Dragonblood: Attacking the Dragonfly Handshake of WPA3

Mathy Vanhoef and Eyal Ronen

Black Hat USA. Las Vegas, 7 August 2019.



NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Background: Dragonfly in WPA3 and EAP-pwd

= Password Authenticated Key Exchange (PAKE)



Provide mutual authentication





Forward secrecy & prevent offline dictionary attacks



Protect against server compromise

Dragonfly



Dragonfly



What are MODP groups?



Operations performed on integers x where:

- > x < p with p a prime
- > $x^q \mod p = 1 \mod b$
- > q = #elements in the group

→ All operations are MODulo the Prime (= MODP)

for (counter = 1; counter < 256; counter++)</pre>

value = hash(pw, counter, addr1, addr2)

if value >= p: continue

 $\mathsf{P} = value^{(p-1)/q}$

return P Convert value to a MODP element

for (counter = 1; counter < 256; counter++)</pre>

value = hash(pw, counter, addr1, addr2)

 $\mathsf{P} = value^{(p-1)/q}$

retu Problem for groups 22-24: high chance that value >= p

for (counter = 1; counter < 256; counter++)</pre>

- value = hash(pw, counter, addr1, addr2)
- if value >= p: ???
- $P = value^{(p-1)/q}$

return P

for (counter = 1; counter < 256; counter++)
value = hash(pw, counter, addr1, addr2)
if value >= p: continue
P = value^{(p-1)/q}
return P

for (counter = 1; counter < 256; counter++) value = hash(pw counter, addr1, addr2)</pre>

if val #iterations depends on password

$$P = value - 1/2$$

return P

for (counter = 1; counter < 256; counter++)</pre>

- value = hash(pw] counter, addr1, addr2)
- if val #iterations depends on password
 P = value

No timing leak countermeasures, despite warnings by IETF & CFRG!

IETF mailing list in 2010



"[..] susceptible to side channel (timing) attacks and may leak the shared password."



"not so sure how important that is [..] doesn't leak the shared password [..] not a trivial attack."







What information is leaked?

for (counter = 1; counter < 256; counter++)</pre>

value = hash(pw, counter, addr1, addr2)

if va Spoof client address to obtain P = 1 different execution & leak new data











Raspberry Pi 1 B+: differences are measurable



Raspberry Pi 1 B+: differences are measurable



What about elliptic curves?



→ Need to convert password to point (x,y) on the curve

Hash-to-curve: EAP-pwd

for (counter = 1; counter < 40; counter++)
x = hash(pw, counter, addr1, addr2)
if x >= p: continue
if square root exists(x) and not P:

return (x,
$$\sqrt{x^3 + ax + b}$$
)

EAP-pwd: similar timing leak with elliptic curves

for (counter = 1; counter < 40; counter++)
x = hash(pw, counter, addr1, addr2)
if x >= p: continue
if square_root_exists(x) and not P:

P =
$$(x, \sqrt{x^3 + ax + b})$$

return P

WPA3: always do 40 loops & return first P

for (counter = 1; counter < 40; counter++)</pre> x = hash(pw, counter, addr1, addr2) if square root exists(x) and not P: **P** = (x, $\sqrt{x^3 + ax + b}$) return **Problem for Bainpool curves:** high chance that $x \ge p$

for (counter = 1; counter < 40; counter++)</pre> x = hash(pw, counter, addr1, addr2) if x >= p: continue if square_root_exists(x) and not P: P = (x, $\sqrt{x^3 + ax + b}$) return P Code may be skipped!

for (counter = 1; counter < 40; counter++)</pre> x = hash(pw, counter, addr1, addr2) if x >= p: continue if square_root_exists(x) and not P: P = $(x, \sqrt{x^3 + ax + b})$ ret **#Times skipped depends on password**

for (counter = 1; counter < 40; counter++)
x = hash(pw, counter, addr1, addr2)
if x >= p: continue
if square_root_exists(x) and not P:
P = (x, $\sqrt{x^3 + ax + b}$)

re → simplified, execution time for several client MAC addresses forms a signature of the password.



Cache Attacks

NIST Elliptic Curves Monitor using Flush+Reload to for (counter = 1; c know in which iteration we are x = hash(pw, counter, addr1, addr2) if x >= p: continue if square root exists(x) and not P: P = $(x, \sqrt{x^3 + ax + b})$ return P **NIST curves:** use Flush+Reload to detect when code is executed

Bainpool Elliptic Cu
for (counter = 1; c Monitor using Flush+Reload to
know in which iteration we are

$$x = hash(pw, counter, addr1, addr2)$$

if $x \ge p$: continue
if square_root_exists(x) and not P:
 $P = (x, \sqrt{x^3 + ax + b})$
return P
Brainpool curves: use Flush+Reload
to detect when code is executed

Cache-attacks in practice



Requires powerfull adversary:

- > Run unpriviliged code on victim's machine
- > Act as malicious client/AP within range of victim

Abuse leaked info to recover the password

- > Spoof various client addresses similar to timing attack
- > Use resulting **password signature** in dictionary attack

Attack Optimizations

Timing & cache attack result in password signature

> Both use the same brute-force algorithm

Improve performance using GPU code:

- > We can brute-force 10¹⁰ passwords for \$1
- > MODP / Brainpool: all 8 symbols costs \$67
- > NIST curves: all 8 symbols costs \$14k

Implementation Inspection







Implementation Vulnerabilities II



Bad randomness:

- > Can recover password element P
- > Aruba's EAP-pwd client for Windows is affected
- > With WPA2 bad randomness has lower impact!



Side-channels:

- > FreeRADIUS aborts if >10 iterations are needed
- > Aruba's EAP-pwd aborts if >30 are needed
- > Can use leaked info to recover password



Denial-of-Service Attack



- > Conversion is computationally expensive (40 iterations)
- > Forging 8 connections/sec saturates AP's CPU

Downgrade Against WPA3-Transition

Transition mode: WPA2/3 use the same password

- > WPA2's handshake detects downgrades \rightarrow forward secrecy
- > Performing partial WPA2 handshake → dictionary attacks

Solution is to remember which networks support WPA3

- > Similar to trust on first use of SSH & HSTS
- > Implemented by Pixel 3 and Linux's NetworkManager

Crypto Group Downgrade

Handshake can be performed with multiple curves

- > Initiator proposes curve & responder accepts/rejects
- > Spoof reject messages to downgrade used curve

= design flaw, all client & AP implementations vulnerable



Disclosure

Disclosure process

Notified parties early with hope to influence WPA3

- > Some initially sceptic, considered it implementation flaws
- > Group downgrade: "was known, but forgot to warn about it"

Reaction of the Wi-Fi Alliance

- > Privately created backwards-compatible security guidelines
- > 2nd disclosure round to address Brainpool side-channels

Fundamental issue still unsolved

- > On lightweight devices, doing 40 iterations is too costly
- Even powerfull devices are at risk: handshake might be offloaded the lightweight Wi-Fi chip itself

Wi-Fi standard now being updated

- > Prevent crypto group downgrade attack
- > Allow offline computation of password element

Additional upates to Wi-Fi standard



- MODP crypto groups:
 - > Restrict usage of weak MODP groups
- > Constant-time algo (modulo intead of iterations)



- Elliptic curve groups:
- > Restrict usage of weak elliptic curves
- Constant-time algo (simplified SWU)

Updates aren't backwards-compatible

Might lead to WPA3.1?

- > Not yet clear how this will be handled
- > Risk of downgrade attacks to original WPA3



Will people be able to easily attack WPA3?

- > No, WPA3 > WPA2 even with its flaws
- > Timing leaks: non-trival to determine if vulnerable

Conclusion

- > WPA3 vulnerable to side-channels
- > Countermeasures are costly
- > Standard now being updated
- > WPA3 > WPA2 & planned updates are strong



