Peer-to-peer Sender Authentication for Email

> Vivek Pathak and Liviu Iftode Rutgers University

Email Trustworthiness

Sender can be spoofed

| 🚔 urgent security notification for clientMon, 07 May 2007 11:17:28 -0500 - Thunderbird 🛛 📮 🗖 🔀 | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <u>File Edit View Go Message Tools H</u> elp | | | | | | | |
| Get Mail Write Address Book Reply Reply All Forward Redirect Delete Junk Print Stop | | | | | | | |
| Subject: urgent security notification for clientMon, 07 May 2007 11:17:28 -0500 | | | | | | | |
| From: Fifth Third Bank <refnumber_550272023022ver@security53.com></refnumber_550272023022ver@security53.com> | | | | | | | |
| Date: 05/07/2007 11:17 AM | | | | | | | |
| To: <u>Vpace <vpace@eden.rutgers.edu></vpace@eden.rutgers.edu></u> | | | | | | | |
| Deer Fifth Third hands have a communial such man | | | | | | | |
| Dear Finn i nird bank business/commercial customer, | L | | | | | | |
| Fifth Third Protection Department requests you to start the client details confirmation procedure. By | | | | | | | |
| The time is the time the effect of the time the time to the time t | L | | | | | | |
| clicking on the link at the bottom of this letter you will get all necessary instructions now to start and to | L | | | | | | |
| complete the confirmation procedure. The following steps are to be taken by all business and commercial | Ł | | | | | | |
| customers of the Fifth Third bank. | L | | | | | | |
| | L | | | | | | |
| Fifth Third Protection Department apologizes for the inconveniences caused to you, and is very grateful | L | | | | | | |
| for your cooperation. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| To start the confirmation procedure, click the following link: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| http://businessbanking.53.com/session8472297353/clientbase/form.asp | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Copyright @2007 Fifth Third Bank, Member FDIC, Equal Housing Lender, All Rights Reserved | 4 | | | | | | |



Need for Sender Authentication

Importance depends on sender

| 📓 urgent s | ecurity n | otification f | or client | Mon, O | 7 May 20 | 07 11:17: | 28 -0500 |) - Thun | derbir |
|---------------------------|--|---|------------------------|----------------|----------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------|
| <u>F</u> ile <u>E</u> dit | <u>V</u> iew <u>G</u> o | <u>M</u> essage | <u>T</u> ools <u>H</u> | lelp | | | | | |
| Get Mail | 📝 Write A | ddress Book | 🏹 Reply | 🤯 Reply All | Rorward | Redirect | Delete | Junk | Print |
| Subject: | urgent s | ecurity noti | fication 1 | or client. | -Mon, 07 | May 2007 | 11:17:28 | -0500 | |
| From: | Fifth Thire | d Bank <refni< th=""><th>umber_55</th><th>02720230</th><th>22ver@se</th><th>curity.53.co</th><th><u>m></u></th><th></th><th></th></refni<> | umber_55 | 02720230 | 22ver@se | curity.53.co | <u>m></u> | | |
| Date: | 05/07/20 | 07 11:17 AM | | | | | | | |
| To: | Vpace <v< th=""><th>/pace@eden.</th><th>rutgers.e</th><th><u>du></u></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></v<> | /pace@eden. | rutgers.e | <u>du></u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Dear Fifth Third bank business/commercial customer,

Fifth Third Protection Department requests you to start the client details confirmati clicking on the link at the bottom of this letter you will get all necessary instructions complete the confirmation procedure. The following steps are to be taken by all bu customers of the Fifth Third bank.

Fifth Third Protection Department apologizes for the inconveniences caused to yo for your cooperation.

To start the confirmation procedure, click the following link:

http://businessbanking.53.com/session8472297353/clientbase/form.asp

Copyright © 2007 Fifth Third Bank, Member FDIC, Equal Housing Lender, All Rights Reserved



Update on Spam Filters

- Circumvention of content based spam classification
- False positives



End-to-end Issues



Can the mail server decide importance for the receiver?

Characteristics of Email

- Social networks of collaborating users
 - Limited trust infrastructure
- Usability expectation
 - Automatic authentication
- Asynchronous
 - Delayed authentication is better than none

Outline



- Byzantine fault tolerant public key authentication
 - Basis of sender authentication for email
- Application to Email
 - Thunderbird sender authentication plugin
- Usability
 - Micro-benchmark
 - Simulation on University and Industry mail trace

Public-key Authentication Model

- Mutually authenticating peers
 - Associate network end-point to public key
 - Asynchronous network
 - No partitioning
 - Eventual delivery after retransmissions
 - Disjoint message transmission paths
 - Man-in-the-middle attack on Ø fraction of peers



Attack Model

- Malicious peers
 - Honest majority
 - At most t of the n peers are faulty or malicious peers where $t = \frac{1-6\emptyset}{3}n$
- Passive adversaries
- Active adversaries
 - Relax network-is-the-adversary model
 - Unlimited spoofing
 - Limited power to prevent message delivery

Authentication Sketch

- Challenge-response protocol B
 - No active attacks
- Man in the middle attack
 - Limited number of attacks



Proof of possession of K_a {b,a,Challenge,K_a(N_b)}_b, {a,b,Response, N_b}_a

Authentication Sketch

- Distributed Authentication
 - Challenge response from multiple peers
 - Gather proofs of possession

- Lack of consensus on authenticity
 - Malicious peers
 - Man-in-the-middle attack

 Detect and correct through Byzantine agreement on authenticity of K_A

R

Scalability of Authentication

- Authentication cost and group size
 - Scale to large peer-to-peer network
 - Operate on local trusted group
 - Tolerate bad group selection
 - Periodic recycling of group members
 - Eventual authentication
 - Operate through epidemic algorithm
 - Eliminate direct connectivity requirement
 - Improve messaging cost

Outline

- Byzantine fault tolerant public key authentication
 - Basis of sender authentication for email



- Application to Email
 - Thunderbird sender authentication plugin
- Usability
 - Micro-benchmark
 - Simulation on University and Industry mail trace

Sender Authentication Design

Backward Compatibility

- SMTP ignores user defined fields
- Operate as an overlay on SMTP





Overlay Limits

Authentication Load



About 20% emails are to new peers

Trusted Group Size

- Authentication messages per email
 System limitation 300
- Peers to authenticate per email
 Mailbox observation 1/5
- Quota of 1500 messages per peer
 - Protocol messaging cost analysis
 - Trusted group size limit 75

Sender Authentication Plugin

- Thunderbird mail client
 - XPCOM layer
 - Implements Public-key authentication
 - Javascript layer
 - Transfer protocol messages to and from SMTP extension fields



Bootstrapping Trusted Group



 University mail trace shows Receiving bias

Bootstrapping Trusted Group

- Required for automatic operation
- Select trusted group
 - Two-way
 - Outgoing
- Selected 53 peers with 10 or more trusted peers using Two-way rule



Implementation Status

Email application

- Automatic sender authentication
- Overlay authentication protocol on SMTP
- Available as Thunderbird extension module
 - Tested on 32bit and 64bit Linux
 - http://discolab.rutgers.edu/sam

Implementation Screenshot

| Inbox for vpathak@cs.rutger | s.edu - Thunderbird | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| <u>F</u> ile <u>E</u> dit <u>V</u> iew <u>G</u> o <u>M</u> essage | Tools <u>H</u> elp | | |
| Get Mail • Write Address Book | <u>A</u> ddress Book Ctrl+2 <u>E</u> xtensions <u>T</u> hemes | K Junk Print - Stop | 0 |
| Folders | Message Filters | 🔎 Subject o | r Sender |
| 🗉 🚮 vpathak@cs.rutgers.edu | Run Filters on Folder | Sender | ⊗ Date ∧ 🖽 |
| | Junk Mail Controls R <u>u</u> n Junk Mail Controls on Folder Delete Mail Marked as Junk in Folder Import JavaScript Console | Pravin Shankar Pravin Shankar Pravin Shankar Christine Stribute Lu Han Tuesda E Crispin III | • 05:16 AM • 05/27/2007 03: • 05/26/2007 10: • 05/26/2007 02: • 05/25/2007 08: ▼ |
| Inbox (6) Inbox (1) Image: Complexity of the second se | Sender Authentication | Message Authentication Status Show Trusted Peers Sender Authentication Settings Clear Authenti <u>c</u> ation State <u>A</u> bout | |
| 🗉 🚽 Local Folders | | | |
| Unsent Unsent Unsent Ursent Ur | | | |
| 2 | | | Unread: 3 Total: 732 |

Outline

- Byzantine fault tolerant public key authentication
 - Basis of sender authentication for email
- Application to Email
 - Thunderbird sender authentication plugin



- Usability
 - Micro-benchmark
 - Simulation on University and Industry mail trace

Micro-benchmarks

- Record the processing time overhead
 - Average over multiple messages
- Operational parameters
 - Public key length
 - Trusted group size

Overhead with Trusted Group Size



- Increasing on Sender
 - Serialization and compression of larger messages

Overhead with Key Length



- Increasing on receiver
 - Digital signature verification
 - Responding to challenges

Micro-benchmark Summary

Sending path overhead of 250ms

Receiving path overhead of 500ms
 Can be done asynchronously

Acceptable level of overhead

Simulation Study

- Process the entire email trace on a single machine
 - Anonymous log records from mail server
 - Exact times have been removed
- University trace of 92 days and 1.19M messages
- Industry trace of 56 days and 2.5M messages

Overhead on Email Size



Recover the designed 10KB overhead

Disk Space Usage



- Epidemic algorithm overhead
 - Trusted group size is 100
 - Overhead about 10MB per peer

Authentication University Trace



- Partial completion on 92 day trace
 - About 40% of peers authenticated

Authentication Industry Trace



- Reduced progress
 - Trace collected upstream of spam filter
 - Effectiveness of Authentication is near 40%

Trace Analysis Study

- Achieve 40% completion on about 3 months of email traffic
 - Using two way bootstrapping group
 - Effectiveness depends on bootstrapping group selection
- Modest cache overhead
- Message overhead is respected as designed

Conclusion

Implemented and evaluated automatic sender authentication for email

- Future work
 - Data collection from deployment
 - Improve bootstrapping group selection
 - Address authenticity vs. importance



Peer-to-peer Sender Authentication for Email Extra Slides

Extra Slides Outline



- Authentication protocol details
 - Distributed Authentication
 - Byzantine Agreement
 - Trust Groups
 - Public Key Infection
- Simulation results
 - Group size
 - Malicious peers

Authentication Model

- Challenge-response protocol
 - No active attacks
- Man in the middle attack
 - Limited number of attacks



Proof of possession of K_a
{b,a,Challenge,K_a(r)}_b, {a,b,Response,r}_a

Authentication Model

- Distributed Authentication
 - Challenge response from multiple peers
 - Gather proofs of possession

Lack of consensus on authenticity

F

- Malicious peers
- Man-in-the-middle attack

Authentication Correctness

- Validity of proofs of possession
 - {e,a,Challenge,K_a(r)}_e, {a,e,Response,r}_a
- All messages are signed
 - Required for proving malicious behavior
 - Recent proofs stored by the peers

| From | P _B | P _c | P _D | P _E | P _F |
|--------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| peers | | | | | |
| From A | P _B | P _C | P _D | P _E | P _F |

F

Byzantine Agreement Overview

- Publicize lack of consensus
 - Authenticating peer sends proofs of possession to peers
- Each peer tries to authenticate A
 - Sends its proof-of-possession vector to every peer
 - Byzantine agreement on authenticity of K_A
- Majority decision at every peer
 - Identify malicious peers
 - Complete authentication

| From B | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|
| From C | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| From D | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| From E | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| From F | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |



Byzantine Agreement Correctness Overview

- t + 2Øn may not arrive
 - P receives at least n-t-2Øn proofs
- t + 2Øn may be faulty
 - P receives at least n-2t-4Øn correct agreeing proofs
 - P decides correctly by majority if n-2t-4Øn > t + 2Øn
- Agreement is correct if $t < \frac{1-6\emptyset}{3}n$

Trust Groups

- Execute Authentication on smaller Trust groups
 - Quadratic messaging cost
 - Peer interest
- Trusted group
 - Authenticated public keys
 - Not (overtly) malicious
- Probationary group
- Un-trusted group
 - Known to be malicious



Growth of Trust Groups

- Governed by communication patterns
- Discovery of new peers
 - Authentication of discovered peers
 - Addition to trusted set
- Discovery of untrusted peers



Evolution of Trust Groups

Covertly malicious peers

- May wait until honest majority is violated
- Lead to incorrect authentication
- Periodic pruning of trusted group
 - Unresponsive peers
 - Remove older trusted peers from trust group
 - Reduce messaging cost
 - Randomize trusted group membership
 - Group migration event
- Probability of violating honest majority

Bootstrapping Trust Group

- Authentication needs an honest trust group
 - Initialize a Bootstrapping trust group
 - Needed for cold start
 - Authenticate each bootstrapping peer
- Size of bootstrapping trust group
 - Recover from trusting a malicious peer

$$n > {}^{3}/_{1-6\emptyset}$$



- Cache of undelivered messages
 - Use peers for epidemic propagation of messages
 - Anti-entropy sessions eventually deliver messages
 - Infect peers with new undelivered messages

Public Key Infection

- Use logical and vector timestamps
 - Determine messages to exchange for anti-entropy
 - Detect message delivery
- Double exponential drop in number of uninfected peers with time
- Number of cached messages is in O(nlogn)

Extra Slides Outline

- Authentication protocol details
 - Distributed Authentication
 - Byzantine Agreement
 - Trust Groups
 - Public Key Infection



- Simulation results
 - Group size
 - Malicious peers

Simulation

- Implemented Byzantine Fault Tolerant Authentication as a C++ library
- Simulation program
 - Make library calls and keeps counters
 - Study effects of
 - Group size
 - Malicious peers

Effects of Group Size

- Constant Cost for trusted peers
- Probationary peers process
 O(n²) messages
- Trust graph does not affect the cost
 - Randomized trusted sets from Bi-directional trust



Effects of Malicious Peers

- Rapid increase of messaging cost
 - With group size
 - With proportion of malicious peers
- Byzantine agreement has quadratic messaging cost



Conclusion

- Autonomous authentication without trusted third party
 - Incremental approach to security
 - Suited for low value peer-to-peer systems
- Tolerate malicious peers
 - Suited for applications spanning multiple administrative domains
- Scalable to large peer-to-peer systems
- Eliminate total trust and single point of failure
- Made feasible by using stronger network assumptions
 - Network adversary is not all powerful