Logical representation and analysis of protocols.I

Security protocols

- A **security protocol** is a set of rules, adhered to by the communication parties in order to ensure achieving various security or privacy goals, such as establishing a common cryptographic key, a achieving authentication, etc.
- We have discussed already several protocol, aiming at:
  - Key exchange;
  - Private electronic payments;
  - E-voting.

Correctness of protocols

- Are they correct at all?
- How do we establish correctness?
- We have used semi-formal arguments, like

If a message is encrypted with the public key of Alice, then only a participant who knows private key of Alice (presumably Alice herself only) can decrypt it.

- Typically we have considered possible attacks and argued using the reasoning as above, that attacks are impossible (under some reasonable assumptions).
- Is that enough? Are we sure that we have considered all possible situations of use?

Correctness of protocols. II

- Security protocols are designed to succeed even in the presence of a malicious agent, often called *intruder (adversary)*;
- Intruder may have complete or partial control over the communication network and may have different computational capabilities;
- The correctness of the protocols depends on the *assumptions* on capabilities of possible intruder;
- Assumptions are often left implicit;
- Typically in security we have to deal with numerous non-trivial assumptions.

The power of formal methods

- What should we do about establishing correctness of security protocols?
- Apply formal methods!
  - Make ***explicit*** all the assumptions involved in a protocol;
  - Make a formal model of the protocol (and its execution);
  - Apply formal reasoning, which would establish the correctness of the protocol.
- Two important aspects:
  - The correctness is established only for a particular formal model of the protocol;
  - and under explicit assumptions (about capabilities of participants, etc) ;

Logical representation

- Formal aspects of reasoning is an important part of logic;
- Logical representation and analysis of the security protocols is a particular successful approach for the protocols verification;
- Non-classical modal epistemic logics dealing with such notions as "*belief*" and "*knowledge*", are more suitable here than classical logics dealing primarily with "*truth*".

Protocol analysis using a logic

- Derive the specification of an idealized protocol in a logical language from the (usually informal) original specification;
- Specify the assumptions about the initial state;
- Attach logical formulae to statements of the protocol as assertions about the state of the system after each statement;
- Apply logical axioms and inference rules to derive beliefs held by parties in the protocols.

BAN logic

- M. **B**urrows, M.**A**badi, R. **N**eedham (1989):
  Logic of authentication, or BAN logic;
- Suitable for formal analysis of authentication protocols;
- A protocol is analysed from the point of view of each principal (participant) *P* .
- Each message received by *P* is considered in relation to previous messages received by *P* and sent by *P*;
- The question, one can address using BAN logic, is what a principal should believe, on the basis of the messages it has sent and received.

Formulae of BAN logic

- P **believes** X is a formula of BAN logic saying
  - P is entitled to conclude that X is true, or
  - P has a justification for X;
- P **sees** X
  - The principal P receives a message containing X. P might need to perform decryption to extract X. X can be a statement or a simple item of data. P does not necessarily believes X.

Formulae of BAN. II

- P **controls** X
  - P has jurisdiction over X, or P is trusted as an authority on X. For example an authentication server is trusted as an authority on statements about a key it has allocated.
- P **said** X
  - At some point in the past, *P* is known to have sent a message including *X*

Formulae of BAN logic. II

- **Fresh**(X)
  - X has not been sent earlier. It is a fresh value (nonce = number used once).
- $P \overset{K}{\leftrightarrow} Q$
  - *K* is a secret between *P* and *Q* and possibly other principals trusted by *P* and *Q* (such as authentication server).

Further notation

- If K is a key, then $\{X\}_K$ means X encrypted with the key K
- If X and Y are statements, then X, Y means X and Y

Main assumption

- Trusted principals do not lie about their beliefs to other principals.
- That means if *P* is trusted, and if a formula *X* is received in a message (known to have been) sent by *P* then it can be deduced that *P* **believes** *X*.

Deduction rules

- Deduction rules (or , postulates) of BAN logic have the following format

$$\frac{X, Y}{Z}$$

meaning Z follows from a conjunction of statements X and Y

Main postulates of BAN logic

The message meaning rule:

$$\frac{P \textbf{ believes } P \overset{K}{\leftrightarrow} Q, P \textbf{ sees } \{X\}_K}{P \textbf{ believes } (Q \textbf{ said } X)}$$

If P believes that it shares a a secret key K with Q, and if P receives a message containing X encrypted with K then P believes that Q once said X

Main postulated of BAN logic

The nonce-verification rule

$$\frac{P \textbf{ believes fresh}(X), P \textbf{ believes } (Q \textbf{ said } X)}{P \textbf{ believes } (Q \textbf{ believes } X)}$$

Nonce = number used once = fresh value.

If P believes that Q once said X, then P believes that Q once believed X (by main assumption). If additionally P believes X is fresh then P must believe that Q currently believes X.

Main postulated of BAN logic

The jurisdiction rule:

$$\frac{P \textbf{ believes } (Q \textbf{ controls } X),\ P \textbf{ believes } (Q \textbf{ believes } X)}{P \textbf{ believes } X}$$

If P believes that Q has control over whether or not X true and if P believes that Q believes it to be true, then P must believe in it also. The reason is Q is an authority on the matter as far as P is concerned.

Decomposition postulates

$$\frac{P \text{ sees } (X, Y)}{P \text{ sees } X}$$

$$\frac{P \text{ believes fresh}(X)}{P \text{ believes fresh}(X, Y)}$$

$$\frac{P \textbf{ believes } (Q \textbf{ believes}(X, Y))}{P \textbf{ believes } (Q \textbf{ believes}(X))}$$