6 Elektronische Geldbörsen

Common Electronic Purse Specifications



Globaler Standard (90% des Marktes).

Smart card speichert Kontostand. Kryptographie auf Chip sichert Transaktionen.

Sicherer als Kreditkarten (transaktionsgebundene Autorisierung).

CEPS Überblick



Aufgabe 12

Zeichne einen Bedrohungsbaum für das CEPS System. [3 P.]

Purchase Protocol

Offline transaction to pay for goods with money previously loaded on card.

Protocol participants: customer's card, merchant's POS device.

POS device contains Purchase Security Application Module (PSAM): all security-critical data processing and storage for POS device.

Card account balance adjusted; transaction data logged and later sent to issuer for financial settlement.

Use at public terminals; Internet use envisaged.

POS Device


POS Device Functional Components
Chip Card Reader
Display (Optional)
Key Pad
Receipt Printer (Optional)
User Interface
POS Terminal Application
Scheme Operating Data
Transaction Data store
Power Supply
Collection Interface
PSAM

UMLsec Spec.


Purchase
«data security»
{adversary=insider}
CEPS
{secrecy={K_C^-1}}
«critical»
{integrity={K_C,K_C^-1,K_CA,ID_C}}
ID_C : Data; K_C^-1,K_C,K_CA : Keys
Pcert(id,k,cert)
Deb(nt,exp)
«send»
«send»
PSAM
«critical»
{secrecy={K_P^-1}} {fresh={SK_}}
{integrity={K_P,K_P^-1,K_CA,ID_P,M_,SK_,NT}}
ID_P,M_ : Data; NT : Data
K_P^-1,K_P,K_CA,SK_ : Keys
Ccert(id,k,cert)
Resp(e,exp)
C:CEPS
P:PSAM
D:Display
entry/NT:=0
purch.C
entry/NT:=NT+1
purch.D
[NT≠limit]
purch.P
purch:
C:CEPS
P:PSAM
D:Display
Ccert(ID_C,K_C,Sign_{K_CA^-1}(ID_C::K_C))
Pcert(ID_P,K_P,Sign_{K_CA^-1}(ID_P::K_P))
[Ext_{K_CA}(cc) = id_C::k_C]
Deb(NT,{M_NT::SK_NT::Sign_{K_P^-1}(M_NT::SK_NT::ID_P::id_C::NT)}_{k_C})
[Ext_{K_CA}(cp)=id_P::k_P ∧ Ext_{k_P}(thd(Dec_{K_C^-1}(c_M))) =m::sk::id_P::ID_C::nt]
Resp(E,Sign_sk(m::E))
Disp(M_NT)
[Ext_{SK_NT}(Resp_2)=M_NT::Resp_1 ∧ Ext_{k_C}(Dec_{SK_NT}(Resp_1))=id_C::ID_P::M_NT::NT]
id_P ::= Pcert_1
k_P ::= Pcert_2
c_P ::= Pcert_3
nt ::= Dep_1
c_M ::= Cep_2
m ::= fst(Dec_{K_C^-1}(c_M))
sk ::= snd(Dec_{K_C^-1}(c_M))
E ::= {Sign_{K_C^-1}(ID_C::id_P::m::nt)}_sk
id_C ::= Ccert_1
k_C ::= Ccert_2
c_C ::= Ccert_3
POS device
«POS device»
Card
«smart.card»
Cardapp
C:CEPS
«wire»
«send»
«send»
PSAM
«smart.card»
PSAMapp
P:PSAM
Display
«send»
«wire»
Dispapp
D:Display

Purchase Protocol: Architecture




CEPS
{secrecy={K_C^{-1}}} «critical»
{integrity={K_C,K_C^{-1},K_{CA},ID_C}}
ID_C : Data; K_C^{-1},K_C,K_{CA} : Keys
Pcert(id,k,cert)
Deb(nt,exp)
«send»
«send»
PSAM
«critical»
{secrecy={K_P^{-1}}} {fresh={SK_}}
{integrity={K_P,K_P^{-1},K_{CA},ID_P,M_,SK_,NT}}
ID_P,M_ : Data; NT : Data
K_P^{-1},K_P,K_{CA},SK_ : Keys
Ccert(id,k,cert)
Resp(e,exp)
Class diagram



Activity diagram



Interaction

Security Threat Model

Supposed to provide mutual authentication between terminal and card.

Card, PSAM assumed tamper-resistant.

Intercept communication links, replace components.

Possible attack motivations:

- **(Non-)Cardholder**: purchase without pay.
- **Merchant employee**: buy digital content with customer's card.
- **Card issuer employee**: credit transactions to own (cover-up) business.

May coincide or collude.

Sicherheitsanalyse

Keine direkte Kommunikation zwischen Karte und Inhaber. Manipulation der Aufladestation möglich.

➔ Post-Transaktions-Abrechnungsystem.

➔ Gespeicherte Transaktionsdaten sicherheitskritisch.

➔ Modell-basierte Analyse dieses Teiles.

Aufgabe 13

Welche Sicherheitseigenschaft, die für Bargeldnutzer im Allgemeinen erfüllt ist, wird durch das Post-Transaktions-Abrechnungssystem eingeschränkt (insbesondere wenn die Karte über ein Bankkonto aufgeladen wird) ? [2 P.]

Security conditions (informal)

Cardholder security. Merchant can only claim amount registered on card after transaction.

Merchant security. Merchant receives proof of transaction in exchange for sold good.

Card issuer security. Sum of balances of valid cards and PSAMs unchanged by transaction.

Merchant security

Each time display D receives value M_{NT}, P is in possession of $Sign_{KCA\text{-}1}(ID_C::K_C)$ and $Sign_{KC}^{1}(ID_C::ID_P::M_{NT}::NT)$ for some ID_C, K_C^{-1} and new value NT.

Not satisfied. Attack automatically computed.

Attack exploits the fact that POS device is not tamper-proof.

Redirect messages between card and PSAM to another PSAM (e.g. to buy digital content, on the cost of the cardholder).


C
Ccert(IDC,KC,$Sign_{K_{CA}^{-1}}$(IDC::KC))
A
Ccert(IDC,KC,$Sign_{K_{CA}^{-1}}$(IDC::KC))
P′
C
Pcert(IDP′,KP′,$Sign_{K_{CA}^{-1}}$(IDP′::KP′))
A
Pcert(IDP′,KP′,$Sign_{K_{CA}^{-1}}$(IDP′::KP′))
P′
A
Deb(NT,{MNT::SKNT::$Sign_{K_{P'}^{-1}}$(MNT::SKNT::IDP′::idC::NT)}kC)
P′
C
Deb(NT,{MNT::SKNT::$Sign_{K_{P'}^{-1}}$(MNT::SKNT::IDP′::idC::NT)}kC)
A
C
Resp(E,$Sign_{sk}$(m::E))
A
Resp(E,$Sign_{sk}$(m::E))
P′
Attack
A
Disp(MNT)
D

Fix: Protect PSAM-device link



Aufgabe 14

Welcher Angriff wäre möglich, wenn es den Transaktionszähler *NT* nicht geben würde ? (Pfeildiagramm des Angriffablaufes zeichnen) [4 P.]

Ladeprotokoll

Karte mit Bargeld an Aufladestation laden (on-line).

Load Security Application Module (LSAM) speichert Transaktionsdaten.

Schickt Daten an Kartenemittent, der finanzielle Abwicklung übernimmt.

Symmetrische Verschlüsselung/Signatur.



CEPS load device

Load «data security»

Card «critical»
{secrecy={K_{CI}}}
{integrity={K_{CI},cep,nt,rc_{nt}}}

cep, nt, rc_{nt} : Data; K_{CI} : Keys

Init(lda,m)
Credit(s2,rl)

LSAM «critical»
{secrecy={K_{LI}}}
{integrity={K_{LI},lda,n,rl_n,$r2l_n$,r_n,m_n}}

lda, n, rl_n, $r2l_n$, m_n : Data
K_{LI}, r_n : Keys

RespI(cep,nt,sl,hc)
RespC(s3,rc)
RespL(s2)

Issuer «critical»
{secrecy={K_{CI},K_{LI},rc_{nt}}}
{integrity={K_{CI},K_{LI},rc_{nt}}}

rc_{nt} : Data; K_{LI}, K_{CI} : Keys

Load(cep,lda,m,nt,s1,ml,h
hl,h2l)
Comp(cep,lda,m,nt,r2l,s3)



Load Protocol: Physical View



Load Protocol: Structural View



Load Protocol: Coordination View



Load Protocol: Interaction View



CEPS Card Statechart



CEPS LSAM Statechart





CEPS Card Issuer Statechart

Variable	Explanation
C	card
L	LSAM
I	card issuer
$\mathsf{rc_{nt}}$	secret random values shared between card and issuer
$\mathsf{rl_n}$, $\mathsf{r2l_n}$	random numbers of LSAM
$\mathsf{r_n}$	symmetric keys of LSAM
$\mathsf{m_n}$	transaction amounts
m, rl, hl	$\mathsf{m_n}$, $\mathsf{rl_n}$, $\mathsf{hl_n}$ as received at card issuer
nt	card transaction number
n	acquirer-generated identification number
lda	load device identifier
cep	card identifier
$\mathsf{s1}$	card signature: $\mathcal{S}ign_{\mathsf{K_{CI}}}(\mathsf{cep}::\mathsf{lda}::\mathsf{m}::\mathsf{nt})$
$\mathsf{hc_{nt}}$	card hash value: $\mathcal{H}ash(\mathsf{lda}::\mathsf{cep}::\mathsf{nt}::\mathsf{rc_{nt}})$
$\widehat{\mathsf{hc}}_{\mathsf{nt}}$	$\mathsf{hc_{nt}}$ as created at issuer
rc, hc	$\mathsf{rc_{nt}}$, $\mathsf{hc_{nt}}$ as received at load acquirer
$\mathsf{K_{CI}}$	key shared between card and issuer
$\mathsf{K_{LI}}$	key shared between LSAM and issuer
$\mathsf{ml_n}$	$\mathcal{S}ign_{\mathsf{r_n}}(\mathsf{cep}::\mathsf{nt}::\mathsf{lda}::\mathsf{m_n}::\mathsf{s1}::\mathsf{hc}::\mathsf{hl_n}::\mathsf{h2l_n})$ (signed by LSAM)
$\mathsf{hl_n}$	hash of transaction data: $\mathcal{H}ash(\mathsf{lda}::\mathsf{cep}::\mathsf{nt}::\mathsf{rl})$
$\mathsf{h2l_n}$	hash of transaction data: $\mathcal{H}ash(\mathsf{lda}::\mathsf{cep}::\mathsf{nt}::\mathsf{r2l})$
$\mathsf{s2}$	issuer signature: $\mathcal{S}ign_{\mathsf{K_{CI}}}(\mathsf{cep}::\mathsf{nt}::\mathsf{s1}::\mathsf{hl})$
$\mathsf{s3}$	card signature of the form $\mathcal{S}ign_{\mathsf{K_{CI}}}(\mathsf{cep}::\mathsf{lda}::\mathsf{m}::\mathsf{nt})$

Bedrohungsszenarien

Annahme: Card, LSAM manipulationssicher.

Mögliche Angreiferaktionen: Kommunikation abhören, Komponenten ersetzen.

Mögliche Motive:

Kartenbesitzer: Aufladen ohne zu bezahlen

Ladestation Betreiber: Geld des Kartenbesitzers einbehalten

Kartenausgeber: Geld vom Ladestation Betreiber verlangen

Gemeinsamer Angriffsversuch denkbar.

Sicherheitsanforderungen (informell)

Kartenbesitzer: Wenn Karte laut Log mit Betrag *m* aufgeladen wurde, kann Kartenbesitzer dem Emittenten beweisen, dass Ladestation-Betreiber ihm *m* schuldet.

Ladestation-Betreiber: Ladestation-Betreiber muss Betrag *m* dem Kartenausgeber nur zahlen, nachdem vom Kartenbesitzer erhalten.

Emittenten: Summe der Guthaben von Karten-inhaber und Ladestation Betreiber unverändert.

Load Acquirer Security

Suppose card issuer *I* possesses *mln=Sign$_{rn}$(cep::nt::lda::mn::s1::hcnt::hln::h2ln)* and card *C* possesses *rln*, where *hln = Hash (lda::cep::nt::rln)*.

Then after execution either of following hold:

- Llog*(cep,lda,mn,nt)* has been sent to I:LLog (so load acquirer L has received and retains *mn* in cash) or
- Llog *(cep, lda, 0, nt)* has been sent to I : LLog (so L returns *mn* to cardholder) and L has received *rcnt* with *hcnt=Hash(lda::cep::nt::rcnt)* (negating *mln*).

"*mln* provides guarantee that load acquirer owes transaction amount to card issuer" (CEPS)

Überraschung

ml_n: „Beweis“ für Bank, dass Ladegerät Geld erhielt.

Aber: r_n geteilt zwischen Bank und Ladegerät.



$ml_n ::= Sign_{r_n}(\ldots, m_n, \ldots)$

Überraschung (2)

rc_{nt}: „Beweis“ für LSAM, dass Ladegerät nur Betrag m_n erhielt.
Aber: LSAM kann Validität von rc_{nt} nicht beweisen.



Schwachstelle

Analyse: Keine Sicherheit für Ladestation gegen interne Angreifer.

Änderung: asymmetrischer Schlüssel in ml_n, Signatur für hc_{nt}.

Modifizierte Version sicher laut Analyse.

Aufgabe 15

Modifiziere das Sequenzdiagramm gemäß der genannten Änderung. [4 P.]

Cardholder Security

Cardholder security: For any message $\mathsf{Clog}(\mathsf{lda}, \mathsf{m}, \mathsf{nt}, \mathsf{s2}, \mathsf{rl})$ *sent to* $\mathsf{c} : \mathsf{CLog}$, *if* $\mathsf{m} \neq 0$ *(that is, the card seems to have been loaded with* m*) then* $\mathsf{rl} \neq 0$ *and*

$$\mathcal{E}xt_{\mathsf{K_{CI}}}(\mathsf{s2}) = \mathsf{cep} :: \mathsf{nt} :: \mathcal{S}ign_{\mathsf{K_{CI}}}(\mathsf{cep} :: \mathsf{lda} :: \mathsf{m} :: \mathsf{nt}) :: \mathcal{H}ash(\mathsf{lda} :: \mathsf{cep} :: \mathsf{nt} :: \mathsf{rl})$$

holds (that is, the card issuer certifies rl *to be a valid proof for the transaction). For any two messages* $\mathsf{Clog}(\mathsf{lda}, \mathsf{m}, \mathsf{nt}, \mathsf{s2}, \mathsf{rl})$ *and* $\mathsf{Clog}(\mathsf{lda}', \mathsf{m}', \mathsf{nt}', \mathsf{s2}', \mathsf{rl}')$ *sent to* $\mathsf{c} : \mathsf{CLog}$, *we have* $\mathsf{nt} \neq \mathsf{nt}'$.

Load Acquirer Security

Card issuer security: For each message $\mathsf{Clog}(\mathsf{lda}, \mathsf{m}, \mathsf{nt}, \mathsf{s2}, \mathsf{rl})$ *sent to* $\mathsf{c} : \mathsf{CLog}$, *if* $\mathsf{m} \neq 0$ *and*

$$\mathcal{E}xt_{\mathsf{K_{CI}}}(\mathsf{s2}) = \mathsf{cep} :: \mathsf{nt} :: \mathcal{S}ign_{\mathsf{K_{CI}}}(\mathsf{cep} :: \mathsf{lda} :: \mathsf{m} :: \mathsf{nt}) :: \mathcal{H}ash(\mathsf{lda} :: \mathsf{cep} :: \mathsf{nt} :: \mathsf{rl})$$

holds for some lda, *then the card issuer has a valid signature* ml_n *corresponding to this transaction.*

Card Issuer Security

Card issuer security: For each message $\mathsf{Clog}(\mathsf{lda}, \mathsf{m}, \mathsf{nt}, \mathsf{s2}, \mathsf{rl})$ *sent to* $\mathsf{c} : \mathsf{CLog}$, *if* $\mathsf{m} \neq 0$ *and*

$$\mathcal{E}xt_{\mathsf{K_{CI}}}(\mathsf{s2}) = \mathsf{cep} :: \mathsf{nt} :: \mathcal{S}ign_{\mathsf{K_{CI}}}(\mathsf{cep} :: \mathsf{lda} :: \mathsf{m} :: \mathsf{nt}) :: \mathcal{H}ash(\mathsf{lda} :: \mathsf{cep} :: \mathsf{nt} :: \mathsf{rl})$$

holds for some lda, *then the card issuer has a valid signature* ml_n *corresponding to this transaction.*

Aufgabe 16

Welcher Angriff wäre möglich, wenn es den Transaktionszähler *nt* nicht geben würde ? (Pfeildiagramm des Angriffablaufes) [4 P.]