

Establishing a Group Key Using One-Way Accumulators

Teklay Gebremichael

Mid Sweden University

teklay.gebremichael@miun.se

May 11, 2017

About Myself

- ▶ BSc in Information Technology, Mekelle Institute of Technolgy, Ethiopia.
- ▶ MSc in Computer Science, University of Trento, Italy.
- ▶ Now PhD candidate at Mid Sweden University, Sweden.

Internet of Things

- ▶ Internet of Things: Interconnection of users, computing systems, and everyday objects.

Internet of Things

- ▶ Internet of Things: Interconnection of users, computing systems, and everyday objects.
- ▶ Main research challenges:
 - ▶ Scaling and Naming
 - ▶ Interoperability (openness)
 - ▶ Big Data Analytics
 - ▶ Energy
 - ▶ **Security and Privacy**

Information Security in Internet of Things

- ▶ Cryptography is the main tool for achieving information security in IoT
 1. Confidentiality
 2. Integrity
 3. Authentication

Information Security in Internet of Things

- ▶ Cryptography is the main tool for achieving information security in IoT
 1. Confidentiality
 2. Integrity
 3. Authentication
- ▶ They all require a **Cryptographic Key**.

Information Security in Internet of Things

- ▶ Cryptography is the main tool for achieving information security in IoT
 1. Confidentiality
 2. Integrity
 3. Authentication
- ▶ They all require a **Cryptographic Key**.
- ▶ Key sharing is usually a challenge.(And specially among a group)

Approaches Today

1. Key sharing schemes based on Symmetric Key Crypto
 - ▶ Each device shares a key with every other device (Secure but does not scale well)
 - ▶ Single key shared among all devices. (very vulnerable)
 - ▶ Key sharing approaches based on observed environment behavior (Limited key size)

Approaches Today

1. Key sharing schemes based on Symmetric Key Crypto
 - ▶ Each device shares a key with every other device (Secure but does not scale well)
 - ▶ Single key shared among all devices. (very vulnerable)
 - ▶ Key sharing approaches based on observed environment behavior (Limited key size)
2. Key sharing schemes based on Public Key Crypto
 - ▶ Computationally Expensive (specially for IoT devices)
 - ▶ Need a "Trust Anchor" to resolve public keys
 - ▶ not suitable for IoT

Research Question

1. How to design distributed key establishment (sharing) schemes ?
2. Schemes where all devices involved do a proportional amount of work in generating the shared key?
3. How about group keys?

Establishing a Group Key Using One Way Accumulators

- ▶ (Objective:) Design a scheme that enables devices to form a "secure multicast" group.

Why Group Communication in IoT

- ▶ Multicast Applications are very common.
- ▶ Example use case:
 1. Smart Home Application : Control of light bulbs
 2. e-health: collection and aggregation of patient data

Establishing a Group Key Using One Way Accumulators

- ▶ (Objective:) Design a scheme that enables devices to form a "secure multicast" group.

Basic Assumptions

1. Network consists of n devices ($d_1, d_2, d_3, \dots, d_n$) and a "trusted" Gateway (GW).
2. Each device has private/public pairs.
3. A device can request the GW to get a list of the devices in the network.
4. The network is relatively stable (low group join and leave rates)

Leveraging One Way Accumulators

- ▶ Establish a scheme that enables devices to form a "secure multicast" group.
- ▶ We leverage the concept of one-way accumulators.
- ▶ One-Way Accumulator:

A function $h : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ such that:

1. It is "hard" to invert
2. $h(h(x, y_1), y_2) = h(h(x, y_2), y_1)$ (Quasi-Commutativity)
3. Hard to find a collisions.

Leveraging One Way Accumulators

- ▶ Establish a scheme that enables devices to form a "secure multicast" group.
- ▶ We leverage the concept of one-way accumulators.
- ▶ One-Way Accumulator:
A function $h : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ such that:
 1. It is "hard" to invert
 2. $h(h(x, y_1), y_2) = h(h(x, y_2), y_1)$ (Quasi-Commutativity)
 3. Hard to find a collisions.
- ▶ (Example): Modular Exponentiation since $exp(exp(x, y_1), y_2) = exp(exp(x, y_2), y_1)$

The proposed Scheme

- ▶ Assume d_1 initiates the group creation process (Otherwise, it can do it through the GW).
- ▶ "Interested devices" reply "join". (signed with their private keys)
- ▶ Assume devices d_2 , d_3 and d_4 reply "join".
- ▶ Then, d_1 does the following sequence of steps.
 1. compute $z = h(h(h(d_1, d_2), d_3), d_4)$

The proposed Scheme

- ▶ Assume d_1 initiates the group creation process (Otherwise, it can do it through the GW).
- ▶ "Interested devices" reply "join". (signed with their private keys)
- ▶ Assume devices d_2 , d_3 and d_4 reply "join".
- ▶ Then, d_1 does the following sequence of steps.
 1. compute $z = h(h(h(d_1, d_2), d_3), d_4)$
 2. For each device d_j , compute z_j . (z_j is computed similarly to z with parameter d_j excluded for each z_j)

The proposed Scheme

- ▶ Assume d_1 initiates the group creation process (Otherwise, it can do it through the GW).
- ▶ "Interested devices" reply "join". (signed with their private keys)
- ▶ Assume devices d_2 , d_3 and d_4 reply "join".
- ▶ Then, d_1 does the following sequence of steps.
 1. compute $z = h(h(h(d_1, d_2), d_3), d_4)$
 2. For each device d_j , compute z_j . (z_j is computed similarly to z with parameter d_j excluded for each z_j)
 3. pick a random $k \in \mathbb{K}$ (This will be the session group key)

The proposed Scheme

- ▶ Assume d_1 initiates the group creation process (Otherwise, it can do it through the GW).
- ▶ "Interested devices" reply "join". (signed with their private keys)
- ▶ Assume devices d_2 , d_3 and d_4 reply "join".
- ▶ Then, d_1 does the following sequence of steps.
 1. compute $z = h(h(h(d_1, d_2), d_3), d_4)$
 2. For each device d_j , compute z_j . (z_j is computed similarly to z with parameter d_j excluded for each z_j)
 3. pick a random $k \in \mathbb{K}$ (This will be the session group key)
 4. finally, to each device send k , z , and z_j encrypted with their respective public keys.

Continued ...

- ▶ any device d_j in the group can send a multicast message by encrypting the message with k .
- ▶ To prove its membership to the group it must append to the message the tuple (d_j, z_j) .
- ▶ Others can verify its membership by computing $h(z_j, d_j)$ and comparing it to z .

- ▶ (Threat Model): what can an attacker do?
 1. (Passive): Simply guess the key. Will be able to passively read messages but can only guess the key with probability $\frac{1}{2^n}$, where n is the key size. (We assume this value to be negligible)

- ▶ (Threat Model): what can an attacker do?
 1. (Passive): Simply guess the key. Will be able to passively read messages but can only guess the key with probability $\frac{1}{2^n}$, where n is the key size. (We assume this value to be negligible)
 2. (Active): Forge membership. The attacker has to produce a fake z'_j such that $h((z'_j)', d_j) = h(z_j, d_j)$. (Hard by assumption).

- ▶ (Threat Model): what can an attacker do?
 1. (Passive): Simply guess the key. Will be able to passively read messages but can only guess the key with probability $\frac{1}{2^n}$, where n is the key size. (We assume this value to be negligible)
 2. (Active): Forge membership. The attacker has to produce a fake z'_j such that $h((z'_j)', d_j) = h(z_j, d_j)$. (Hard by assumption).
 3. Forward Secrecy ?

- ▶ (Threat Model): what can an attacker do?
 1. (Passive): Simply guess the key. Will be able to passively read messages but can only guess the key with probability $\frac{1}{2^n}$, where n is the key size. (We assume this value to be negligible)
 2. (Active): Forge membership. The attacker has to produce a fake z'_j such that $h((z'_j)', d_j) = h(z_j, d_j)$. (Hard by assumption).
 3. Forward Secrecy ?
 4. How about group add and leave operations ?

Thank You!