BULDING A DIY ZERO-TRUST SSH CA SECURE AND TRANSPARENT SSH ACCESS MANAGEMENT WITHOUT BLOAT



András Veres-Szentkirályi 2021-08-28

\$ whoami





András Veres-Szentkirályi

- OSCP, GWAPT, SISE
- Silent Signal co-founder
- pentester, toolmaker

The basics

O The problem

Our solution



SSH in a nutshell



- complex protocol standardized in RFCs
- PFS encryption, server authentication
- multiple authentication methods

Hardware tokens



can be cheap

- or even "free" like Krypton
- can be "something you have" in 2FA
 - and even enforce "something you know"...
 - ...and/or "something you are"
- can be used in various ways
 - resulting in different security levels
- 🕨 can be lost
 - more on that later
- can be standardized
 - PIV, OpenPGP, FIDO, FIDO2, CTAP, U2F...



2 The problem

Our solution



Authentication



small non-tech organizations and personal servers

- few servers to log into
- few users to log in
- manual tinkering works great
- big organizations
 - SSO
 - dedicated support for this SPoF
- problems for those between the above two
 - technical users
 - revocation
 - tokens

SSH and hardware tokens



$\blacktriangleright \quad \mathsf{YubiKey} \ \mathsf{OTP} \to \mathsf{DEMO}_1$

- easy to manage, compatible with everything
- not so secure (think MITM)
- ► SSH public key authentication → DEMO₂
 - more secure (no MITM possible)
 - technical users can be limited (see AUTHORIZED_KEYS in sshd(8))
 - who manages the keys? (see AuthorizedKeysCommand)
 - public key can come from anywhere (file or device)
 - can use PKCS#11
 - GnuPG offers SSH agent emulation
 - no expiration
- SSH certificates

SSH certificates



certificate: issuer signs a statement about a subject's public key

- SSH certificate: much simpler than X.509
 - simple serialization format
 - no multi-layer PKI implemented
- has expiration, can be revoked
- can have limitations (e.g. which commands can be executed)
- lots of trust placed in CA(s)
- much less supported than "plain" public key authentication
 - OpenSSH supports a lot, yet not everything
 - most other clients not so much
 - OpenSSH example: port forward granularity

SSH certificate authentication



- TrustedUserCAKeys: like authorized_keys, just for CAs
- Principal: list of strings
 - ▶ can be a literal username \rightarrow DEMO₃
 - can match an entry in AuthorizedPrincipalsFile
- AuthorizedPrincipalsCommand: taking it to the next level, like with keys
- RevokedKeys: refuses otherwise valid certificates

CA trust and transparency



- has the CA signed a certificate it shouldn't have?
- can the CA demonstrate that its key is secure?
- do leaf certificates match the policy?
 - expiration date
 - key security
 - limitations
- what to do if something has gone wrong?
 - compromised CA
 - compromised user key
 - improperly issued certificates
 - destroyed/lost tokens



O The problem

3 Our solution



Attestation



"The concept of attestation is to cryptographically certify that a certain asymmetric key has been generated on device, and not imported. This can be used to prove that no other copies of the asymmetric key exist." – https://developers.yubico.com/PGP/Attestation.html

- the implementation is YubiKey-specific, but the idea is not
- X.509 both for PIV and OpenPGP
- ► can be parsed with OpenSSL (→ DEMO₄) and https://cryptography.io/
- our take: necessary for regular users and CAs

OpenPGP (\neq GnuPG)



supports EdDSA (Ed25519) on newer YubiKeys

- unlike PIV, which supports RSA and ECDSA only
- 🕨 subpar everyday UX
 - unlike PIV, which has https://github.com/FiloSottile/yubikey-agent

has a signature counter \rightarrow DEMO₅

- but only for the signing key, not the (technically identical) authentication key
- GnuPG SSH agent emulation can only use latter
- besides GnuPG, there's a low-level Python implementation
 - ▶ https://github.com/bitlogik/OpenPGPpy \rightarrow DEMO₆
 - Ed25519 had problems, see issue #1

our take: signature counter is a must-have for CAs

How it all works together





Attacker model



- attacker can make the CA sign something it shouldn't have
- if it gets saved into the database, it can be seen during an audit
- if it's not in the database, counter doesn't match the number of certs
- centralized logging and SIEM could improve this even further

"Testing shows the presence, not the absence of bugs" – Dijkstra (1969) J.N. Buxton and B. Randell, eds, Software Engineering Techniques, April 1970, p. 16. Report on a conference sponsored by the NATO Science Committee, Rome, Italy, 27–31 October 1969.

http://homepages.cs.ncl.ac.uk/brian.randell/NATO/nato1969.PDF

Further tests



- every attestation chain is valid
- every attestation leaf certificate indicate hw-generated keys
- every attestation leaf certificate matches the unique Yubikey ID
- every SSH certificate is valid and unique
 - the public key within the certificate matches that of the Pubkey
 - the signature is can be verified using the Pubkey of the CA
 - the certificates differ in at least 1 bit, thus their signature differs as well, proving that the signature counter was incremented

every SSH certificate has an expiration date within a preconfigured limit



O The problem

Our solution

4 Final thoughts





- "Look ma, no secrets!"
- anyone can inspect the database and verify its integrity
- currently Python/Django
 - nothing specific to these stacks
 - could be implemented in anything else
 - we already have it in the stack and the libraries were nice
- many hate PGP...but we use nothing (OpenPGP serialization, GnuPG tools, keyservers, web-of-trust) that this hatred is focused on
- many hate certificates... but we use nothing (X.509 and thus ASN.1, sub-CAs) that this hatred is focused on





- web interface (Django makes this easy)
- self-service renewal
- handle first three PGP (self-)signatures





- source code and binaries under MIT: https://github.com/silentsignal/zsca
- core functionality WORKSFORME
- pull requests welcome
- we're hiring!

THANKS!

ANDRÁS VERES-SZENTKIRÁLYI

vsza@silentsignal.hu



facebook.com/silentsignal.hu



@SilentSignalHU



@dn3t

