

INNOQ Technology Day / Online / 2023-11-13

iSAGB Advanced Level WEBSEC

Sneak Peek





Christoph Iserlohn Senior Consultant





11.04.2023 KI und Security

Eine Risikobewertung

 \longrightarrow

CHRISTOPH ISERLOHN FELIX SCHUMACHER

26.01.2023 Das LastPass Drama

Passwort-Manager? Na klar. Aber doch nicht so!

 \rightarrow

LISA MARIA MORITZ CHRISTOPH ISERLOHN

About the iSAGB e.V.

International Software Architecture Qualification Board

- non-profit organization founded in 2008
- approx. 20 founding members from industry, consulting and education
- iSAQB manages curricula





International Software Architecture Qualification Board

About the advanced level

This course's content and structure m software architects of the iSAQB e.V.

More information can be found under http://www.isaqb.org/certifications/advanced-level/





This course's content and structure match the standardized curriculum for

International Software Architecture Qualification Board

Agenda

- IT-Security & Protection Goals
- Risk Management
- Security Controls
- Secure Development Process, Design **Principles & Patterns**
- A "Birds View" on Cryptography
- Applied Cryptography aka Web Basics
- Attack vectors & Classifications
- Infrastructure & Operations





Deriving many keys from one

K → KDF →



•	k ₁	k ₂	k ₃	•••	k _N
---	----------------	----------------	----------------	-----	----------------

Stretch/Strengthen user supplied key



HKDF – a KDF from HMAC

RFC 5869

Step 1 (extract): k = HKDF(salt, K)

Step 2 (expand): k* = HKDF(k, CTX || N)

CTX – a string uniquely identifying an application N – amount of derived keys



Password based KDF (PBKDF)

Deriving keys from passwords

Important:

- Passwords have a very low entropy
- HKDF is not applicable as derived passwords will be vulnerable to
 - Dictionary attacks •
 - Lookup tables •
 - Rainbow tables
 - Brute force attacks

Working with Passwords

... at Rest

 $\bullet \bullet \bullet$

- Plaintext just don't do that!
- measures for the encryption key(s)
- Hashed Vulnerable to
 - Dictionary attacks, Lookup tables, Rainbow tables
 - Brute force attacks
 - Identification of users, which use same passwords



Encrypted & Integrity Protected – introduces a backdoor and requires a very high security

Algorithm Requirements

So, we need something which is resistant to:

- Dictionary attacks
- Lookup tables
- Rainbow tables
- Brute force attacks
- Collision attacks
- Side-Channel attacks
- Identification of users with same passwords

And does not require additional security measures and infrastructure

Peppered hashes

How it works:

- Add a secret random string ("pepper") to the password before hashing it
- Same pepper for all passwords
- So hashed password = H(password || pepper)





Salted hashes

How it works:

- Add a random string ("salt") to the password before hashing it
- Salt is unique per password
- Salt is not a secret and can be stored along the password
- So hashed password = H(password || salt)



And now?

Challenges with cryptographic hash functions

- Cryptographic hash functions are designed to be fast
- Can easily be implemented on GPUs or custom hardware (ASIC or FPGA) to parallelize computations
- Don't protect individual hashes against brute-force attacks (Blockchains)

So, we need something like:

- "hash of hash of hash of hash ..." (slow CPU intensive)
 - a lot of memory (not parallelizable memory hard)

PBKDF2 - Password Based Key Derivation Function 2

- Family of key derivation functions defined in PKCS#5 as
 - derived key = PBKDF2(random function, password, salt, number of iterations, desired key length)
- Recommended by NIST and is widely used, e.g in Boxcryptor, Django, GRUB2, MediaWiki, WPA2, and others.



hash = BCrypt(log₂(iteration count)=cost, salt of 16 bytes,

Built for OpenBSD and used in many Linux distribution

Implements expensive key schedule Blowfish cipher (from 1999) as

- password [max 56 bytes])



 Family of KDF developed by Co Defined as

> derived key = scrypt(password, salt, work factor [(CPU / memory)²] (N), block size (r), parallelization [1..2³²⁻¹ * r/4] (p), desired key length)

Paper exists with formal proofs and cost estimations

Family of KDF developed by Colin Percival for Tarsnap (from 2009).



Multiple flavors exist:

- argon2i focuses on side-channel attacks prevention,
- argon2d focuses on brute-force-attacks prevention and
- argon2id a combination of both. IETF defines it as the primary flavor of the algorithm

hash = argon2id(password, salt, number of iterations, memory cost, parallelization, length of resulting hash, version)

	Pros	Cons
PBKDF2	 CPU intensive (tunable) Very mature - the algorithm itself has not been broken. 	 not memory hard can be efficiently implemented on GPUs and custom hardware like FPGAs
BCrypt	 CPU intensive (tunable) Mature - the algorithm itself has not been broken. 	 Password length is limited Issues with non-ASCII chars and \0 termination incompatible flavors exist 4Kb not memory hard anymore
scrypt	 CPU intensive (tunable) Memory hard (tunable) Measures against parallelism 	 there are few cryptoanalysis work results
Argon2	 CPU intensive (tunable) Memory hard (tunable) Measures against parallelism Resistance against side-channel attacks 	 very new - there are very few cryptoanalysis work results

Recommended Parameters

- Running time for interactive logins ≈ 100 ms
- Running time for non interactive uses ≈ 3000 ms
- Salt: At least 16, better 32 random bytes
- Memory ≈ 1-16 MB

Recommended Parameters

- PBDKF2: random function=SHA-2 or SHA-3 family, iterations => 600000, salt length >= 64-bit random string
- BCrypt: cost = 12 or more if possible (= 2^{12} = 4096 iterations)
- SCrypt: N = 16384, r = 16, p = 1; higher N is better than higher p
- Argon2: hash & salt length=128-bit, parallelization = 1, iterations=2, memory = >19MB

Estimated hardware cost for cracking

... a password in a year

KDF/password length	6 letters	8 letters	8 chars	10 chars	40 chars	80 chars
DES CRYPT	< 1\$	< 1\$	< 1\$	< 1\$	< 1\$	< 1\$
MD5	< 1\$	< 1\$	< 1\$	1.1k\$	1\$	1.5T\$
MD5 CRYPT	< 1\$	< 1\$	130\$	1.1M\$	1.4k\$	1.5 * 10 ¹⁵ \$
PBKDF2 (100ms)	< 1\$	< 1\$	18k\$	160M\$	200k\$	2.2 * 10 ¹⁷ \$
BCrypt (95ms)	< 1\$	4\$	130k\$	1.2B\$	1.5M\$	48B\$
SCrypt (64ms)	< 1\$	150\$	4.8M\$	43B\$	52M\$	6* 10 ¹⁹ \$
PBKDF2 (5.0s)	< 1\$	29\$	920k\$	8.3B\$	10M\$	11 * 10 ¹⁸ \$
BCrypt (3.0s)	< 1\$	130\$	4.3M\$	39B\$	47M\$	1.5T\$
SCrypt (3.8s)	\$900	610k\$	19B\$	175T\$	210B\$	2.3 * 10 ²³ \$

Colin Percival, Stronger Key Derivation via Sequential Memory-Hard Functions, https://www.tarsnap.com/scrypt/scrypt.pdf



Password Hash Encoding

- The result of a password hash is just a hash value (raw bytes)
- So how to encode?
 - Remember Kerckhoff's principle
 - Self descriptive
- Before PHC
 - Modular Crypt Format
 - Other legacy schemes
- After PHC
 - PHC String Format



Modular Crypt Format (MCF)

where

- id an identifier representing the hashing algorithm/scheme content – content of the scheme [a-zA-ZO-9./]. Can be structured as well



\$<id>\$<content>

Example \$5\$QEDek12fCb8Hw.6U (5 stands for sha-256)

Modular Crypt Format (MCF)

- Ambigous, thus not portable
- Ad-Hoc
- Shouldn't be used

PHC Encoding

\$<id>[\$<param>=<value>(,<param>=<value>)*][\$<salt>[\$<hash>]]

where

- id an identifier representing the hashing algorithm
- param parameter name and its value, like rounds/iterations count, etc
- salt: Base64-like encoded salt
- hash: Base64-like encoded result of hashing the password and salt

A well-defined and self-describing subset of the Modular Crypt Format

PHC Encoding



1..... 3 email address



Guestions? Answers!



Christoph Iserlohn christoph.iserlohn@innoq.com @ci@innoq.social

innoQ Deutschland GmbH

Krischerstr. 100 Ohlauer Str. 43 40789 Monheim +49 2173 3366-0

10999 Berlin

Ludwigstr. 180E 63067 Offenbach

Kreuzstr. 16 80331 München





Hermannstrasse 13 20095 Hamburg

Erftstr. 15-17 50672 Köln

Königstorgraben 11 90402 Nürnberg