



Public Key Establishment

Bart Preneel

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

February 2007

Thanks to Paul van Oorschot



How to establish public keys?

- point-to-point on a trusted channel
 - *mail business card, phone*
- direct access to a trusted public file (registry or database)
 - *authentication trees*
- on-line trusted server (bottleneck)
 - *OCSP: Online Certificate Status Protocol*
- off-line servers and certificates
 - *PKI: Public Key Infrastructure*
- implicit guarantee of public parameters
 - *identity based and self-certified keys*

What is a Certificate?

DN: cn=Planckaert

o=VTM, c=BE

Serial #: 8391037


Start: 1/3/07 1:00

End: 7/3/08 1:01

CRL: cn=CRL2,

o=VRS, c=US

Key:



CA DN: o=GLS, c=BE

Unique name of owner

Unique serial number

Period of validity

Revocation information


Public key

Name of issuing CA

CA's digital signature on the certificate



What is a Certificate Revocation List?





PKI Overview

1. Background:
Keys and Lifecycle Management
2. PKI components (“puzzle pieces”)
3. PKI Architectural View
4. Trust Models





Background:

Keys and Lifecycle Management


Sending secure e-mail

Encrypting/Signing...




👉 Alice composes a message for Bob

Receiving secure e-mail



👉 Bob uses the one-time symmetric key to retrieve the message text and signed hash


Key Lifecycle Management






Fundamental PKI features


- Automated and transparent key and certificate lifecycle management
- Consistent behavior across applications



PKI provides Unified Security



Certification Authority






Certification Authority

- Issue certificates for all entities / devices (for multiple applications) from a single CA
 - single system saves h/w, s/w, training, personnel
- Flexible certificate policy / security policy
 - tailor to needs of environment, application or entity (e.g. certificate lifetime, crypto algorithms, keylengths, password rules, ...)

Certificate Repository






Certificate Repository

- LDAP-compliant directory stores certificates
 - standards-based for interoperability
- Directory products built specifically to address scalability issues
 - X.500 or proprietary schemes to replicate data (scales to millions of users)

Certificate Revocation System






Certificate Revocation

- Automated CRL publishing
 - when certificate revoked, CRL can be automatically published to directory providing near-immediate availability
 - automated CRL checking by application
 - want to avoid applications which require manual end-user actions to check CRLs for each application or certificate usage

Automated Key Update & History






Automated Key Update & History

- Users should never even need to know they have their own certificates (password only)
- If key management is not automated or does not provide key history . . .
 - when certificate expires, lose access to all past encrypted data, e-mail, . . .
 - user must request new certificate and repeat entire registration process
- Should replace key, not just new expiry date
- Transparent triggering mechanism, ideally

Key Backup & Recovery






Key Backup & Recovery

- Enterprise will lose valuable data if keys used to encrypt data are not backed up
 - 20-40% of users forget passwords / year
 - employees leave the organization
- Allows the enterprise to control the backup
 - not reliant on 3rd parties
 - should be configurable to require multiple administrators to authorize access

Support for Non-Repudiation






Support for Non-Repudiation

- Must use separate key pairs for digital signatures and encryption
 - want backup of encryption keys, do not want backup of signature private keys
- Separate key pairs allows lifecycles to be managed independently
- Different policy controls for each key pair
 - security requirements per pair may differ, e.g. valid lifetimes

Cross-Certification






Cross-Certification

- Sufficiently flexible to model existing business relationships
 - includes 1-1 relationships and hierarchies
 - cross-certificate associated with an organization (vs. a service provider)
 - compare to web trust model: trust anyone signed by browser-embedded CAs
- Enterprise manages cross-certification policy & procedures, to reduce business risk
 - cross-certificates created by authorized administrators, transparent to end-user

Timestamping






Timestamping

- Legal requirements
- Business requirements related to fixing transactions in time
- Technical requirements related to certificate revocation (non-repudiation)



Application Software





Application Software

- Designed to be enabled to use the PKI (“PKI-ready”)

application software

(email, file encryption, VPN, web security/SSL, ...)


PKI

key & certificate lifecycle mgmt

(certificate validation, key update, ...)

crypto algorithms (symmetric encryption,
signature, hash, MAC, key establishment, ...)

PKI-ready application software completes the picture






Summary - Essential PKI Components

Much more than a “certificate server” or set of toolkit calls

- Certification Authority
- Revocation system
- Certificate repository (“directory”)
- Key backup and recovery system
- Support for non-repudiation
- Automatic key update
- Management of key histories
- Cross-certification
- PKI-ready application software





More info: IETF PKIX Working Group

www.ietf.org

- de facto standards for Internet PKI, X.509-based
- Certificate & CRL Profile [PKIX-1]:
RFC 2459
- Certificate Mgmt Protocols [PKIX-CMP, PKIX-3]:
RFC 2510
- PKIX roadmap: www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-pkix-roadmap-01.txt



PKI vs. Privilege Management

- Public key certificate binds a public key to an entity
- Establishes who owns a key vs. what privileges that key / owner is granted
- Certificate-processing software (relying party) may implicitly grant privileges
- Privilege Management Infrastructure (PMI) makes privileges explicit
- PMI may utilize PKI as base infrastructure
- example: attribute certificates



PKI vs. Privilege Management

- Public key certificate binds a public key to an entity
- Establishes who owns a key vs. what privileges that key / owner is granted
- Certificate-processing software (relying party) may implicitly grant privileges
- Privilege Management Infrastructure (PMI) makes privileges explicit
- PMI may utilize PKI as base infrastructure
- example: attribute certificates



Key generation: where?


- CA generates key for user
 - absolute trust
 - need transport of private keys
 - easier management for backup/recovery
- user generates his/her key
 - does user have the expertise? (ok if smart card)
 - need to transport of public keys (integrity channel)
- specialised third party generates keys



Trust Models




Hierarchical trust model



Relying parties transfer risk to the Root CA




Hierarchical trust model



Root CA “deputizes” subordinate CAs, which issue certificates




Enterprise trust model



Relying parties transfer risk to their local CA




Enterprise trust model



The same local CA issues certificates to these parties




Enterprise trust model



Qualified relationships between CAs are established




Enterprise trust model



Hierarchical relationships are a special case



Enterprise trust model




Spoke-and-hub model is another special case



Browser trust model


Trusted CA list in browser



All relying parties rely on public keys of same set of CAs




Browser trust model



Each of these CAs defines its own community of trust



Browser trust model



A relying party trusts the union of these communities



Personal trust model (and related: “web-of-trust”)

- all entities are end-users (CAs do not exist)
- keys are essentially self-guaranteed
- some end-users may also be *introducers*
- end-user imports public keys of others

CHARACTERISTICS

- suits individuals, not enterprise/corporations
- user-centric
- requires security-aware end-users
- poor scalability



Trust models & Revocation

- public-key systems are commonly engineered with long-life certificates
- certificates bind a key-pair to identity (and potentially privilege information)
- circumstances change over certificate life
 - keys may become compromised
 - identifying information may change
 - privilege may be withdrawn
- need ability to terminate the binding expressed in the certificate
- revocation: most difficult issue in practice



Revocation options

mechanisms indicating valid certificates

- short-lifetime certificates

mechanisms indicating invalid certificates

- certificate revocation lists - CRLs (v1 X.509)
- CRL fragments (v2 X.509), including ...
 - segmented CRLs (CRL distribution points)
 - delta CRLs
 - indirect CRLs

mechanisms providing a proof of status

- status-checking protocols (OCSP, ValiCert)
- iterated hash schemes (Micali)
- certificate revocation trees



CRL: properties

- basic CRL
 - simplicity
 - high communication cost from directory to user
- improved CRL
 - very flexible
 - more complex
 - reduced communication and storage



Online Certificate Status Protocol (OCSP) [RFC 2560]

- on-line query to
 - CA
 - or Trusted Responder
 - or CA designated responder
- containing
 - hash of public key CA
 - hash of public key in certificate
 - certificate serial number



OCSP: signed answer

- status
 - good: not revoked
 - revoked
 - unknown
- time
 - thisUpdate
 - nextUpdate
 - producedAt



OCSP: evaluation

- [+] positive and negative information
- [-] need to be on-line
 - risk for denial of service
 - not always possible
- ! OCSP may send you freshly signed but old information



Revocation summary

- established standard meets needs of major application categories
 - ITU-T X.509: 1997, ISO/IEC 9594-8: 1997
 - v2 CRLs
- continued industry discussion of further options for certificate revocation and validation
 - other standard solutions may emerge
 - vendors will support mainstream alternatives





Characterizing questions for trust models

- what are the types/roles of entities involved
- who certifies public keys
- are trust relationships easily
created, maintained, updated
- granularity of trust relationships
- ability of particular technology to support existing business models of trust
- how is revocation handled?
 - . . . of end-users . . . of certification authorities



Trust model continuums



Many other continuums can be formulated



Trust model summary

Key idea: manageability of trust relationships

Each model has its place --

- personal trust model: okay for security-aware individuals working in small communities
- browser model: simple, large communities, everyone trusts all CAs defined by s/w vendor
- hierarchical model: best given an *obvious* global root and a *grand design* methodology
- enterprise trust model: best between peer organizations, where trust flexibility is required
- global PKI will include variety of trust models