
- second version (RFC-2406):
 - provides also authentication (but the IP header, so the coverage is not equivalent to that of AH)
 - the packet dimension is reduced and one SA is saved



ESP in tunnel mode pro: hides both the payload and (original) header con: larger packet size 									
	IPv4 header (end-to-end)	TCP/UDP header + data							
IPv4 header (tunnel)	IPv4 header (end-to-end)	TCP/UDP header + data							
IPv4 header ESP (tunnel) header	IPv4 header (end-to-end)	TCP/UDP header + data	ESP trailer						
encrypted part									





IPsec implementation details

- sequence number:
 - not strictly sequential (protection only from replay)
 - minimum window of 32 packets (64 suggested)
- NULL algorithms :
 - for authentication
 - for encryption (RFC-2410)
 - to adjust the protection vs. performance trade-off

















- Internet Key Exchange (RFC-2409)
- ISAKMP + OAKLEY
- creation of a SA to protect the ISAKMP exchange
- this SA is used to protect the negotiation of the SA needed by IPsec traffic
- the same ISAKMP SA may be reused several times to negotiate other IPsec SA



- negotiation only of the IPsec SA
- New Group Mode:
 - 2 messages



IPsec in the OS

- IPsec is available in all recent Unix versions
- SUN implemented it with SKIP in Solaris < 8 Linux:
 - native IPsec since kernel 2.6 (derived from Kame)
 - FreeS/WAN (www.freeswan.org) and successors:
 - openswan (www.openswan.org) strongswan (www.strongswan.org)
- Microsoft has introduced IPsec in its products since Windows-2000

IPsec in the router

- all main network equipment manufacturers (Cisco, 3COM, Nortel, ...) have IPsec on the routers
- typically used only to create protected channels between the routers but not with the end-nodes

IPsec in the firewall

- some firewall manufacturers (e.g. IBM, Checkpoint) offer IPsec as part of their secure tunnel products
- typically offer a free Windows client, limited to create IPsec channels only with the firewall itself

VPN concentrator

- special-purpose appliance that acts as a terminator of IPsec tunnel:
 - for remote access of single clients
 - to create site-to-site VPN
- very high performance with respect to the costs (low)

System requirements for IPsec

on router:

- powerful CPU or crypto accelerator
- not managed in outsource
- on firewall:
 - powerful CPU
- on VPN concentrator:
 - maximum independence from the other security measures

IPsec influence on performance

- network throughput is reduced:
 - larger packet size
 - transport mode AH: +24 bytes
 - transport mode ESP-DES-CBC: >= 32 bytes
 - larger number of packets (for SA activation)
- usually reduction is not very large
- exception: point-to-point link that used L2 compression that now becomes useless or counterproductive when applied to ESP packets
- possible compensation via IPComp (RFC-3173) or application-level compression

IPsec tunnel mode/L2TP

- Windows 2000 protects remote access of the client to the gateway by using L2TP with IPsec
- MS explains this choice because IPsec tunnel mode:
 - doesn't permit user authentication
 - doesn't support multiprotocol
 - doesn't support multicast
- the choice of L2TP generates:
 - a large performance penalty
 - interoperability problems with various systems

What is L2TP?

- Layer-2 Tunnel Protocol (RFC-2661)
- PPP encapsulation in IP
- pro:
 - can use PPP support for multi-protocol (e.g. for IPX, Netbeui and Appletalk)
 - user authentication (PAP / CHAP)
- con: overhead
- with L2TP each end-point maintains a PPP state machine as if the two parties would be connected via a serial line



Applicability of IPsec

- only unicast packets (no broadcast, no multicast, no anycast)
- between parties that activated a SA:
 - by shared keys
 - by X.509 certificates
- ... therefore in "closed" groups

IP (in)security

- addresses are not authenticated
- packets are not protected:
 - integrity
 - authentication
 - confidentiality
 - replay
- therefore all protocols using IP as carrier can be attacked, mainly relevant for the "service" protocols (i.e. the non-application ones, such as ICMP, IGMP, DNS, RIP, ...)

ICMP security

- Internet Control and Management Protocol
- vital for network management
- many attacks are possible because it has no authentication
- ICMP functions:
 - echo request / reply
 - destination unreachable (network / host / protocol / port unreachable)
 - source quence
 - redirect
 - time exceeded for a datagram



Anti-smurfing countermeasures

 for external attacks: reject IP broadcast packets at your border

interface serial0 no ip directed-broadcast

 for internal attacks: identify the attacker via network management tools



ARP poisoning

- ARP = Address Resolution Protocol (RFC-826)
 - used to discover the L2 address of a node when knowing its L3 address
 - result stored in the ARP table
- ARP poisoning:
 - nodes accept ARP reply without ARP request
 - nodes overwrite static ARP entries with the dynamic ones (obtained from ARP reply)
 - the "ar\$sha" ARP field (sender hw address) may differ from the src field in the 802.3 packet
 - used by attack tools (e.g. Ettercap)



- multiple requests with IP spoofing
- the connection table is saturated until half-open connections timeout (typical value: 75")



SYN cookie

- idea of D.J.Bernstein (http://cr.yp.to)
- the only approach really effective to completely avoid the SYN flooding attack
- uses the TCP sequence number of the SYN-ACK packet to transmit a cookie to the client and later recognize the clients that already sent the SYN without storing any info about them on the server
- available on Linux and Solaris













BIND

- for DNS security the use (and periodic update!) of BIND is suggested
- BIND = Berkeley Internet Name Domain server
 free
- for Unix and Win-32
- http://www.isc.org
- subscribe to the BIND mailing list because since it is a huge piece of software – it has security bugs

DJBDNS

- DNS server by D.J.Bernstein, designed for security:
 - simple and modular
 - developed with secure programming techniques
- http://cr.yp.to/djbdns.html
- three distinct services:
 - tiny DNS (authoritative nameserver for a domain)
 - dnscache (cache manager)
 - walldns (a reverse DNS wall)

DJBDNS security features

- unharmful processes:
 - the UID is not root
 - run chroot'ed
- dnscache discard:
 - requests not coming from "trusted" addresses
 - answers from IP addresses different from the one to which the query was submitted
- dnscache is immune to cache poisoning
- tinydns and walldns do not cache any information

walldns

- hides the true names of the network nodes
- useful when an application server queries the PTR before providing the service
- the true names are never disclosed, walldns provides only fictitious names (to satisfy the requestor)
- problem with the "paranoid servers", that is those performing a double cross lookup:
 - N = dns_query (client_IP, PTR_record)
 - A = dns_query (N, A_record)
 - is A equal to the client_IP?

DNSsec

digital signature of DNS records

- who is "authoritative" for a certain domain?
- which is the PKI? (certificates, trusted root CA)
- complex management of the DNS infrastracture
 - hierachical and delegated signatures
 - distributed signatures
- handling of non-existent names?
 - the ABSENCE of a record must be signed too
 - this requires sorting of the records

Some DNSsec issues

- no signature of the DNS query
- no security in the dialogue between the DNS client and DNS (local) server
 - use IPsec or TSIG
- encryption to be performed by the DNS server
 - computational overhead
 - management overhead (on-line secure crypto host)
- bigger record size
- scarce experimental results
 - configuration? performance?

Routing security

- low security in the system access to routers for management (telnet, SNMP)
- Iow security in the exchange of routing tables:
 - authentication based on IP addresses
 - optional protection with a keyed-digest
 a shared-key is required!
 - key-management is required!
- dynamical routing variations also on end-nodes possible via ICMP

Physical router protection

- Iimit physical access only to authorized people
- serial line console port:
 - direct connection of a terminal or PC
 - permits direct access with maximum privilege
 - protect it with a password (default: no password!)

Logical router protection

- activate the most common ACL
- protect the configuration file (wherever it's stored) because it contains:
 - the passwords (often in cleartext!)
 - the IP-based ACL

Protection from IP spoofing

- to protect ourselves from external impostors
- also to protect the external world from our internal impostors (=net-etiquette)
- RFC-2827 "Network ingress filtering: defeating Denial of Service attacks which employ IP source address spoofing"
- RFC-3704 "Ingress filtering for multihomed networks"
- RFC-3013 "Recommended Internet Service Provider security services and procedures"





SNMP security

- packets 161/UDP
- SNMP (v1, v2, v3):
 default protection via shared secret transmitted in
 - cleartext (the so-called "community" string)
 - no client authentication
 - no message protection
- SNMPv3 pays more attention to security but it is seldom implemented and often without the security paty

SNMP access protection examples

access-list 10 permit 132.5.1.1 access-list 10 permit 132.5.1.2 snmp-server community public RO 1 snmp-server community private RW 1