

Secure Messaging

Lecture 23

Messaging



Secure Messaging


- Corruption model
- Server/network is adversarial (but trusted identity registration needed)
- Windows of compromise when a party is under adversarial control (or readable to adversary)
 - Messages that are sent/received while a party is corrupt are revealed to the adversary
 - Goal: Messages sent/received prior to compromise and after compromise should remain "secure"
 - Forward secrecy (secrecy of prior messages) and "Future secrecy" (secrecy of future messages)
 - Assumes that secure deletion is possible

Secure Messaging

- Communication model different from standard setting for TLS
- Many applications/services offering secure chat
 - “Off-The-Record” messaging (2004)
 - Signal protocol (starting 2013)
 - Used in WhatsApp, Google Allo, Facebook Messenger, Skype (optional), etc.
 - Some formal analysis (2017)

Synchronous Messaging


A first solution



- PK_B^0 should be used only once (over all senders), so that SK_B^0 can be deleted after recovering m_0
 - E.g., Alice may download PK_B^0 from a list of PKs hosted by a server who deletes each PK on download


Synchronous Messaging

A first solution




- (SK_i, PK_i) are generated just before sending PK_i and deleted right after using SK_i for decryption (window for compromising SK_i)
- At any point only one SK stored
- Assumes strict alternation

An Optimization




- Consider using El Gamal encryption: $PK_B^0 = g^y$, ciphertext = (g^x, MK) and $PK_A^1 = g^{x'}$. Use g^x in the ciphertext as next PK?
- Can be OK when a symmetric key is derived using a random oracle, under stronger assumptions than DDH

Asynchronicity




- Ideally, should be able to delete the decryption key right after using it for a single decryption

Ratcheting


- Suppose Alice and Bob have shared a symmetric key
- Want forward secrecy without need for synchronisation
- Ratcheting 
- $K_i \rightarrow K_{i+1}$ using a "forward-secure PRG" s.t. K_i remains pseudorandom even given K_{i+1}
- After using K_i for encryption/decryption, derive K_{i+1} and delete K_i
- Does not help with "future secrecy"

Double Ratcheting




- Update public-keys for every received message, and do symmetric key ratcheting for messages in between
- Can delete an asymmetric secret key after the second symmetric key is derived from it

Double Ratcheting



- If messages received out of order, will need to retain symmetric keys that were ratcheted through

Messaging



- Symmetric keys are used for AEAD (e.g., using encrypt-then-MAC)
- Asymmetric key updates are MAC'ed using a key derived from the previous asymmetric key
- (Long-term) Identity key (signature verification key) should be obtained via (out-of-band) trusted setup

Establishing Identity

- Easy to ensure that conversation is with an entity who created a certain “identity key” (signature verification key)
- But in real life, want to ensure it is a certain person
- A malicious server can launch an adversary-in-the-middle attack
- Options (can use a combination):
 - Trusted key servers: Key servers will have to verify real-life identity! Require “transparency” to deter corrupt servers.
 - Trust-On-First-Use: problematic assumption, e.g., if server always corrupt.
 - Manual key dissemination or via a web-of-trust
 - Use PAKE (need shared secrets)
 - KeyBase: proves control of social media identities instead of “real-life” identity. Enough to trust at least one service.

Initial encryption
PK will be signed
with this

Deniability

- Suppose Alice and Bob chat with each other. Later, Bob turns over the transcript to a “Judge”
- Can Alice claim that she is not responsible for the transcript?
 - Problem: If the messages are signed by Alice, she can't deny responsibility
 - Assumption: Alice is responsible for keeping her private keys secure (and her public key is known to the Judge)
- Alice should not sign the messages, but only MAC them
 - Bob also has the MAC key. So he could have faked the MACs himself
 - More complicated if Judge observed the (encrypted) transcript between Alice and Bob.