International Journal of Research (IJR)
e-ISSN: 2348-6848, p- ISSN: 2348-795X Volume 2, Issue 10, October 2015
Available at http://internationaljournalofresearch.org

Hybrid Authentication Techniques as a Security Measure

Student: **Mithinti Hemanth** (13H61D5818)
Guide: **Mr. Thota Pandu Ranga**
(M.Tech) Associate Professor
(Anurag Group of Institutions)

Abstract—

Many security primitives are based on hard mathematical problems. Using hard AI problems for security is emerging as an exciting new paradigm, but has been underexplored. In this paper, we present a new security primitive based on hard AI problems, namely, a novel family of graphical password systems built on top of Captcha technology, which we call Captcha as graphical passwords (CaRP). CaRP is both a Captcha and a graphical password scheme. CaRP addresses a number of security problems altogether, such as online guessing attacks, relay attacks, and, if combined with dual-view technologies, shoulder-surfing attacks. Notably, a CaRP password can be found only probabilistically by automatic online guessing attacks even if the password is in the search set. CaRP also offers a novel approach to address the well-known image hotspot problem in popular graphical password systems, such as PassPoints, that often leads to weak password choices. CaRP is not a panacea, but it offers reasonable security and usability and appears to fit well with some practical applications for improving online security.

Index Terms— Graphical password; password; hotspots; CaRP; Captcha; dictionary attack; password guessing attack; security primitive

INTRODUCTION:

A Fundamental task in security is to create cryptographic primitives based on hard mathematical problems that are computationally intractable. For example, the problem of integer factorization is fundamental to the RSA public-key cryptosystem and the Rabin encryption. The discrete logarithm problem is fundamental to the ElGamal encryption, the DiffieHellman key exchange, the Digital Signature Algorithm, the elliptic curve cryptography and so on. Using hard AI (Artificial Intelligence) problems for security, initially proposed in [17], is an exciting new paradigm. Under this paradigm, the most notable primitive invented is Captcha, which distinguishes human users from computers by presenting a challenge, i.e., a puzzle, beyond the capability of computers but easy for humans. Captcha is now a standard Internet security technique to protect online email and other services from being abused by bots. However, this new paradigm has achieved just a limited success as compared with the cryptographic primitives based on hard math problems and their wide applications. Is it possible to create any new security primitive based on hard AI problems? This is a challenging and interesting open problem. In this paper, we introduce a new security primitive based on hard AI problems, namely, a novel family of graphical password systems integrating Captcha technology, which we call CaRP (Captcha as gRaphical Passwords). CaRP is click-based graphical passwords, where a sequence of clicks on an image is used to derive a password. Unlike other click-based graphical passwords, images used in CaRP are Captcha challenges, and a new CaRP image is generated for every login attempt. The notion of CaRP is simple but generic. CaRP can have multiple instantiations. In theory, any Captcha scheme relying on multiple-object classification can be converted to a CaRP scheme. We present exemplary CaRPs built on both text Captcha and image-recognition Captcha. One of them is a text CaRP wherein a password is a sequence of characters like a text password, but entered by clicking the right character sequence on CaRP images. CaRP offers protection against online dictionary attacks on passwords, which have been for long time a major security threat for various online services. This threat is widespread and considered as a top cyber security risk [13]. Defense against online dictionary attacks is a more subtle problem than it might appear. Intuitive countermeasures such as throttling logon attempts do not work well for two reasons: 1) It causes denial-of-service attacks (which were exploited to lock highest bidders out in final minutes of eBay auctions and incurs expensive helpdesk costs for account reactivation. 2) It is vulnerable to global password attacks whereby adversaries intend to break into any account rather than a specific one, and thus try each password candidate on multiple accounts and ensure that the number of trials on each account is below the threshold to avoid triggering account lockout. CaRP also offers protection against relay attacks, an increasing threat to bypass Captchas protection, wherein Captcha challenges are relayed to humans to solve. Koobface was a relay attack to bypass Facebook's Captcha in creating new accounts. CaRP is robust to shoulder-surfing attacks if combined with dual-view technologies.

CaRP requires solving a Captcha challenge in every login. This impact on usability can be mitigated by adapting the CaRP image's difficulty level based on the login history of the account and the machine used to log in.

Typical application scenarios for CaRP include:

1) CaRP can be applied on touch-screen devices whereon typing passwords is cumbersome, esp. for secure Internet applications such as e-banks. Many e-banking systems have applied Captchas in user logins [\ For example, ICBC (www.icbc.com.cn), the largest bank in the world, requires solving a Captcha challenge for every online login attempt.

2) CaRP increases spammer's operating cost and thus helps reduce spam emails. For an email service provider that deploys CaRP, a spam bot cannot log into an email account even if it knows the password. Instead, human involvement is compulsory to access an account. If CaRP is combined with a policy to throttle the number of emails sent to new recipients per login session, a spam bot can send only a limited number of emails before asking human assistance for login, leading to reduced outbound spam traffic.

A. Graphical Passwords:

A large number of graphical password schemes have been proposed. They can be classified into three categories according to the task involved in memorizing and entering passwords: recognition, recall, and cued recall. Each type will be briefly described here. More can be found in a recent review of graphical passwords. A recognition-based scheme requires identifying among decoys the visual objects belonging to a password portfolio. A typical scheme is wherein a user selects a portfolio of faces from a database in creating a password. During authentication, a panel of candidate faces is presented for the user to select the face belonging to her portfolio. This process is repeated several rounds, each round with a different panel. A successful login requires correct selection in each round. The set of images in a panel remains the same between logins, but their locations are permuted. Story is similar to Passfaces but the images in the portfolio are ordered, and a user must identify her portfolio images in the correct order. Déjà Vu is also similar but uses a large set of computergenerated "random-art" images. Cognitive Authentication requires a user to generate a path through a panel of images as follows: starting from the top-left image, moving down if the image is in her portfolio, or right otherwise. The user identifies among decoys the row or column label that the path ends.

B. Captcha

Captcha relies on the gap of capabilities between humans and bots in solving certain hard AI problems. There are two types of visual Captcha: text Captcha and Image-Recognition Captcha (IRC). The former relies on character recognition while the latter relies on

International Journal of Research (IJR)
e-ISSN: 2348-6848, p- ISSN: 2348-795X Volume 2, Issue 10, October 2015
Available at http://internationaljournalofresearch.org

recognition of non-character objects. Security of text Captchas has been extensively studied .The following principle has been established: text Captcha should rely on the difficulty of character segmentation, which is computationally expensive and combinatorially hard .Machine recognition of non-character objects is far less capable than character recognition. IRCs rely on the difficulty of object identification or classification, possibly combined with the difficulty of object segmentation. Asirra relies on binary object classification: a user is asked to identify all the cats from a panel of 12 images of cats and dogs. Security ofIRCs has also been studied. Asirra was found to be susceptible to machine-learning attacks . IRCs based on binary object classification or identification of one concrete type of objects are likely insecure . Multi-label classification problems are considered much harder than binary classification problems. Captcha can be circumvented through relay attacks whereby Captcha challenges are relayed to human solvers, whose answers are fed back to the targeted application.

C. Captcha in Authentication:

It was introduced in to use both Captcha and password in a user authentication protocol, which we call Captcha-based Password Authentication (CbPA) protocol, to counter online dictionary attacks. The CbPA-protocol in requires solving a Captcha challenge after inputting a valid pair of user ID and password unless a valid browser cookie is received. For an invalid pair of user ID and password, the user has a certain probability to solve a Captcha challenge before being denied access. An improved CbPA-protocol is proposed in by storing cookies only on user-trusted machines and applying a Captcha challenge only when the number of failed login attempts for the account has exceeded a threshold. It is further improved in [16] by applying a small threshold for failed login attempts from unknown machines but a large threshold for failed attempts from known machines with a previous successful login within a given time frame.

CAPTCHA AS GRAPHICAL PASSWORDS:

A. A New Way to Thwart Guessing Attacks :
   In a guessing attack, a password guess tested in an unsuccessful trial is determined wrong and excluded from subsequent trials. The number of undetermined password guesses decreases with more trials, leading to a better chance of finding the password.

B. CaRP:
   An Overview In CaRP, a new image is generated for every login attempt, even for the same user. CaRP uses an alphabet of visual objects (e.g., alphanumerical characters, similar animals) to generate a CaRP image, which is also a Captcha challenge. A major difference between CaRP images and Captcha images is that all the visual objects in the alphabet should appear in a CaRP image to allow a user to input any password but not necessarily in a Captcha image. Many Captcha schemes can be converted to CaRP schemes, as described in the next subsection.

C. Converting Captcha to CaRP:
   In principle, any visual Captcha scheme relying on recognizing two or more predefined types of objects can be converted to a CaRP. All text Captcha schemes and most IRCs meet this requirement. Those IRCs that rely on recognizing a single predefined type of objects can also be converted to CaRPs in general by adding more types of objects. In practice, conversion of a specific Captcha scheme to a CaRP scheme typically requires a case by case study, in order to ensure both security and usability. We will present in Sections IV and V several CaRPs built on top of text and image-recognition Captcha schemes.

Security of Underlying Captcha :

Computational intractability in recognizing objects in CaRP images is fundamental to CaRP. Existing analyses on Captcha security were mostly case by case or used an approximate process. No theoretic security model has been established yet. Object segmentation is considered as a computationallyexpensive, combinatorially-hard problem [30], which modern text Captcha schemes rely on.

Automatic Online Guessing Attacks :

In automatic online guessing attacks, the trial and error process is executed automatically whereas dictionaries can be constructed manually. If we ignore negligible probabilities, CaRP with underlying CPA-secure Captcha has the following properties: 1. Internal object-points on one CaRP image are computationally-independent of internal object-points on another CaRP image. Particularly, clickable points on one image are computationally-independent of clickable points on another image. holds, i.e., trials in guessing attacks are mutually independent.

Human Guessing Attacks:

In human guessing attacks, humans are used to enter passwords in the trial and error process. Humans are much slower than computers in mounting guessing attacks. For 8-character passwords.

Relay Attacks :

Relay attacks may be executed in several ways. Captcha challenges can be relayed to a high-volume Website hacked or controlled by adversaries to have human surfers solve the challenges in order to continue surfing the Website, or relayed to sweatshops where humans are hired to solve Captcha challenges for small payments.

Shoulder-Surfing Attacks :

Shoulder-surfing attacks are a threat when graphical passwords are entered in a public place such as bank ATM machines. CaRP is not robust to shoulder-surfing attacks by itself. However, combined with the following dual-view technology, CaRP can thwart shoulder-surfing attacks.

CONCLUSION :

We have proposed CaRP, a new security primitive relying on unsolved hard AI problems. CaRP is both a Captcha and a graphical password scheme. The notion of CaRP introduces a new family of graphical passwords, which adopts a new approach to counter online guessing attacks: a new CaRP image, which is also a Captcha challenge, is used for every login attempt to make trials of an online guessing attack computationally independent of each other. A password of CaRP can be found only probabilistically by automatic online guessing attacks including brute-force attacks, a desired security property that other graphical password schemes lack. Hotspots in CaRP images can no longer be exploited to mount automatic online guessing attacks, an inherent vulnerability in many graphical password systems. CaRP forces adversaries to resort to significantly less efficient and much more costly human-based attacks. In addition to offering protection from online guessing attacks, CaRP is also resistant to Captcha relay attacks, and, if combined with dual-view technologies, shoulder-surfing attacks. CaRP can also help reduce spam emails sent from a Web email service. Our usability study of two CaRP schemes we have implemented is encouraging. For example, more participants considered AnimalGrid and ClickText easier to use than PassPoints and a combination of text password and Captcha. Both AnimalGrid and ClickText had better password memorability than the conventional text passwords. On the other hand, the usability of CaRP can be further improved by using images of different levels of difficulty based on the login history of the user and the machine used to log in. The optimal tradeoff between security and usability remains an open question for CaRP, and further studies are needed to refine CaRP for actual deployments. Like Captcha, CaRP utilizes unsolved AI problems. However, a password is much more valuable to attackers than a free email account that Captcha is typically used to protect. Therefore there are more incentives for attackers to hack CaRP than Captcha. That is, more efforts will be attracted to the following win-win game by CaRP than ordinary Captcha: If attackers succeed, they contribute to improving AI by providing solutions to open problems such as segmenting 2D texts. Otherwise, our system stays secure, contributing to practical security. As a framework, CaRP does not rely on any specific Captcha scheme. When one Captcha scheme is broken, a new and more secure one may appear and be converted to a CaRP scheme.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. Biddle, S. Chiasson, and P. C. van Oorschot, "Graphical passwords: Learning from the first twelve years," ACM Comput. Surveys, vol. 44, no. 4, 2012.

[2] (2012, Feb.). The Science Behind Passfaces [Online]. Available: http://www.realuser.com/published/ScienceBehindPassfaces.pdf

[3] I. Jermyn, A. Mayer, F. Monrose, M. Reiter, and A. Rubin, "The design and analysis of graphical passwords," in Proc. 8th USENIX Security Symp., 1999, pp. 1–15.

[4] H. Tao and C. Adams, "Pass-Go: A proposal to improve the usability of graphical passwords," Int. J. Netw. Security, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 273–292, 2008.

[5] S. Wiedenbeck, J. Waters, J. C. Birget, A. Brodskiy, and N. Memon, "PassPoints: Design and longitudinal evaluation of a graphical password system," Int. J. HCI, vol. 63, pp. 102–127, Jul. 2005.

[6] P. C. van Oorschot and J. Thorpe, "On predictive models and userdrawn graphical passwords," ACM Trans. Inf. Syst. Security, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 1–33, 2008.

[7] K. Golofit, "Click passwords under investigation," in Proc. ESORICS, 2007, pp. 343–358.

[8] A. E. Dirik, N. Memon, and J.-C. Birget, "Modeling user choice in the passpoints graphical password scheme," in Proc. Symp. Usable Privacy Security, 2007, pp. 20–28.

[9] J. Thorpe and P. C. van Oorschot, "Human-seeded attacks and exploiting hot spots in graphical passwords," in Proc. USENIX Security, 2007, pp. 103–118.

[10] P. C. van Oorschot, A. Salehi-Abari, and J. Thorpe, "Purely automated attacks on passpoints-style graphical passwords," IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Security, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 393–405, Sep. 2010.

[11] P. C. van Oorschot and J. Thorpe, "Exploiting predictability in clickbased graphical passwords," J. Comput. Security, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 669–702, 2011.

[12] T. Wolverton. (2002, Mar. 26). Hackers Attack eBay Accounts [Online]. Available: http://www.zdnet.co.uk/news/networking/2002/03/26/hackers-attack-ebay-accounts-2107350/

[13] HP TippingPoint DVLabs, Vienna, Austria. (2010). Top Cyber Security Risks Report, SANS Institute and Qualys Research Labs [Online]. Available: http://dvlabs.tippingpoint.com/toprisks2010

[14] B. Pinkas and T. Sander, "Securing passwords against dictionary attacks," in Proc. ACM CCS, 2002, pp. 161–170.

[15] P. C. van Oorschot and S. Stubblebine, "On countering online dictionary attacks with login histories and humans-in-the-loop," ACM Trans. Inf. Syst. Security, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 235–258, 2006.